

## Tyler again

The top two finalists in the ASUO primary election for the Incidental Fee Committee (IFC), David Tyler and David Parr, will again face each other in the ASUO general election this week. In the primary race the *Emerald* endorsed Tyler. He still remains the more qualified candidate.

Our endorsement of Tyler is based on his perceptive analysis of several shortcomings in the way the IFC has operated this year. Tyler is upset and justly so, considering the IFC's decision to drop the appeals process for program budgets. Because of this decision, the only hope a program has of getting the IFC's budget recommendation for the program changed is for the ASUO Executive to veto the IFC's recommendation.

Tyler also takes exception to a change in the IFC's procedural rules. Under the new procedure the IFC chairer is allowed, at the chairer's discretion, to solicit a member's vote by telephone when the committee has less than a quorum. We feel, as does Tyler, that members who can't attend the meetings should not be allowed to vote.

Another procedural rule that he objects to is the method for removing a member from the committee. The criteria for removal is so vague that conceivably a member could be removed for petty, personal reasons.

Tyler is determined to insure that programs funded by the IFC develop their full potential. One reason that this potential is sometimes not fully realized is a lack of communications between the program and the student body. He would encourage programs to include line items for funds to open up lines of communication between the program and the students. He would also encourage the IFC to set aside enough money in its own budget to publicize the programs it funds.

When evaluating program budgets, Tyler would insist that the committee look at the program's past performance as well as its future plans and goals. He does not advocate, however, that the IFC tamper with the internal policy and operation of a program unless the program is grossly negligent in living up to the goals for which it was originally funded.

Tyler, an economics major in the Honors College, is aggressive, articulate and well-informed. His knowledge of the committee's past performance and his hopes for its future direction also speak well of his candidacy. His election to the IFC would add an assertive, program-oriented voice to the committee.

## Letters

### Story corrected

Concerning the *Emerald's* recent article about KASH, there are several mistakes that I feel should be corrected.

First, the article mentions that our all news and information format is not yet three weeks old. This is a trivial mistake, but it indicates to me that your reporter was not paying close attention when she interviewed me. KASH switched to the all news format last March 22, 1976.

The article mentions that we feature NBC news. This is not correct. KASH subscribes to the News and Information Service (NIS). NIS is a subsidiary of NBC. There is no duplication of programming, announcers or features on NIS and NBC news. They are separate, distinct services.

The article further implies that KASH will broadcast the Olympic Games. Of course NIS will feature extensive, in-depth coverage of the games, but this is not the same thing as carrying the games in their entirety.

I point out these mistakes because other media and broadcast outlets in our area may be carrying portions of the Olympic games and NBC news is carried by another local radio station. Since the article was based on an interview with me, I do not want other area broadcasters to think that I'm making false claims about our programming.

Finally, the article says that KASH expects a smaller share of the audience than competing sta-

tions. This is simply not true. I never made such a statement. Programmers at any commercial broadcast station always strive for the largest share of the listening audience. Your reporter must have been confused when I explained that, historically, all news stations tend to show up in the rating books with a "come" or cumulative audience, that is disproportionately large in comparison with their average share.

I do appreciate the *Emerald's* interest in our new format. All of us at KASH are very pleased with the response from the community thus far, and are proud to be able to bring complete and in-depth news and information to the area.

**John Etheredge**  
operations manager

*Editor's note: The Emerald appreciates these errors being brought to our attention. The "mistakes" Mr. Etheredge refers to crept into the story somewhere between the original copy which did not contain these errors and the rewritten version which went to the printer.*

### Last minute help

As coordinators for the 1976 Mock Democratic Convention we have been working throughout the school year in an attempt to organize a realistic simulation of a national convention. It has proven to be quite a task, and some aspects of the national convention

## Controlling tuition levels

Year after year students in higher education are hit with tuition increases. This, combined with the problem of insufficient financial aid, threatens to deprive persons of access to higher education. It is the mission of a responsible, well-run, student association to work to alleviate these problems.

We as students have good reason to be unhappy with the way tuition has been rising. Even in inflationary times the spiraling cost of tuition stands out, rising 210 per cent in the last ten years.

In the past, the Department of Higher Education has proposed budgets to the Legislature — budgets including increased costs due to rising salaries, increased staff, and general inflation. In an effort to placate students and enlist their support for the budget at the Legislature, the State Board of Higher Education has always promised no tuition increase. Students have naturally gone along with the board in presenting a united front to the Legislature on behalf of the proposed budget. The problem is, however, that this tactic has never worked. Historically, resident undergraduate tuition has been set at a level to be a certain proportion of the total cost of instruction — roughly 25 per cent. This philosophy, in conjunction with pressure for state funding of other worthy programs, has meant approval, in substantial part, of the budget, an important exception being that the state share has been reduced with the student burden increased.

In April, the State Board's Committee on Finance half-heartedly decided to once again come up with an increased budget which provided for no increase in tuition, with increased expenses to be covered by state funds. Once again, it looks as though students may fall into the trap of aligning themselves too closely with higher education officials with regard to tuition and the State System budget.

The time has come for students to take a new approach. As consumers we should play an active role in seeking the best possible education for the lowest possible cost. To achieve this, we must eliminate unwarranted costs from the higher education budget and work for a lowering of the percentage paid by students.

To eliminate unwarranted costs, we will have to scrutinize the budget and ask tough questions. Is it wise to offer degree-granting programs in some fields at more than one campus, or can we save money by eliminating costly duplication? For the next academic year, faculty members will be given an average of a 10 per cent increase in salary, coming on the heels of an increase in excess of 13 per cent for the present year. Can we justify giving such extensive increases to faculty members who are already getting more than

\$20,000 per year while teaching no more than two classes, with the cost-of-living rising less than 6 per cent annually? Couldn't students get a better education at less cost if we put more emphasis on instruction over research? Is it justified for the State System to continue its expensive construction program at a time of stable enrollment and short supply of money?

By working to lower the percentage of the budget covered by tuition, students can for once be a truly effective party in the establishment of future tuition levels. It can be expected that legislators will be receptive to student concerns about getting the most out of their tuition dollars. Any costs must be justifiable in terms of the education which will accrue to students.

We as students can make our case most effectively by responsibly arguing for both cutting unnecessary costs and altering the tuition proportion of the budget. In addition, we ought to explore ways of establishing tuition rates independently of the total cost of instruction. For example, we may find it productive to argue that faculty salary increases be separated from the budget. This would have the benefit of not pitting students against faculty in the fight for scarce dollars.

Much of what we have said about the higher education budget has been in terms of looking to ways of minimizing costs. Students should also be in the position of working to fund programs which are in the student interest. This weighing by students of where the money should go — using judgment independent of board officials — is entirely new and represents the realization that we constitute a separate and distinct interest and must arrive at positions based on our own analysis. For too long students have found themselves in the position of aligning themselves completely either with faculty members or administrators when it comes to the higher education budget. Now is the time for independent action as a separate and distinct third party.

By carefully studying the facts of the student financial issues of keeping tuition down and ensuring adequate funding of financial aids, and then working aggressively to achieve these ends in the Legislature, the ASUO as the advocate for student concerns will be able to protect all students. Complete and successful action on behalf of students requires an experienced and knowledgeable, competent and committed, hard working and independently active ASUO Executive.

**Jim Davis**  
candidate, ASUO pres.

**Mark Cogan**  
ASUO admin. assistant

we found impossible to simulate. In some of our endeavors we have been successful, and in others, we have not. However, we are receiving some last minute assistance in our efforts. The Revolutionary Student Brigade is planning to form a picket line and stage a rally on Friday night at Mac Court, the site of our convention. We are very pleased to learn of this, and since it makes our convention a more realistic simulation we encourage attendance. However, we deeply regret that those students outside Mac Court will not be able to receive any credits for their efforts, as those inside Mac Court are receiving.

**Penny Roberts**  
pol. sci., sr.  
and five co-signers

### Back into it

I am quite concerned about the level to which the ASUO presidential contest has dropped. I am the first to admit that Davis has made mistakes and enemies this year, but none of the letters blasting him gave facts or real incidents except for one campaign violation that even the Elections Court admitted was petty.

I think back nostalgically to the Liberty administration whose slogan was "out of the sandbox." This campaign has dragged the ASUO back into it. The integrity and credibility of either candidate

is in jeopardy for next year as a result of divisive and irresponsible political slurs.

Serious issues face the students next year, but debate has centered only on personality and image. Davis has been painted as a "more of the same" candidate as if that were bad, even though this year's executive has been rated first in the nation by the National Student Association due to innovation and probing into new areas of student interest and power.

I have no personal allegiance with any Executive staff member but I do support their issues. Davis has made his stand clear; Oliver has not been as clear. I urge public debates between the candidates so the serious issues can be raised, and I urge voters to base their choices on the issues, not on rhetoric or image.

**Dan Garner**  
pol. sci., sr.  
ASUO admin. assistant

### I urge

As a stop-Carter movement seems to be gathering momentum, I caution all Mock D-N-C voters to use the practical approach when balloting for president. The anybody-but-Carter approach is impractical as would a Humphrey draft be. In reality, Humphrey's health and illegal contributions would be liabilities in the November election.

I personally favor Morris Udall, but would be willing to support him for V.P. should Carter garner enough votes to take the nomination on the first or second ballots. What our party needs is a candidate who has won the nomination through the primary system and state conventions. This would avoid the bitterness which results from a brokered convention in the infamous smoke-filled room. We need not repeat 1968 nor 1972.

Last Friday, Washington and Lee in Lexington, Virginia held a Mock D-N-C. The school, with a nine-out-of-ten record for picking the actual presidential nominee, gained national attention by nominating Jimmy Carter on the second ballot.

In short, I urge a practical approach in our Mock D-N-C towards unity of the party. This could take the form of uncommitted delegates supporting the Democratic frontrunner, of those committed to favorite sons or long-shots similarly changing their votes for the second ballot or of those committed to the second-place candidate compromising for a V.P. slot on the ticket. In any case, the nomination must occur no later than the second ballot if we are to bring it out of the smoke-filled room and into the hands of the American people.

**Barry Hood**  
Chairperson, New Jersey  
UO 1976 Mock Democratic  
Convention