

All input important

As a story on page one of today's issue underlines, students are given minimal, if any, opportunity to participate in promotion and tenure decisions at the University. Recent state board decisions trying to insure even the slightest student input have raised complaints from the Faculty Personnel Committee. The committee's complaints are out of line.

Students are not asking that they be allowed to choose which faculty members are promoted and which ones aren't; they simply want to take part in that decision. Opponents of student participation complain that students lack sufficient knowledge to judge the overall performance of their instructors. Maybe, but students are in an excellent position to judge the classroom performance of their department's staff, and they should be given a chance to put those judgments on record.

University Pres. William Boyd claims the purpose of this university is a dual one of instruction and research. If this is indeed the case, and it seems like a good goal to strive toward, a professor's classroom capability should be an important part of tenure decisions. Students could play an important role in assessing that capability, and should be given a chance as voting members of department and school level personnel committees.

Recall should be denied

Today, the future of four members of the Eugene School Board rest in the hands of that district's voters. The four's biggest problem may be getting their supporters to the polls.

Those in favor of the recall measure, prompted by the shuffling of district administrators, are highly motivated by their feelings of resentment against the board. Those on the other side of the issue may lack that motivation but there are other factors to consider.

Eugene's school district is a progressive system that provides opportunity for experiments. To maintain this atmosphere often requires bold measures like the transfer of administrators to keep programs from going stale. The cries of people who would have our education systems staunch and inflexible should not inhibit such moves. The school board should be supported.

Members of the University community should not observe the school board issue as spectators. Those of us with children in Eugene schools, as well as those of us who benefit from the learning and research opportunities provided by the innovative system, have a great stake in the matter. On the way home from school today, take the time to vote.

Letters

It will be noticed

In the Aug. 3 issue of the *Emerald* Prof. Goldstein expresses his doubts about Ballot Measure 9. He wonders if it is helpful for Oregonians "to impose a ban on nuclear power". Other states and nations are building nuclear plants, so risk-wise Oregonians are helpless.

First of all, the ballot measure calls for stricter safeguards and not for a ban. Secondly, I do not agree with his main argument that we might as well do what everybody else is doing. America has for decades been ahead of the

rest of the world in industrial development. Call it progress, if you like. Other nations followed suit and in the process have repeated our mistakes. They will also follow us when we start correcting our mistakes.

If America starts backing away from nuclear power, other nations will probably do likewise. To give another example, we have built too many freeways and we have now reached the point where we react against them. This, too, will happen elsewhere.

Please read "Sweden backs off on nuclear power", *Christian Science Monitor*, Dec. 31, 1975.



'MYSELF, I FIND ALL DIS TALK HIGHLY DEMORALIZING TO MY AGENT SELF-IMAGE!'

There is already a movement against more freeways in the Netherlands.

In the United States, Oregon has provided leadership with the Bottle Bill. Other states are watching us. Why not show initiative with nuclear safeguards? It certainly does not go unnoticed elsewhere.

Huibert Paul
Library

Funding off-base

Just a quick reaction from a ASUO Program point of view regarding the funding of Women's Athletics in the \$80,000 bracket: I don't like it. Not for any reasons that would be considered sexist or anti-feminist; hardly, some of my best friends are very feminine.

Rather, I'm looking at it from a position of financial inequity. Meaning, the WIA, which serves roughly 210 women students per year, gets an average of nearly \$400 per program participant; SEARCH, another Incidental Fee supported ASUO Program, serves 5,000 students per year and runs on a budget of \$9,000. Can you rectify an inequity which allows one program to allow participants services totalling approximately \$1.80 while another is able to allow nearly \$400 per student?

Here it would be awfully easy to mention that SEARCH doesn't discriminate between men and women, between athletically proficient or physically uncoordinated; however, I feel this is not the key point of my issue. I simply hope to make you more aware of the anti-WIA feelings that have started to manifest since the State

Board overruled the IFC recommendation regarding WIA funding. I may further add that this new level of funding will affect the rest of student services and programs for many years to come; under State and University laws, the ability to reduce program funding is extremely harsh and nearly unrealistic. What we're talking about here is a tying up of student monies for many years to come, not simply an increase of \$1.25 for this term. What this likewise means is that all the existing programs on campus which serve various student needs will have to compete for a constantly decreasing amount of money since such a large portion is set aside for two athletic issues. Men's Athletics receives \$136,000 of student Incidental Fees, but that is an issue for another time.

Michael Connelly
SEARCH

Three questions are salient:

1) Why don't I run myself? I'm too young. Besides, we need contributions from the citizens of twenty states, and the head of a University with a lot of rich out-of-state students can best attract the donations.

2) What happens to the other 25 per cent? Some of it will establish a lobbying organization to lobby against increases in incidental and health fees. The rest will finance a Bicentennial exchange program with Poland. Kosciuszko, we are here.

3) Isn't this naughty? Yes! it was naughty to throw tea into the harbor. It was naughty to keep choosing lettuce when the ASUO and *Emerald* told us we couldn't. It was naughty to bug Larry O'Brian's phone. It was naughty to take the inmates on a fishing trip. Live a little.

Mike Sylwester
Russian

Run for the money

Consider the following facts—they are salient!

1) It would be a good thing if William Boyd were President of the United States.

2) It is a sad commentary on the American spirit of enterprise that the government is paying people to run for President and only six people are doing so.

3) We've been carrying the rich for 200 years. Let's make some money and ride like they do.

Therefore: I nominate William Boyd for President of the United States. He is for the U of O, and so am I. Let's return to the Golden Mean. We can abolish the Federal Reserve Board, redistribute the nation's wealth, legalize victimless crimes, overthrow the Cambodian government, lower the retirement age, and establish a negative income tax.

When WB accepts my nomination, I will send him a \$100 contribution, and I advise you to do the same. In return, he will appoint you and me official campaign managers and send us each out \$175 pay check. Your wage is 75 per cent more than your contribution. If you give \$40, you will get \$70. If you give \$800, you get \$1,400. As official campaign manager, your official duties will be to "check out the grass roots" and to try to convince your friends to vote for WB (Wild Bill).

This is not a pyramid club. It's perfectly legal, and it's financed by federal matching funds for Presidential candidates. Let the other candidates spend their money on expensive television advertising and on gaudy billboards and bumper stickers. We will pay the people to campaign for us.

Thanks for the help

I should like to publically acclaim the following:

My thanks to the faculty and staff of the College of Education, especially to Dr. Edna De Haven for seeing me through these last two particularly chaotic years.

My regards to both the Financial Aids and Accounting Office for helping me through all of the red tape and miscellaneous necessities.

My gratitude to the staff of Taylor's Tavern for putting up with me both fall and winter terms.

And my extreme admiration for both the faculty and research of the Special Education Department.

(But I'm still not sure if it was worth the phenomenal price and the insults to my humanity.)

Marcie Halperin
College of Education

Letters policy

The *Emerald* will accept and try to print all letters containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community.

Because of space limitations, letters must be no more than 200 words, typed, triple-spaced, dated and signed with the person's major. No unsigned letter will be published.

