

Defend contract rights

Following the April 27 and 28 elections, GTFs will face the important task of negotiating a contract. A grievance procedure is one of the most important items in a union contract. Currently, the grievance procedure offered by the University allows GTFs to pursue grievances through an appeals process that ends with the President of the University.

The Graduate Teaching Fellows Federation feels that this grievance procedure is inadequate for the following reasons:

1. A grievance procedure should allow the grievant to have his or her case heard before an impartial third party.
2. The President of the University is the direct employer of GTFs. Although an individual grievance may not be directed against President Boyd, he is ultimately the representative of University management, and can hardly be considered a third party, whether he is impartial or not.
3. The grievance procedure as it stands now is analogous to a situation in private industry in which a grievant must take his or her case before the President of the company to have a labor-management dispute settled. Certainly no union would subjugate itself to such a procedure.

The GTF Federation proposes a new grievance procedure that would attempt to resolve problems at the University level, but would allow the grievance to be carried into binding arbitration if the union and the grievant decide the issue is not satisfactorily resolved at the lower levels. The GTFFF proposes a five-step grievance procedure with time limit specifications at each level to insure that the grievance is processed as quickly and fairly as possible. The five steps are outlined below:

Step One: An informal meeting at the department level between the GTF and the immediate supervisor. The grievant may have his/her departmental union representative present at this meeting if desired. Hopefully, most problems will be settled at this informal level.

Step Two: A formal written grievance is prepared by the grievant and the departmental union representative and submitted to the department head.

Step Three: A meeting is held at the Graduate School level with the grievant and the union.

Step Four: If the grievance is not resolved at the above level, the grievant and the union may take the grievance before a representative of the President of the University.

Step Five: If the grievance is considered important enough by the grievant and the union, the union may take the case before an arbitrator. The arbitrator, chosen by the union and the University, holds a formal hearing at which the union and the University present their cases. The final decision of the arbitrator is final and binding on the union and the University.

The purpose behind step five seems obvious. Having the opportunity to work out our disagreements at the departmental level is essential; equally important, however, is being able to take our grievances outside the University structure where we can be more certain of an impartial hearing.

The important thing that an arbitrator does is listen to the facts presented, and then decide if the negotiated contract has been violated. This points out the crucial importance of negotiating a good contract at the outset. If we have a good grievance procedure and sound contract items to begin with, we have a better chance of defending our rights during the life of our contract. As we have pointed out in our leaflets, your input on this and other contract issues and your support during negotiations will help insure a strong contract. Vote on April 27 and 28.

Cal Harris
Carolyn Howe
GTF Local 3544

Luau blighted

I attended the nine o'clock showing of the Hawaiian Luau Saturday night, and I am sorry to say that a very well-rehearsed and entertaining performance was blighted by the crudeness of the emcee. I thought his extremely personal remarks to the winners of the door prizes were both embarrassing and uncalled for, and certainly must have taken away from the pleasure of receiving the gifts.

An unnecessarily lengthy (if necessary at all) series of comments on "farts" was accompanied by spotlighting and embarrassing questions to specific members of the audience. I thought this was in very poor taste and totally inappropriate for the occasion.

I was sorry to note that this person also holds the position of Hawaii Club Vice President. It would be sad indeed for the traditionally high reputation of the politeness of the Hawaiian people to be damaged by the thoughtless behavior of one person on the night our attention was focused on them.

If I attend the Luau next year, it will only be after ascertaining that this person will not be the presiding emcee. One can only hope that he will not be considered as representative of Hawaiian culture.

Mary Anne Gawl
Graduate Student-
Romance Languages

Demand a hearing

What are the facts? The people want a hearing. The students demand a hearing. This is a people's country. Who is taking over the peoples right? This is a university for education, not an institution to be dealt with behind closed doors. What are the facts? We demand a public hearing on the proposed tuition hikes and education cut-backs. A statement by the University outlining the proposed 77-78-79 University tuition costs, in fairness to the students, should be given to the Daily Emerald and printed on the front page today.

Pete Fena
Sophomore-Business
Thursday, April 21, 1977



STUDY OF BABY WITH HAND GRENADE

Letters

Deserves thanks

I read with surprise recent letters on this page criticizing Representative David Frohnmayer's position on HB 2702 (public release of certain portions of faculty evaluation results). Rep. Frohnmayer said on the House floor that the arguments in favor of the bill advanced by Rep. Mary Burrows convinced him to support the bill and vote "yes" which he did. I might also point out that on a motion to refer to committee (which would have killed the bill) Rep. Frohnmayer voted "no." In both instances Rep. Frohnmayer supported the Oregon Student Lobby (OSL) position in the face of criticism from his colleagues on the University faculty.

Rep. Frohnmayer is also working with us to keep tuition down, gain increased appropriations for financial aid, and funding for child care.

Simply put, Rep. Frohnmayer does not deserve the criticism he has received in recent letters to the editor. To the contrary, I wish to thank Dave for the help he has and is providing us on our student legislative program.

Kirby Garrett
OSL Executive Coordinator

Lawyers respected

In his story about me, Nick Gallo attributed to me a statement and a viewpoint that needs correction. The fact is that I have a great deal of respect for a good many people who are presently practicing law in Lane County. As I expressly stated, the legal profession is no better or worse than any other profession, and lawyers are no better or worse than any other set of people. Any article with an undertone which aims to moralize and present any group of people, be they paupers or professionals, as scapegoats for today's deeply seated ills does not accurately convey my sentiments.

There is one particular gross misrepresentation of my views which calls for specific correction. When Nick asked me how I thought the legal profession would take my remarks, I took a poke at myself and joked that I probably didn't have too much good will to lose before going on to give the more serious response that appeared earlier in the article. Unfortunately my joke was misquoted and was presented as a serious remark. In fact I have experienced no ill will or hostility from members of the legal community, and I am most grateful for the help that many experienced lawyers have been willing to give me.

Page 4 Section A

I realize that a certain amount of inaccuracy, misquotation and nuance change are among the hazards of being interviewed, however, when other persons are undeservedly presented in a disfavorable light through remarks that are attributed to me, I feel an obligation to set the record straight.

Mike Goldstein
1020 River Road, #3
Eugene, Or.

The reporter asks that the next time Mike makes "jokes" about people hating him to please nudge the interviewer in the ribs.--ed.

Students let down

President Boyd's recommendation that the University's School of Librarianship be closed by the summer of 1978 stunned my wife and me. I'm an English teacher/school librarian in a small town in Eastern Oregon near John Day. My long distance calls to the Library School Dean Totten confirmed what I had by chance read in the Oregonian that day. Three days later I found out that my wife, who works as news editor/office manager for the county newspaper, is pregnant and will deliver around November.

Last summer I earned 14 hours toward my MLS. I planned to go this summer and then finish off the requirements during the summer and fall of 1978. If the school closes at the end of the summer of 1978, however, our plans will have to be scrapped. We need that extra year in order to save money. President Boyd's recommendation, if carried out, will mean that I'll have to go to leave my pregnant wife with her folks in La Grande and go to Eugene and stay there from June, 1977, to March, 1978. That's 10 months. I'll be able to see her and my child between each 11-week term and perhaps once a month during those terms.

President Boyd gave as a reason for wanting to shut down the School the fact that there are many "unemployed and underemployed professional librarians." That's true, but if that's a reason for shutting down this ALA-accredited school, then half the University should be closed.

"Boyd had no comment when asked if his recommendation was related to the quality of the school." A "no comment" usually means "yes." I have a MS Ed with my norm in school librarianship from PSU. I took every library course they offered. In addition I

have three years of successful school library experience; a year working in the New Title Department of Richard Abel & Co., the largest college library book distributor in the world; and a summer as a vacation replacement for the librarian at the Oregon Graduate Center. I say the school is fine. I had to work hard, the students were intelligent and competitive, and I learned a great deal.

Ironically, I could have made it by the summer of 1978 if PSU had allowed me to transfer just a few of my 30 hours in librarianship to the UO (my remaining 24 hours were in education and English).

So, here I am with a pregnant wife who I'll have to leave for 10 months. By March nearly all our savings will be gone. The Universities refused to allow any transfers that would have allowed me to work and to be with my wife and baby. Now the University wants to shut the School itself down.

We didn't let the University down, the University let us down.

Ray Dinsmore
P.O. Box 341
Mt. Vernon, Or.

Vote for the union

On April 27 and 28 GTFs on campus will have the chance to make a crucial decision in favor of democracy. By voting for the union we can insure ourselves an equal voice in determining with the University our conditions of employment. Through collective bargaining, our representatives of the Union meet with the University to work out, collectively, a written contract spelling out such things as wages, working conditions, and benefits. While some GTFs may feel that their working conditions are just fine at present, we owe it to ourselves, to other GTFs and to future GTFs to create the union structure whereby we can all benefit from fair and just treatment by our departments and the University.

Some GTFs fear that if the union is voted in it will become a great dictator and forbid friendly relationships with faculty and department heads and that it will create strict and rigid rules that will make working here intolerable. As a union member I want to dispell these fears. The union is not going to negotiate anything that we don't want it to. No one from Washington, Portland, or Madison is going to tell us what we want. We alone will determine what our contract will cover based on our needs and interests.

Carolyn Howe
Interdisciplinary Studies