

# SUAB looks into governance changes

In 1974, The University Charter was formally amended to allow student representation in the University Senate, creating the 18-member body of the Student University Affairs Board. The 18 members serve together with 36 faculty members in the University Senate and all faculty in the General Assembly.

Through the past eight years, the student members of the SUAB have worked with the faculty and administration on matters that affect students and the quality of education at this institution. During this time, the SUAB has made a great effort in representing the students' interests through surveys, meetings, and lobbying. We work to express the views of our constituents in our respective departments and vote according to our department preferences. Well over 90 percent of the time has been in line with the faculty sentiment. Furthermore, since the SUAB represents the very diversified views of the students in different departments, the board does not vote in a block. The only time the SUAB has voted in unison is on some SUAB sponsored legislation, including the denoting of Honors on diplomas and the Dead Week/Finals test restrictions. In any case, the SUAB cannot change the outcome of voting independent of faculty sentiment since it comprises only one-third of the Senate and far less in the General Assembly.

## comments michael prothe

Proposed rule changes on University Governance may change the structure completely. We applaud the intent and direction of these changes. They are long overdue. But the arguments for reducing student membership in the Senate from 18 to 8 are vague and misdirected.

One goal is to reduce the Senate membership from 54 to around 40, providing a less cumbersome size and allow-

ing for more in depth discussion on major issues. We agree. Attendance in the Senate has been somewhat disappointing. Although student attendance averages between 85 and 95 percent, faculty attendance ranges between 60 and 75 percent. In fact, many faculty members have pointed out that this is due in part to the burden placed on the departments and schools in their effort to fill all 36 seats (18 each year). It is difficult to select faculty who are both free on Wednesday afternoons and are willing to devote the time and energy in the Senate. We question whether the disproportional reduction of four faculty and 10 students will lend towards a Senate with better attendance.

The members of SUAB realize the responsibilities of working with members of the faculty and administration, and have won praise for their objectivity and responsibility in dealing with many difficult and important issues. We work hard, typically in a low profile approach. The SUAB specifically avoids "headline grabbing" or taking the lead on "radical" and "ill-advised" legislation. The SUAB debates major issues before meeting in the Senate to be better prepared.

To reduce the SUAB to eight members will severely hamper its effectiveness as a representative body. Currently, the SUAB is apportioned across the schools and departments with each member representing about 900 students. If the SUAB were reduced to eight, we would be representing nearly 2,000 students each. Our representative system would become awkward with an unrepresentative combination of departments and schools. It would also limit our ability to research and study legislation on behalf of the Senate, handle student grievances, and carry out other duties currently overseen by the SUAB.

The SUAB is not after greater power. At issue is a continued effective representation for both faculty and students. As representatives, we work together for the betterment of education. Our obligation is to not only consider the impact of legislation on the current student body,

but also for the students in the coming years, especially when issues like semester conversion arise. The decisions we make together contribute to the life and future growth of this institution. We cannot be separated in the classroom and should not be divided in the decisions that affect those classes. We rely on each other.

The University has been unique in its governance process. The use of a "town hall" format of discussion and advising to the administration will remain with the Assembly. It is a system of cooperation. Any issue in the Senate may still be determined in the General Assembly under the proposed changes. This is an effective method for faculty, students, and the administration, and must be maintained.

We ask only to continue building upon the qualities of this University. An adequate proportion of students and faculty on the Senate will help further the positive goals and ideals of the University. Unfortunately, the SUAB was excluded from the task force on governance since it began formulating the proposed governance rules last fall. We urge you, however, to support our compromise amendments for a student membership of 14 and faculty membership of 28. We offer this for the numerous reasons previously stated. We also believe that the reduction in size of the Senate and continued ratios of two-thirds faculty to one-third students will lend towards effective attendance and representation. Furthermore, when the Senate was revised in 1951, it consisted of 28 faculty members with at least one guaranteed representative from each Professional school and the College of Arts and Sciences. (A clause not provided for in the new governance document). An adequate cross representation of all schools and departments should continue.

The meeting on Wednesday, Nov. 9 at 3:30 p.m. in 150 Geology will be important for faculty and students alike. We urge all faculty to attend and vote, and concerned students should attend as well.

Michael Prothe is chair of SUAB.

## letters

### Meditation

In deep sorrow for the death of our soldiers in Lebanon, in profound concern for the spirit of our people, and in prayer for healing so many broken hearts, the staff of the Campus Interfaith Ministry offers this meditation:

The young soldiers do not speak. Nevertheless, they are heard in the still houses; who has not heard them? They have a silence that speaks for them at night and when the clock counts. They say: We are young. We have died. Remember us. They say: We have done what we could but until it is finished it is not done. They say: We have given our lives but until it is finished no one can know what our lives gave. They say: Our deaths are not ours; they are yours. They will mean what you make them. They say: Whether our lives and our deaths are for peace and a new hope or for nothing we cannot say; it is you who must say this. They say: We leave you our deaths. Give them their meaning. We were young, they say. We have died. Remember us.

Myron Kinberg

### Embarrassed

Considering John Healy's article, "Autzen Observations," published on Oct. 26, I have to admit that much of what he said is true. However, he didn't have all the facts straight.

First of all, what the band was feeling on Saturday was not awe, but embarrassment because of the Oregon crowd. The Washington crowd's response to the Washington band was incredibly good, whereas our own loving fans threw things at us when we tried to get some spirit going in the stands. We Oregon band members spend two and a half hours a day for three days a week, plus weekends, to work up a show and stand music, and the only thanks we get is empty Coke cups thrown at our backs.

Second, Healy, you were close in our annual budget, but you estimated high. We actually get \$7,900, making us the lowest-funded band in the Pac-10. The next lowest-funded band has an annual budget of over \$38,000, and the top band gets more than Oregon Daily Emerald

\$100,000. We are a much smaller band than Washington's, and when any band is seated at the top of the stadium, nobody hears it but the fans on the other side.

Third, the cheerleaders were doing their damndest, but it's hard to get a crowd cheering and doing cheers when the crowd doesn't care.

I'm glad you wrote this article, but next time you write an article on the band or the cheerleaders, try to get the other side's viewpoint.

Tim Vian  
junior, music education

### Mucho macho?

Steve Turcotte's column, "Just Thinking," in Tuesday's Emerald should be retitled "Not Thinking."

In my opinion, the new IM football program rules are a well designed and prudent attempt to interject a degree of control over certain mindless behavior on the part of some participants. The rules are an effort to require more skill in play rather than a reliance on brute force alone. These rules were not introduced without cause. Myself and other injury care specialists have been most distressed with the injury rate presented in this "limited contact sport." In the past, many such contests have degenerated into a means to vent hostility, aggression, and violent acts reminiscent of those staged in the Roman Colosseum in the 1st century A.D.

Full contact football is not to be played without the use of extensive protective equipment such as that used by professionals and intercollegiate teams. Even with such equipment, serious injuries sometimes occur. Anyone who cannot appreciate the danger of unrestricted contact flag football has, in my opinion, already suffered possible brain damage. If Turcotte and his disgruntled friends believe that the new IM rules make the game "too wimpy," perhaps they should indeed form their own league that could promote greater contact. We could then see once again the macho forearm fracture, the very macho ruptured kidney, and of course the beyond macho fracture of the cervical spine. What lasting memories they could provide.

Some would say that the



violence exhibited in sports is simply a microcosmic model of the violence in society. Society attempts to protect itself from unrestricted violence through the enactment of laws. IM organizers are attempting to protect participants through the enactment of rules; even those who do not wish such protection will receive it. If Turcotte and others find such rules intolerable, they should find a sport and circumstance where brute force may be legally substituted for skill.

Rick Troxel  
clinical instructor, athletic training

### Policemen

Pres. Ronald Reagan shouldn't have invaded Grenada. His own arguments for entry were not strong enough to justify overt military action.

First, the United States infiltrated Grenada with the aim of protecting its citizens. It has been demonstrated that they were in little danger, if any. Americans were allowed to leave Grenada freely; in effect, our invasion put the Americans in much more danger potentially.

Secondly, although the U.S. invaded Grenada at the pleas and demands of the surrounding countries and to "restore democracy," it is important that the U.S. not become combative policemen of the world.

Thirdly, I don't condone the vicious killing of Grenada's former leader, yet the U.S. shouldn't be sticking its nose into the internal affairs of other countries, especially when the action is based on "what if" presumptions rather than fact.

The future rebuttal in the United Nations from both Grenada and U.S. allied countries will be vigorous. Cuban public opinion of the U.S. will become increasingly anti-American after their "construction workers" heroics. It remains to be seen how countries such as Russia will use this to their benefit through propaganda.

Brad Simpson

### Updated list

How does it strike your conscience to be a citizen of a country which economically and militarily supports fascist regimes which currently or in the near past have tortured and murdered tens of thousands of men, women and children?

Let's get an updated list. El Salvador, Guatemala, Chile, Nicaragua under Somoza, and what do you know, the Pol Pot Regime of Cambodia. I'd better update that last death count to millions. It's probably a good idea we supported the Khmer Rouge freedom fighters though — they said they were against our old and

evil enemies, the Vietnamese. That's what really counts. These trophies of progressive government should be remembered for years to come by all the oppressed peoples of the world. Let's all join hands with Henry Kissinger and bring a democratic dictatorship back to those Nicaraguans who have strayed from our loving arms.

Our administration has truly revealed its belligerent and violent sense of world diplomacy. What amazes me is their sometimes incredibly shrewd methods of achieving certain ends. (Did I forget to give any credit to the CIA?) The KAL flight 007 leaves some interesting oddities on which to ponder. Let's take a good positive look at the outcome. We got defense contracts for the B-1 bomber, the Pershing, cruise, and MX missiles, nerve gas, the Stealth bomber, and a stronger position for the deployment of missiles in Europe.

What does all this mean? It means this country's reputation as well as security is going straight to hell because of its current leaders' military fanaticism, corporate greed, and support of Third World fascism. Unless our foreign policy is based on some sense of realism and true good will, in spite of "God being on our side," like the Titanic, we'll suffer the consequences.

Gerry Rempel