

Oregon beats
'the Beavs'
AND
Fresno State
See page 7

oregon daily emerald

Monday, April 30, 1984

Eugene, Oregon

Volume 85, Number 144

Board solicits advice on new budget model

By David Stone
Of the Emerald

Responding to the concerns of University Pres. Paul Olum, the State Board of Higher Education decided Friday to seek outside advice on the accuracy of a new budget model.

In addition, the board was informed that the state will fight a lawsuit by two Oregon legislators aimed at forcing Attorney General Dave Frohnmayer to reveal the cost of defending a \$32 million sex discrimination lawsuit.

The Budget Allocation System Model, which would be in effect for the 1985-87 biennium, is the new method for measuring the relative funding level for state colleges and universities. It uses factors such as student credit hours, faculty productivity and salaries, and number of degree programs to construct each "building block" of the model.

According to Olum, the model was designed to allocate funds and prove statistically to the legislature that the state system is underfunded.

Only one member of the board, James Petersen of La Grande, objected to the delay. Seeking the advice of a third party was "a cave-in to a special interest group — the University of Oregon," Petersen said.

Petersen's remarks were aimed at Olum, who questioned the accuracy of the model in determining the efficiency of the schools' budgets.

Olum said the model was too unwieldy to be accurate.

"The model is so large, so complex, so unusable — it's absolutely impossible to tell by looking at whether it's right or wrong," Olum said. "I object in general that it's possible to know what's happening."

However, Olum said he agreed with the model's concept, which he said is needed to show statistically that Oregon's higher education schools are funded at least 25 percent below the level of comparable schools in other states.

Though he said he would be willing to prepare a detailed criticism, Olum said he prefers to bring in an outside consultant to judge the model's fairness.

"I really feel that if we don't do our utmost to take care of the most obvious areas of disagreement now, it will be very easy for the folklore to spread," board member John Alltucker said in support of the study. "Its credibility will be damaged because of that."

In response to one complaint that the delay was an "eleventh hour" tactic, Olum said he had objected to the proposal from the start.

"I don't believe it's going to be possible to ever get a satisfactory model that meets quality considerations (and) strategic planning considerations," Olum said.

Though the current model isn't "amenable" to repair, a simpler model open to change might work, he said.

The simple model, Olum said, should consider the mission, size and quality of the institutions in the system.

Athearn wins IFC seat following vote recount

By Jim Moore
Of the Emerald

Everyone who breathed a sigh of relief Friday — happy that the hustle and bustle of campaigning was over following Thursday's general election finale — may be surprised that the counting didn't end until Sunday.

And more surprising is the final tally.

A recount of Incidental Fee Committee candidates cost Bill Odegaard the seventh and final seat on the committee and moved Lloyd Athearn, who finished eighth in the original count, on to the IFC.

The closeness of the original tally necessitated the recount, according to Sherri Schultz, ASUO vice president in charge of elections.

Odegaard had 890 votes, Athearn 884 and Fred Elledge was ninth with 875 on the first count.

Schultz and Mary Shrauger, a member of this year's IFC, spent Sunday recounting and the new tally shows Athearn with 896, Odegaard 887 and Elledge 868.

The reversal in positions brought predictable reactions from the involved parties.

"I feel like I gave it my best shot and that's all anyone can do," Odegaard said. "If I had to lose out to anyone, I'm glad it was Lloyd."

"I'm just disappointed that there are people who don't vote because they think their vote doesn't count," he said.

Athearn, who was visibly shaken when Thursday's results were posted, was overjoyed with the final tally.

"I'm extremely elated right now. It makes up for Thursday night — coming so close but being so far," he said.

"I feel sorry for Bill, though," Athearn added.



Photo by Michael Clapp

Seven groups share EMU Suite 1; the arrival of the most recent resident, the College Republicans has introduced an element of acrimony.

Activism ignites Suite 1 sparks

By Michael Doke
Of the Emerald

Society for the encouragement of open and civil discussion.

So states the sign Frank Geltner hangs proudly on his office door. He says it represents what student activism ought to be. It concludes:

Down with acrimony!

"Acrimony is a harsh or biting sharpness, especially in words, manner or disposition," says Geltner, assistant director of University programs. "I'm excited to see different ideas creating sparks. I'm not excited when this turns to acrimony," he says.

The sparks Geltner refers to are the result of friction in Suite 1 on the ground floor of the EMU. His office sits just off the suite and, for the past two years, he has walked through the room daily to get to work.

Seven groups have set up shop in the room and through the process of territorial imperative — stronger led groups tending to control a greater and growing space in the room — organizations stake their claim in the suite, he says.

"And if you consider the names of the groups there, it would seem that there is a common thread: a strong tie to social awareness and the environment," he says.

"I don't like the word, but you might call them liberal."

But sparks really heated up in Suite 1 this year with the addition of the College Republicans, students there say.

And push came to shove on Friday when the EMU house committee met to decide if the conservative group should be moved from the room, says Maria Neese, EMU Board member.

The committee met to decide the fate of office space for many campus organizations, she says, cautioning that the College Republicans were not singled out. The final decision was tabled until next year, she says.

Although some groups in the suite have been against the conservative group's presence there, Neese says the move is a reflection of the ASUO Executive's desire to reshuffle the office space of many groups — including the Incidental Fee Committee and the Student University Affairs Board — so that legal services can be in closer proximity with the administration.

But the move is not an idea the College Republicans relish, says Paul Matthews, chair of the University's College Republicans.

"Traditional use of the room has not been just for environmental groups. Like the EMU itself, the use of Suite 1 is for students," Matthews says.

"We didn't ask for space here, but because office space is allotted by the EMU Board on a first-come-first-served basis, we do have the right to be here," he says.

The contrast between the College Republicans and the other groups — the Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group, Students Campaigning for Disarmament, People and the Oregon Coast, Students Opposing Registration and the Draft and Interschool Christian Fellowship — is good, Matthews says.

Across from the College Republicans is the

Survival Center, the largest of the groups in the suite, says co-director Dave Rusk, adding that the ambience of the room has changed with the addition of the conservative group.

"They take away from the general energy of the suite; they act as a downer," Rusk says. "We haven't started speaking in whispers, though."

Rusk says Suite 1 has reflected the attitude of the 1970s. The room was included as part of the 1974 addition to the EMU and over the years groups have come and gone, he says, but the environmental theme has been dominant.

The College Republicans not only take away from this feeling but, with the group there, public discussion at the University is also slipping away, Rusk says.

"Before the College Republicans had office space in Suite 1, they would protest and hold counter demonstrations against us out in the open where the public could become involved," Rusk says. "Now we're isolated from the student body. The College Republicans don't confront our opinions in public anymore."

"They've held no open demonstrations against us since they've been in here," he says.

And the process of suite-osmosis has been difficult for the College Republicans to complete, Matthews says. Vandalism has occurred and their office space has been partitioned off at the request of the other suite groups, he says.

Continued on Page 6

**'Swastikas have been drawn on
our picture of Ronald Reagan'
— Paul Matthews
College Republicans**