

Opinion

Student success: whose responsibility?

by Alberta Roper
Staff Writer

As I researched the story "Student Success Strategies," I found myself pondering the one-sided emphasis of the project. It appears that the burden for student success falls mainly on the shoulders of the college faculty and staff. What about the responsibility of the incoming student?

Looking through the questions on the survey, I wondered why questions were being asked as to whether there should be testing and prerequisites required prior to a student's acceptance into the class. Why should a student be allowed into a class if they're not equipped to handle it? Why would a question come up such as, "How do we say 'no' to students?" Have the tables been turned to such a degree that the student dictates how a college is run? Has a breakdown in the respect for authority caused institutions to be intimidated?

Terry O'Banion, who is the executive director of the League for Innovation of Community Colleges, gave some interesting observations in his speech summary from the May conference on student success. I found his comparison of the years 1960, 1970, and a projection for 1990 a good trend indicator.

According to O'Banion, colleges in the year 1960 had strong intervention programs, established course prerequisites, had a "probation system in place with a mandatory limit on course load," and the "student hours of employment limited to 20 hours."

By 1970, constraints were all but removed. O'Banion writes, "Students are responsible for self," have "freedom to explore and grow without restraints from past failures," and are "free from institutional intervention." He further said, "Humanistic education has encouraged removing the barriers to learning, i.e. testing, grades, and probation ... do not expose students to their own inadequacies."

Is it possible that our society's demand for less constraints has not given us more freedom, but has put us in bondage to mediocrity? Why should anyone put forth their utmost when doing a half-job gains the same rewards?

O'Banion projects for 1990 a pendulum swing back toward more constraints: intervention, testing, "mandatory assessment," and "mandatory placement."

Questions posed for consideration in the Student Success Project included, "What is excellent teaching? Who is an excellent teacher? What is worth learning? How do we know anyone has learned anything?" To these I would add, "What constitutes a teachable student? Who is an excellent student? How do we know if anyone has the desire to learn anything? If it's not worth learning, is it worth teaching?"

Maybe we need to redefine education as a partnership between two willing and committed adults.

Page 2

A woman's place is in the house?

Point

by Dean Grey
Editor

In the beginning God created man, then as an afterthought he created women. He created women to be the subservient aid to the better cause (once again man).

Back then everything was systematic; man brought home the money and spanked the kids, woman spent the money, cleaned the house, cooked the meals, raised the kids, and cared for the man when he came home from work so that he might be rejuvenated enough by the next day to go back to work and get more money for the

woman to spend.

It was a happy time, a simpler life. Every now and then man would go off to war and woman could play the man's part and go to work. I think that was what started the change; women became power hungry, not realizing the important part they played in the betterment of mankind.

We gave up a lot of our personal man stuff to allow them to participate, but they wanted access to all of our traits but expected to be treated like a lady at dinner (yet some got pissed when you opened a door for them). Gave to them and they

took, now they want us to give while they already have it all. They wanted the choice to ask us to dance, yet wanted to be asked instead. They wanted to play the men's games (football to name one) and still be treated like a woman (soft and gentle). They wanted to earn their own way, while still taking our money. And we gave.

Hell did we give, all the way down to our very rib we gave. We gave them major appliances, credit cards, and soap operas and they still weren't satisfied.

What did they want? They wanted to get out so we let them

do the shopping, but that wasn't enough. Women felt that they were ready to take their unrightful place in the male workforce, we as men knew better (of course).

We knew that women were made to stay home and cook and clean and raise our future, the beloved children, after all they've had hundreds to thousands of years practice and they're good at it.

So in all fairness men must admit that women are better at the menial labor tasks that make up the housekeeping "job." They probably are pretty good at picking berries too.

Counterpoint

by Lyn Marie Thompson
Staff Writer

So, you think a woman's place is in the home, eh? Wrong. Try again. A woman's "place" is wherever she feels most comfortable and happy. That neanderthal-like phrase "barefoot, pregnant and in the kitchen" makes my skin crawl! That has got to be one of the most narrow-minded attitudes I know of!

In the past women have been dumped on constantly. Their parents married them off as quickly as possible to someone they thought was best for them. The woman's desires were never once contemplated. She then became her husband's slave. What he said went and that was the end of the discussion. She did her duty and bore his children, and

heaven help her if she didn't give him at least one son. She cleaned his house, washed his clothes, cooked his meals, raised his children, and pleased him as best as she could. But no one ever thought to ask her if she was happy. For a woman to think about herself, to ask "Is this all there is?" was scandalous. Women just didn't do those kinds of things. For a woman to use her mind, well really! Women weren't allowed to attend college because it wasn't "right." Why would a woman need to be educated? No one thought she might like to be able to support herself like men. Heaven forbid!

Even though it's taken hundreds of years, women have proven many times over that they are capable of competing in the man's world, and beating men at their own game.

Women can be found at the top of corporate ladders now, not just in the secretaries office. Eileen Ford runs one of the world's most prestigious modeling agencies with an iron fist, has for years, and will for years to come.

Women have discovered that they are people too with needs, wants and desires just like men. But now they're getting more complete educations, supporting themselves, raising children on their own and supporting them as well.

Anything a woman wants to do, she does now. Even if it is a scandalous thing to do. Shirlee Muldown races top fuel dragsters with the big boys, and beats them!

Society finally is becoming a bit more androgenous. Men are allowed to stay home and cook while women are out in the

work force bringing home the bacon. Let's face it, some women couldn't cook an edible meal to save their souls. But they can be the toughest people in the business world. There are also men who haven't the foggiest idea as to how to balance their checkbook, but can make a hollandaise sauce perfectly lumpless and unseparated. But hey, let's be fair, there are still a few women who really like being housewives. That's fine, more power to 'em. But my point is that a woman deserves to make her own choice. Women are really fantastic people and they should be treated with respect, just like every other human being. They have a right to be happy, to enjoy life, to explore their potential, to be themselves. And if you don't believe me, ask your mom.

Einstein got screwed too

by Scott Wyland
Contributing Writer

Been screwed-over lately? Can you think of an instant, within short or long term memory, where you haven't received credit for your effort, talent, or efficiency; worse yet an instant where you were actually rebuked for a job, although well-done by any human measure, was still unacceptable to the rigidly bias standard of the boss, teacher, parent, friend, enemy, acquaintance or whomever you were attempting to impress?

If you've never experienced the discomfort of censure, are a virgin in the realm of disapproval, then you're possibly (1) a robot (2) everybody's fool (3) a manikin (4) fit to be displayed as a rare specimen in a museum.

If however, the former is more fitting, then you don't fit; you suffer from the ghastly stigma of being a round peg in an inherently square world. But don't be dismayed, you're in prodigious company.

The greatest minds in history, the beacons who flamed torches still shining effulgently to inspire our spirits, the paragons of our civilization, were, in nearly all cases, round pegs screwed-over by small minds attempting to jam everything and everybody into a neat, square hole.

Einstein was rejected from a university because his entry-essay was "unintelligible"; Churchill, after saving England from Hitler, was fired; Lincoln was a hated man, often called "ape" Lincoln, that is, before he was shot; Joan of Arc was barbecued for her heroism; Socrates drank poison for his wisdom; Jesus was crucified for his.

It is typical of this world to award salt for wounds begot from our labors - and more typical for our accomplishments, no matter how great, to be subject to the unqualified, myopic criticism of non-creative, square pegs.

It's bad enough when a competent, open-mind is evaluating us, but too often it's a provincial, by-the-book stooge, smug in his square-peg position, contemptuous of anyone not trapped in the same stagnant, square abyss he's planted himself. A person who wouldn't know quality work if it jumped up and kicked him in his square head.

But don't fret, if life seems to give you only flack for your attempt at well-rounded perfection, then perhaps you're being initiated into the ranks of the immortals, and will receive your much-deserved credit after you're squarely dead.

A snooze is too valuable to lose

Letter to the Editor:

Napping between classes is classical student behavior. At every university I've attended, students could be found sleeping on couches, at study carrels in library, on the grass, etc. I agree that we don't want non-students making camp in the community center (which is what Stan

Johnson objects to), but let's not take the extreme step of removing the comfortable furniture in the vain expectation that this will keep students from snatching a few zzz's

Yours truly,
Marlene Tufts
Psychology Instructor

The Print

The Print aims to be a fair and impartial newspaper covering the college community. Opinions expressed in *The Print* do not necessarily reflect those of the college administration, faculty, Associated Student Government or other members of *The Print* staff. Articles and information published in *The Print* can be reprinted only with permission from the Student Publications Office. *The Print* is a weekly publication distributed each Weds. except for Finals Week. Clackamas Community College, 19600 S. Molalla Ave., Oregon City, Oregon 97045. Office: Trailer B. Telephone: 657-8400, ext. 309.

Editor-in-Chief: Dean Grey
Entertainment Editor: Thad Kreisher
Sports Editor: Christopher Curran
Copy Editor: Bret Hodgert
Cartoonist: Samantha Storm, Keith Casper
Darkroom Tech: Juan Callahan, Amy Clifford, Jeff Schoessler
Advertising Manager: Jim Brown
Advertising Sales: Michelle Miller, Stephani Veff
Office Manager: Stephani Veff
Staff Reporters: Marie Stoppelmoor, Alberta Roper
Layout Staff: Melody Wilttrout, Tracie Watterberg, Scott Wyland, MaryPrath, Jolene Kippes
Photo Editor: Lyn Thompson
Typesetter: Crystal Penner
Advisor: Linda Vogt

Clackamas Community College

