

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press
editor-in-chief Al Scarth

managing editor Ginny Bax
news editors Sid Stephen, Peggi Selby
sports editor Bob Anderson
layout editor Joe Czajkowski
photo editor Dave Hebditch
short shorts editor Beth Nilsen
page forum five Jim Carter

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Well, we finally accomplished two things in one week and there is still one more paper to go. Yesterday, we finally had our censored picture printed, maybe minutely (page one), but it was printed. Tonight we finished everything by 8:30 under the direction of illustrious Brian Campbell, whose knuckles are slightly sore from beating up staff for not having their copy in by 6 p.m. Working diligently under our slave driving friend were—Dennis Zomerschoe, Beth Winteringham, Bob Blair, Wayne Morrison, Joe Czajkowski, Beth Nilsen, Ginny Bax (in mind but not in body), Barry Nicholson, Eric Hameister, Dan Jamieson and whoever else I missed, but let us not forget our good friend and co-boss, Harvey G. Thomgirt, who now has a new body.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline for Tuesday edition—6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Thursday prior; for Thursday edition—6 p.m. Wednesday, Advertising—noon Monday prior; for Friday edition—6 p.m. Thursday, Advertising—noon Tuesday prior; Casserole—copy deadline 6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Friday prior. Short Shorts deadline, 3 p.m. day prior to publication, Advertising manager Percy Wickman, 432-4241. Office phones 432-5168, 432-5178. Circulation 13,000. Circulation manager Wayne Bax.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1970

But they wouldn't listen

by Al Scarth

In one of the first Gateways of the year way back then in September, an editorial told student representatives to reject tokenism and get off university governing committees.

The editorial said, in part: "It is our intention to suggest that all student representatives should make serious evaluations of just what effect they have had on the actions of their respective committees.

"If they decide that their voices have been heard and acted upon and that their presence on committees will continue to be a strong lobby, then they should remain.

"But we seriously doubt they can, in good conscience, make that decision . . . They might find students' union vice-president Bob Hunka's reply to Provost Aylmer Ryan's comment before the law and order committee illuminating.

"Student members of GFC speak much more often and are more effective than most other members, said Provost Ryan.

"Their effectiveness is severely limited when votes are taken, replied Mr. Hunka."

That was the paper's stand as early as September. At the end of that first month, students' council defeated 11-5 a motion by dent rep Gerry Connolly that the council remove its representatives unless three conditions also suggested in the same editorial were met: parity, open meetings and student agreement with the committee's purposes.

President David Leadbeater opposed the move because he wanted to see what the committee on student representation would do. It took until this week for the president to discover and act upon GFC's closed-door policy. He chose The Gateway censorship issue as indicative of GFC's attitude.

But his council, close as the vote was, didn't back him up. For that, they should be ashamed. The GFC representatives themselves inform council how futile their presence is and in all their wisdom, the councillors decide they know better what happens in the governing committee's meetings.

Maybe it is gratifying to first be proved right and then become the viable issue to initiate the action but council's stance makes it an entirely empty gratification. We are still back where we started.

THIS
S
FORUM
I
V
PAGE



Yes

by Dan Jamieson

The concept of tenure, the system whereby a professor is granted immunity from diseases like unemployment if he proves he can last and still be a nice guy after four years on a university campus, is a form of institutionally sanctioned robbery.

An outdated law

It robs the people who help pay for the campus operation, however, and not the ones who are spending the money, the administrators, and has therefore never been revoked. Unlike other outdated laws on suicide and birth control, it is still enforced.

Rules of the game

The rules of the game state that four areas of competence will be considered before a professor will be granted tenure. They include research, teaching, administrative, and "academic community."

That means a professor who has had published research, can teach his material, participates on some administrative committees, and gets along well with his fellow professionals for four years, will be allowed to hang around the university for the rest of life if he so desires.

Another interpretation of these criteria is as follows. A person will perform well in four different areas during the time in which he is on probation in an effort to get tenure. Though some people can perform well in four different areas, most find it extremely difficult to do one thing well, without having to be bothered with three others.

He must publish a certain number of research papers which will be next to useless both to his academic field and his classes, since they will probably be read by only a few members of either.

He spouts party line

He must sit on committees, and spout the party line in doing his committee work, which won't help his students in any way.

Unfortunately, he has to do it, or they will get him on the

next criterion, academic community. That means he doesn't agree with his fellows in one too many areas. Usually if he has disagreed once, he has disagreed once too often.

Fortunately he does not have to worry about his teaching. As long as he shows up in a few of his classes, his teaching is considered to be satisfactory. Unless he is a border-line case, the tenure officials never look at his pass-fail record, much less his performance in the classroom. He can bore his classes to death as long as he lives up to the departmental standards in the other three areas.

The student, the person who pays \$400 or more to be taught, and thus defrays a large slice of the university's operating budget, is robbed as the result.

Brown-nosing

He's robbed by the eager young professor who wishes to make a good impression on his overlords and thus does not do as good a job as he might as a teacher, because he is trying too many other things.

He's robbed by the professor who's been around a while and knows that brown-nosing is a surer way of getting tenure than teaching.

He's robbed most blatantly by the tenured professor who has no interest in teaching, and thus sits back, passing out boredom and bullshit in classes and devoting his full interest to other areas. His job is in the bag, and he knows it.

System allows it

All of this is merely human weakness. No man whose job is as secure as a tenured professor's can be blamed for backsliding, or brown-nosing if the system will allow it.

The administrators who are enamoured of tenure also cannot be blamed for displaying their weaknesses in its application. But under the guise of "academic community" or a poor research record, there often lies a dislike for a man's personality, his politics or his academic stance. Those who do not fit *our* system do not get a job here, is the feeling which

often underlies the dismissal of many professors.

This, too, is robbery of the worst type. Students have a different point of view, academic, political, or social stolen from them by the discriminatory practices used in the granting of tenure.

Students deserve teaching

These are all flaws in human character. They are not universally displayed by professors or administrators, but they are flaws to which the system is vulnerable.

Because students are paying for their education, they deserve good teaching, not interrupted or interfered with by professional duties other than teaching.

This can be overcome by hiring professors with the specific purpose of teaching leaving administration to people hired to perform specifically in that area, and so on.

By reviewing the contract under which a professor is hired every few years, teachers can be kept on their toes, and not allowed the complacent backsliding which often occurs under the present system.

Do you want it?

Comfortable categories which could have any "undesirables" removed with no real reason other than personal incompatibility could also be removed, taking away the power to discriminate on this level.

The tenure system is stealing from you. Do you want it to continue?

Be
sure
to
vote