

## Correspondence

On Thursday, January 8, 1981, three motions affecting college tutorials were passed at a meeting of the Council of the Faculty of Arts. The first made college tutorials no longer mandatory for Arts students. The second allowed for the cross-indexing of courses between Arts departments and colleges. The third stated "that every effort should be made to encourage on-load teaching of college courses" by full-time faculty.

During the discussion of these motions, the air was redolent with their supporters' statements of good intentions. In fact the first motion was amended and passed to include a statement of good intention by Dean Kaplan. And we were assured of the hard work, the detailed consideration of the needs of the colleges, and the good intentions of the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning, which had put forward the three motions. The depths of all these admirable qualities were plumbed by spokesperson for the Committee, Professor Stewart, when she was asked how the committee proposed to provide for the official counselling role of the college tutor for those students who elected not to take a college tutorial. She had to answer that she did not know. Nor, apparently, did anyone else.

Added to the statements of good intentions was the appalling literalness with which we were asked to take the rather vaguely worded motions. (No, the first motion isn't budgetary—none of them are—and, no, it isn't for the good of the departments—where does it mention departments or money?—it's for the good of the colleges. No, no, the third motion isn't aimed against part-timers; why, it doesn't even mention them.) Such ingenuousness in the amiable mouths of grizzled

academics smacked loudly of disingenuousness. The fact was, no-one who supported these motions spoke specifically to their effects. Intentions were all the rage. But here, from the CUEW perspective are some of the likely effects:

Departments will have a greater sphere of power in the university. Departments suffering drops in enrollment and facing cutbacks can hope (perhaps in vain) for increased enrollments and a staving off of the axe.

Many first-year arts students electing out of a college tutorial will suffer anomie and anonymity in a full load of other and larger class sections (some of them mandatory).

Teaching assistants in popular Arts courses can expect greater enrollment pressures in their classes, and perhaps an increase in the upper level of enrollment.

Part-time faculty will find their job opportunities reduced. Over 80 college tutorials are taught by part-timers this year. In future, as lowered demand cuts the number of tutorials offered and as full-time faculty are prodded into taking up a larger percentage of the diminishing number, the colleges will need fewer part-time tutors.

Fewer college tutorials and more full-time faculty teaching them on-load (ie. as part of their regular pay packet), will mean a budgetary saving for York. Thus York will continue its apparent policy of financial appeasement vis a vis Queen's Park by cutting out bits from its base instead of excising administrative fatty cerebral tissue from the expensive top.

**John Bell**  
**Shop Steward**  
**CUEW College Tutors**  
**CUEW, Local 3**

### Stong blasts tutorial decision

First of all, I would like to thank you for the stand you took in your editorial on the college tutorial programme in the January 15 issue of *Excalibur*. It was far better informed than many of the Arts Faculty Council members who debated the issue on January 8. I would like to take this opportunity to put it on record that we at Stong College have fought to retain the college tutorial requirement for the following reasons:

1. These courses have benefited from a practically ideal pedagogical situation; that is, the dynamics of a small group experience, and the closest attention from the instructors. Most instructors teach for the love of their subject and of the students. Students are advised and counselled sympathetically throughout, and referred to the Academic Advisor or other relevant channels for additional assistance. The college tutorial is a concrete, tangible academic link between our students and the college community with all its other activities. Through this link approximately 400-500 students are introduced to college services, facilities, and programmes: cultural, curricular, extracurricular, formal and informal, social and academic. In a word, they are placed in a learning atmosphere amidst a community of scholars from different disciplines and faculties.

2. To be sure, there may be good tutorials and weak ones, as in any department or division. But I am referring to the overall structures of the programme, which has been reviewed many times in official reports anyone can consult. These structures have facilitated the more experiential and experiential role of the colleges which was part of their original mandate.

3. Most college tutorials at Stong are taught by part-time faculty,

who are completely dedicated and who are not teaching primarily for the low stipend (only \$1520). As far as I can see, most departments and divisions have not made tenure-stream appointments at York for the last ten years. The colleges, through the tutorials, are about the last remaining entity at York where we are getting new blood into the system, and at minimal cost. These people create and generate their own courses, bringing new ideas and techniques into a middle-aging system. Their courses are reviewed by college curriculum committee, the I.C.C. (Inter-College Curriculum Committee), Senate. They are evaluated more frequently than corresponding first-year General Education courses, and the Faculty of Arts has done multiple studies of their effectiveness over the years.

4. I could understand optionality if all the General Education requirements were made optional. That would constitute a total shift in the thrust of first year. But to single out the college tutorial seems to me an unfair proposition, and a serious mistake in curriculum design.

The decision seems to hide an attempt to protect certain areas and segments of the faculty at the expense of others.

5. It is easy to see the payoff—we are budgeted for one year, minus the university-wide 10 per cent cut. We are to be given the money to mount courses, but enrollments are being deliberately undermined so that fewer courses are likely to survive. This move does not give students free choice, as has been alleged; rather, it restricts it, since they still have three General Education requirements to meet, and lose the range of subject matter and teaching techniques offered by the tutorials.

Not only do we at Stong disagree totally with the decision of Arts Faculty Council, but we are going on record that we intend to offer as many of our courses as possible, and on the first year level where the need is most acute. We want to offer students this kind of teaching format, and to continue to give part-time faculty an input into the life of a university which needs them.

We have been tossed the little bone of cross-listing courses by the motion, but the notion is not defined. What does it do to the life of the college? Who pays for it? What is the advantage to the college, and to the department in question? What about staffing? Part-time or full-time? Who chooses the teacher?

Moreover, third and fourth-year enrollments are down in most areas. It makes little sense to go into competition with departments and divisions for third- and fourth-year students. Stong has a model or pilot project for a planned sequence of courses in Cultural Studies, involving cooperation with departments and divisions. But that model is based on first year. We needed the first year base from which to bargain with departments for a proposed minor or combined major: now we have nothing to bargain with. We did not need a legislative push in the direction of increased cooperation with the rest of Faculty of Arts: most colleges were already exploring possibilities.

The passage of this motion was a good example of how York continues to make this mistake of cutting programmes of proven worth to support initiatives no one can even define. It calls into question the validity of the decision-making process at York. I hope that Senate will keep all these aspects in mind and will have the foresight to send the decision back to committee for further study.

**Hedi Bouraoui**  
**Master, Stong College**  
**Professor, French Literature/**  
**Graduate English**

### The Pie

The pie is **not** shrinking.

In the editorial of last week's *Excalibur* entitled, "Budget" you quote a member of the Council of York Student Federation as saying the "pie is shrinking". While it may be true that the budget was calculated on an expected decline in enrolment of 3 per cent and it is certainly true that some people are gobbling up larger portions of the pie, nonetheless it is not true that the pie is shrinking.

President H. Ian Macdonald reported at the last meeting of the Board of Governors that York's enrolment is up by 5.5 per cent. This will automatically result in a similar increase in funds for the CYSF. In fact, Vice-President Bell reported at the same meeting that graduate enrolment is up by 8 per cent which means that at least 72 more graduate students are paying \$7.50 each towards CYSF.

The graduate enrolment increases mean a net increase to the CYSF budget of at least \$500 and there are five other constituencies which would increase their contributions by as much or more. The CYSF pie is not shrinking, it is expanding.

**Peter Brickwood**  
**Student Representative on the**  
**Board of Governors**

## Move's cost high

From page 1.

"The TTC would lose between 8 and 10 million dollars in revenue from this move," he said, "and this would

mean higher fares for everyone else. If Metro would be willing to do as they do for senior citizen tickets and reimburse us for each ticket purchase, we would consider it."

Encouraged by the support of Metro's students councils,

Sisberg will ask that the special pass be extended to part-time students, as well as full-time. When asked if she would mind paying higher property taxes to cover the larger TTC deficit, Sisberg replied, "Yes, I'd mind. Our taxes keep rising and I think that the money should come from the province."

An officer of Bethune College Council said that the issue would be discussed at the next council meeting. He expects the motion to support the petition to pass easily.

The Petition will be in the office of the Council of the York Student Federation early next week.

*Excalibur* spoke with CYSF Malcolm Montgomery earlier this week, and asked him why he thought he could succeed in getting the TTC's fares rolled back, when both the Mayor of Toronto and the Metro Council could not. Montgomery responded, "Maybe our contributions along with those of Mr. Eggleton will bring some result."

## Lawyer called in

From page 1.

When approached by Maraj on January 5 Malcolm Montgomery also refused to release any money. Maraj said that although Montgomery indicated the matter would come up at the Council meeting two days later, it was not on the agenda.

On January 5 two of Maraj's pay cheques, totalling over \$800, bounced. Fed up, Maraj hired a lawyer and refused further contact with both Montgomery and Empey.

Montgomery stated that he wants a quick settlement to the

whole affair, and will not go to court unless Maraj demands it. Both CYSF and Maraj are adamant in maintaining their positions.

Resolution of the controversy could be difficult, as it is clouded with conflicting accounts of what the facts are.

The central dispute is whether or not Maraj was properly informed of the wage cut. Maraj says she was never properly informed, while Empey maintains that she was told of the cut in the presence of Keith Smockum.

Smockum denied this, saying that he instructed Empey to tell Maraj of CYSF's intentions. He said he was not present when Maraj was supposedly informed of the cut by Empey, and could only assume that she had been told.

Montgomery and Empey stated that the amounts of Maraj's pay cheques since the middle of October reflect the fact that she was told of the cut. Maraj said that these amounts mean nothing since she often pays part of her salary out of the service's cash on hand.

Maraj said that the service had consistently lost money since it began in October 1979. The service was a viable business concern, according to Gary Empey, right up to the point that Maraj took over as manager.

Maraj has filed a claim with the Ontario Ministry of Labour, and advised York president H. Ian Macdonald and Star Probe's Rod Goodman of the situation.

## LSAT REVIEW COURSE

- 20 Hours of intensive classroom preparation emphasizing question answering techniques
- Practice exam and LSAT score projection
- Average scores received — 70 points above average.
- Course may be repeated at no additional charge.



**Tuition Fee \$130**  
**Weekend Seminars**  
**For**  
**Feb. 21, 1981 LSAT**  
**Feb. 13, 14, 15**

To register, call or write:  
**LSAT Review Course**  
**2509 Renzoni Rd.**  
**Mississauga, Ont.**  
**L5K 1W8**  
**416-531-4731**

## WEIGHT ALERT



**GET YOUR BODY IN SHAPE**  
**FOR 1981**

**LOSE EXCESS WEIGHT!**  
And Keep It Off With Our Professional Help

NO FAD DIETS. NO INJECTIONS.  
NO PILLS. NO STRENUOUS EXERCISES

CALL NOW FOR A FREE CONSULTATION

TELEPHONE - 741-8240

**WEIGHT ALERT**  
2065 FINCH AVE. W., STE. 208  
DOWNSVIEW, ONTARIO