

**STAFF THIS ISSUE**—Countdown—third-last press night of the year and already the handsome, lovable, cuddly male staff were feeling restless. However they managed to sublimate very well in an unofficial keg-tossing contest. Watching the keg fly by were Ina van Nieuwkerk, Judy Griffiths, Peter Johnston (keg tossing champion), Catriona Sinclair, Bob Anderson, Dave (Shorty's Developer) Hebditch, Hiro Saka, Brian Campbell, Lynn Hugo (this week's Flying Fickle Fingernail of Fate), Al the Beard Scarth, Cathy Morris, Joe Czajkowski, Ken Bailey, Phil Lenko, Dale Rogers, B.S.P. Bayer (Diddled by the Deadly Digit of Destiny), Terry Pettit, Judy (Scoop) Samoil, Steve Makris (looking just adorable in his frosh beanie), and yours truly, in my sleeveless sweatshirt, Harvey G. Thomgirt.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—8 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—8 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts 5 p.m. Tuesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—12,000.

The Gateway is published bi-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

## Editorial

# The university seminars may be in trouble

There seems little doubt the student-faculty-administration seminars scheduled for next Wednesday will be a complete and utter bomb.

The seminars, originally proposed by Gateway columnist Brian Campbell, were intended to air a little of the dirty laundry within the university and provide at least some communications between the three segments involved.

Maybe the faculty and administration know about the seminars. But the students don't. Besides, the seminars couldn't possibly be held at a more inopportune time.

Consider the average student—because the whole university functions around the average student. The radicals and other minority groups only make the place more exciting for the average guy—the radicals don't make it function.

The average guy is going to take advantage of a Wednesday holiday in this way. Since Friday is spring break, a student can get a five-day weekend while missing just one day of classes which is Thursday. So who in their right mind is

willing to spend a whole day talking about university matters.

Many, many students will be heading for Banff, Jasper and Edson for a few days of skiing and then come back and get a weekend of studying done in preparation for midterms.

Others are going to make use of the break to catch up on term papers due in the next little while.

Besides, nobody knows the issues to be discussed at the seminars. Students don't even know the location of the seminars or how to get any information on them. In this office, we obtained information on the seminars early this week.

It would be advisable that the group running the seminars plead guilty to mismanagement and postpone the seminars for at least a week. They could have two days to hold the seminars—one morning and one afternoon of separate days within a week. This way, students could grasp basically the issues being discussed in the first seminar and prepare for discussion in the next.

# Teachers are required also

Many feel too much emphasis is being placed on research ability when hiring university professors. Great universities can be both research institutions and teaching institutions.

Undergraduates suffer the most from lack of good teachers and there are a goodly number of undergraduate students at this university. This lack may be reflected in our high undergraduate mortality rate, especially among the first year students.

At this university, advancement and hiring seems to be based on the number of research papers one

puts out and little or no consideration is given to teaching ability. Perhaps it would be good policy to also hire professors who are good teachers first, and researchers second.

What are the aims of the university—to train everyone to become research workers or to provide a general education for those who wish, and further specialization for the few?

Perhaps a clarification of university policy is necessary. In fact, faculties being the independent bodies they are, it would be interesting to hear the views of various deans on this matter.

## (From the Student Christian Movement)

The Whiteside—Fisher controversy is a matter having implications that go far beyond the question of these two men's future. As most of us are aware of by now, the Chairman of the Sociology department, Dr. Hirabayshi, has made the following recommendations: (1) Prof. Seth Fisher be denied tenure at this time, and (2) Prof. Don Whiteside not be granted a renewal of his two-year contract.

These two men are not being axed because of poor research or teaching ability. As even the letters from Chairman Hirabayshi admit, both men were quite acceptable in both research and teaching ability.

Rather, they are being axed because of a vague clause on Page 9 of the Faculty Handbook which reads:

**"A successful candidate also should have shown that he is capable of working effectively as a member of this department and of the university."**

As the letters show quite clearly, Chairman Hirabayshi has used this unfortunately vague clause to get rid of Fisher and Whiteside, not for being disruptive, but simply for holding and stating minority views.

That is where our concern should be focused. If these two men can be removed simply for holding and expressing what happens to be a minority view, then what implications follow regarding academic freedom in this institution as a whole, and in relation to other individuals, student and faculty, in particular?

Is this a place where critical dialogue takes place and is encouraged, as seems a minimal requirement for a university? Is this a place where change can happen through 'proper' channels? Or is it to be

a place where the slogan reads forever, "No change wanted; only the status quo need apply." Because that's what the issue is here. If two men can be removed for holding minority views, then how many others, no matter what their views, will quietly shut up for reasons of fear? How many of you in fact know, or are, a student or faculty member who for reasons of pressure feels less than free to speak and act his own views?

Do not become confused about what this means. If there are people who should be removed for whatever reasons, then this institution owes itself the morality and dignity of removing them openly and legally. Any other method legitimizes extra-normal channels of dissent. Such as are now taking place. If, as Dean Smith, Faculty of Arts, constantly reiterates, all of the proper channels and procedures have been followed in this case, and if he cannot see anything wrong with secret files from which he and a few others choose selective material at their discretion, then we suggest that his stand in itself shows the futility of going through normal channels. Because if we are to take him seriously, as his position warrants, then it is precisely the normal channels which must be challenged and changed.

We believe there is still room for a rational attempt to get to the bottom of this problem. If you do too, then come to the Student Christian Movement Forum this Friday, at noon, in the SUB Theatre for a discussion of the topic: **IS THIS UNIVERSITY DEMOCRATIC OR AUTHORITARIAN?**

The following speakers have been invited:

- Dr. Hirabayshi; chairman, Dept. of Sociology
- Dr. Smith; Dean, Faculty of Arts
- Dr. Fisher; Faculty, Dept. of Sociology
- Dr. Whiteside; Faculty, Dept. of Sociology

## The university administration and its secret files

By PETER BOOTHROYD

When some 30 students visited the office of the Dean of Arts last week to debate the Fisher-Whiteside case, several aspects of Administrative procedure came to light. Among the frightening items discovered was the fact that the Dean, like all other Deans, is in possession of files on students and faculty which the people concerned are not allowed to see.

Like the CIA, RCMP, or KGB, the university holds secret files on each of its employees and students. Just what these files contain, few of us are privileged to know. But on the basis of a number of reports and incidents, it seems fair to suggest that the files can contain any or all of the following:

- results of psychological tests—including even psychological tests ostensibly administered "solely for research purposes"; e.g., the questionnaire issued by the Department of Psychology to incoming freshmen in 1967.

- gratuitous comments made by professors regarding graduate students and kept in departmental files.

- "confidential" evaluations of student teachers—confidential, that is, until an interested employer comes along.

- resumes of interviews at Student Counselling: these are never released as such, we are told, but recommendations on the basis of these files may be given to other universities or prospective employers.

These files are useful to the administration in a number of ways. Decisions on tenure or contract renewal can be made on the basis of secret information such that the professor in question has no means of refuting claims made regarding his competence. This effectively cuts short protracted disagreements about the merits of any given case, but it is efficiency at the expense of civil (or organizational) safeguards for the individual.

Secondly, the very existence of these files creates a subtle pressure on staff and students to toe the line.

Thirdly, secret files are useful for the university's external relations. Department heads or Deans can write to one's

prospective employers letters of recommendation which have the stamp of authenticity through loose allusions to the subject's activity at the university—primarily his academic and psychological progress. Any similarity between the person described in such letters and actual persons living or dead is accidental. But the employer is led to believe the university is doing its proper job of screening people for its labor force. Happy with this service, the business promotes the university and supports its fund drives.

The idea that secrecy protects the individual student or professor is nonsense. If in fact the files were confidential for the benefit of the person concerned, they would be open to that person. Further, procedures would be available to him whereby he could dispute the validity of the claims made regarding his activities, history or competence. Limits would be set on the kinds of impressionistic comments allowable in such files, on the kinds of data relevant to documentation of academic progress, and on the time period for which information about a person's early career would be kept.

The individual concerned would have control over the use to which his files were put, and would be kept informed of all who saw his files. Without such safeguards, abuse of files is too easy. Students and faculty have no means of assuring that privacy is guaranteed or of confronting false accusations made without their knowledge.

Some people argue that letters of recommendation, for instance, would lose their significance if files were made open to the person concerned. This implies that a letter writer has not the courage of his convictions about the reference. It may be stretching the point, but for the life of me I cannot see why letters of recommendation should be kept secret from the persons in question any more than should evidence in a court of law. As a matter of fact, on the basis of this principle, many professors insist on showing their recommendations to the person concerned.