



YOUR GUESS IS AS GOOD AS MINE: Sculptor Louis Stokes stands in front of his latest creation, chuckling to himself thinking about all those people who will spend hours agonizing over just what exactly his sculpture is. Stokes' exhibit is called "Not Really Trees," and is made solely with organic materials.

GARY BLAKELEY

Gilmor's proposals elicit strong reactions

By LORNE MANLY

Recommendations calling for student government based along faculty lines and a much stronger central government, are the highlights of a recently released discussion paper written by the Provost of the University of Guelph, Paul Gilmor.

These two major themes of the discussion paper have elicited strong reactions from various members of the York community who would be adversely affected if the paper's recommendations are implemented in their present form.

Gilmor, who was commissioned by the University's Board of Governors to undertake a review of the nature and funding of student government, issued his preliminary report "to solicit some reaction from those whom I had the opportunity to interview in preparing my report," according to the covering letter on the document. Gilmor, in this report, did not have the intention of

prescribing "detailed solutions to problems," but wrote that he wanted to "describe a general direction with sufficient clarity to lead to a framework of common aims and the improvement of . . . student government at York."

The report's recommendations, if adopted as written, would have the main effect of taking power away from the colleges and giving it to the faculties, as well as considerably strengthening central student governments at York, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

"The primary organizing vehicle for central student government, graduate or undergraduate," Gilmor wrote in his report, "should be the faculty structure of the University, and not, as previously supported, the Colleges."

College representatives, however, do not feel that the creation of student governments along faculty lines will be helpful in involving York students in university life and providing for their non-academic concerns. "I very much appreciate the time and effort of Provost Gilmor," said David Lumsden, the Maser of Norman Bethune College, "but I don't believe that the proposal is a useful solution to the problems. The faculty option would only exacerbate the problems. We are better served by improving the college system, not by detracting from it."

Lumsden is pleased with the idea of strengthening the central undergraduate student government, the Council of the York Student Federation (CYSF), but is disappointed by the methods Gilmor proposes to accomplish it. "If Gilmor wants a strong, united voice on campus," Lumsden remarked, "it doesn't help to propose a whole series of faculty-based student governments. The best system would be to strengthen both the colleges and the CYSF, like Reya Ali's New Model proposal. A strong college student government and a strong CYSF go together."

Gerard Blink, the President of CYSF, also welcomes the idea of a stronger central government but expresses reservations about the diminished college role, and how the faculties will be able to involve the students. "The Gilmor report seeks

cont'd on pg. 2

Liberals plug tuition loophole

By KEVIN BRAY

A decision by the Minister of Colleges and Universities to ban tuition-related ancillary fees—incidental charges above regular tuition fees—while allowing an offsetting increase in discretionary fees, has left Ontario university students uncertain about the future costs of education.

The June 20 announcement by Minister Gregory Sorbara means ancillary fees will be reclassified as tuition, and if universities continue to levy these compulsory tuition-related fees, their provincial grants will be reduced accordingly. To make up for the revenue that will be lost because of this ban, the Government will allow the universities to increase discretionary fees (an additional levy universities are allowed to charge above the fee set by the provincial government) by an amount to be determined following a province-wide survey of ancillary fees.

Presently the formula fee is \$1,149 and universities are permitted to charge up to 10 percent on top of this as discretionary fees. After May 1, 1987, the allowable surcharge will be no more than 15 percent.

Until the survey is completed, the revenue implications for the universities and the students will not be known. Representatives from the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), the Ontario Federation of Students (OFS), and the Ontario Council on University Affairs (OCUA) are being asked to determine which ancillary fees should be considered tuition related. For the interim period between September 1, 1986 and April 30, 1987 Sorbara has asked universities to freeze both existing and new tuition-related ancillary fees.

"The freeze doesn't impact our financial planning," said Bill Farr, Vice President of Finance and Administration. "Our fee increases were approved long ago."

An 11-item list of non-tuition-related ancillary fees not subject to the freeze, such as student government, convocation, and health services fees, has created uncertain financial prospects for students and left

Sorbara's policy with questionable benefits.

"I think they (the administration) will have to increase these fees," said Gerard Blink, President of the Council of the York Student Federation (CYSF). "The government is telling the universities, by abolishing ancillary fees, that they can charge only level Y, which is below the level X that students have been paying. Where is the money going to come from to balance this out? I don't think the extra five percent is going to do it," Blink stated.

Because York does not break down the miscellaneous fee, the impact of Sorbara's policy is unknown. Of the \$152.80 in charged miscellaneous fees, about \$70 is not tuition-related, comprised partly of health services, student government and student athletic fees. Assuming that both the computer and materials fee, a combined cost of \$62.50, are abolished, students can expect to save approximately \$90. However, this best guess depends on the composition of the miscellaneous fee, which the administration is not prepared to reveal.

Blink believes the government should ban all ancillary fees, including health service, student activity, and student athletic charges—not just tuition-related fees.

"There are some fees that not everyone is paying and that are optional, but most are mandatory," Blink said. "I consider any fee that is mandatory an ancillary fee and these should be banned. These are open-ended variables and the administration can increase any of these. The benefits of this policy are contingent upon what happens to these fees."

Bob Richardson, Special Assistant to Sorbara, disagrees. "We aren't in business to regulate every fee on campus. I don't know of any instance where these fees have increased dramatically."

The motivation to ban ancillary fees originated with both students and the OCUA. In 1982 the Council first reviewed university fees to ensure they were reasonable. A third review, heightened by concern over computer fees charged at the Univer-

sity of Waterloo, prompted the Council to advise the government that ancillary fees were proliferating and that social policy was being rendered empty by these back-door tuition charges. According to the OCUA, banning tuition-related ancillary fees would close this loophole and reestablish government control.

"The primary purpose for this policy from the Council's point of view," Marnie Paiken, chairperson of the OCUA indicated, "is that back-door tuition fees should not be permitted any longer. The system is now fairer."

Richardson suggests that students will no longer be surprised when they pay their fees. "The purpose of this policy is to ensure students know up front what they will pay," Richardson said. "The entire thrust is to make it simpler. At the present time it's the best thing to do."

Registration line-ups may soon be obsolete

By PAULETTE PEIROL

Registration lineups at York may, within three to four years, become virtually obsolete, if the implementation of a new touch-tone telephone enrolment system is successful.

The computerized system has already been approved in principle by the President's Policy Committee, and a test-run, using a group of students from one Arts department, will take place in March 1987.

"This system should get rid of the mundane aspects of registration and alleviate frustration," said Noel Berman, Manager of the Transcripts office. Berman, along with Susan Salusbury (seconded from her regular duty as Co-ordinator of the Arts Advising Centre) and systems analyst Mike Kukuk, make up the touch-tone "project team."

The telephone registration system would benefit both students and the university, according to Salusbury. Students would be able to avoid line-

ups and not have their vacations interrupted, while faculty members and advising staff would have more time to talk to students. The system would make enrolment procedures easier (for example, departments would have access to up-to-the-minute enrolment information), and would smooth paper flow.

Enrolling in courses could become almost as simple as using a banking machine. The student dials a phone number to access the computer from a touch-tone phone, and is greeted by a bilingual human voice instructing him to key in his student number and birthdate. The computer then "validates" the student (checking that there are no outstanding debts, etc.) and instructs him on how to proceed, using only the numbers and pound key (#) of his telephone.

Callers have two options: to verify their course enrolment, or to add and drop courses. Any errors made by the student are explained by the

cont'd on pg. 3

INSIDE NEWS

SECURITY NABS BURGLARS: York security had minor successes last month in its battle against campus break-ins but now have to contend with a more worrisome development: armed robbery. Page 3

OPINION

ALI COMMENDS GILMOR: Excalibur's new monthly columnist, Former CYSF President Reya Ali makes his newspaper debut with a few controversial remarks about the Guelph Provost's discussion paper on student government at York. Page 5

FEATURES

YORK AWARD WINNER: Atkinson prof Shelagh Wilkinson, a recent winner of a prestigious teaching award, is profiled in this month's feature. Page 6