

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing

editor Ronald Yakimchuk

news editor Miriam McClellan

assistant news

editor Glenn Cheriton

casserole

editor Elaine Verbicky

sports editor Bill Kankewitt

photo editor Chuck Lyall

STAFF THIS ISSUE—It was supposed to be a press afternoon, but it wasn't till pretty late that people came in to help yours truly H. G. T. put out the paper. Rich 'twinkle-toes' Vivone showed us the latest Russian Dance—the Fox Trotsky, watched by Mary Ellen Boyd, Joe Czajkowski, Gail Evasiuk, Judy Griffiths, Marilyn Astle, who is still after my bawd, Bob Anderson, Dennis Fitzgerald (he never fail-lus), Elizabeth O'Donoghue, Judy Samoil, Catriona Sinclair, Ellen Nygaard (who didn't come in but we used her story), and the aforementioned, ever-present and ever-b.s.-ing snake, Harvey (the 'G' stands for grass) Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published tri-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.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Tuesday. For Friday edition—7 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Wednesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—10,000.

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.

PAGE FOUR

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1968

On the fee situation

Yesterday was Oct. 15, or, yesterday was the last day for paying tuition fees without incurring a penalty. Therefore most of you realize your fees have increased up to \$100 over last year, if you did not find out last spring.

This came about to partially cover the difference between the university's request of \$2,658 per student from the provincial government last year, and the final government grant of \$2,440.

Considering that expenses for university students run from about \$1,000 per session for Edmonton residents to nearly \$2,000 for out of town students, this means an increase in expenses of 10 to 20 per cent per student—in one year.

What then, is the prospect for next year?

Two factors indicate a fee increase is impossible, but if none occurs, it is not likely to occur until after the next provincial election. First, the recent fee increase covered only part of the \$218 the university was short for this year. There are no indications that

operating expenses for the coming year will remain at their present level, since there are so many new buildings opening up and these will have to be staffed.

Secondly, the last fee increase was approved, in effect, by the first session of the Alberta legislature meeting after the 1967 provincial election. There was no attempt to reduce the university's budget before the election.

This would indicate the provincial government does not want to antagonize the university immediately prior to an election. But since it is still several years until the next election, and since Alberta voters have notoriously poor memories, there is no danger to the government in a fee increase for a second year in a row.

The Gateway would like to advise all students to come together on a fee policy now, instead of doing so after the fact as they did last year.

To assist in this, we will be printing, in the next several issues, stories on the proposed financing of the university for the next year.

Re-organization urgently needed

The Friday fiasco in which only 16 per cent of the arts faculty voted points to the urgent need for a major overhaul of the present students' union structure.

Students' council appointed a re-organization committee several years ago, to study exactly this problem, but has come up with little to justify itself. Current reports indicate there will be little in the nature of concrete proposals this year either.

We would like, then, to make a few suggestions to the committee.

The faculties of arts, science, and education are faced under the present system with the problem of one man making himself known to several thousand students, and in turn knowing something about them. Considering that these students are well dispersed among students of other faculties, we must realize this is virtually impossible.

Two solutions suggest themselves. The number of students representing the student body could be increased, or natural links should be set up between the students and

their representatives.

Increasing the number of representatives may be a solution, but it would also create an unwieldy council. And could three men know the diversified faculty of arts better than the present one?

A much better solution would be to break the whole campus into natural groups who associate frequently. Suggestions: first year commerce, all arts students taking English 200 in sections 1 to ten, ten to 20 etc.

Each of these groups would elect one person to a large supercouncil. The supercouncil could then be broken into natural groups such as faculties, and elect proportionate numbers to an inner council.

Each inner council member would then have a group of students who can communicate for him with the large student body and none of these should have more than 200 people to be in touch with, all of whom are in their normal sphere of activity.

Therefore, no 16 per cent turn-outs in elections.



The first modest proposal: research into classroom design

By BRIAN CAMPBELL

There has been a lot of noise around here that the students never come up with concrete proposals for solving any of the problems around the university.

For the next few weeks this column will deal with some mouldy old proposals this university should have tried years ago.

Any kid old enough to know who won the World Series knows that universities do research. Professors do research, they tell you. And I agree, they do research—into everything but the university. A certain Dr. O'Dowd, who is the provost at Oakland University, once noted that more teaching ideas are generated in any one faculty club at any one lunch hour than have ever been tested.

This is stupid.

Consider the problem of classroom design. The University of Alberta consists of a collection of little, one-room schools, stacked one on top of the other, to save space, and with variations in size, where necessary, to accommodate more students.

No, Virginia, I am not Frank Lloyd Wright, and I have no magic solution, but there is at least one way to get started towards finding a solution.

First, consider that the capital budget of this university is well over 10 million dollars each year. Second, consider that the university does next to nothing to determine how best to spend this money. Third, consider the Henry Marshall Tory Building.

After we have considered all these things, I suggest we come to the mutual conclusion that we do not learn as well as we could in the sort of classrooms

we have now. But how to solve these problems?

Let me suggest that this university invest \$100,000 in an experimental classroom.

An experimental classroom would be an external shell within which facilities for two or three classrooms could be varied as widely as possible. The faculty, administration, and students would all meet and decide on two or three designs they would like to try out, and then build them and try them out.

Particular sections would spend the first term in one of the new classrooms and the second term in one of the standard classrooms, and, of course, reverse this procedure with another class in the same time slot. What happened in each class would be determined through questionnaires and interviews administered to all students and professors who used the designs. By finding the advantages of both classrooms tested in each section, and pooling the knowledge and preferences so generated, we would perhaps be able to produce a better environment.

The experimental classroom would be a permanent fixture until the university reached maximum size. It would be used to solve specific design problems, since the research would be aimed at building a specific building, housing specific students.

If the administration intends to forge ahead and build buildings as it always has—by the seat of its pants—we can expect the same ugly abortions this campus has always had. But if we can work together in a plan like the experimental classroom, we might find, through spending a little money, that things are cheaper in the long run.