

Vanek, administrators & educology

After some consideration, I have decided to reply to the second letter of Mr. Simpson to the *Gateway*. His discussion reduced the issue of possible over-administration of the University to one of pious concern for tedium on the part of academic staff with some administrative duties. Mr. Simpson herein displays a remarkable naivete about how the University of Alberta actually operates. The Academic Staff Association estimates that AT LEAST 80% of academic staff have substantial administrative responsibility. This is hardly a trivial issue. Figures available on request from the President's Office indicate almost 10% of the full-time academic staff, up to the level of Deans, are **full-time administrators**. Contrary to Mr. Simpson's assertion, these full-time administrators are formerly academics, that is, their originally chosen profession (and professional training) were **not** in administration. I was also surprised to note that the figures supplied to me referred to a category of "Administrators" and a second category of "other academic staff." I object to the priority implied for administration over the teaching and research which is the proper business of the University. The aim of having administrators who are trained as academics is, I would assume, that their priorities are educational rather

than administrative. My objections to the University of Alberta philosophy of administration is precisely the frequent reversal of priorities.

My presentation of my platform for candidacy as University President has, unfortunately, suffered from what is considered newsworthy by the media, particularly the *Gateway*. My educational philosophy, as developed before my appointment to this University, has received little attention, in spite of its inclusion in all releases. I would like to quote from the release in which I stated my candidacy (January 3, 1973):

"I have previously coined the term 'educology' to describe my philosophy of education. The Educology symbol consists of a circle representing the horizon, and a central dot representing the insignificant sum of our total knowledge. The heavy arrows signify the limiting and confining forces of present-day education. The outward-bound arrows represent the effort to enlarge present knowledge by breaking through existing horizons to create new ones. More recently, I have spoken of 'academic genocide', the process whereby such ideals of scholarship and academic communication may be prostituted if they do not

meet vested interests or established procedures."

In light of these concepts, the entirety of my platform for the University Presidency should be easier for Mr. Simpson, and perhaps others, to understand. An administration which operates for its own sake, not to facilitate teaching and research, reverses the emphasis of the arrows in the Educology symbol. Education is largely limiting and confining. Breaking through to new horizons of knowledge becomes virtually impossible. Mr. Simpson sees my concern for administration as possibly "facile." On the contrary, I believe that society suffers if educational priorities are not those of educology. The recent conclusions regarding goals of the Education Faculty stressing innovation and creativity in instruction support my view. I find it incomprehensible that any educator could disagree in principle. We would be better off with a government-run University than with reversal of the priorities of real education from within the University itself. I, however, believe that the University of Alberta, and universities generally, have the potential and the responsibility to serve education in its highest sense, and, indeed, to define what that education may be in a rapidly changing world.

Anthony Vanek

Press freedom and puppetry

If it's not already apparent, it's only fair to alert Gateway readers to the particularly cozy relationship between Poundmaker and the Kuhnke slate in the coming election.

Since her decision to run for the presidency, Kuhnke's interest in and animosity toward the Gateway have increased markedly.

She proposed to Students' Council what amounts to an entirely new constitution for the Gateway. The first copy of these changes, hot off the xerox, was personally delivered to the Gateway by Poundmaker editor Ron Yakimchuk, and Kuhnke has been quite frank about the Poundmaker's role in drafting the changes.

The merit of the proposed changes is not at issue here—some are good, some are not—but rather, the way they were formulated and especially their motivation.

In light of these small services done for the Poundmaker their endorsement of the Kuhnke slate came as no surprise. My father would probably describe the situation with the phrase "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours."

The Gateway has made room in this edition for some advice on election choices (see Candace Savage's "point" on page four). But we did so without even mentioning to the candidates "endorsed" that we planned to do so, and particularly without making promises or political deals. The freedom and autonomy of the Gateway is too important to our staff to be bargained away.

Terri Jackson

Vote NO on BAC

Someone asked me the other day if there was "anything more to the Biz-Ad building opposition than "just emotionalism."

I said there was, and if you doubt the serious reasons behind the opposition to the building site, have a look at Peter Smith's brief on pages 2 and 3.

But I also said that it's time for us to develop a little more respect for "just emotionalism." First, because our reaction to beauty and its opposite are basically emotional responses. This is an ugly campus—godawful ugly. And my response to this campus—admittedly an emotional one—is depression, anger and alienation. Every day I look at this jumble of buildings and styles, crowded shoulder to shoulder and forming an impossible maze of the campus, I am told by the university's planners that they don't care that I have to be here looking at their mistakes for up to 12 hours a day.

That anger and alienation—again emotional—are also directed at the way planning decisions are made here. I wish there had been more students at the December hearings on the Biz-Ad building—but the committee was clever enough to hold the hearings during Christmas exams.

What I saw there was the most incredible arrogance on the part of the committee and the hired planners. One committee member quite openly admitted to me after the meeting that he had his mind made up long before the hearings. Obviously the rest of the committee had its mind made up too: in spite of ten briefs opposing the site and only two (one from the hired architects, one from the hired landscapers) favouring the site.

We must say no to that arrogance, and a start is to say no to the Biz Ad building.

Finally, on the same principle that governments are turned out of office as a sign of non-confidence, it's time to call the campus planners to account, and bring them back to reality.

This year's university budget shows that it will cost \$700,000 more next year just to clean the buildings which were completed this year. With enrolment declining, there's no point in gratifying the pipe dreams of the empire builders in campus development. To do so will cut into the declining university budget for operating costs: more buildings to maintain mean fewer instructors, fewer books in the library.

It's too bad that the stop has to come at the expense of the Commerce faculty, but it will have to stop somewhere and there will inevitably be a faculty which suffers. But the stop must come and to start the re-thinking so necessary to campus planning, we must start by saying no to the Business Administration and Commerce building.

Terri Jackson

Ballot made easy(?)

by returning officer, Bruce Ney

The preferential ballot as used in elections by this Students' Union can be of great benefit to the voting students. This voting system allows the student to indicate who the voter would like to see elected at every stage of the voting if his favourite choice is not elected. But this only works if the majority of students use this system. If not and the race is a close one, separated perhaps by tens of votes, then a small number of students actually decide who will attain the office as they are the only ones who vote preferentially. With a clear cut leader or preferred candidate then the number of preferential voters, or lack of them, has very little effect as the initial trend is carried on. In the upcoming general election, though, with its large number of candidates and the suspected low turnout, it is of prime importance that every voter indicate all his choices in the position. If not, as I mentioned before, a small number of people will decide who will win. The results may not indicate the preferred candidate as the winner may have carried sufficient second and third favourite votes to carry him to victory. Sound unfair? Perhaps, but the student has been informed on many occasions about the use of the preferential ballot and yet the majority of students fail to use this method, perhaps out of mistrust or disgust with the system.

For those students who are interested, I shall explain the workings of the preferential ballot system. For simplicity sake, I shall use four candidates in an election for some office. This can be extended into any number of candidates but this explains the basic idea. In this election A, B, C, and D receive 150, 100, 90 and 60 votes respectively. Since D has the least votes he is dropped from the running and his votes are redistributed. What this means is that on any vote that has a 1 beside D now has the second choice on that ballot added onto the old total of the other candidates. For instance, if the second choice on one of the ballots that has Ds as a number one was C then C's total vote now becomes 61. This process is continued until all of D's ballots have been redistributed in this manner. Ideally, if all people vote preferentially then the new totals could be A - 170, B - 130 and C - 100. Now C is dropped as he has the least number of votes. Now C's number two choices are added onto the remaining candidates totals and the same process is done with D's number three choices. Any votes for C from D are not counted, but this does not prevent D's later choices from being counted if later redistributions are necessary. This second redistribution now gives A - 270 and B - 180. This gives A the majority of the votes cast so he is the

winner. If the voting had been closer and now clear majority had been gained then A would have been declared the winner as he obtained the largest support.

The whole idea behind this type of voting is that it allows the voter to say well, if I cannot have D in then I would like to see C in office. If this is not possible then my support goes to B. This particular voter would like to see A in least of all but his preferential voting has hindered A's chances by indicating that A has no support from that particular voter. Ideally this system allows you the most freedom when it comes to indicating the order of your preference of people who you would like to get into office. But only if you use it!

This year the ballot has been changed to incorporate all the ballots and the referendum on the location of the proposed Business, Administration and Commerce Building in the Arts Court onto one long ballot with perforations between all the sections. Once the voter has completed voting (hopefully preferentially) then the voter should not tear the sections apart but merely fold the ballot together and place it in the appropriate ballot box. If in doubt read the instructions at the top of the ballot or else ask one of the poll clerks. That is what they are there for. In your own interests with as many candidates running as there are, vote preferentially.

Letters to the Gateway on any topic are welcome, but they must be signed. Pseudonyms may be used for good cause. Keep letters short (about 200 words) unless you wish to make a complex argument. Letters should not exceed 800 words.

The Gateway is published bi-weekly by the students of the University of Alberta. Contents are the responsibility of the editor. Opinions are those of the person who expressed them.

Staff this issue: Allyn Cadogan; deena hunter, arts; Terri Jackson, editor; Sylvia Joly, typesetter; Harold Kuckertz, jr; Laura Leake; Loreen Lennon, arts assistant; Colleen Milne, headlines; Walter Plinge; Vic Post, photos; Les Reynolds, footnotes; Michel Ricciardi, photos; Sylvia Ridgley; Candace Savage, news; Margriet Tilroe, typesetter; ron treiber, production; Brian Tucker.

gateway