

# U of T Birth Control Information Program Meets Opposition

TORONTO (CUP) — Students attempting to distribute birth control literature in U of Toronto residences are meeting opposition from some officials.

Laurel Limbus said she has been officially requested not to hold meetings in St. Michael's College.

Some deans of women have put the question to votes of the residence governments. Others ask that the information be distributed, not at meetings called for this purpose.

Miss Limbus says she suspected officials were afraid of bad publicity.

"The general attitude seems to be that having sex is more damaging than a pregnancy."

The U of T student council has endorsed the birth control information program being conducted on campus by co-eds.

# U of S May Get Student Senators

SASKATOON (CUP) — A committee of the board of governors of U of S has recommended that students be given seats on the senate.

If recommendations are adopted one student from each campus will be appointed by the student council to the senate posts.

Saskatoon campus student president Pearpoint said he does not regard the move as a breakthrough in student-administration relations, but sees it instead as a step toward opening lines of communication.

Past student president Dave Tkachuk said "the student council has been sucked in again!"

"It happens every year," he said "University president Spinks pats you on the back and you that everybody can get along, but you end up with nothing."

He said only when students are allowed access to all the secret little committees of the senate will they really have something.

# UVIC May Pioneer in Pot Research

VICTORIA (CUP) — University of Victoria may become a centre for a research study of marijuana.

Student council went on record Sunday as "supporting the structure of an independent research body, preferably at the University of Victoria, to study the uses of marijuana."

The motion, initiated by student-at-large Tom Paul, passed unanimously.

"Quite a few people on Campus are using marijuana," he said. "It's use will eventually become so widespread as to cause problems for the government."

"For the sake of the rationalists in the population information should be collected," he added.

Council president David McLean was concerned lest the motion be passed and forgotten.

"Unless there is subsequent action on the motion here there is no point in passing it," he said.

He added he thought the university administration would recognize the need for and be willing to support such a study.

# JELLYBEANS

by Tom Murphy

## QUALITY OF EDUCATION

- (1) Do you feel that your professor would accept your criticism of him (a) sincerely (b) lightly (c) as "student talk" (d) by flunking you.
- (2) Do you feel that your professor is: (a) well organized (b) mis-organized (c) disorganized (d) forget it.
- (3) Is your main text for the course (a) related and readable (b) related and not readable (c) not related but readable (d) bad new, brother.

Questions like these could be on a course evaluation questionnaire. How would you honestly answer them? Could you comment on them, or expand upon them? Would you even answer them?

Quality of education should be a major concern to all students. This is what you are paying for. But what is the price? Students at the University of New Brunswick have virtually no say in directing a particular course, choosing a text, or determining the quality of education they will receive. True, a student is not particularly qualified to direct courses or choose texts, but he does know the difference generally between a good course, a hard course, an easy course, a bad course, and similarly so with texts and professors. Students, on one hand, are continually accused of not taking education seriously, but on the other hand, how can they take seriously something with which they are so minutely involved? Students should have a say—they MUST have a say if there is to be any growth (other than red bricks) within the university.

As I mentioned a few Jellybeans ago, there is NO dialogue between the faculty and the students. The forced co-existence between faculty and students is necessary to preserve the peace. The professor talks; the student writes. The professor asks; the student mumbles. The professor writes; the student copies. The professor assigns; the student reads. The bell rings; the professor talks; the student shuffles; the professor packs; the student leaves. The professor says under his breath, "I'm glad that's over." The student says under his breath, "I'm glad that's over." Everyone says to everyone else "I'm glad that's over." Hurray for dialogue! Hurray for communication! The score, at the end of one degree is professors, 0, students 0. That's right, no dialogue, no score, and no winner.

What then, is a valid method or approach for attaining this dialogue, in reference to the questions posed at the beginning of this article, is course evaluation. Basically, course evaluation involves at one stage the handing out of questionnaires to students, in each of the courses they take, and asking them to answer the questions honestly on the various aspects of that course. Then the data can be compiled, edited, and published in the form of an "ANTI-CALENDAR," as opposed to the university calendar. (provided the necessary funds can be attained.) The "anti-calendar" is of service to students particularly those with plenty of options. But just as important is the service it is to professors who get a reflection of the opinions the students of his past class had of him.

More important, still, however, is the work involved in producing an anti-calendar. If passed by the SRC, a standing committee consisting of both students and faculty will be set up not only to iron out the flaws in course evaluation and anti-calendars, but as well, will be available to students who want to meet with them to talk over specific problems encountering the student at that moment. That way, everyone joins, and the first sparks of true dialogue begin to glow. The objective is sky high flames engulfing the university.

These are primarily my own ideas. Help is needed on everyone's behalf to make student-faculty dialogue a reality. Thus, I am going to misuse my column and make a direct appeal to students and faculty to attend a meeting on the SRC on Sunday, Oct. 29, in the Tartan Room starting at 6:30. The main theme of discussion will be course evaluation. It is essential that those show up who are in favour of or indifferent to, and perhaps most important, against course evaluation. Depending on the issues brought forth at that meeting, up to \$4,000 will be spent on course evaluation, which comes out of student funds.

In this column, I have not attempted to lay out any of the issues surrounding course evaluation; my only attempt was to introduce them in the dark of student-faculty relationships. The question, however, remains — where is the light switch?

## LAW BALL

Friday, November 3, 1967

Lord Beaverbrook Hotel

Tickets available from any Law student or at the Law School  
238 Waterloo Row.

Students: \$5.00

Others: \$7.00