

The Gateway

Member of the Canadian University Press
Winner N. A. M. MacKenzie Trophy 1963-64
Winner Ottawa Journal Trophy 1963-64
Editor-in-Chief - - - Bill Winship

Associate Editor	Barry Rust	Editorial Assistant	Adriana Albi
News Editor	Don Sellar	Fine Arts	Marion Raycheba
Sports Editor	Alex Hardy	CUP Editor	Patricia Hughes
Features Editor	Janis Kostash	Photo Editor	Hiroto Saka
City Editor	Doug Walker	Makeup Editor	Bill Miller

PAGE FOUR

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1964

Admission Standards Reviewed

President Johns stated last week an effort is being extended to standardize entrance requirements for Canadian universities. He also anticipates three criteria will be used for judging admission—a common entrance exam, grade twelve results, and a high school principal's report.

It is hoped the effort being made is a substantial one.

Standardized requirements are welcomed but not essential. What is essential, however, is a new means by which to determine student admission.

The present system, 60 per cent average in six high school courses, leaves much to be desired.

It is not an accurate indication of a student's ability or potential. It allows for university enrollment far above the number existing facilities and qualified instructors can adequately accommodate. It establishes an unnecessary drain on scholarship, grant and loan funds supposedly provided for needy and deserving students.

The end of any educational system must surely be as much education as

possible for as many as possible.

However this does give license for an "open door" policy and accommodation of those who view university as little more than a playground.

In recognition of this problem, the University of Saskatchewan has indicated it is prepared to raise admission requirements to a high school average of 65 per cent. An 80 per cent drop-out rate of students receiving high school averages below 65 per cent exists at the U of S. In light of these facts the new policy at Saskatchewan seems appropriate.

But what of the other 20 per cent? Must they of necessity be deprived of a university education?

Before admitting any student to an undergraduate program a university should be aware of his basic intelligence, performance record, and desire of and appreciation for higher education.

The three point system as set out by Dr. Johns appear to meet these demands as closely as they can presently be met. Implementation of the proposed program cannot come too soon.

Food For Thought

To clarify:

There is nothing wrong with the food at Lister Hall.

The quantity, the quality, and the variety of meals served at Lister Hall are quite adequate.

We have never said otherwise.

We have voiced complaints about the cost of eating at Lister Hall.

We have voiced complaints about the food service policy on campus in general.

Our complaints have been based on the assumption that food services on campus, including Lister Hall, are not perfect, and therefore open to

constructive criticism and suggestions.

We are especially pleased to hear that residence students are enjoying their meals. They should be.

We are also aware, however, that a great many non-residence students have expressed strong criticisms of food service policies.

Perhaps in so successfully meeting the needs of residence students, off-campus students have been neglected. Or perhaps for the moment the two objectives are incompatible.

Is there not some justification for such complaints?

Communication Problem

Students' Council, and in particular Students' Union President Francis Saville, are to be congratulated for their efforts to place two more councillors on the University Athletic Board.

In the past, lack of communication and coordination has led to serious misunderstanding. The UAB proposal last spring to build a grandstand around the university track is a good example of the communication breakdown.

Students' Council was not aware of the proposal; it was not consulted in advance. In view of the large amounts of student money the University Athletic Board handles, it is imperative that students have more to say in its allocation. The present system is obviously not working.

The first step to improve communication is the reinstatement of

the Presidents of Men's and Women's Athletics on council with full voting privileges. Both presidents were noticeably absent during most summer council sessions. Perhaps voting privileges will encourage their attendance.

Second, the agendas of UAB meetings should be in the hands of all councillors before each meeting. As well, the minutes of UAB meetings should be distributed to all councillors.

Third, the President of Men's Athletics should be installed as chairman of the University Athletic Board.

The active participation of students in the policy decisions of UAB is essential. It is obvious, moreover, that changes in the UAB structure must be made if students are to have an effective voice.



"WE'LL SHAPE YOU UP YET, SON"



The horrors of Registration and the mad run-around of Freshman Introduction Week are now safely behind us. Students are hard at work on their respective studies. (Except for a friend of mine, who stepped on his IBM card with a golf shoe and found himself with a Ph.D. in Phrenology). Freshmen are comfortably adapted to university life, going about their business in the usual calm, assured manner.

Oh?

You show me a calm, assured freshman and I'll show you a fink. Even after the reams of advice expelled by various authorities, the freshman situation is still as hopeless as it always is. At about this time next year things may begin to improve, but by then there will be a new motley horde descending on campus in exactly the same condition.

And it is all so unnecessary. All that need be done is to provide the first-year student with a little Instant Status.

Status, in this case, is not an index of social position. It is vaguely related to pipe-smoking, Intellectualism, the Varsity Look, and fraternity membership, however.

Status is what makes people ready to listen to what a person says. Status is what makes the person able to say it, whether or not they listen

at all.

People with status can talk to President Johns without stuttering. People with status go through Registration calmly. People with status can contradict their professors.

In the final analysis, the only thing that distinguishes an upperclassman from a frosh is that the upperclassman has a degree of Status; the frosh has none.

Status can be achieved in several ways. One can wait until he gets it by normal seniority. But this means an entire year of nonentity, surely what we are trying to avoid. One can pretend to have Status by taking up all the aforementioned symbols of pipe, etc. But this is only a sham. Probably there is no real shortcut, because Status is only achieved when a person feels completely secure in his campus niche, or can completely cope with all the insecurities he has left. Good luck!

Letters

Letters should be addressed to The Editor, The Gateway, University of Alberta. The Gateway will publish letters under a pseudonym, but in all cases writers must sign their own names and include an address or telephone number.

The Papermakers

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Bruce Ferrier, Jim MacLaren, Patricia Hughes, Lawrence Samuel, Irene McRae, Bill Salter, R. B. Flewelling, Helene Chomlak, David Estrin, Cherylyn Smith, Janet Orzech, Miles Murray, Barrie Brennan, Larry Krywanluk, Ginger Bradley, Malcolm Fast, Garry Klerman, Carole Kaye, Pat Mooney, Mary Shearer, Gloria Stybel, Brenda Walls, Donna Shoebottom and Regina. The Gateway is published twice weekly by the Students' Union of the University of Alberta. Opinions expressed by columnists are not necessarily those of the editors. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final Copy Deadline: for Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Thursday: for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Monday. Advertising Manager, Bev Bayer. Circulation 7,500. Office phone—433-1155.