

# THE SCAB SHEET

VOL. I NO. VI

APRIL 9, 1969



Be for the truth

## Computer Registration Sucks

Oregon State University is currently planning to institute a plan for computer registration beginning next fall term. While we are not questioning the theory of instituting computer programming on this campus, the program presented as of this date does not accomplish its purpose of simplifying registration nor does it allow the individual student a greater opportunity to receive the schedule he desires.

One of the benefits of this computer registration was originally stated as giving a complete course demand program of all courses at OSU. This requires that cards be available at the class tables for everyone and anyone desiring any course listed in the class schedule. If anyone conceivably can register for any course, the computer registration program will complicate, rather than simplify, the administrator's job in that he will be required to hand out two to ten times as many class cards as there is room in the course. The administration is bound to classify these popular courses (almost invariably popular because of the professor and not the subject matter) as exceptions and adopt pre-registration methods for solving course limitation requirements. However, this completely negates the premise that all courses will be included in the course demand program and therefore the schedule of classes will be invalid.

One aspect of the proposed computer registration program that should concern every member of the student body is the fact that there is no availability for the student to specify which professor he desires in any but single section classes. In other words, freshmen enrolling in English composition will be programmed into a time slot by the computer--that student will have no way to influence which professor he receives. This arbitrary procedure will apply to every multi-sectioned class.

Under the present system, admittedly slow and painful, there is some choice of instructor, whereas under the computer registration there is no choice available. Students should be guaranteed the right to preliminary selection of their professors, whether in practice they receive that choice or not. Obviously, all the students cannot be fully satisfied in their desire of professor preference, but efforts should be undertaken NOW by the administration to work out a human program for the computer. The administration's computer programmers must operate from the premises of humanistic requirements and the computer must serve man's needs. If this is not possible because of machine limitation

or programmer limitation, then the computer must not be used at all.

In order that you, the student, may see the program planned for next fall term, we are printing an itemized statement of the computer registration procedure.

1. A schedule of classes will be made available to all students in similar form to the present schedule. This is to allow the student to select a successful individual schedule, such that two single section courses meeting at the same hour on the same day will not be accidentally selected. This program will be entered on a "Course Request Card" (CRC).

2. The CRC will be submitted to the student's advisor and the school dean for approval, as is presently done with the trial study form. The CRC will indicate the student's name, the course letter, and number code only (such as Ec. 201, Wr. 303, etc.). There is no provision for course time or professor preference on the CRC.

3. Students will go to "sectioning tables" (a meaningless term since the student has no choice of section in multiple section courses) to get their class cards. The packet of cards will be handed over to a collection desk when leaving Gill Coliseum. All of the student body will register the first day and all cards will be available to the computer center for processing on the first evening.

4. The computer center will process all the course cards to give a printout to each school as to how many students desire each class offered in the schedule of classes. The department heads and deans will then decide which courses need more sections and what ceilings to put on single section courses.

5. The dean's decisions are sent back to the computer center for implementation in determining individual student class programs. The order of processing, and thus who gets first choice of classes, will be determined on the basis of Seniors first, with the remainder of the students considered according to the alphabetic "permit to register" schedule on the back of the schedule of classes. If a course does not fit a student's time program, the computer will alter that student's program by moving a multiple sectioned course to another time slot and then trying to fit the course that previously conflicted into your program. The computer will (cont'd.)

## Computer Reg. Sucks (cont'd.)

try this method randomly 5000 times, and if no solution is possible in that many tries, it will reject the student's entire program and proceed to the next student. After the student receives his program the next day, he will have to work out his schedule by the "manual" method so familiar to the campus now, the same method which we have been assured this computer programmed registration was going to eliminate. In the 5000 tries of the computer to work out a schedule, the multi-sectioned courses will be shuffled randomly to achieve a non-conflicting schedule. The final schedule presented to the student could conceivably be drastically different from the program desired by that student.

6. When all student programs are processed, individual student schedules will be printed out with itemized bills. These schedule/bills will be distributed the second day of registration at various distribution points, where fees are collected.

The program presented above obviously caters to the desires of the people involved in running registration, with little or no attention to the needs of the students. We must oppose the present system and demand that either a plan be presented which reflects human concerns or the idea of computer registration at OSU be discarded as inhumane and merely another attempt by this administration to control student decisions.

## The American Renaissance Symposium Exists

I think; therefore, I am.  
I am; therefore, I exist.

--Descartes

The American Renaissance Symposium will take place April 25, 26 and 27. The American Renaissance Symposium and the sponsoring organizations exist and are functioning. The committee would like to clear the air of some of the misconceptions surrounding the symposium.

Yesterday, the Student Activities Committee (composed of eight students and ten faculty and administrators), refused recognition of the program outlined by the Symposium Committee on the following grounds:

1. lack of organization
2. fear of reprisals of state legislators in the form of reduced funding for universities
3. fear of riots or whatever.

The grounds upon which the committee refused recognition are both illogical and unreasonable. In the first place, the Symposium Committee has been functioning since approximately the middle

of last term. It has made arrangements for funding, speakers, and facilities. Apparently, however, the mere fact that an organization does not feel the Activities Committee should dictate to them is ground enough for the Activities Committee to ignore the organization's integrity, ability to organize, and responsibility.

Secondly, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education has adopted a statement which says basically that universities are institutions established for the pursuit of intellectual activities without the fear of reprisals from within or without the university community. This position must be maintained. This pursuit of learning is the only legitimate purpose of the university and until the legislature understands its position, the institutions of higher learning in the state of Oregon will continue to be shackled by fears and ignorance. The state legislature has no right to determine what can and cannot be discussed on a university campus. We must educate that legislature to its role; test cases cannot be avoided.

As to the fear of undesirable actions as a result of the symposium, this is a paradigm example of precisely the type of ignorance and fear the symposium was designed to alleviate. The speakers have been invited to Oregon State not to incite riots, but to enlighten through intellectual discussions (repeat: intellectual, educational) members of this particular institution. In addition, there is no way of predicting what will be the results of any activity--be it Greek Week, Centennial Lectures, or the American Renaissance Symposium.

The committee, in trying to allay these fears and in trying to cooperate through established organizational procedures, made numerous concessions--i.e. the program was cut from four days to two so that it would not interfere with classes and so that there would be an uninterrupted schedule of events, leaving no free time for riots. Also, the number of principal speakers was cut from nine to seven and the desired budget was reduced. The committee promised to operate within established procedural boundaries.

The Activities Committee rejected the Symposium, but it did say that it would be willing to reconsider if certain conditions were met. The Renaissance Committee was in full accord with all but two of the proposed conditions. First, there was a provision for the establishment of a committee to be composed of representatives from sponsoring organizations, the status or (cont'd.)

function of which was not made clear. In fact, such a committee exists in the form of the American Renaissance Symposium Committee, which is made up of representatives from each sponsoring organization and will include more members at such time as commitments are made by other organizations. It seems that the Activities Committee wants to define for the Renaissance Committee which members would be acceptable.

The second condition found unacceptable was that the symposium must be carried out "over a period of time." The "period of time" mentioned was not made specific. Obviously, the schedule does cover a period of time--two days. The implied intent of the Activities Committee in this area was quite clearly an extended period of time, more than one week. Such a modification effectively destroys the concept of a symposium which is, by definition, not a multiple-week series of lectures. These people have seemingly failed to grasp the fact that what the symposium is designed to present is an overview of an integrated cultural movement. This overview cannot be accomplished through piecemeal presentations. The Activities Committee is, in effect, attempting to regiment and restrict the presentation of a way of life founded upon a rejection of regimentation and restriction. Although not a direct, or perhaps even conscious, attempt at censorship, the actions last night are a more subtle and possibly more dangerous form of restriction on the efforts of students who want to become involved in their own education.

The following is part of the document on "Student Rights, Freedoms, and Responsibilities" accepted by Student Senate last week and currently before Faculty Senate.

"Students shall be allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing. While the orderly scheduling of facilities may require the observance of routine procedures before a guest speaker is invited to appear on campus, institutional control of campus facilities shall never be used as a device of censorship. It shall be made clear to the academic and larger community that sponsorship of guest speakers does not necessarily imply endorsement of the views expressed, either by the sponsoring group or the institution."

It seems that the Activities Committee does not believe that "students shall be allowed to invite and hear any person of their own choosing." Or could it be that the Committee believes it is the sole judge in such matters; that it alone can read the minds of students, that it is the supreme being of education on this campus?

### Here We Go Again?

"No person should use the threat of removal of an athlete's or any other student's grant or scholarship; or suspension from his participation on teams or other groups; or any other form of coercion as a means of forcing behavior on an athlete." (the revised Administrative Proposal approved by Faculty Senate)

Already this term, actions have been taken which are in direct violation of the above statements. Andrew Hill, OSU basketballer, was barred from the court by coach Valenti and told not to return until he had cut his hair. Bryce Huddleston, varsity football player, was told to leave spring practice and warned not to return until he had shaved his mustache. According to George Carr, BSU President, these particular cases are in the process of being recommended to the President's Commission on Human Rights and Responsibilities.

We have been told that this Commission will settle such matters, but it remains to be seen whether the Commission will act on its intentions. The individuals involved are presenting their cases to the "proper channels." Hopefully, the "proper channels" will prove responsive to student needs, thereby eliminating the necessity for a recurrence of last term's disruption.

---

"I do not think; therefore, I am not.

I am not; therefore, I do not exist."

Student Senate

---

Administrator! Your computer is ingenious, it channels faster than the tide and processes faster than an army, but it has one defect: it needs a technician.

Administrator! A student is very useful, it can learn and it can mimic, but it too has one defect: it can think.