

d.n. soapbox

Uniform evaluations benefit all

Teachers grading students for their efforts is a traditional part of the university system.

Not so traditional, though, is the idea of students grading their teachers.

Student evaluation of teaching performance was an issue that crested on the great wave of "educational reform" in the late sixties. Students wanted to have more to say about teaching and began to develop a consumer attitude toward the educational process.

It was a commendable step. While a true university includes much more than teaching (research, service and intellectual commentary for example), teaching is the prime component—the "why" of a university.

Current UNL stipulations call for periodic evaluations—some from students and some from faculty members. It is a vague requirement, but many departments already exceed these guide-

lines and demand regular student evaluation of teaching.

The College of Arts and Sciences faculty members will consider a proposal to make uniform evaluations part of the college policy. As a standard, they would more likely be part of the promotion and tenure consideration mechanism when considering teaching skill.

The proposal also calls for uniform review of the evaluation by the chief administrator within each school or department.

It is to be hoped that faculty members will accept the proposal. In effect it would only extend to the entire college a proposal that has been part of several departments for a long while.

Moreover, faculty acceptance would be tangible evidence of student opinion having some real meaning within the educational community. A university is a cooperative exchange, a communication between teacher and learner.

Evaluations could signify that both students and faculty members are at some time learners.

Vince Boucher

ralph



by ron wheeler

letters to the editor

In the Feb. 11 issue of the Daily Nebraskan, Barb Ang wrote a letter entitled, "Oppose McDonald's Zoning." No one could have looked upon it with more disgust than we did. We are the employees of McDonald's Restaurants.

Our jobs are not easy, but we pride ourselves in working as a team, working to serve the public, not just take their dollars. Our smiles are not plastic, but warm and sincere. A smile and a greeting are the first steps in making new friends. We enjoy making people happy, and we all make new friends everyday.

Our phenomenal growth can attest to that. Our restaurants are sparkling clean and well lit. We don't try to hide dirt. We want every corner to echo with, "look, we care, enjoy your meal in a pleasant atmosphere." Our own corporate standards for cleanliness far and away exceed those set up by any government agency.

Our products are the absolute finest money can buy. Guaranteed 100 per cent beef, the finest potatoes in the world, and properly calibrated soft drinks. Not exactly a "soybean slop shop." It's plain to see good old Barb didn't research her complaints very well.

She also states that "we may be the only campus on earth to co-habitate with Ronald McDonald." Another false statement. McDonald's is operating food services inside the student union of a major university, and it is working out fantastically!

Barb Ang also asks in her letter, "Do we want McDonald's sacks littering our campus?" We can answer that. . . NO! McDonald's doesn't litter, people litter! We provide plenty of trash receptacles at all of our stores. We have employees on every shift who make sure paper is picked up, tables cleaned off, and spills wiped up. If everyone was as litter conscious as our employees, those clean-up people wouldn't have to work so hard.

So next time you are walking to class, Barb, and you glance back and see that nice looking student pick up the candy wrapper you just dropped, look at her closely. She just might be that one smiling at you over the counter on your next visit to McDonald's. You, you're the one!

The Employees of McDonald's

word unheard

Grassroots anti-fees effort: 'Ours is not to question. . . ?'

By Del Gustafson

The secretary smiles and tells you the Vice-Chancellor for student affairs will see you now. You walk rather stiffly through the door, but are immediately at ease. The vice-chancellor rises, shakes your hand, smiles a disarming smile, settles back into his chair, and puffs amiably and serenely upon his pipe.

"You see, sir, my friends and I are running a party in the ASUN elections. We have no previous campus political experience or particular ambition to lead our fellow students; but we do have a basic conception of right and wrong which tells us it is wrong to compel 20,000 students, or anybody for that matter, to contribute to private organizations or newspapers. That, we understand, is exactly what student fees do, and to end those fees is our purpose for running."

The vice chancellor puffs a little more vigorously on the pipe. Then, with the confidence and mien of a father about to explain those sublime and beautiful facts of life to his adolescent son, he leans forward and tells you that those fees really are just like taxes. And everyone, including mommy and daddy, have to pay taxes.

Just when you're about to reply in that cocksure, undergrad way—that you know few people who have to pay taxes to support an organization dedicated to the glorification of sexual perversion, or a newspaper—just then, you look into that benevolent face. Argument becomes out of the question; one doesn't argue with grandfather.

Fee reduction

Feebly you try to recoup the lost moment. "I guess it's a matter of opinion." He nods approvingly. "But what we really wanted to know is, would you reduce or end fees if the students elected an anti-fee party?"

The vice-chancellor replies that if the students supported an anti-fee position it probably would result in a fee reduction.

You and your compatriots walk out of the office elevated of spirit, knowing justice will be done and truth will prevail. Unfortunately, a month later, after a whopping 7 per cent turnout at the polls, justice and truth pull up second.

Then you read it in the "Rag." The vice chancellor candidly proclaims that even had we been elected, student fees could not have been decreased—UNL simply couldn't survive without them.

Never believe administrator

After resolving never to believe a college administrator again, I continued to resist the argument that a college must have student fees.

Now, I have been vindicated. Indiana University has recently done away with the mandatory fee on all its campuses. To quote from the guidelines established by the IU trustees: "Non-university controlled student-related activities will not be funded through either mandatory nor optional fees but will be required to collect fees on an 'activity day' or some other such event not connected with registration."

Indiana's move is a wise one. It lays to rest the baffling argument that students need to have their pockets picked each semester by enterprising campus organizations to obtain an education. By the way, anyone interested in joining my new campus organization, "The Committee to Horsewhip Ken Bader," should call 474-1182.

(Editor's note: Mr. Gustafson's opinions, as those of other editorial columnists, are solely his own. They do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Daily Nebraskan.)

innocent bystander

Reagan economics painted red?

By Arthur Hoppe

Rise today in defense of Ronald Reagan. No matter what his critics may charge, there is not one shred of concrete proof that he is currently a member of the Communist Party.

True, in the only major economic proposals of his campaign thus far, he has espoused the two basic principles of Marxist-Leninism: redistribution of the wealth and government ownership of the means of production.

But those certainly make him a Communist. Not necessarily.

Actually, there is much to be said for Mr. Reagan's bold Four Year Plan to redistribute the wealth. As you know, he is calling for returning \$90 billion (or \$200 billion or something) worth of Federal programs to the states.

Apparently, he is not referring to our Federal nuclear warfare capacity, although this isn't too clear. He probably means welfare programs primarily.

Vote with their feet

Naturally, a poor state like Mississippi could not sup-

port a welfare recipient as regally as a rich state like California. But, as Mr. Reagan points out, poor Mississippians could "vote with their feet" by walking to California.

This influx of poor would, of course, impoverish California. But why should bloated California capitalists greedily enjoy the fruits of their labor? And, eventually, under Mr. Reagan's plan, all 50 states would achieve the Marxist dream and be equally poor.

More difficult to defend is Mr. Reagan's suggestion that the \$58 billion in Social Security trust funds, which now earn 6.7 per cent in Federal bonds, might better be invested in the stock market.

Speaking in behalf of Mr. Ford, Elliot Richardson was quick to say this would "put the U.S. Government in the position of controlling every major industrial firm in the United States."

Well, what's wrong with the Government controlling the means of production? With \$58 billion to pay with, the Government could buy short, sell long and maybe even corner the market in hogback futures. It could make

a killing, if it was lucky.

Who needs it?

True, it would bankrupt a lot of widows and orphans in the process and undoubtedly destroy the nation's faith in Wall Street. But as Karl Marx said about Wall Street, "Who needs it?"

And think how excited—if that's the right word—our trusting old folks will be when Mr. Reagan removes their life savings from those stodgy old 6.7 per cent Federal bonds to take a flyer in the stock market. Heck, "excited" isn't even close to the right word.

But just because Mr. Reagan wants to destroy accumulated wealth, individual initiative, private property and the free enterprise system, that doesn't mean he's a card-carrying Communist.

Fair is fair. He could be a Trotskyist, a Utopian Socialist or—let's be charitable and give him the benefit of the doubt—a Presidential candidate who doesn't know what on earth he's talking about.

(Copyright Chronicle Publishing Co. 1976)