

Balancing academics and athletics

There is a debate going on in the athletic department on whether to have athletic scholarships given to students or not. It is one that has involved both the athletic instructors and the instructors of regular academic subjects such as science, english, and so forth.

It is fine to have students receive athletic scholarships for it will enhance the St. Andrews athletic department. Having athletic scholarships will probably make the student enrollment higher and therefore enhance the college's earning capacity.

However, our letting students receive athletic scholarships may lead to a Pandora's box situation where the money generated from the allocation of athletic scholarships will be the paragon issue of the college. The money that is referred to in the above is money that would come from tickets sold to view the games. If the college gets better athletes from offering athletic scholarships, then the college theoretically, will start winning more games. If the college starts winning more games then the participation by students to those games will pick up. When more and more students start to participate in viewing the games, the college gets more and more money. If the college team gets good enough it could win a conference title. Then scouts from other teams will come and want to draft our players which is more money for the college. Soon the whole area of academics is put to rest, because everyone would be coming to St. Andrews for athletics and not for an education. Of course this is all hypothetical; still, this kind of situation forms when athletics is put above academics because academics does not "rake" in the money that athletics does.

If an athletic scholarship program is to be implemented, then the best way to insure that people with a score of 700 on their SAT do not enter this institution is to have a committee of one half academic instructors and the other half athletic instructors. This will insure that no "under cover" dealings will ever occur. Certainly there is no full proof plan that will insure that corruption, like the situation at Clemson about two or three years ago, will be deterred altogether, but at least there will be some kind of system of checks and balances that would keep each other in line.

Surely the St. Andrews athletic department has only the best interests of the college in mind as they debate this issue. Hopefully, they have pondered the givings and misgivings of a program such as this. It is in all hopes that only the best and fairest will come from the decision. It is also in all hopes that the thought of money will not over power the existing purpose of St. Andrews which is to deliver the most far-reaching and complete education possible. If those two concepts are kept in mind then the program in debate should be successful for both the students and the college as a whole.

Bobby C. Simpson

SCRC seeks access to SAGA/SAPC contract

In the last issue of THE LANCE an article submitted by the members of the food service committee suggested several constructive proposals on how to improve SAGA. Recently the North Carolina Student Legislature at St. Andrews recognized the importance of the food service issue and formed the Student Consumer Rights Committee (SCRC) whose sole purpose is to seek and find a resolution to the poor quality of the present food at St. Andrews.

The creation of the committee was based on several important factors. First and perhaps most importantly we feel the quality of food served must be upgraded drastically. While other steps are being taken at this time no one yet has addressed this concern. As students, the most often heard complaint is that the food we are eating is not a justified reflection of the money we are paying. Furthermore, students are far more concerned with the taste and quality of the food than the way it is garnished or displayed, and perhaps most importantly no matter what formation the line may take or speed it may move the product we wait for is foremost on our minds.

So as students how can we improve the quality of our food service? How can we use the money we are spending on board to provide us with better food? Students have offered many suggestions, but before we take action we must know how much of our money is being spent for the actual food. The only way we can find out how our money is being spent is to see the contract between SAGA and St. Andrews.

The SCRC feels that the students have the inherent right to review the contract on the following grounds:

- 1) The contract exists for the sole purpose of providing a food service for the students.
- 2) The money designated for this contract comes from the students.
- 3) Food service at St. Andrews is required with few exceptions.
- 4) The students are consumers, and therefore have the right to see and influence how their money is spent.

Therefore, the North Carolina Student Legislature's Student Consumer Committee requests the disclosure of the contract between SAGA and St. Andrews to be released for review by the St. Andrews community.

If you support this view please look for notices of upcoming SCRC meetings.

*SAGA is owned by Marriott Corporation.

Standing Members of SCRC

- | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Lauralen Avery | Bill Mellott | Joe Sproule |
| James Beatty | Kathy Miller | John Thomas |
| Roger T. Cole | Greg Minns | James W. Ward |
| James Dulin | Kathy Naylor | Christopher Weinmann |
| John Edmonson | Julie E. Norem | Janice Willis |
| Carol Franks | Todd Repass | |
| Brian Green | Al Ripley | |
| Katie Harrison | Stephen Skinner, Journalist | |

