

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where it is published daily except Saturday, Monday, examination and vacation periods, and during the official summer terms. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates mailed \$4 per year, \$1.50 per quarter; delivered, \$6 and \$2.25 per quarter.

Editor: WALT DEAR
Managing Editor: ROLFE NEILL
Business Manager: JIM SCHENCK
Sports Editor: BIFF ROBERTS

News Ed.: Bob Slough
Sub. Mgr.: Carolyn Reichard
Ass't. Sub. Mgr.: Bill Venable, Tom Wikky
Office Mgr.: Buzzy Shull
Assoc. Ed.: Nina Gray, Jane Carter

NEWS STAFF—John Jamison, Louis Kraar, Tom Parramore, Bea West, Jim Wilkinson, Sally Schindler, Jess Nettles, Hubert Breeze, Harry Dunlop, Ellen Downs, Tom Neal Jr.

SPORTS STAFF—Vardy Baskalov, Paul Cheney, Melvin Lang, Everett Parker, John Hesser, Sherwood Smith, Al Long, Dick Crouch, Benny Stewart, Wilbur Jones.

EDITORIAL STAFF—A. Z. F. Wood Jr., John Gibson, Dorman Cordell, Dan Duke, Curt Hatledge, Don Thornton.

ADVERTISING STAFF—Pete Adams, Bob Mason, Bob Wolfe, Eleanor Saunders, Buddy Harper, Dorman Cordell, Ned Whitmore.

CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT—Roger Williams, Richard O'Neal, George Harris, Veneta Zeller.

Night editor for this issue: Dorman Cordell

Revise, Change, Improve, Enlarge

Editor's Note: We conclude publication of the Faculty Conference's findings with this report on Student-Faculty relations. Because of space limitations, we are unable to print the remaining reports on Graduate Work and Research and The Integrated Mission of the University.

President Gray, colleagues of the faculty, and distinguished guests: If the learning process—the academic work of a college or university—is the main reason for existence of the institution, then the relationships of faculty and students are at the very center of institutional activities. Our panel feels, therefore, that no defense needs to be made for the importance of student-faculty relationships in a conference like this. We are dealing here with the very heart of a university.

Before the conference convened, the chairman and the six co-chairmen responsible for this study met and decided that some preliminary work should be done on each of the three campuses before the discussion sessions convened. It was agreed that it would be helpful to bring before the discussion groups two main questions with very tentative answers to each. This procedure was not to exclude consideration of other questions, but to insure the facing of what we deemed to be two basic issues. The two questions were:

1. What do the students on each campus say is wrong with student-faculty relationships?
2. What does the faculty on each campus say is definitely helpful or constructive in respect of student-faculty relationships?

Obviously, not all students nor all faculty members could be polled on these questions, but sincere efforts were made to get a fair sampling of both student and faculty groups. It was felt especially necessary that a cross-section of the student body be interviewed, not just student leaders.

The results of the campus survey were brought to the various discussion groups and naturally evoked lively and sometimes diverse reactions. Especially was it made clear that the main "gripes" of students on one campus were not the main ones on another. Similarly, what the faculty representatives from one institution believed worked well on their campus was frequently thought impracticable or of slight value on another campus.

Student Complaints

In general, however, fairly substantial agreement was found that the following student complaints were pretty widespread and rather deeply rooted:

1. Many, though not all, faculty members take an indifferent attitude toward their students. They do not seem to care whether a student passes or not. Some teachers will not go out of their way to help a floundering student over the rough places.
2. Many faculty members do not want to be bothered by students coming to them and taking up their time. This discourages students from taking the initiative in seeking counsel from such faculty members, some of whom they would like to know better.
3. Freshmen and sophomores have different problems of student-faculty relationships from those of juniors, seniors, and graduate students. Not only are the underclassmen younger in age and more recently thrown into a different world from home and high school, but also more of their work is required and taken under conditions less conducive to close and inspiring contacts with faculty than is true of upper classmen. Underclassmen are more often the forgotten people and feel the need of a friend more than the upperclassmen. The heavy mortality in the first two years may be due in considerable measure to the lack of more helpful student-faculty relationships.
4. Student-faculty relationships could be put on a more human and friendly basis if a teacher in the early days of a course announced to his students that while his office door was not always open, it was open at certain definite times and that entrance was not to be restricted to those seeking counsel on academic matters only.
5. Student-faculty relationships could be improved if the parties could meet informally more often. Places suggested were in the Student Union, in recreation activities, in departmental or professional clubs, in homes and in residence halls, though it was recognized that many such affairs are a distinct bore to many of those attending.
6. The advisory system especially at State and Chapel Hill needs complete re-vamping. In general, it was felt that mass production of advice has no place in so human a problem. More will be said later on this point.

Several students at one institution, where they had experienced something of a riot, told one of our chairmen that the real trouble-makers, the agitators, were all northerners. Fortunately the word "subversives" was not brought in.

What Works Best?

On the issue "What do the faculty think works best on their respective campuses in student-faculty relationships?", wider divergencies appeared than in discussion on students complaints. Doubtless this should be expected in view of the diverse nature of the student bodies and of the functions of the three institutions.

In this field several activities on the Woman's College campus elicited favorable comment and even formal approval from the discussion groups. One of these is their joint committee system. At the Woman's College there are 10 or 12 functioning committees composed jointly of students and faculty members. One of these is a Finance Board which administers the funds paid by students under the so-called Student Activities fee. This Board is composed of four students and three faculty members with a student chairman, and allocates the student fee money among the various college-wide student activities deemed to be properly supported by student fees, such as the student publications, religious activities, Recreation Association, and Student Government.

Another joint committee that received general approval by the discussion groups is the Student-Faculty Reviewing Committee at the Woman's College, composed of an equal number of students and faculty and set up to hear any complaints

or grievances of any student or group of students on the campus. The committee has no administrative authority but can often explain to complaining students why things are as they are and if changes are deemed advisable, take up such needed changes with the proper authorities. In any event, a "safety valve" is provided whereby students can blow off steam.

Another helpful experience on the Woman's College campus is their Pre-School Conference. Three or four days before college opens in the fall the Student Government officers invite some 100 students and about 50 faculty members to discuss problems facing the campus that year. Such problems as those of social affairs, of better student government, of honor policy, of maintaining a high standard of work and behavior on the campus. Twice during the year a check-up conference is held to review progress or lack of it on the items of objectives laid down in September. The Orientation program at both Carolina and State does much the same thing.

Advisory Setup Inadequate

In the six discussion groups, more time was given to a discussion of the advisory system than to any other single topic. It was felt that this was the very heart of student-faculty relations, second only to effective classroom work. The representatives from State College stated that a Chapel Hill student's report reflected generally their views of the situation and needs in Raleigh. Excerpts from the memorandum read as follows:

"1. The present faculty adviser system in the General College at Chapel Hill is gravely inadequate, even to minimum student needs.

"2. There is a real need for closer and more informal personal contact between students and faculty and students and administration members, for their mutual benefit.

"3. The most expeditious means of making available to freshmen and sophomore students an opportunity for personal contact with at least one faculty member lies in the establishment of a system of faculty advisers for those classes which will provide for (a) a very small advisory load for each adviser, and (b) emphasis on the student-adviser relationship as an opportunity for contact and consultation on matters beyond the minimum concerns of schedule and curriculum planning.

Abolish It!

"1. The present system of General College advisers should be abolished entirely. What is needed is not simply a renovation or patching-up, but an entire reorientation of the whole program, and of attitudes toward it.

"2. The freshman and sophomore advisory load should be distributed as widely as is feasible among faculty and administrative personnel, so that each adviser will have a workable ratio of advisees to adviser.

"3. It should be possible for any student to change advisers with a minimum of difficulty, should he feel it advisable to do so, although care should be taken to avoid overloading the more popular advisers. The initial assignment of men to their advisers should not always be made on the basis of anticipated major. While certain policy objectives and suggested modes for their attainment should be set forth by the General College administration, implementation should be left very largely with the individual adviser.

"Some students have problems and know what they are; some have problems and have only a vague awareness, at best, that something is wrong. Those in the former category have at least some advantage: they can go to a person whose known specialization or experience might hold out a prospect of assistance—if they know such a person, and if personal timidity or embarrassment do not discourage such an approach. But those students in the latter category—those who have undefined or unapprehended difficulties—are at a double disadvantage, for they must first find out what their problem is. In either case, knowing a faculty or administrative person with whom they have a sufficiently intimate and cordial relationship that the student feels he may approach him in confidence and with a feeling of mutual respect is of the greatest value. Of course, no faculty member or administrator would attempt to give authoritative advice on a matter on which he feels a colleague might better be consulted, but he can at least aid the troubled student in defining his difficulties, and in determining what form his problems seem to take, before referring him elsewhere.

Not Everyone Has Problems

"But not all students have problems—at least perpetually. Yet there is much that even the troubled student might gain from some close personal relationship with an older person: a more balanced view of life and of some of its value; a greater thirst for learning; a higher concept of service to others; some objective orientation in the matter of spiritual needs and values—perhaps the most universal need among men freshly broken from home's moorings. Often such help can be more easily sought and more readily gained from persons other than parents or old friends, who tend still to think of a boy of eighteen as the child they have known, rather than the rapidly developing and at times perplexed person he really is.

"Note that the issue is not merely one of student-faculty relationships, but of student relationships with administration members as well. In this area, it is not only the student who can draw much from the type of contact suggested. To the teacher, maintaining daily contact with students, in and out of the classroom, there is at least an opportunity to see something of the "normal" student; to learn about his concerns; to hear his viewpoint expressed on matters beyond the course topic. But for the non-teaching administrator, it is all too easy for the students to become either an endless line of trouble-bearers (or makers), or mere columns of statistics for which there is never quite enough housing space, or classroom facilities, or instructors, or gymnasium seats, or money.

It is entirely understandable that, lacking the natural and direct contact with students which the teacher has every day, the administrator should come to have a detached, cold, impersonal, and even distorted view of the student-person and his real needs and feelings. Thus it is believed that the emphasis on student contact with University personnel should expend with particular force towards the cultivation of such relations between student and administrator. In this way, the administrator might in part compensate for his lack of classroom contact with students. Participation in the proposed advisory program should include all administration members charged with policy-making responsibilities.

"Special notice in this regard might be given the President of the Consolidated University, although in his case the necessity for an equitable distribution of time between three institutions presents special problems. But in his case particularly it should be remembered that the chief benefits accruing from some direct and regular contact with students would be those flowing to him, in terms of a clearer understanding of student views and aspirations than can be obtained through multiple filters.

"Emphasis here has been largely concentrated on the freshman and sophomore groups, and their relationships with advisors and faculty members. This is done in the belief that the attitudes of students during their initial years here are especially plastic, but that early impressions are likely to last. If a student can form a satisfying relationship with one faculty or administration member, that experience will stimulate the cultivation of other such relationships in later years. A certain amount of direct encouragement—even a gentle but disgusted push—is necessary to break through the reserve and timidity which most students feel, even in their later school years, towards the average teacher or administrator. The barrier which this reservedness constitutes is easily underestimated.

"It is natural that as a student moves into a major field of study and acquires an advisor in that field, he should tend to rely more heavily for counsel and guidance on such an adviser, or perhaps on a favorite instructor in his major field. Here too there should be emphasis on a student-adviser relationship which extends beyond mere schedule-arranging. Given the earlier experiences of a fruitful relationship with a General College adviser, the development of such a relationship here would seem to be greatly facilitated.

"Extent of Participation by Students—

Accessibility to Faculty:

"It would be overly sanguine to expect that all students would take full advantage of such a program as that outlined here, however great its merits. It would be equally optimistic to expect that teachers and administrators, for whom no day has quite enough hours, would greet with universal applause a program of this sort. But the important thing for the students is that, for those who will avail themselves of it, there be an opportunity for them to establish some reasonably close contact with a member of the administration or faculty. And for the advisors, the time to be consumed in this manner should not be as great as the above commentary might suggest, and certainly advisory duties should not be carried to the point of being a positive burden on the time of any adviser."

Our discussion groups faced a few other issues and took positive stands on most of them.

The housing of students at State and Chapel Hill received severe criticism. It was felt that no real constructive housing policy was being carried out, that some dormitory heads were not trained for nor really interested in their work, and that true housing should mean much more than room assignments and that true living should mean much more than mere housing.

One group passed a motion approving the principle that rating sheets on the faculty to be filled out by the students during a single class period on a voluntary basis and for the sole benefit of the individual faculty member were valuable.

Another group wanted a constant re-emphasis to be made of the academic obligation of students—their first duty is good class work—and the same for the faculty.

Another resolved that a university-wide study should be made on our methods of determining size and teaching load for freshman and sophomore work to see what the three institutions have in common.

Some divergence of views was expressed on whether the main attitude of faculty toward students should be much concern over their individual welfare, going out of our way to help them, or should it be a minimum of cordial or counselling, treating them as adults and expecting them to act as adults. The outcome of this discussion was a general consensus that freshmen, especially, and sophomores to some degree need a good deal of sympathetic attention, such per-

(See REVISE, CHANGE, page 4)

No Lack Of Confidence

In a move for harmony and better relations, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees has told the faculties of UNC, State and WC that the Trustees have not lost faith in the faculties.

This information was relayed to the faculties at the consolidated conference held here last week by President Gordon Gray. Gray predicted, "There will be a greater caution on the part of the Trustees in exercising control in faculty affairs." Gray observed that "we cannot destroy the Executive Committee. . . . We need it to get the business of this university done."

Thus, in one short speech, Gray made an effort to let the faculties know that their voice in the government of the University was not weakened. The very fact that a faculty conference had been called to open the academic and administrative heart of the University is a clear indication that Gray is depending on the faculties for advice and effective leadership in academic affairs.

Even more important to students, we finally get the answer to Gray's almost intolerable support of Saturday classes in the full board's meeting on February 23. Many principles were involved, yes, but to Gray's mind the most important principle was the continuance of the Executive Committee as a working organization to carry out the business of the University. Gray obviously felt that if the Executive Committee lost out on the Saturday class issue, then they would become a greatly weakened body. Then, too, the Saturday class question had been on the trustee's minds since 1948.

The other principle involved—that of trustees meddling with matters that are traditionally handled by educators—professors and administrators—must have been weighed by the Consolidated President. He will be dealing with the trustees and the faculties in the future. He thinks no damage has been done, that the trend towards dictation of academic matters will be cut short.

This is heartening news, now, but it's like feeling better after a long sickness. If this indication of trustees non interference in academic matters holds true, then the Saturday class issue will not have been a disaster.

A Penetrating Warning

The tragic death of Jerry Galanides is a warning to all of us students who drive.

It is a sign to young people that the heavy foot on the accelerator leads to heavy consequences. It is a warning to use common sense once we are sitting behind the wheel.

Jerry Galanides was a likable person. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa. He was known to be a speedy driver, a carefree man at the wheel. He had been in wrecks before.

We are cognizant of the enjoyment of smooth, quick transportation. We enjoy the fast pace on the open road, the pick-up on a new car. But, more than ever, we realize the dangers of speed. If we, as students, and as young people don't put some kind of governor on our feet as we press down on the accelerator, the law, eventually, will. Insurance rates on those under 25 are extremely high already. Each time such an accident occurs, the public becomes more aroused.

To continue to enjoy our care and the pleasures derived from the use of them, students must lead in a program of safe driving.

The Grey Fox Goes West

The Grey Fox is moving westward after an energetic coaching career in the North and South.

We know him best for his work here and for his teams from 1947 to 1949. But Carl Snavelly compiled excellent records at Cornell and at Bucknell.

His new job at Washington University in St. Louis should be a refreshing challenge, and an enjoyable task. Life at a smaller college should be somewhat freer from the pressures of alumni and the "Win them all or get out" philosophy.

Snavelly's 1948 team was undefeated in regular season play. In 1947, he compiled an 8-2 record and in 1949, seven wins and four losses including a loss to Rice in the Sugar Bowl.

In his next years, Snavelly teams reversed the numbers in the won and lost columns with 3 wins and seven losses, then two wins, etc. It has been said that Snavelly's success depended on the athletic abilities of Charlie Justice and one or two other top stars. Yet there was no greater praise for Snavelly in the plush years for his outstanding capabilities as a coach, nor no greater demands for a resignation by the same people because of "poor coaching" towards the end.

As Carl Snavelly leaves for St. Louis, we feel that the whole University community bids him well on another football adventure.

DAILY CROSSWORD

- ACROSS**
1. Cry as a calf
5. Handle of a knife
9. Ascend
10. Ireland
11. Wet thoroughly
12. Rewards for merit
14. Wayside hotel
15. Rod
16. Music note
17. Showy flowers
19. Edge of a garment
20. Personal pronoun
21. Sphere
22. Weary (poet.)
24. Apex
25. Agreement
27. Obscure
28. Thus
30. Wine receptacle
31. Wealthy
33. Measure (Chin.)
34. Citrus fruit
35. Poem
36. Legislative assembly
38. Norwegian snow shoes
39. City in Alaska
40. Remove the skin
41. Prominent actor
42. Volded escutcheon
- DOWN**
1. Alloy of copper and tin
2. Any climbing vine
3. Question (So. Am.)
4. Tellurium (sym.)
5. Backs of feet
6. Assistant
7. Friar's title
8. Bank employe
11. Kingdom in Asia
12. Ancient kingdom
13. Identical
15. Saucy
18. Attic
19. Ripe fruit of the rose
22. Large volume
23. Tuber (So. Am.)
24. Prong
25. Chums
26. City in France
27. Vaulted roof
28. Seat in the chancel (Ecol.)
29. Poems
31. Bishop's headpiece
32. English plowboy
34. Tibetan priest
37. Word of negation
38. Varying weight (Ind.)
40. Italian river



Yesterday's Answer