

Tuesday the College Council voted to send a recommendation to the Dean of Academic Affairs to review her decision regarding Sr. Vivian Rose.

One month ago a similar meeting took place, one in which the students felt that they were not recognized. Now however, things are very different. Students have been heard and action was taken by the College Council in regards to Sr. Vivian Rose.

Action began when Sr. Jean Gabriel added to the agenda an item wich would recognize the students and allow them an opportunity to be heard. After the motion was seconded it was placed at the end of the agenda.

Finding that something needed to be done immediately, David Edgecombe, Chairman of the Theater/Speech Department, asked that the issue be brought up for a "5 minute discussion", so that other matters could be delt with. Recognizing that 5 minutes wouldn't be enough time to thoroughly discuss the manditory retirement issue, James Goebel. Chairman of the English Department.moved to lengthen the period of time devoted to the issue. "5 minutes isn't enough time" said Goebel an asked for an extension to 30 minutes.

After it was agreed that 15 minutes would be devoted to the discussion (with extensions of the limit possible), the students were heard. Chris Worley read a statement that included the following points. After the statement was read, anyone who had anything to say concerning the issue had a chance to ask questions (although answers weren't always given) and to voice their opinions.

After the first question was asked by Jeff Johns, Sister Margaretta responded that it isn't a matter of public debate or discussion, nor is it a matter of student or faculty voice. She then stated that her decission in Sr. Vivian's case was "not to grant an exception of policy for the fourth year."

All during the debate, the administration kept stating that all they did was to follow the policy as outlined by the Board of Trustees. Kitty O'Donnell added that the emphasis was on the wrong issue, because the exsisting policy allowed for the continuance of an individual over 70 years on a part time basis. Chris Worley added that the problem was the way the policy was being applied.

> 1. There is a provision for faculty members to teach on an annual basis after the prescribed retirement age.

> 2. The members of the Music Department faculty unanimously requested that Sister Vivian Rose be permitted to continue teaching part-time for the comming academic year.

3. Without further consultation with members of the Music Department staff this request was denied by the Academic Dean, with no professional reasons. After the second allotment of time ran out with the situation in a stalemate, James Goebel asked for an "indefinite" extension of the time limit. Then the council nearly turned into a gripe session with both sides exchanging innuendos and very threatening comments.

Time was running out. Nothing seemed to have been accomplished when Chris Lowe suggested that the Council make a recomendation to the Academic Dean asking her to reevaluate her decision. A secret ballot was implemented because of the fears of some of the members that negative consequences would occur if they voted against the administration.

The resolution passed with 16 affirmative, 6 opposed, and 1 abstention on the recomendation of one more year of part time service for Sr. Vivian Rose.

An important precedent occurred Tuesday. Students gained the right to be heard and in turn to be recognized by the administration. Perhaps now the students, faculty, and the administration can work together for an adequate solution that not only credits this institution but one that is pleasent to both sides and will show, as ChrisWorley said "that Marian College is a people place."

ADMINISTRATION RESPONDS TO STUDENT REACTION

With a number of faculty members supporting them, students received a hearing Tuesday from the College Council. This hearing resulted in a recommendation to be sent to Sister Margaretta Black, Dean of Academic Affairs, asking that the decision to retire Sister Vivian Rose be reconsidered.

Several faculty members and students expressed the belief that policy not be viewed as central to the argument; this, however, cannot be done according to the administration. Policy states that normal retirement is at the age of 65 and mandatory retirement at age 70. A provision voted on by the faculty and the administration permitted the annual extension of an individual's contract once he or she reached the age of 7C. This extension was left to the authority of the Academic Dean.

the misunderstanding. Much of according to President Gatto, has occurred over the word "mandatory." The Administration and the Board of Trustees desire that "mandatory at 70" be a final word. This would enable individuals to leave fully competent and would not force the administration to tell the individual otherwise. Such policy would also give younger a persons with new ideas a chance to work in the department involved (much like the term limitations set down for the President of the United States and Senators, etc.). Thirdly, the policy would allow long range planning by the institution. telling the administration when they need to begin looking for competent replacements. Thus, in theory, mandatory retirement attempts to benefit the individual, the department involved, and the institution.

This is the policy and theory involved in this issue. President Gatto expressed the need for a procedure which will directly address

retirement and said that it will be forthcoming.

Policy is necessary just as law is necessary. The policy is "an attempt to meet everyone's needs fairly," commented Sister Margaretta. Extending a contract is "extremely rare", Sister continued and the college cannot be put through this "constant rangling."

"A lack of understanding," is the Academic Dean's cause for much of the questioning and disagreement. Sister welcomes questions but also points out that communication involves "listening and understanding--not necessarily agreeing with--but understanding."

K.R.

