

Shannon Clarifies Ruling For Future SAC Funding

By LIBBY WITHERS

University President Edgar F. Shannon Jr. stipulated last Tuesday that Student Council examine the constitution of only those funded organizations "in which substantial social activity may be contemplated," in a letter to Vice-President for Student Affairs D. Alan Williams.

The letter answers a request from Student Council for clarification of the Board of Visitors' recent decision to deny funds to the Gay Student Union (GSU). This decision led to questions from Council concerning the future

allocations of all organizations.

Mr. Shannon defined "de facto access" as existing if membership criteria in an organization "are applied equally to all students." He stated that "those charged with allocation of the fund determine the membership practices of the organization in fact as distinguished from statements in its constitutions or by-laws."

Council's Judgement

The Board desires that Council "make judgments concerning the substantial religious, political or social activities of a group" and deny funds to these groups, Mr. Shannon said.

Council President Jim Rinaca said the interpretation leads to "very little change. The Board meant to deal specifically with the GSU funding, not other allocations."

The Student Activities Committee (SAC) will "continue as we have except for social activities and speaking groups, but we'll have to be more careful," Council Vice President and SAC Chairman Larry Sabato said.

A resolution calling for modification of dormitory space for transfer and 3rd and 4th year students was

unanimously passed by Council.

"A given number of rooms shall be reserved" based on "a fixed percentage of the population of each student group," the resolution states.

Nursing school representative Sally Kauffman pointed out that "3rd and 4th year students know the ropes, and know more about off-grounds housing than transfer students."

Miss Kauffman also pointed out the importance of living on the Grounds in order to learn more about the Honor System.

2.5 Decision Arbitrary

In discussing the misunderstanding over the grade point average for Lawn applicants, Mr. Rinaca, a member of the requirements committee, said he "felt the 2.5 decision was made arbitrarily and is, if not an injustice, a big misunderstanding."

He indicated two alternatives: a reconstitution to decide what the vote determined, or a reversion to a 2.0 average because of the delay in action on this matter.

"Mr. Williams felt it unfair for this year's applicants because of the delay," Mr. Rinaca added.