Women's Recreation unhappy; scrambling again for funds

by LINDA GILL

With the end of a school year approaching, besides elections and exams, another event that takes place is allocating funds to recognized campus groups. Recommendations for the 1975-76 ASI budget must go through the Finance Committee, Student Executive Council (SEC), Student Affairs Council (SAC), and lastly to Pres. Robert E. Kennedy for final approval.

This year funds are tight and groups have had to tighten their belts. One group, unhappy about their proposed budget is the Women's Recreation Association (WRA).

WRA's fight for funds has long been a sore point on campus and according to Denny Lopez, WRA's president, this year is no exception.

The vice President Education major said, "SAC and Finance keep shoving us into a comer, they're not giving us any help."

The subsidy given to WRA for the 1973-74 academic year was $6,600. Representatives from WRA have stated that their program can not realistically be run with anything less than $29,000.

However, after the final results of Finance Committee's recommended budgets were made known, WRA may have to work with much less than $20,000. After three cuts, Finance finally set WRA's proposed budget at $12,051.

According to Holly Gunterman, representative to the Finance Committee for the School of Human Development and Education, the final cut was made due to an error resulting from mistakes made in adding and subtracting the budget.

ASI Pres. Scott Ploshkin has taken the responsibility for the error which caused a deficit of $10,000 to appear in the budget. Ploshkin explains WRA's subsidy was cut because they had received the largest increase for the School of Human Development and Education. WRA, the Women's Physical Education (WPE) department, $12,651 for 1974-75.

When asked where WRA will go after the final results, Lopez explained that the WRA needs more money to operate. She added, "I don't want to share any information about what will happen to our program if they are only given the $12,651. According to Mary Lou White, Women's Physical Education (WPE) department head, $12,651 will not be adequate to meet the needs of WRA.

"That amount of money just won't do the job at all," she said. When asked where WRA will go if Finance cuts them, Lopez said, "WRA just will have to fight for more funds."

She said, "If we can't get more money then we will have to sit down and bash it all out and we will really have to make many cuts."

She added, "There is no way we can offer anything close to what the needs are." WRA is quick to point out that they don't want to take any money from the men and give it to the women, but they want something to be done. Lopez suggested that some of the other groups be investigated more closely to see if they really need the funds they are receiving.

She added, "I don't want to hurt men's athletics, but we need help." Didi Boles, newly elected WRA president for 1975-76, explained that the WRA needs more money to make it an effective program.

Boles would really like to see the program expand to include more women. She added, "Right now we're burning, we really are."

Interest in the expansion of WRA is evident to its members. Next year, according to Lopez, many programs have been requested by women.

"Right now we have about 15 girls who are interested in forming a swim team," she said. "These girls practice every day, but there is no money to join a league." Next year these girls may go to several invitational meets, but if they go, they must pay their own expenses.

Field hockey and golf are two programs that are not realistic to operate unless funds are made available.

"After three cuts, Finance finally set WRA's proposed budget at $12,051," Lopez said. "We are just trying to fight for our rights as the program expands to include more women." She added, "I don't want to share any information about what will happen to our program if they are only given the $12,651. According to Mary Lou White, Women's Physical Education (WPE) department head, $12,651 will not be adequate to meet the needs of WRA."
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Candidates speak

To: Mustang Daily
From: Rob Chappell and Mike Hurado

We recognize many students have become very involved in this year's elections, emotionally and physically. Unfortunately, a few of these supporters from both sides have exhibited poor judgment ranging from minor infractions to gross irresponsibility.

Again, we recognize each of us have such supporters and we plead with them and the student body in general to start helping the students of Cal Poly have an opportunity to express their will and not have others force what they want, whether it be juvenile and irresponsible.

We urge our supporters to conduct themselves by maintaining the highest ethical and moral standards.

Mike Hurado
Rob Chappell

Grads may have names omitted from programs

Graduation programs for June 1975 commencement ceremonies will contain the student name, type of degree, major subject area, and whether a person is graduating with honors. If a graduate does not wish to have his or her name included in the graduation program, a form must be filled out by the student.

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (Buckley Amendment) states that publication of graduation programs is considered "directory information." Students that do not want their names to appear in the graduation program may file an election with the Office of the Director of Judicial Affairs in the Administration Building, Rm. 115. The forms will be provided by that office and must be returned not later than 5 p.m., May 22.

The Buckley Amendment, a recent federal law, requires campuses to abide by the proposition that students have a right to privacy where their records are concerned.

The Buckley Amendment says that certain categories of information about students can be classified as "directory information." This information can be made available to the general public, but students must first be notified of the types of information which could be made available.
Rejected ad ‘nothing but a personal attack’

I must reply to a flyer that was circulated around the campus last week. I was planning to comment on the flyer after the election, but I don’t feel I can wait any longer.

In short, the flyer accused me of trying to control freedom of expression on this campus because I refused to print an ad AGAINST Mike Hurtado which was signed by 16 members of SAC. I was not trying to “control” anything—1 refused the ad because it was nothing but a personal attack: it was inflammatory and most important of all, probably libelous.

Before refusing it, I consulted with two key administrative officials: Bob Walters, Elections Committee advisor and Dr. John Lawson, Director of Activities Planning. Both advised me to take the step I finally took—rejecting the ad.

Regardless of my endorsement for Mike Hurtado, I would have refused such an ad no matter which side it came from. I have no respect—only disgust—for personal attack campaigns.

And I will NOT condone it in a paid ad that is supposed to sell a product, not condemn one. Such “backwards” endorsement is called negative advertising, and is strongly discouraged in the “real world” outside of Cal Poly.

Most of all, Mustang Daily or any newspaper, for that matter, cannot afford to risk printing ANYTHING that has even the remotest possibility of being libelous. And the possibility of that ad causing such problems was far from remote.

It is rather ironic that the people who signed the ad, and subsequently accused me of controlling “freedom of expression” are the same people who haphazardly and emotionally voted to suppress Mustang’s endorsements of candidates on the basis of Title V. I don’t feel I need to elaborate on this.
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Women ask share of money (continued from page 3)

lodging from our May 8 trip to the regional or about fund for our April 17-18 trip to UC Riverside." She said.

Stallard's team will be traveling to Salinas for a tournament on May 80-81. "I was given $80 for the $40 entry fee I had to pay for this tournament," she said. Stallard and Murray both realize that money is tight, but feel this should not affect their teams.

When asked why the softball team hasn't received any reimbursement for the two trips as of yet, Wilson explained the money must come from the ASI contingency fund and that this fund has been overspent by the ASI already.

"Release of more funds requires Kennedy's approval," she said. According to Roy Gersten, ASI Business Manager, and Plotkin, Kennedy's approval has been given.

Gersten explained that she has already informed Wilson of the approval that was given early in May. As of May 14, however, Wilson, Lopez and Murray agree they have not received any information from anyone in ASI.

Lopez said, "In fact, we got a letter from Gersten early in May telling us not to spend because the approval had not been given." This particular situation has completely bewildered the WRA members.

The WRA now feels certain they will have to put up a fight to get the money they need to run an effective program, Lopez said, "We are going to try and get the funds so that we can offer a better program that can include more interested women."
Senior editor Jim Martin

The King lives: Poly captures net title
by Jim Sweeney

The king of California Collegiate Athletic Association tennis completed its second consecutive season of dominance. The Mustangs lost only a single match in sweeping the final round-robin of the year and cruised to the fifth CCAA crown in the last six years.

Coach Ed Jorgensen's squad opened the tournaments with a 9-4 shellacking of Cal State Los Angeles on Thursday. Cal State Bakersfield was annihilated by the Mustangs in Friday's competition, 8-1.

On Saturday, the Herd turned in two more whitewashes, blanking UC Riverside 9-0 in the morning and Cal State Northridge 9-0 in the afternoon. Northridge had given Poly the stiffest competition earlier in the season, going down 6-3, and the Mustangs clinched the CCAA slate with a 7-2 victory.

According to Jorgensen, the two crucial matches were in the final confrontation with the Mustangs.

Senior Jim Martin came up with a clutch win over Mike Novik, winning a tie-breaker in the third set. The other pivotal match was Tom Zurn's singles victory over Mustard Keith Simpson. This match also went three sets, with a tie-breaker in the third set.

In addition to the league title, the Mustangs also took eight of the nine All-League positions, based on their overall league records.

All-Around Cowboy honors went to Hartnell's Chris Libert who won the calf roping and was runner-up in the steer wrestling.

Dudley Little of Fresno was the All-Around Cowboy of the region for the second straight year.

In girls competition, Fresno's behind Becky Fullerton, who took all-around honors, walked off with the team trophy capped by piling 318 votes.

Leigh Sensenig, who finished second in All-Around honors, placed third in the region. She was fifth in barrel racing, sixth in great riding and third in breakaway roping.

Classifieds

WHAT'S NEW? Ropers take another crown

Announcements

Fresno State, making a strong run for the title, finished well back of the Mustangs, whose winning point total was 865. Hartnell college was second with 375 and Fresno was third with 321.

For the season, the Mustangs finished ahead of Fresno with points based on each school's top five rodeos.

Cal Poly will receive $1,000 in scholarship money from the Copenhagen-Skoal Scholarship award program for winning the regional title and will go on to the National Intercollegiate Rodeo Association rodeo at Bozeman, Montana.

Cal Poly had two event winners. Jim Pratt was the saddle bronc winner and Steve Mitchell and Pat Kirby topped the individual team roping.

The entire team placed in at least one event each. John McDonnell won the region title in bullriding which means the Mustangs qualified for the rodeo club.

Bruce Hunt was third calf roping and fourth in steer wrestling. Troy Moore placed fourth in saddle bronc and sixth in calf roping.

In other competition, Fresno, second with 375 points based on each school's top five rodeos was second with 375 and Fresno was third with 321.
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