

has Finally Arrived - With Mixed Reactions, of Course

Student Commentary

There are three proposals in the Committee on Aims and Objectives Report which I'd wish to comment upon. First, there is proposal 18 which is intitled "University Community Center". The committee recommends that highest building priority to this facility which would include a Coffee Shop, recreational facilities for indoor games such as darts, table tennis, pool tables, etc.. Student Union offices, cadre offices, CIMN offices, and a common room with lounge and has facilities, a cafeteria, a Dining Room, dance facilities, student meeting rooms, an amphitheatre, banking facilities and a Chapel would also be included in this complex.

The report ranks as its second highest priority in building that an athletic complex should be built. The committee expressed the opinion that enough attention was being paid to intercollegiate sports and more attention should be paid to intermural



also discouraged that the student's proposals were not identified, but were assimilated and watered down, so that our efforts appear to have been of no use. For example, the Tenure proposal (see article by Ro Turkington). In conclusion, the booklet that was written by Leon Loucks, Mujeeb ur-Rahman, and Barb Stevenson will probably effect little change in the University, and cause yet another Senate showdown.

Elaine Smithies

sports here on campus. This relates to the dispute which surfaced this summer over whether U.P.E.I. should have a football team or not. Money eventually becomes the stumbling block and football is seen as the biggest expense for a single sport.

The report makes no mention or specifies as to what these improved athletic facilities should include but I would hope that a swimming pool would be in order; hopefully one which would be of regulation, competitive size so that the sport of swimming on P.E.I. as a whole could benefit.

In my opinion, the two buildings just dreamed about should be combined if possible to form one huge University Centre. Athletic and recreational-social facilities are at a sickening level at this University. This is not to say that the programs suffer as much as the facilities do. However, this is because a few hard-working people have told themselves that they will make the best of what we have.

The third proposal which I would like to comment upon is the one concerning Tenure. The Tenure Committee is set up to include eight faculty members and one student at present. The members teaching, research, etc. to decide if he or she should be granted a life-long contract with our University. The report by the Committee recommends that two students, five faculty, and two people from outside the University make up the committee. This matter was brought to the attention by a students group last year and this group recommended five faculty and four students. The Committee has settled on a compromise which I find unsuitable and which I believe faculty would also find suitable if there is any consistency to their arguments. Last year when they were negotiating for a new contract, one of their complaints was that certain members of the Board of Governors from the community had no conception of faculty's job as such. They merely looked at the 12-15 hours that most professors spend in a class each week and decided that teaching at a University was a pretty easy job. Well, now these people or their peers will be helping to decide not only how much faculty gets paid, but also if they have a job. Myself, I still stick to the original demand

by the Student Committee on Aims and Objectives that there be five faculty and four students. If someone believes that this is not a better system than the one proposed in the report, I would be glad to hear their argument.

This is my review of three particular sections of the report. I don't quite know what to say about the entire report. It certainly tries to please everyone by being very conservative and low key in many of its recommendations. However, if it is handled in the usual way that these reports are handled at UPEI I'm sure it will remain on paper for some time and we won't even have to think about it. . . . unless someone wants to do something about it. But who? Gerald "Woozy" MacDonald UPEISU

The highlights of the Report from the Senate Committee on Objectives, as seen in the light of the Student Report, are the "Tools of Education" course, general degree program, and Community Professors.

The student proposal for the opening of university books is left out, as is our proposal for the eventual abolition of tenure. We also made a proposal on the evaluation of professors. It was a three-phase affair:

1. a simple evaluation form.
2. personal interviews with students in the professors' courses.
3. review of data gathered before the appropriate Committee, with professor present.

To ensure an adequate teaching staff at U.P.E.I. we proposed a five-year contract system.

The Ombudsman and Council on University Life recommendations are vague and could (as the report warns us) be drained of their power or have no power at all.

"The big job for the University Community now is to define the power of the Ombudsman the function and membership of the Council of University Life. I encourage each person in the U.P.E.I. Community (students, faculty, Administration) to do some hard studying and thinking about these two positions."

On the Ombudsman, our proposal was that he should be on an equal power level with the Senate and Board

of Governors and be able to go to the P.E.I. Government with complaints. We also proposed that the Council on the University Life please keep the Student Report proposal on the subject in mind.

Bing Gallant

The report of the Committee on Aims and Objectives is a mixture of woeful and useless points. Perhaps its strongest point lies in its being full of concrete proposals, not a mish-mash of vague generalities. To leave yourself open to criticism takes courage; for this the committee is to be commended.

While the report contains some proposals of great merit—a campus ombudsman, a "University Community Centre", a school of veterinary medicine, suggestions to improve the quality of tenured faculty, courses in agriculture etc.—on the whole the report is something of a disappointment.

It takes the philosophy of a Mujib Rahman to state that the most important priorities in creating a "Democratic University Centre" are the University Community Centre, more intermural athletics, and a Council on University Life! It takes even more gall to say "the democratization of the University system [is] a feature quite fully realized at U.P.E.I.", when student and faculty representation on the Board of Governors up to 30%, when Board meetings and books are not open, when students have little or no input into decisions as to who will teach or what will be taught.

Also disheartening is the tendency to advocate more bureaucracy, more regulations, an expanded business office, a research officer, more required courses, etc.. Surely when both student and faculty numbers have gone down, it is no time to increase the administration's.

Perhaps, though, most invidious is the tendency to be concerned with image rather than actuality. U.P.E.I. will never gain a "good" image until it is deserving. Public relation campaigns will only serve to raise and then dash - expectatrocis.

In summary, there is much in the report to be desired but at the very least, it provides a working document to be criticized. After a year and a half - that's something, at any rate.

David MacRae