

Jo's The Senate Part II



kampus concern

Students and the Senate

Since last week's article on the Senate was published I have heard many comments like "that's right you know", "it's about time these things were known" and someone asked me if I had been kicked out of the University yet! What I want to make known is that the Senate is a powerful organization of the university, the Senate should become more functional and effective, and I have no intent whatsoever to massacre the Senate. I am endeavouring to present the Senate as it is and possibly present some ideas which would assist the organization in becoming more responsive to today's needs at U.P.E.I.

Last week, the problem of the confusion of roles of Senators was presented. This week, I would like to present the problems that student senators face in Senate. Right now there are six student members of Senate who have the same voting power as the faculty and administration have. But this is not where the problem starts. The problem starts as soon as a student member begins to speak on a certain matter. Most of the other faculty and administration members have a tendency to shut off their minds and become resentful when a student senator begins to speak to the situation being discussed. Subtlety seems to be their best weapon. I'm sure that some senators don't feel this way, but student senators do feel this resentment during the meetings.

The student senators, as mentioned before, are entitled to the same rights and privileges as the other senators and these rights and privileges that are not being given to the students. Possibly due to the students inexperience in being involved in this type of organization should not be held against them nor should they be ridiculed or put down be-

cause they were not informed of proper procedures. This has happened more than once during Senate meetings. Again possibly not intentionally, but these things still happen.

Student Senators should be informed about procedures as soon as they are elected to Senate. The way it runs now, is that a Student learns by experience, and it takes about six months to gain this experience.

Another notable fact is that the elected student representatives on Senate represent the largest constituency of any Senators.

The article which they speak on directly concern the welfare of their electors. To date, the Senate has stifled these members from fulfilling their positions due to the manipulation of the Senate by certain members and also due to lack of procedural information, as mentioned before. There are also other things which alienate the students from the Senate. Lack of information on agenda items, poor communication between senate meetings and the collective, defensive attitude of faculty towards the student senators.

All the student Senators wish to destroy the problem before it gets really out of hand. The student senators need their elector's support in endeavouring to alleviate this problem. The majority of senate decisions directly affect students and if the senate will not seriously consider and listen to how programmes will and do effect students, the whole procedure is nothing but an exercise in

futility. If the Senate really wants to make itself a feasible organization and not a dictatorship some things are going to have to change. It has to reconsider its responsibility and procedures so that they can integrate with the rest of the university community.

There comes a time when every organization has to face the reality of the present world and determine whether it is playing an intricate part in the changing times. Of course everything can stop until the Committee on Objectives tables its report. Is this the excuse we can use this time?

This week's "Poke in the Ribs" goes to Jane McCormac, secretary of the U.P.E.I.S.U. Due to circumstances beyond her control, she will not kiss anybody for the next few weeks. Hmmm?!!!

A Biased Report on last weeks Senate Meeting



Last Thursday's Senate meeting was a lot of talk but really very little action. The first point of discussion was initiated by Andrew Robb who had been pondering the actual function of Senate. He inquired as to the why's and wherefores of the individual efforts of Ronald Baker for the addition of new faculties at UPEI without consulting Senate. The discussion seemed a bit strained and after Baker gave a quick circumventuous explanation the subject was dropped.

Another ad hoc Senate committee was established to peer into the various complaints over timetable changes made every year after the semester begins. This is the usual Senate procedure. There was even a proposal on the agenda to set up an ad hoc Senate Committee to Review Other Committees. Speaking of committees, the Tenure Committee was given an extension of time, because the original deadline October 15th had come and gone.

The Senate was asked to review a previous Senate ruling in regards to the 'Review Procedure for Deans and Chairmen'. The document is to be reviewed again because it was an absurd contradiction. Mr. Baker assured us and the Senators (first and second class) that the document was not meant to be so unclear - a small committee was set up to look into the matter.

Kenneth Osmond was elected to fill the seat on the Board of Governors that was left vacant by Leon Loncks.

The Senate finally remembered Remembrance Day and it was declared a day without classes (not a holiday) at UPEI.

One of the last points brought and discussed was initiated by Joanne Ings and supported by the other student Senators. A proposal was made asking that a bill be put though that would require a compulsory review of every student's transcript of marks in their Junior year. This would help eliminate the problem many Seniors are facing now, of having to take seven courses in their last semester in order to graduate and even having to take summer school after graduation. The bill was tabled till the next meeting.

