

\$15 Million Donation to UofT Veiled in Secrecy

(CUP) — A \$15 million donation to the University of Toronto sets a bad precedent because the donor placed conditions on the gift and university administrators have agreed to keep terms of the deal secret, say student leaders and some faculty members.

The donation from businessman Joseph L. Rotman to the faculty of management is being matched by U of T to create a \$30 million fund to attract top business professors.

The bulk of the money will be used to establish and endow six new chairs in the faculty, which as yet have no names. These will be based upon recommendations of the Rotman Foundation.

The faculty of management will also be renamed in honour of Rotman, a member of the university's governing council, chair and chief executive officer of Clairvest merchant banking group, founder and chair of Tarragon Oil and Gas Limited and a director of the Barrick Gold Corporation.

Although the university's governing council unanimously approved the donation agreement at its most recent meeting, members of the university community have voiced concerns over specific terms of the deal.

Critics say the deal gives the faculty of management special status within the university protecting it against budgetary cuts by giving it highest priority in allocation of funds, and guarantees new appointments for 14 years. The deal also forces faculty search committees to consult with a committee outside of

the university for advice, and requires the university to use Rotman's choice of a public relations firm for the faculty.

Other sections of the deal are confidential.

Bill Graham, president of the U of T Faculty Association, says full disclosure is essential when public funds account for half the endowment.

"We are in favour of transparency and full disclosure, especially since half the money comes from the public," he said. "There is a principle of public accountability."

University vice-president Jon Dellandrea defends the deal saying a full and complete review of the agreement by governors is adequate and customary in such cases.

Although Graham says the faculty association's concerns about academic freedom with the initial draft of the agreement have been adequately addressed in an amended version, he says full public disclosure of the agreement would serve as an additional safeguard of academic freedom.

"Academic freedom and transparency go together," Graham said. "How do you know if academic freedom is protected unless you have public scrutiny?"

But Hugh Arnold, dean of the faculty of management, says the special treatment granted to the faculty in the agreement is necessary to attract private donors.

"There is a sense that having a very good and well regarded business school tends to enhance the reputation of the university within the busi-

ness community," he said.

"The university is trying to support business. Business will then be more likely to donate."

Arnold says the academic integrity of the faculty is not compromised by the creation of an external committee to serve in an advisory capacity at the beginning of an internal search for academic staff.

"We'd never accept a gift that carried stipulations that weren't governed by university's regulations about academic appointments," he said.

"The agreement makes provision for eminent experts in the business world as a source of advice. At the beginning of the search process, the search committee will consult that group of distinguished business experts."

Elan Ohayon, an executive of the Graduate Students' Union says this emphasis on soliciting the input of business leaders, as well as naming building and chairs after private donors is a dangerous trend for a public university.

"These moves don't strengthen the university, but undermine it. The university is suppose to be creating independent thought. But if you're going out asking the people you should be evaluating, academic integrity is undermined," said Ohayon.

"The public will stop seeing this as its own institution. Someone comes along, lays on the last coat of paint and people forget who built the house. It undermines what the public puts in."

...Continued from Page 3

tation is by bringing in an external chair. As it stands now, the department is clearly mismanaged and unable to manage itself."

"Personal Bias"

In yet another controversy surrounding UPEI's Soc/Anth department, Geoffrey Dale* has stated that the actions of Holbrook regarding the marking of his papers were based on personal bias and not on academic standard. Dale had received a 95% on his first paper of the semester and on the day the second paper was due, Dale asked a question that as Dale put it left Holbrook feeling agitated. He also felt that the response was more of a reprimand than an answer. Subsequently Dale received grades of 35% and 65% respectively on the next two papers, which were not returned. Upon receiving his mark of 65% for the semester Dale felt that a clerical error had been made.

After several attempts to contact Holbrook, Dale finally ran into him outside of class in the hallway, Holbrook tried to brush him off stating he hadn't the time to see Dale and said that he should come back during office hours. Holbrook did not have office hours posted and even the secretary for the department did not know when he would be in his office. Out of frustration, Dale approached Dean Campbell who himself contacted Holbrook.

When the meeting between Dale and Holbrook finally took place, Dale was not satisfied with his professor's comments and wrote the President of the university to request that his mark for the course be readjusted. Dale was not available for comment on whether or not his grade was ever changed.

One student also mentioned that while Holbrook was passing out evaluation forms at the end of the semester, the professor mentioned that because of tenure he was in the position to disregard any comments made by student on the evaluation forms and that to remember when filling them out that he would be teaching some of them next semester. Holbrook then, against University rules, collected the forms himself.

These indiscretions cause the students of UPEI to wonder what other incidents the Department of Sociology/Anthropology have been hiding. And furthermore, why the administration is ignoring these problems.

John Crossley, VP Academic agreed that "[there is a] history of some difficulty within the department." Crossley also pointed out that the department is currently undergoing another planned internal review. The external review is scheduled to take place in March or September.

"[The study] looks into more comprehensive things, but student complaints do bubble up."

Write 4
US!