

The legacy of soc/anth; part two

continued from page 3

1997 immediately petition the Dean of Arts, Dr. Philip Smith, to remove both Dr. Nagarajan and Dr. Horwich from the review committee by Thursday, March 13, 1997 and replace them with impartial appointees. Be it also resolved that if the review is allowed to proceed with such improprieties as are obvious to the Student Union, and the reviewers are not removed, the Student Union will not recognize the findings presented to Senate." NO reaction to the motion was ever received by the UPEI Student Union.

In an effort to get a response to the motion, a request was made by student senators to have the SU motion included in the agenda for the March 14, 1997 Senate meeting. The item was not included, and when Dr. Epperly was approached for a reason for the exclusion, her response was that the issue would be better dealt with in a President's Report (Note: no copy of this report can be found). Student senators tried to reintroduce the item at the Senate meeting, during the approval of the agenda, but were blocked by other senators. No formal motion was made to introduce the concerns of the Student Union, and the Senate never officially recognized the prevailing problems with the Soc/Anth Department.

The reason for the administration's backing of the reviewers became apparent this past summer. In hindsight, the ignoring of the SU motion

by the Senate, by the administration, and by Dean Smith is quite understandable. It is now known that the reviews were actually part of a mandatory five-year curriculum evaluation of the department. The reviewers were approved in the Spring of 1996, six months before any investigation into the problems of Soc/Anth. Their only mandates were to decide if the courses offered in the calendar were reasonable – no authority was given to investigate student complaints regarding professors or marks. Complaints could be heard, but would not be reflected in the official report.

Since the review was merely an investigation into curriculum, there seems to be no conflict of interest on behalf of the reviewers. As Dean Smith stated, Horwich's tie to the department "does not hinder his ability to offer a fair assessment of the Department's curriculum and scholarly efforts." But the impression students received regarding the mandate of the reviews was entirely false. Neither the Student Union Ombudsman nor the soc/anth students were informed that the review was not a forum for their particular complaints.

To date, there has still been no formal, public review of the problems that occurred over the last three years and no recognition from the administration of any problem in the department of Sociology and Anthropology.

Election and Referendum Results

All right. Kristen Patterson finally found out who is what, and what is who:

Vice President External:

Adam Kenny

Senate Representatives:

Michael Drake
Stephen Patrick Hann

Board of Governors Representative:

Fidel Murphy

Arts Representative:

Melissa Doucette

Business Representatives:

Kyle Hann
Dale Proude
W. Darcy MacDougall

First Year Representative:

Duncan Quinn Crawford

Senior Class President:

Bernadette Mary Lynch

Congratulations everyone. It seems that approximately 15% of the student body voted, which is one of the best turn-outs in a while. Way to go apathetics! As far as CIMN is concerned, the majority voted in support of a student radio service so here's hoping the station has a long life.

