

- (1) What is your perception of the student newspaper and how do you think a student newspaper should be run?

Well obviously it should be run by students and for students. What that means, in my view, is that there be a Board of Directors who are all students, elected by students, to be responsible for the editorial and financial policy of the paper. They should also be in charge of appointing and removing the editor and staff. It seems to me, given the history of the Northern Light this is the only way of preventing a small group of people, students and faculty, who have axes to grind, from taking over the paper and using it for their own purposes, and in the process using tactics that are simply unacceptable in an academic community. I also believe the paper and especially the office should be open to all students. One of the reasons we allocated the space directly off the student lounge for the Student Newspaper office was that it would be open and accessible to students on a daily basis. This certainly, according to my observation, was not the case last year. The office was hardly ever open, and staffed, for students to just casually walk in, and get involved. Rather it was run like a closed private clique.

More generally, the paper should stop trading in personalities and begin to deal with issues - current issues in university education in the 70's. Have you seen, for example, any articles recently in the Northern Light on the meaning and importance of tenure in universities in the seventies? No, instead all we have seen is very distorted stories on what has happened in the course of trying to establish a tenure policy.

- (2) Would you like to make some comments in regard to the Tenure Committees?

Yes, but in the context of the whole process of obtaining a policy here on tenure. There has been some dispute about who should have developed the tenure policy. I believe that dispute is largely beside the point even when it was not misrepresenting one party to the dispute. A small dissident minority of faculty felt that Academic Council, by past precedent, should have developed the policy, not the Faculty Association. Well, if you go back to the very early days of the College it was the Faculty Association that developed the first draft policy on tenure. Subsequent drafts were also developed by the Faculty Association.

When I was asked to remain in the Office of the Principal in August, 1973, I asked for certain commitments from various bodies at the College. I explicitly singled out the Faculty Association to develop certain policies, including one on tenure, "bilaterally negotiated with the Administration and Board." This was explicitly stated in a lengthy letter which Academic Council read and debated at length and then, with Dr. Gardezi in the Chair, gave me, and the position outlined in the letter, a unanimous vote of confidence. It was rather surprising several months later to hear certain faculty members dispute Faculty Association's jurisdiction in this area. So in February I wrote a memorandum jointly to Academic Council and Faculty Association outlining my view of the process of development and approval of various policies. It is interesting that Academic Council did not make any comment on that memorandum. In the meantime Faculty Association was in the process of developing and approving several policies including one on tenure.

The tenure policy was not developed in isolation of previous policy drafts. There were available, for example, comments of Dr. Monahan on the previous draft. One of Dr. Monahan's comments on the previous tenure draft was "I think this section is poorly developed and needs major revision."

When Faculty Association had a final approved draft it was passed on to Administration and then to Academic Council and to the Board. It was on the Agenda of Academic Council for literally months, before it was finally approved by the Board on June 20, 1974. Academic Council certainly had its chance to comment on the Policy. Certainly strong objections, had they been forthcoming from Academic Council, would have received full hearing by the Board. The Board even delayed approval of the Policy on the basis of objections by one unidentified telephone caller.

Academic Council minutes record mention of the Tenure Policy and/or Committee in six meetings between February 1, 1974, and July 26, 1974. In one of these, a motion to suspend final approval of the Tenure Policy until the fall when a full meeting of Academic Council could discuss it, failed to gain a seconder. Others involve information on

the reconstitution of the Tenure Committee, the actual approving of tenure to individual faculty members and the approval of the Tenure Policy. Thus most of the allegations made in the recent Northern Light are complete fabrications.

There is no question that Academic Council could have had and did have its say in the Tenure Policy. But what is more important, and ultimately the only thing that is important, is that, by the terms of the Policy Academic Council has a role in the actual awarding of Tenure to individual faculty members.

- (3) What would you like to see take place in the future at Algoma University College in regard to the role of the Academic Council?

Well, in a word I would like to see it develop into a responsible University Senate, act like a Senate and call itself by that name.

But in order to do so it must stop losing out by default. Collectively, more valuable time has been lost at this College by people sitting around waiting for a quorum for Council than I would want to admit openly.

As for parity, well there are a few facts which students should be aware of before they blithely believe the Northern Light distortions that Administration and faculty are out to destroy parity. First they should check who was responsible for the motion that ushered in parity. Then they should check the students track record of running for Council elections and then their attendance at, and participation in, Council meetings.

If parity disappears in Academic Council at this College it will be because of default by students. If students continue to consistently fail to participate then parity will in reality be only a dream or a myth, and there will not be much point in perpetuating it. But I am an optimist; I still believe the bold experiment we started a few years ago can work. But it was predicted on the parity value of reasoned argument and truth whether that be voiced by faculty members or by students. It was not based on, and cannot work on the basis of, a power block concept - faculty vs students. Power blocks and power politics have no place in my concept of a university.