

The University of Arizona
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

January 4, 1971

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, January 4, 1971, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Forty-six members were present with Vice President McMillan presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Bannister, Bartlett, Bingham, Boyer, Brewer, Carlson, Cole, Delaplaine, Dewhirst, Dixon, Edwards, Fahey, Freeman, Gegenheimer, Giebner, Goodwin, Gould, Grant, Herber, Kemmerer, Krebs, Little, Lytle, Mautner, McMillan, Mees, H. Myers, Paulsen, Paylore, Perkins, Putt, Reiblich, Rhodes, Richard, Robson, Selke, Siegel, Sorensen, Steelink, Svob, Varney, W. Voris, Windsor, Wise, Yoshino, and Zwolinski. Student representatives attending were Cathy Cleven, and Bruce Eggers.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: J. R. Anthony, J. W. Anthony, Ares, Barnes, Blitzer, Bok, Bretall, Christopherson, DuVal, Gaines, Harvill, Houston, Hull, Johnson, Kassander, Lane, Lowe, Murphy, L. Myers, Nigh, Peters, Resnick, Schaefer, Tomizuka, M. Voris, and Younggren. Student representative absent was Charles Eaton.

CATALOG MATERIAL: The catalog material previously distributed to members of the Senate by means of the "Curriculum" Bulletins was approved.

STATEMENT BY DR. RAY THOMPSON RE "LETTER TO EDITOR" IN ARIZONA DAILY STAR:

Mr. McMillan informed the Senate that Dr. Ray Thompson had requested the privilege of speaking to the Senate on a matter of concern to him. Mr. McMillan then recognized Dr. Thompson who referred to a statement attributed to him which had appeared in the Letters to the Editor column of the Arizona Daily Star on December 28, 1970. This in fact had been an excerpt from a report prepared by Dr. Thompson as the University of Arizona representative on the joint committee (made up of one representative from each of the three universities) which had worked with a subcommittee of the Board of Regents on revising the Code of Conduct for the three universities. The Star had published in the same column an extract from a report prepared by Dr. Thornton W. Price, of Arizona State University in his work as that institution's representative to the joint committee. Dr. Thompson pointed out that the way in which this material was presented in the Letters to the Editor column with both Dr. Price and Dr. Thompson identified by name and their title at their respective universities, implied both their personal support of the Code of Conduct and their support as representatives of their institutions. The statements were published out of context. Dr. Thompson said he wanted his faculty colleagues to know that the excerpts from his and Dr. Price's reports had been published without the Star's informing them that they were going to be published.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that the Senate express its sincere thanks to Dr. Thompson for his fine work in representing the University of Arizona on the

joint committee that had worked with the Regents' committee to revise the originally adopted Code of Conduct. He said he felt all members of the faculty of the University appreciated very much Dr. Thompson's fine effort in this enterprise. Many seconds to the motion were heard and it carried unanimously.

STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OF FACULTY MEMBERS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, APPROVAL OF: The chair again recognized Dr. Thompson, asking him to present the next item on the agenda, consideration of a proposed statement on the professional conduct of faculty members at the University of Arizona.

Dr. Thompson explained that the draft of the proposed statement as distributed to members of the Senate with the agenda of this meeting had subsequently been revised modestly upon the suggestion of representatives of the University of Arizona Chapter of the American Association of University Professors. Dr. Thompson felt these suggestions had improved the original statement. He referred Senate members to the revised draft which each Senator had been furnished as he entered the meeting room today.

Dr. Thompson went ahead to explain that the statement on the professional conduct of faculty members had been prepared in order to develop a faculty-produced statement in the hope that the Regents then would delete from the Code of Conduct they had originally approved a section on faculty conduct. The Regents had now in fact deleted the faculty section of the Code, once they were aware that the three universities' faculties were developing their own codes of conduct.

He explained that the Regents continued to refer to the well-known "Starsky case" involving an ASU professor who had come to Tucson to address a student protest meeting and had not met his classes in Tempe that day. The Board of Regents feel strongly that all faculty contracts should include a statement referring to the obligation of a faculty employe to meet his classes as scheduled. Dr. Thompson and Dr. Price have been asked to assist the Regents in developing an appropriately worded statement about this matter for inclusion in faculty appointment letters in the future.

He said he hoped the faculty of the Senate of the University of Arizona would take action adopting an appropriate statement of professional conduct before some other statement of conduct was forced on the faculty by the Regents. He urged adoption of this report.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved adoption of the proposed statement on professional conduct of faculty members at the University of Arizona, as originally prepared by the University Committee of Eleven and then revised to incorporate suggestions of representatives of the University of Arizona Chapter of the American Association of University Professors. He said he understood the code would subsequently be published in the University of Arizona Faculty and Staff Handbook. Further, adoption of the code by the Faculty Senate should be reported to the Board of Regents. Many seconds to the motion were heard.

Dr. John Robson then stated that he was going to vote against the proposal, particularly because it included a provision that a faculty member accepts the responsibility to meet and conduct his classes at all regularly scheduled times and places. He said he felt a faculty member had the right to teach his course as he deemed appropriate and this included the amount of contact time involved as well as when such contact time should be scheduled. He said that during the current semester he had excused students in one of his classes from meeting for some weeks. He felt this was his right.

Dr. Thompson said that faculty members in fact have an obligation to meet classes at regularly scheduled times now, and this statement includes nothing new in that regard. It has always been understood that an instructor's schedule of class meetings may be modified so long as the chairman of the department concerned is aware of the adjustments and has approved these. He said he felt Dr. Robson was reading more danger into that provision of the code than was in fact there. Dr. Dixon said that he felt other language in the code provided adequate flexibility for a professor to be able to adjust the times he meets his classes.

Dr. Siegel questioned the provision that a faculty member has the responsibility of conducting his course in general conformity with the content format and official description of such course as established by the faculties and approved by the President and the Board of Regents. He said he felt many courses were changed from time to time and yet the original syllabus might not be updated. Several members of the Senate said they felt the syllabi of courses in most departments were revised and updated regularly. It was pointed out by Dr. Thompson that the code here refers only to the description of a course published in the University catalog since this is what is approved by the Board of Regents.

The question was then called for and the motion carried, formally adopting the proposed statement as one governing the professional conduct of faculty members at the University of Arizona. One negative vote was heard. The statement was adopted as follows:

Statement on Professional Conduct of Faculty Members
at the University of Arizona

I. Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, administrators, and regents an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus.

As a teacher, the faculty member encourages the free pursuit of learning in his students. He holds before them as best he can the scholarly standards of his discipline. He demonstrates respect for the student as an individual, and adheres to his proper role as intellectual guide and counselor. He makes every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that his evaluation of students reflects their true merit. He respects the confidential nature of the relationship between faculty member and student.

The faculty member, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognizes the special responsibilities placed upon him. His primary responsibility to his subject is to seek and state the truth as he sees it. To this end he devotes his energies to developing and improving his scholarly competence. He accepts the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending and transmitting knowledge. He practices intellectual honesty.

As a member of his community, the faculty member has the rights and obligations of any citizen. He measures the urgency of these obligations in the

light of his responsibilities to his subject, to his students, to his profession, and to his institution. When he speaks or acts as a private person, he avoids creating the impression that he speaks or acts for his college or university. (University of Arizona Faculty and Staff Manual of Procedure and Policy, 12th edition, p. 100.)

II. In order to accomplish these goals, the faculty member assumes certain specific responsibilities. He particularly accepts the responsibility:

1. To conduct each course he has been employed to teach in general conformity with the content, format, and official description of such course as established by the faculties and approved by the President and Board of Regents.

2. To meet and conduct his classes at all regularly scheduled times and places. The president or his duly appointed representatives may authorize a member of the faculty to be absent from his classes or to reschedule the work for reasons of health or when in the best interests of the university.

3. To notify as promptly as possible the head of the department whenever emergencies such as illness or accident prevent his meeting a scheduled class so that a replacement may be arranged. (University of Arizona Faculty and Staff Manual of Procedure and Policy, 12th edition, p. 43.)

III. In the event that a member of the faculty appears to have failed in meeting these standards, any affected member of the university community may make a complaint. Such a complaint should, in the first instance, be made to the head of the accused faculty member's department. The head of the department and the dean of the college shall first of all attempt to resolve the matter in a manner satisfactory to all parties utilizing the offices of the faculty Committee on Conciliation when appropriate. If they are not successful, they shall refer the matter to the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure for consideration in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Constitution and By-Laws. (University of Arizona Faculty and Staff Manual of Procedure and Policy, 12th edition, pp. 97-100.)

SELECTION OF PERSONNEL TO IMPLEMENT UNIVERSITY CODE OF CONDUCT: Dr. Gegenheimer pointed out that the revised Code of Conduct for the Arizona universities tentatively approved at the December 19 meeting of the Board of Regents probably would be formally adopted by the Board within the next few weeks. The Code provides that certain Boards are to be created. The Faculty Senate is to provide the President of the University with twenty names of faculty members, no more than five of whom may be from any one college, from which the President will appoint three to the Trial Board. The Senate is to provide the President with a list of ten names of faculty members, no more than three of whom may be from any one college, from which the President will appoint two to serve on the Review and Advisory Board. The Senate is to submit to the President a list of eight names of faculty members from which he will appoint four persons to sit on the Conduct Board.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that the Senate request the Committee on Committees to provide the Senate with thirty names as nominees for the Trial Board, twenty names as nominees for the Review and Advisory Board, and fifteen names as nominees for the Conduct Board. A mail ballot should then be conducted among the membership of the Faculty Senate to select the appropriate number of names to be submitted to the President of the University as described above. Dr. Gegenheimer hoped that the balloting could take place as soon as possible. Dean Myers seconded this motion.

Dean Rhodes asked if duplication of membership on two or more of the Boards was encouraged or discouraged. Dr. Gegenheimer said that the view had been expressed that different types of persons might be better qualified for service on one Board than another. The question was asked if the Committee on Committees should find out before submitting names to the Senate if the nominated individuals would be willing to serve. Dr. Gegenheimer said once the balloting was in progress, if an individual did not want to serve he could urge people not to vote for him. However, he felt that the Committee on Committees should not have the obligation to screen persons before submitting their names to the Senate. He said he hoped that any faculty member whose name was submitted would accept the obligation to serve if selected.

Dr. Thompson pointed out that several times the Regents had commented that if faculty members in sufficient numbers were not willing to serve on the proposed Boards, interested outside citizens should then be brought in. He felt that the University should make every effort to keep control of affairs within the University community. He hoped that at least in the selection process this first time, even though in time the Committee on Committees might be asked to screen faculty members before submitting their names, there would not be undue "fuss and flurry" among the faculty on the technicality of getting an individual's permission in advance to submit his name.

Dr. Gegenheimer pointed out that the Code provides that members of the several Boards are to be selected in May of each year. He hoped that the persons selected now would serve not only until May but be considered elected for the period beginning May 1971 as well. He said he would so incorporate this understanding into his original motion if it was agreed to by his second. Dean Myers agreed to this change in the motion. The question on the motion was then called for and carried with no negative vote heard.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 o'clock.

David L. Windsor, Secretary