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ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-428-94/PPC
RESOLUTION ON
REVISION OF THE FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

Background Statement: Throughout the last several years, criticism has been received informally that the existing Code of Ethics is awkwardly written and lacks the force of law in that it does not appear in the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM).

During spring 1993, interested members of the Personnel Policies Committee worked on revising the existing Code to remove the awkward "he/she" phraseology, make the Code gender-neutral, and thereby make it more readable and meaningful.

Personnel Policies Committee approved (February 16, 1994) a resolution to adopt the revised Faculty Code of Ethics and include it in CAM. After considering the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) Statement of Ethics (revised, 1987), the Personnel Policies Committee did not see any significant difference between its revision and the AAUP's revision. The Personnel Policies Committee voted (April 20, 1994) to adopt the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics as the Faculty Code of Ethics for this campus.

WHEREAS, The original Faculty Code of Ethics was based on the 1966 American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics; and

WHEREAS, The present "he/she" format is difficult to read; and

WHEREAS, The present Faculty Code of Ethics appears on pages 1 and 2 of the Faculty Handbook; and

WHEREAS, Official campus policy should be included in the Campus Administrative Manual; and

WHEREAS, The American Association of University Professors has developed a national standard for professional ethics and responsibility which has been adopted by many institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS, The American Association of University Professors has revised its Statement on Professional Ethics in 1987; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics (revised, 1987) be adopted as the Faculty Code of Ethics for this campus; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the revised Faculty Code of Ethics shall be included in the Campus Administrative Manual as CAM 370.TBD.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
February 16, 1994
Revised April 20, 1994
Statement on Professional Ethics

The statement that follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Council as Association policy, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting in June 1987.

INTRODUCTION

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has consistently affirmed the responsibilities in the academic profession to meet special responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as the exercise of responsibilities to students and colleagues, and conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The Statement on Professional Ethics that follows sets forth general standards that serve as a reminder of the integrity of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of such local action and standards, the academic profession differs from the profession of law and medicine, whose associations assure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession, the individual institution of higher learning provides the assurance and so should non-normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework reference to a faculty group. The Association sorts such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee 5, to consult with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 Statement on Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Proc edural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, or the applicable provisions of the Association's Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

THE STATEMENT

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidentiality nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

From: Bob Koob
Here's Jack's reply to the message that follows. Would you draft up a memo
based on my request? Thanks

Bob, you are correct, but in order to clarify for our records what has occurred
would you please simply send me a memo stating what you stated in your e-mail?
Thanks.-- Jack

*** Forwarding note from DU521 --CALPOLY 12/27/94 13:34 ***
From: <DU521 AT CALPOLY>
To: Jack Wilson <DI465 AT CALPOLY>
Subject: uncl: lost resolutions

From: Bob Koob
I uncovered some old paperwork that I apparently buried early in the year
(it was dated June 29, 1994). This was a request from the President's
Office to prepare responses for Senate resolutions 23, 24, 25, & 29 (as in
AS-423-94). My take in looking at them is that the first is already
completed, so a response now would not be timely, and that the remaining
three pertain largely to internal workings of the Senate and don't actually
require presidential approval to be useful. I'd appreciate your guidance
in how you'd like the record closed on these. Thanks.
The 7th Whereas clause appears to have an error, substituting "pedagogues" for "pedagogies."

The definition of Distance Learning in the 9th Whereas clause is limiting. Not all distance learning involves electronic technology, although that is increasingly the preferred mode of delivery.

All new courses are reviewed for mode--lecture, lab, activity, case study, etc., so this is no additional requirement. Courses are also reviewed when there is a change of mode. However, much of this is a vestige of the mode and level system; as we move further away from mode and level, there is less justification for this type of scrutiny by university level faculty committees.

Matters of curricular structure, course content, and instructional practices are the responsibility of the faculty. Although instructional techniques associated with distance learning have been in existence for many years in higher education, the development of new technologies applicable to distance learning has rightfully engaged the interest of the faculty. Faculty members should be encouraged to explore these applications for their ability to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of learning, as they would any pedagogical technique. I hope that the faculty as a whole, through its regular process of course and curriculum review, will not restrain pedagogical innovation and practices of departments and faculty members with regard to distance learning or other instruction, or in any way interfere with the freedom accorded to faculty members to present material to students in the manner they determine best.

Barb -

I have asked Glenn for the recommendations on the attached Senate Resolution (4) 2-4). Note his comments, especially the one above for the resolution on Distance Learning. How should we respond to the President?

Regarding the resolution on indirect costs, I assumed you would go way up to date on this. I did not get advice from John.
MEMORANDUM

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
      President

Subject: RESPONSE TO ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTIONS

Date:       June 15, 1994
File No.:   
Copies:    Robert Koob
            Robert Gish

Academic Senate Resolution AS-426-94/BC, Budget Information Reporting, is approved. It is my understanding that this practice has already been placed into operation.

I am also approving the Senate Resolution AS-427-94/EX regarding the campus policy developed on the Repatriation of Native American Objects.

I am also hereby approving the Senate Resolution AS-428-94/PPC, Revision of The Faculty Code of Ethnics. This code of ethics will be placed in the next revision of the Campus Administrative Manual.