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Interim statement on Professional Rights and Responsibilities

At its May 1971 meeting, the Senate adopted the statement on Professional Rights and Responsibilities.

The viability of a university depends upon two principles:

1. Colleges and universities serve the common good through learning, teaching and scholarship and the fulfillment of this function necessarily rests upon the preservation of the freedoms of teaching, learning, expression, research and debate.

2. All components of the academic community have a responsibility to exemplify and support these freedoms. In making this statement we are to honor the freedoms we are to be protected and how this responsibility is borne, we wish to emphasize its applicability to the entire professional staff of the State University of New York whether their primary responsibility is teaching, research, or administration.

The 1940 AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure asserts the primacy of this responsibility. The 1966 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics underscores its pertinence to the individual faculty member and calls attention to his responsibility, by his own actions, to uphold his colleagues' and his students' freedom of inquiry and to promote public understanding of academic freedom. The Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students emphasizes the shared responsibility of all members of the academic community for the preservation of these freedoms.

Continuing attacks on the integrity of our universities and on the concept of academic freedom itself come from many quarters. These attacks, sometimes marked by tactics of intimidation and harassment or by political interference with the autonomy of colleges and universities, may provoke harsh responses and counter-responses. Especially in a repressive atmosphere, the faculty's responsibility to defend its freedoms cannot be separated from its responsibility to uphold those freedoms by its own actions. The responsibility of administrators to conduct their offices so as to give primary consideration to protecting and upholding these freedoms must also be emphasized.

Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, administrators, and trustees 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. Speakers on campus must not only be protected from violence, but given an opportunity to be heard. The expression of dissent and the attempt to produce change, therefore, may not be carried out in ways which injure individuals or damage institutional facilities or disrupt the classes of one's teachers and colleagues. Those who seek to call attention to grievances must not do so in ways that significantly impede the functions of the institution. However, it should be emphasized that the university, and its administrators in particular, have an obligation to give fair and fair hearing to reasoned expressions of grievances.

(Continued on Page 4.)
respond promptly and in good faith to such expressions and to widely expressed needs for change; and, when making decisions which concern the university community as a whole, or part of it, to consult with those affected by such decisions.

Students are entitled to an atmosphere conducive to learning and to even-handed treatment in all aspects of the teacher-student relationship. Faculty members may not refuse to enroll or teach students on the grounds of their beliefs or the possible uses to which they may put the knowledge to be gained in a course. The student should not be forced by the authority inherent in the instructional role to make particular personal choices as to political action or his own part in society. Evaluation of students and the award of credit must be based on academic performance professionally judged and not on matters irrelevant to that performance, whether personality, race, religion, degree of political activism, or personal beliefs.

It is a teacher's mastery of his subject, his scholarship, and his abilities as a teacher, which entitle him to his position and to freedom in the presentation of his subject. Thus, it is improper to impose material which has no relation to his subject, or to fail to present the subject matter of his course as announced to his students and as approved by the faculty in their collective responsibility for the curriculum. This should not be interpreted, however, to discourage student participation in curriculum planning or experimentation, nor flexibility in courses, curriculum, or pedagogy.

Because academic freedom has traditionally included the teacher's full freedom as a citizen, most faculty members face no insoluble conflict between the claims of politics, social action, and conscience, on the one hand, and the claims and expectations of their students, colleges, and institutions, on the other. If such conflicts become acute, and the teacher's attention to his obligations as a citizen and moral agent precludes the fulfillment of substantial academic obligations, he cannot escape the responsibility of that choice, but should either request a leave of absence or resign his academic position.

Concern for sound principles and procedures in the imposition of discipline has been reflected in the AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Procedures Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, the 1968 "Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure", and the many investigations conducted by the AAUP into disciplinary actions by colleges and universities. We generally support these principles and procedures, but would note some special requirements which the issues dictate.

In any matters involving a determination of an alleged breach of professional obligation, the basic determination should be made by a tribunal of peers. In matters involving disciplinary penalties immediate concern should be given to penalties less drastic than dismissal. In addition, the determination of penalties should always reflect a total review of the professional life and contributions of the person involved and not of a single incident.

The question arises whether the customary procedures, even as supplemented by the suggestions above, are sufficient in the current context. We believe that by and large they do serve their purposes well, but that consideration should be given to supplementing them in other respects.

First, plans for ensuring compliance with academic norms should be enriched to emphasize preventive as well as disciplinary action. Toward this end the faculty should take the initiative, working with the administration and other components of the institution, to develop and maintain an atmosphere of freedom, commitment to academic equity, and respect for the academic rights of others. The faculty should also join with other members of the academic community in the development of procedures to be used in the event of serious disruption, or the threat of disruption, and should ensure its consultation in major decisions, particularly those related to the calling of external security forces to the campus. Such procedures should include clear methods of prior consultation, information exchange among responsible bodies within the university community, cooling off periods if possible, and significant faculty participation in any determination that a sufficient emergency exists that requires the use of external agencies. Should such external agencies be used, the control of them and the decisions as to their continued use should be made only after comparable consultation and participation.

Second, there is need for the faculty to assume a more positive role as guardian of academic values against unjustified attacks from its own members. The traditional faculty function in disciplinary proceedings has been to assure academic due process and meaningful faculty participation in the imposition of discipline. While this function should be maintained, faculties should recognize their stake in promoting through other means adherence to norms essential to the academic enterprise. Consistent with the principles set forth in this statement rules designed to meet these needs for professional self-regulation should be adopted on each campus in response to local circumstances and in continued experimentation. In all sanctioning efforts, however, it is vital that proceedings be conducted with fairness to the individual, that peer judgments play a crucial role, and that adverse judgments be clearly founded on demonstrated violations of appropriate norms.