

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S.82-48

MEMORANDUM

To..... SENATE

From..... SENATE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER FACULTY
ETHICS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Subject..... REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE TO
CONSIDER FACULTY ETHICS AND
RESPONSIBILITIES

Date..... March 22, 1982

MOTION:

"That Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the inclusion of the attached Code of Professional Ethics and Professional Relationships as University policy.

The Senate Committee to Consider Faculty Ethics and Responsibilities recommends, but does not insist, that this code be appended to AC 2."

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To..... H. M. EVANS,

..... SECRETARY OF SENATE

Subject..... REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE TO
..... CONSIDER FACULTY ETHICS AND
..... RESPONSIBILITIES

From..... W. L. CLEVELAND

Date..... March 3, 1982

Attached is the report of the Committee with a specific motion for Senate. The Committee would appreciate your efforts to have the motion placed before the April meeting of Senate.

Thank you.

W. L. Cleveland

cc. N.M.G. Bhakthan
M.E. Manley-Casimir
C.H.W. Jones

DRAFT

The Senate Committee to Consider Faculty Ethics and Responsibilities recommends the adoption of the following motion:

"That Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the inclusion of the attached Code of Professional Ethics and Professional Relationships as University policy.

The Committee recommends, but does not insist, that this Code be appended to AC 2."

REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER FACULTY ETHICS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Committee received three charges -

- I) To review the need for a University policy on faculty ethics and responsibilities;
- II) To consider relevant policies and procedures in effect at other Canadian universities;
- III) To consider previous efforts at developing policies in this area.

This report addresses each of these charges.

- I. The Committee concluded that a code of faculty ethics ought to be University policy. The particular code recommended by the Committee is a slightly revised version of the CAUT guidelines as adopted by the SFU and UBC faculty associations. The SFU Faculty Association executive was consulted by the Committee and has endorsed both the proposed code and the recommendation that it become University policy.
- II. The situation at other Canadian institutions -
 1. UBC - In 1973, the UBC Faculty Association approved the adoption of 'Guidelines Concerning Professional Ethics' for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook. The guidelines are very similar to those adopted by the CAUT and recommended by this Committee. They are not part of UBC official policy.
 2. U. Vic. - At this institution, a statement headed 'Professional Ethics' is included in the tenure document approved by the University's Board of Governors. It is thus part of university policy. The statement itself conforms to the tone of the CAUT document.
 3. York - The collective agreement between the Board and the Faculty Association defines the professional responsibility of faculty members. Among those responsibilities is the establishment of fair and ethical relationships with students and colleagues.
 4. University of Alberta, Calgary - No guidelines on ethics are in effect.
- III. Previous efforts at Developing Policies at SFU -

A persistent effort to deal with the definition and codification of standards of faculty ethics was undertaken by an ad hoc Senate Committee struck in September, 1968. Known informally as the Day Committee, it submitted its first report in 1969, its second in 1971, and its final one in 1974.

In the course of its lengthy deliberations, the Day Committee concluded that the CAUT 'Guidelines concerning Professional Ethics and Professional Relationships' were the most suitable guidelines for faculty conduct at SFU. Senate voiced no major objections to the 'Guidelines' themselves, and they were eventually adopted by the SFU Faculty Association in July, 1981. A version of those guidelines is what is now before Senate.

The Day Committee encountered difficulties when it attempted to establish rules and procedures which contravened certain provisions of the University Act. These difficulties caused the Committee to be dissolved and its final report to be withdrawn.

IV Conclusions

Since the dissolution of the Day Committee, the University has adopted policies which make it unnecessary for the current ad hoc Committee to accompany its motion with a series of procedural recommendations.

Any faculty member who feels he/she has been wrongly accused of a violation of the proposed code of ethics has recourse to an appeal through the mechanisms of AC 41, the University Act, and the University Affairs Committee. In addition, we feel that the informal channels of communication between Department Chairpersons and faculty members, between Chairpersons and Deans, and between Deans and the President and Vice-President Academic are such as to protect faculty members from unjust accusations and to protect students and colleagues from the persistence of unethical behaviour as defined in the proposed Code.

The Committee recommends to Senate that these formal and informal procedural safeguards be allowed to service the implementation of the proposed Code for a period of two years. If, at the end of two years, more specific procedures are deemed necessary, they should be drawn up by the appropriate bodies.

ASSOCIATION des ÉTUDIANTS
de SIMON FRASER

SIMON FRASER
STUDENT SOCIETY

1981 September 11

Harry Evans, Secretary of Senate
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, B. C.

Dear Harry:

Re: Faculty Code of Conduct and Ethics

Please be advised that the Simon Fraser Student Society Forum,
on 1981 September 9, passed the following motion:

"That the Simon Fraser Student Society endorses the development
of a Faculty Code of Ethics and Responsibilities, and


that the C.A.U.T. guidelines concerning professional ethics and
professional relationships is the minimum acceptable such code, and

that the Simon Fraser Student Society would greatly prefer that
the provisions of such a code be mandatory and not advisory, and

that the Simon Fraser Student Society urges and endorses the
addition of such a code to the University's policy."

I trust that you will forward this motion to both the Senate
Committee on Academic Planning and the Senate Committee on Agenda
and Rules.

Respectfully



G. T. McNabb
Internal Relations Officer

GTMc;pc
CUPE 2396

RECEIVED

SEP 11 1981

REGISTRAR'S OFFICE
MAIL DESK

I. FACULTY MEMBERS AS TEACHERS

1. The first responsibility of university teachers is the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and understanding through teaching and research. They must devote their energies conscientiously to develop their scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers.
2. They must be conscientious in the preparation and organization of their subject matter and should revise this periodically in the light of developments in their fields.
3. They must conscientiously strive to improve the methods of presentation of their subjects to their students.
4. They must encourage the free exchange of ideas between themselves and their students.
5. They must always be fair to their students. It is unethical for them to exploit students for their private advantage. It is unethical for them to utilize the work of students in a publication without appropriate attribution.
6. They are guilty of unethical conduct if they act so as to prevent the fulfilment of these responsibilities by themselves or by other members of the academic community.
7. They must keep in confidence all privileged information gained about a student, whether concerning academic progress, personal life or political and religious views. Nevertheless, they may reveal information about the academic standing of students in response to a request from a reputable source; they may refer to the student's character only insofar as this is relevant. When acting as referees, they must strive to be fair and objective.

II. FACULTY MEMBERS AS SCHOLARS

1. All scholarly activity conducted within the University must have as its primary objectives: (i) the increase of knowledge and understanding; (ii) the improvement of the scholarly competence of the teacher, and (iii) insofar as possible, the initiation of students into the academic disciplines.
In view of the first objective, it is essential that faculty members be free to disseminate the results of their research through publication, lectures and other appropriate means.
2. It is unethical for faculty members to enter into any agreement that infringes their freedom to publish the results of research conducted within the university precincts or under university auspices. Notwithstanding this, faculty members may agree to delay, for a specific period of time, publication of the results of sponsored or contract research, provided that this condition is agreed to by the University.

III. FACULTY MEMBERS AS COLLEAGUES

1. They have the obligation to defend the right of their colleagues to academic freedom. It is unethical to act so as deliberately to infringe that freedom.
2. They should refrain from denigration of the character and competence of their colleagues. When presenting a professional judgment on a colleague at the request of an appropriate university committee or authority (e.g. a committee dealing with appointments, tenure, dismissal or research grants), or in any other forum, they have the obligation both to the colleague and to the University to be fair and objective.

3. It is unethical to fail to respect the confidentiality of information about a colleague gained during participation in the work of committees such as those described in Section IV.2.
4. They have the responsibility to acknowledge in their scholarly lectures and publications, academic debts to colleagues and students.
5. It is unethical for them to exploit the unpaid work of colleagues for personal gain.

IV. FACULTY MEMBERS AND THE UNIVERSITY

1. In accepting a university appointment, faculty members assume obligations to the University in addition to their primary duties as teachers and scholars. They have the responsibility to participate in the life of the University, in its governance and administration, through membership on committees and organizations at Board, Senate, Faculty and Department levels, provided that this participation is consistent with the discharge of their primary responsibilities and with their own abilities.
2. It is unethical for them to accept an appointment to an administrative position (e.g. Department Chairman, Dean, President) unless satisfied that adequate consultative procedures have been employed in filling the post.
3. They have a responsibility to abide by the rules and regulations established for the orderly conduct of the affairs of the University, provided that these rules and regulations do not infringe the academic freedom of faculty and students or the principles of ethical conduct as set forth in this policy. At the same time, they have a responsibility to seek reforms which would, in their judgment, improve the University.
4. It is unethical to fail to give proper notice of resignation of a faculty appointment, in accordance with the appropriate university regulations, or to accept another position involving conflicting obligations for a period covered under the terms of an existing appointment.
5. Faculty members should avoid the following potential conflicts of interest unless, after full consultation, they have the approval of the university officer to whom they are responsible:
 - a) Authorize the purchase by the University of equipment, supplies or services from a source in which they or their families have a substantial interest;
 - b) Hire any member of their immediate family as an employee or consultant for any project supported by funds administered through the University;
 - c) Be associated with the management of any undertaking which hires or proposes to hire university personnel.

V. FACULTY MEMBERS AND THE COMMUNITY AT LARGE

1. In statements outside the University, they retain the responsibility of seeking the truth and of stating it as they see it. However, they should make clear that except when specifically authorized to do so, they are acting in their own names and not in the name of the University.

2. Secondary income: The time involved in any consulting or related work and the nature of such work, involving payment to the professor by any person or organization other than the University must be disclosed to the appropriate university authorities in accordance with existing university policies.
3. When they enter into a special relationship with some sector of the community at large, as when they are engaged as consultants or when they conduct research under contract, they have a responsibility to ensure that these duties are consistent with their primary obligation to the University and in no way deleteriously affect their duties within the University.