

THE MARLET

Vol. 6

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, VICTORIA, B.C., APRIL 5, 1967

No. 31

Faculty Freak-Out! No Reasons Given Shelved to Committee

By GUY STANLEY

Joint Faculties stood up for peace at any price and passed the ball back to the students Tuesday.

Unanimous endorsement was given UVic president Dr. Malcolm G. Taylor's proposal for a five-member committee to preface criteria for evaluation, a statement of professional ethics and determine the composition of faculty review committees.

Apart from two motions for adjournment the committee was the only proposal voted on by the 220 attending.

The committee, incorporating a representative of each academic rank, is to meet this summer.

Also incorporated in the proposal was the holding of Joint Faculty meetings on a regular basis—two each term.

These proposals were contained in Dr. Taylor's lead-off address to the hour and 40 minute meeting.

In the address he read to the faculty the Prof. J. B. Milner

telegram, (reprinted below) and added that Dr. Charles D. Tarlton had "reservations" about it.

These reservations, he said, were that the report said not that there was no violation of academic freedom, but that there was no evidence of such violation.

The telegram also says the procedures were open to serious question and that more public discussion might do more harm than good to all parties involved, Taylor reported to Joint Faculties. The full CAUT report is private. Only Taylor and Tarlton have copies.

The meeting was to be a frank discussion of the circumstances surrounding the contract terminations of Professors Schwartz, Tarlton and Mackenzie.

In promising the meeting, Taylor told a joint students faculty delegation that the meeting would allow "free access to any pertinent information."

Dean of Arts and Science, Dr. Alex. Wood underwent 10 minutes of questioning about

the reasons for the terminations of the contracts.

He replied his refusal to answer to date had been based on the 'Canadian tradition' of non-disclosure of reasons, and said that if the meeting wanted them revealed he would abide by their decision.

Professor Anthony Emery said he could see no reason why reasons shouldn't be aired if it was alright with those directly involved.

But no reasons were given. The meeting failed to come to a decision on whether giving the reasons for the terminations would set a bad precedent.

Dean Wood said the reasons had been released to those involved. Tarlton said that he had not been told.

Said one faculty member after the meeting: "What was decided today was what kind of university is wanted and that if you don't agree, you had better stay away."

"The best thing the students can do," he said, "is, to a man, to stay away."



THE OTHER CHEEK

MILNER TELEGRAM

Procedures Questionable

A statement released by the CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers) yesterday stated that "there was no violation of academic freedom" in the non-renewal of the contract of Dr. C. D. Tarlton.

The statement followed on the heels of the CAUT report which has been released "confidentially" to Dr. Tarlton and Dr. Taylor, Uvic President.

The statement continues to say the investigating committee "recognized that the procedures followed in arriving at the decision were seriously open to question in a number of respects, and has recommended to the university that changes be made in its procedures for dealing with renewals of appointments."

At a meeting of the Joint Faculties on Tuesday, Dr. Taylor announced that the full CAUT report was confidential and made references only to the statement released by Professor J. B. Milner of Toronto under whose signature the above statement was released.

Dr. Tarlton said later, "I find Dr. Taylor's references to the report unethical and Professor Milner's assessment of the report unbelievable."

The statement also said that "the university had the right to come to the decision that it did and that it did so honestly."

The complete report will not be publicly released at the moment as the CAUT has "requested that the report be kept private and confidential to the parties themselves."

The CAUT announcement from Ottawa yesterday morning advised that further public discussion would not be beneficial to any of the parties involved.

Dr. Tarlton was one of three professors who had their contracts terminated at Uvic this year. He was the only one to

appeal to the CAUT whose job includes investigating charges of infringements of academic freedom.

The full text of the CAUT statement is reprinted below.

"The academic freedom and tenure committee of the CAUT has carried out a private and confidential investigation of the circumstances surrounding the decision of the University of Victoria not to renew the appointment of Dr. Charles D. Tarlton to the faculty of the University. The committee has concluded that there was no violation of academic freedom in the affair, and that the university had the right to come to the decision that it did, and that it did so honestly. The committee has recognized that the procedures followed in arriving at the decision were seriously open to question in a number of respects, and has recommended to the university that changes be made in its procedures for dealing with renewals of appointments.

"The committee has prepared a full report of its investigation and has given a copy to each of the principal parties involved. Feeling that further public discussion of the circumstances of the case can do no good to any of the parties and may well do harm to all, the committee has requested that the report be kept private and confidential to the parties themselves."

Questions

Here are some questions to ask Dr. Taylor. The editors of The Martlet urge that students be satisfied with nothing less than specific answers.

Dr. Taylor:

• Taken individually, why were contracts of professors Tarlton, Schwartz and Mackenzie terminated without them being told the reasons?

• Do you believe that Dean Wood's action in threatening a group of students with his resignation if these people didn't leave is in keeping with professional academic ethics.

• What concrete steps have you taken to ensure that this university is a place of tolerance, where professional performance counts for more than compatibility, and where there is freedom to criticize?

• How is it that you told Dr. Tarlton there has been a violation of academic freedom in his non-renewal, but on television and in Joint Faculties you denied there had been such a violation?

Joint Faculties Meeting Disaster An Open Letter

While I endorse wholeheartedly the proposals and principles enunciated today by President Taylor, my estimation of the meeting of the Joint Faculties is that it was a disaster. I had been led to expect that the meeting would result in a full disclosure of the circumstances surrounding the current non-renewal crisis. Such was the wording of the resolution of the Faculty Association which President Taylor referenced in his announcement of the meeting.

Not only was no disclosure made, but, on the whole, none was desired. When it was suggested that "established procedure" be dispensed with so as to enable a full discussion, the result was electric: persons can be evaluated and dismissed for unspecified reasons and if one wants to know why, he is a rebel; but if one suggests the superseding of "established procedures" he has mentioned an unmentionable.

In fact, and this is, to my mind, truly unbelievable, it was even suggested at one point that probationary initial contracts implied no intention to retain such a professor, but rather were self-expiring. According to this reasoning, a new faculty member's contract "expired", after which he could reapply for reappointment. This neanderthal notion makes one wonder how long ago—and where—this particular faculty member served his untenured years.

In conclusion, I feel that the faculty has failed to respond to the clear challenge presented to it—to explain with reason and logic why a teacher who was a successful and accomplished scholar and a good teacher (by his own students' evaluation) should not be invited, encouraged and persuaded (much less permitted) to remain at UVic. Positive and immediate changes are the only hope, as I see it, if making UVic the sort of institution of teaching and learning I think it aspires to be; and with ignorance of the past, what light can be thrown in the future?

Dr. Richard Powers,
Assistant Professor
Department of Economics
and Political Science.