Resolution of Educational Planning.

[s.l.]: [s.n.], 1970-04-07

https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/7PTY4Q7W5EIGN86

http://rightsstatements.org/vocab/CNE/1.0/

RESOLUTION ON EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

(Submitted by Leonard Uhr, Computer Sciences)

The spirit of a committee of the whole vote is to advise and to suggest, not to decide. In that spirit, I would like to move:

A. The bargaining teams should make every effort to end the strike.

B. An educational planning agreement should be worked out along lines suggested by the following tentative models:

   1. In each department faculty, students, and teaching assistants should together develop mechanisms for mutual meaningful participation in educational planning.

   2. In each department faculty and the department's TAA affiliate shall have an obligation to establish decision-making mechanisms by which teaching assistants and students shall participate meaningfully in the educational planning of a course in which the TA teaches.

Background: Model 1 is my attempt to shorten and clarify the "COUNCIL OF TEN RESOLUTION." Model 2 is the latest TAA proposal (as reported in the "INTERIM REPORT" by Prof. Feinsinger), with the two words "bargain collectively" deleted, for the many of us who dislike union jargon.

Chancellor Young, and the bargaining teams - on both sides - have made tremendous progress toward an agreement. It's as though General Motors had not merely agreed to wages, working conditions, and fringe benefits, but had also agreed that cars should run as well as possible, and should not pollute. We are on the verge of an agreement that goes far beyond the typical union contract, and we still have the trust and respect that we need to run an academic and intellectual enterprise. There is nothing about the present incomplete agreement that offends people, and yet there is a great deal that, if settled, may be looked back on as a model for the development of faculty, teaching assistant and student relations.

Our one remaining problem is educational planning, and we are in great danger that this whole potential success will crumble and blow up because of it.

I suggest that we are simply enmeshed now in verbal ambiguities, that no real differences remain on educational planning. That's not to say the problem has been solved, but simply that both sides have agreed, in different words, as to the next steps.

There are three basic points in all recent proposals - including that of the Committee of 10, the Committee of 30, and the TAA:

1. departments must decide.
2. there should be meaningful participation of TAs (and students) in educational planning.
3. Faculty, TAs, and students should decide upon mechanisms.

One resolution uses the term "meaningful participation", another uses "effective weight." If people can point out how these words and these resolutions differ, they should try to do so. If they cannot, we should not stumble around over meaningless or ambiguous verbal connotations.

We, the undersigned professors, concerned with the consequences of the TAA strike, urge a careful consideration of the controversial educational planning issues, which appear to be the principal stumbling block to a settlement.

We offer the following suggestions as a possible solution:

1. Educational planning should serve these policies:

   A. Within the bounds of responsibility and fulfillment of course goals the best source of good teaching is to grant the teacher, whether he be a professor or a teaching assistant, the freedom to teach as well as he can in the way he best can.

   B. In courses taught co-operatively by faculty members and teaching assistants, the teaching responsibilities should be allocated to assure the greatest possible latitude for each to teach in his own way within the boundaries of the course content and objectives.

   C. In specifying the educational goals and programs within each department, the opinions of teaching assistants and students should be given effective weight.

2. The procedures for implementing these policies should be arrived at by agreement among the faculty members and teaching assistants in each department, meeting at reasonable times and conferring in good faith.

3. Nothing in the previous statements should be construed as an abridgement of the rights of a professor to offer a course in which he bears the sole pedagogical responsibility.

Benito Brancaforte, Associate Professor, Spanish
Peter Boerner, Professor, Comparative Literature
William H. Stone, Professor, Genetics
Bert N. Adams, Associate Professor, Sociology
Michael Voichick, Assoicate Professor, Mathematics
Eugene Vinaver, Visiting Professor, English and French
Antonio Sanchez-Romeralo, Professor, Spanish and Portuguese
Jost Hermand, Professor, German
Reinhold Grimm, Professor, German
Neils Ingwersen, Assistant Professor, Scandinavian Studies
Paul K. Conkin, Professor, History
Haskell Fain, Professor, Philosophy
John S. Steinhart, Professor, Geology and Geophysics
Anatole Beck, Professor, Mathematics
Julius R. Weinberg, Professor, Philosophy
Diego Catalan, Professor, Spanish, Humanities Resch
Norman P. Sacks, Professor, Spanish and Portuguese
Ved Prakash, Associate Professor, Urban and Regional Planning
Thomas H. Logan, Assistant Professor, Urban and Regional Planning
Millard Susman, Associate Professor, Genetics
Edward E. Smith, Assistant Professor, Psychology
Paul C. Plass, Associate Professor, Classics
Alan E. Gross, Assistant Professor, Psychology
Douglas Kelly, Associate Professor, French and Italian
Charles Cnudde, Assistant Professor, Political Science
Jorge de Sena, Professor, Portuguese