

From: "Miller, Robert J - (millerr)"
<millerr@email.arizona.edu>

Date: Oct 2, 2014 7:17 AM

Subject: NEWSPAPER REPORTING |

Dear Architecture Faculty and Staff,

Many of you will by now have seen or heard about the article in the *Arizona Daily Star* by CAROL ANN ALAIMO entitled "UA professor plagiarized student's work, school finds." You can readily imagine how damaging this story could be for the University and to the people involved. The Provost has ordered that all questions from outside the University be addressed with one voice through a spokesperson in his office. ABOR policy (6-912) prohibits the release of most personnel information other than name, title, dates of employment, and salary, and although this was designed to protect the privacy of individuals, it extends to all situations. In light of this policy, the Provost has explicitly prohibited us from discussing with anyone particulars related to individuals mentioned or implicated in the story, including the media. Including the faculty. Including students.

On a different topic, you might recall a story run by the *Star* a couple years ago about the poor energy performance at CAPLA facilities, particularly our new addition. It was a sensational story that the reporter developed by downloading student submittals to the Green

Fund, most of which were factually inaccurate. Although the reporter talked to Professor Chalfoun and Dean Cervelli before the story ran, it was not tempered by their more nuanced explanations of the actual performance, and actual issues, attending our facility. We know the place isn't perfect, but also know how it performs and what it does well. The story ran, generated a great deal of criticism and excitement, and was largely untrue.

And finally, many of you sent me kind messages about my little story on the original Circle K stores that ran in the *Star* last weekend. This was a fun diversion. I built my story by driving around town in an unairconditioned '68 Bug, interviewing a couple local architects, and doing some abbreviated web research. My initial original submittal was right at the given word limit. It was returned with proposed cuts that removed my part of the story about glu-lam technical innovations, which I had particularly liked because it added the one shred of depth to an otherwise superficial set of observations. I accepted the cuts, understanding that a newspaper has to address the interests and motivations of its readers. The story was then printed with additional and unapproved changes--even a title change, which had originally included a bit of word play of which I was fond. Well, it's a newspaper. What should I expect?

It just goes to show: be careful about believing what you read.

Be well. Be compassionate. Rob