

CHAPTER 11

THE FACULTY

MANY of the problems confronting the trustees relate to the faculty. A happy, contented faculty, working efficiently and working in cordial cooperation with each other and with the administration, depends largely on the policies affecting them and their work that are adopted by the trustees and followed by the administration.

The trustees should never lose sight of the fact that nothing can take the place of inspiring teachers, of fine personality and noble character.

All teachers impart knowledge to their students, some few leave a personal imprint of their character and personality on their students. These latter are the men and women who really teach and develop the best that is in the students. These teachers are personally acquainted with their students; they do most for small classes, through intimate contact. They open themselves to their students and give them freely of their experience and wisdom as well as of their knowledge. Such teachers are never forgotten. The memory of them and their classes remains a permanent part of the student long after all knowledge acquired there has been forgotten or merged in one's general body of information. Fortunate are the students who come under such teachers. Fortunate are the institutions, which in these days of specialization and detailed research, number such teachers on their faculties.

Appointments and Promotions

While the trustees should leave all selection of new staff members, and all promotions, wholly to the president and

deans, they should concern themselves with the *policies* relative to new appointments and promotions.

Nothing is much more objectionable or more detrimental to morale and academic standards than trustee-dictated appointments to the staff. In fact it is rarely wise for any trustee to make any suggestions as to who should be appointed, promoted, or discharged. A suggestion from a trustee is often misinterpreted as an order.

On the other hand, a sound policy on these matters, fixed by the trustees, if they hold the president to the policy, can be most helpful. In another place the tenure of the president has been discussed. Here, however, it is well to note that every president who is retained too long shows his failing usefulness early in acquiescing in undesirable appointments and unwarranted promotions and in retaining too long unpromising teachers. It is a very common experience for a newly appointed president to find on the staff a considerable number of members who are of relatively little value, but who have been retained so long that it is difficult to drop them or secure them other employment.

Two vital points of policy that should be followed are:

(1) To appoint or promote no one to a professorship or associate professorship without the most careful scrutiny and the confident opinion that in ability and personality, in success in teaching or in research, or in both, he is the man desired as a permanent member of the staff.

(2) To retain no instructor or assistant professor more than three or six years unless it is definitely planned to retain him permanently.

The crucial point in building a strong staff is in employing only very capable persons in the lower positions. If a high standard is maintained at the bottom it insures able young men of proven ability and personality for promotion, and relative ease in securing positions elsewhere for those who cannot be promoted.

There are a great number of teachers with the appropriate degrees and unobjectionable character who lack personality, enthusiasm, and vigor which a successful teacher must have. These teachers usually grow less useful with time, and they give little to students. If appointed to lower positions, they could certainly be identified in a few years and should not be retained. Far too many of such teachers are on the staff of every institution.

If the trustees called for a discriminating report on all staff members each year, it would go a long way to keep the executive up to the mark in this vital matter. Staff members in each of the usual four grades (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor) can be rather readily grouped in three classifications:

1. Those who are so valuable that they cannot be replaced for the same salary and who should be considered for promotion or salary increase. This group usually includes a few persons who are so useful and so loyal and who have so woven their lives into the fabric of the institution that no one could replace them.
2. Those who could be replaced at the same salary, but probably could not be bettered at that salary. The assumption is that they should be retained without promotion or salary increase, unless they are instructors or assistant professors, and have reached the term limit of employment and so should be promoted or assisted to an appointment elsewhere.
3. Those who could be replaced by more valuable staff members at the same or a lower salary and who should presumably be replaced.

If the trustees' committee on teachers, by whatever name it may be called, would give one day each spring to such a report and a discussion with the president of what he proposes to do in promotions and in the removal and replacement of the least useful staff members, much good might be accom-

plished toward strengthening the staff over the years. The temptation to the deans and president is to let things drift, and especially so as the time of their expected retirement approaches. A drifting policy always results in losing the ablest and keeping those who should be removed and so steadily weakens the staff.

The less valuable staff member in the lower ranks who is retained eight or ten years, and all associate and full professors have a strong case against dismissal. The trustees should concern themselves to see that staff members liable to dismissal later do not get into the higher ranks or overstay their appointments in lower ranks.

College professors esteem very highly the permanence of their positions. Usually more is lost in morale than is gained in strength in dealing summarily with staff members retained too long through executive neglect.

Another matter the trustees can well query is whether every vacancy needs to be filled. The tendency of college and university deans and presidents is always to fill vacancies. Often this is not the wisest plan. A policy of constant inquiry on the part of the trustees into the desirability of filling vacancies will in the long run increase efficiency and economy.

Except for serious specific offense it is very rarely wise to dismiss a staff member on short notice. The president, acting for the trustees, employed him. He must be as good as when he was employed. If he does not fit this institution permanently, it is probable he can find another that would better appreciate his services if he is given time. His employment was a mistake of the employing institution, and so it can well give ample notice and bear with him until he secures other employment. A considerate policy in such cases amply justifies itself.

The responsibility of an institution for the advancement of its younger staff members appears to deserve more consideration than it usually receives. No institution can promote all

younger men. As a rule many more of the rank of instructor are employed than can possibly be promoted. As an illustration, in one institution employing 120 with the rank of instructor, only 10 are promoted each year on an average. The others are not re-employed after three to six years.

While, of course, many leave after a few years for further graduate work, for better teaching posts elsewhere, or for other reasons, there is usually no systematic assumption of responsibility for the employment of these younger men.

It would seem to be a sound and fruitful policy for an institution to obligate itself to either retain the services of young staff members, or secure satisfactory employment for them elsewhere. Such a policy, carefully pursued over a period of years, would materially improve the quality of men called to instructorships, improve the quality of assistant professors promoted from instructors, and materially increase the loyalty and enthusiasm of the younger men. It would also make the post of instructor at the institution more attractive to able young men.

The position of instructor at from \$1,200 to \$2,500 a year is recognized as a temporary appointment. Unfortunately, many department heads and deans, conscious of the temporary nature of these appointments, do not give their best efforts to securing the best possible men, and often appoint men lacking in personality, ability, or interest in teaching. These instructors usually teach full-time, and the appointment of an inferior man is always a calamity for the students. Such men are not usually reappointed, and drift away to what they can get.

Further, as the appointment of an instructor is temporary, it is exceptional for a department head to make any special effort to develop and improve his skill as a teacher. This results again in less skillful teaching than could be secured.

If it was the understood policy of the institution on employing a young instructor that he would be promoted or placed

in a position elsewhere, distinct pressure would at once be felt by the dean and the department head, first, to secure as able and personable a man as possible, and second, to develop him into a good teacher so that he could be promoted or strongly recommended for a desirable post elsewhere.

If a department head, on the arrival of a new instructor, would ask him to select one of the best teachers in the department as his advisor, with the understanding that they would each visit the other's classes, and that they would discuss teaching problems and methods freely, a great deal could be done to correct the faults and improve the skill of a young teacher. At the same time the department head would have at hand an experienced professor who would know at first hand what quality of teaching the instructor was doing and what promise he had.

- ▷ An astonishing amount of dull, uninspiring, and inept teaching that is unnecessary is being tolerated in most colleges and universities. Much of it is done by young, inexperienced teachers, who are given no help or suggestions by the able teachers.

Salaries

In a small college where the staff is small, if the salary limit is low and close to a minimum living wage, say if the average full professor's salary can only be \$1,800 or \$2,000, all full professors should receive the same salary. With such low salaries the spirit of the faculty is better if all share alike.

As salaries rise above a minimum living standard in the locality, differentiation can be introduced. Differences in salaries are generally based on length of service, if the maximum is not above \$4,000. For example an associate or assistant professor may be promoted to the rank of full professor at \$3,000 with an automatic increase of \$200 every three years to a maximum of \$3,600 after nine years' service.

In a large institution with higher salary limits, it is common to make salary increases based on the value of the man in teaching and research. Naturally in such cases the person who is both an outstanding teacher and a research man of distinction will receive the highest salary.

In any college or university much friction due to jealousy can be avoided by great care in the fair adjustment of salaries. To this end it is rarely sound practice to employ both a man and his wife. Their joint income from the college lifts their income well above that of their associates and may easily provoke serious contrasts with the ease of living of associates of the same rank.

Inasmuch as the value and distinction of any college depends almost wholly on the quality, ability, and personality of the faculty members, the administration of the institution by trustees and president should be steadily bent toward paying the highest salaries possible and securing the ablest men these salaries will command. No occasion should be given for a reputation that new buildings, athletic success, or any other matter is valued above the faculty. Wherever the athletic coach receives more than a full professor, this question is at once raised with cause.

It may be illuminating to say a word about the higher salaries being paid in our universities and colleges. There are 1,700 colleges and universities with 1,700 executive officers and over 121,000 on the teaching staffs. The following estimates are based in part on exact knowledge and in part on general knowledge and conversations with others; they are believed to be fairly accurate and conservative.

Among the higher paid university and college presidents:

20-25 receive salaries from \$15,000 up to \$30,000.

50-75 receive salaries of \$12,000 to \$14,000.

100 receive salaries of \$9,000 to \$10,000.

1,000 receive salaries of \$4,000 to \$8,000.

Among the higher paid university and college professors:

100–150 receive \$10,000 to \$12,000 or more.

250–300 receive \$8,000 to \$9,999.

1,200–1,500 receive \$6,000 to \$7,999.

10,000 receive \$4,000 to \$5,999

Of the 211,000 on the staffs of our colleges and universities, excluding the presidents, about 10 per cent receive \$4,000 or more.

There is a general idea among college teachers that they are poorly paid. It is certainly true that all people in this service have very high standards of living. They must dress reasonably well; they are hospitably inclined; their tastes in house furnishings call for good things; travel and books are much needed; adequate life insurance is felt necessary; certainly, they have many worthy uses for a good deal more money than they usually receive. If, however, we recall that the total income of half the families in the United States is below \$1,500; that \$3,000 a year places a family among the wealthiest 10 per cent, college teachers do not fare so badly.* While the most successful doctors and lawyers certainly receive much larger incomes than college professors, their expenses are much higher, and their lives are much more strenuous and much less under their own control. It is certainly true that few people live and work among pleasanter associates, or more nearly work along the lines of their own special interests than college teachers. It might also be added that many of the less valuable men are paid far more than they earn.

Teaching Load

The question of what constitutes a reasonable teaching load in college and university has been much discussed. It is

* See page 6, "Consumers Incomes in the United States" 1935–36, United States Government Printing Office.

evident that in teaching, as in any other kind of work, a heavy overload is a mistake. A teacher with more students than he can teach well, instructs all poorly.

Of course some teachers can teach effectively more students than others. Some great teachers, like Professor Kilpatrick of Columbia, have directed and inspired very large classes to most effective work. This, however, has little bearing on the work an average college teacher can do.

In a college where teaching is the main work of the staff and research is a very minor matter, it is usually considered that 15 to 16 hours of classes a week is a full load. These classes ordinarily number thirty or less. Some colleges regard 12 hours as full work.

A teacher to do his best work cannot deal with too many different students if he is to meet them for individual, or small group conferences, which is often very desirable. The total number of students a teacher can deal with effectively seems to lie between 80 and 120, depending on the teacher and on the method of instruction.

It is evident that the teaching load depends on the number of classes met, and the number of students in the classes. We often call this "student-class-hours." Four hours of class with 30 students would be 120 "student-class-hours." Four hours of class with 8 students would be 32 "student-class-hours." In a college, 300 to 350 student-class-hours is usually considered a full teaching load for an instructor who is free from other duties.

The work of different instructors varies greatly with the subject. An English teacher will have many essays to mark for spelling, punctuation, grammar, and style, meaning much work outside of class. A teacher of conversational French would have relatively little work outside class. Some courses require frequent conferences with individual students.

However, for a college as a whole it is reasonable to say

that the teachers should carry on the average 300 student-class-hours per week. Most college students enroll for 15 or 16 hours a week. Therefore, 400 students would require $400 \times 15 = 6,000$ student-class-hours of instruction. If the curriculum could be so organized that each teacher on the average carried 300 hours, twenty teachers ($6,000/300 = 20$) would be adequate, or one to each twenty students. However, it does not work out this way, because some courses like Latin, Greek, Philosophy, German, and others, if offered, usually enroll small classes. It is evident from the above that it is *possible* in a college to give good instruction with a staff of one teacher to twenty students. Just so far as the less popular subjects are included in the curriculum and as the range of subjects offered is increased above the minimum, the ratio drops.

It may prove interesting just here to give the actual ratio as determined from the statistics on enrollment for 1940 as reported by President Raymond Walters in *School and Society*, December 14, 1940. All the institutions included below are of the undergraduate college type where there is small emphasis on research or graduate work.

TABLE 9

Number of Colleges	Number Enrolled	Average Enrolled	Ave. No. Teachers	Ratio Students to Teachers	Extreme Ratio Students to Teachers
26.....	86 to 194	161	28.5	5.75 to 1	3.92 to 12
63.....	200 - 299	254	31.7	8.3 - 1	4.8 - 14.6
84.....	300 - 399	347	35.2	9.85 - 1	4.5 - 16.9
70.....	400 - 499	447	37.9	11.8 - 1	6.8 - 20
43.....	500 - 599	552	47.7	11.7 - 1	7.1 - 27.6
34.....	600 - 699	653	54.4	12.0 - 1	5.9 - 25.1
23.....	700 - 799	755	72.0	10.5 - 1	6.8 - 16.7
14.....	800 - 899	844	67	12.6 - 1	8.5 - 19.9
7.....	900 - 999	930	65.7	14.1 - 1	10 - 17.7
8.....	1,000 - 1,099	1,049	85.8	12.2 - 1	8.3 - 19.4
15.....	1,100 - 1,499	1,250	97.7	12.8 - 1	7.1 - 23.4
8.....	1,500 - 1,999	1,665	126.0	13.2 - 1	8.1 - 17.0
7.....	2,000 - 2,999	2,255	150.4	14.9 - 1	8.8 - 21.5
2.....	6,688 - 7,008	6,848	563	12.2 - 1	

From the above it is evident that very few colleges are operated with a minimum faculty. The larger faculty is provided partly to increase the offerings of the curriculum and give students a wider selection of subjects, and partly to provide instruction in physical education and athletics, music, and other subjects giving little or no academic credit. Both reasons are good, but it should be remembered that increasing the staff is done by paying lower salaries and presumably getting less able teachers. Bearing all things in mind it seems reasonable to suggest that the objective of the trustees of a college with limited resources might be set at a ratio of fifteen students per teacher, with a maximum teaching load of 350 student-class-hours, and an average for the whole staff of 225.

In a university or in an institution however named in which there is large emphasis on research, the teaching load is usually lighter. The calculation is difficult because there are so many part-time instructors and also those who do not teach at all but give their time to research. On the other hand, these institutions are usually large, enrolling from 2,000 to 16,000 students, and there are very few small classes except at the graduate, or senior-college-graduate level. Here many teachers can well carry a full load of 300—350 student-clock-hours, while many others will of necessity carry much lighter loads, those teaching graduate students only, perhaps averaging 120. For the whole institution an average of 200 to 225 student-clock-hours might be regarded as reasonable.

In most universities, from 8 to 12 hours of teaching a week is regarded as a full teaching load for a professor who engages in research. The truth is that when such a standard is set up many claim it as a reasonable load when they really do little outside of teaching. It is reasonable anywhere to expect a teacher giving little or no time to research, administration, or other outside duty to instruct classes from 12 to 16 hours a week.

A good university teacher, like any good worker, expects

to put into his job about 45 hours of work a week. Many work from 50 to 75 hours a week. This will be distributed between some or all of the following duties: classroom instruction, conferences with students, preparing lectures and classroom discussions, reading papers and reports, research and writing, reading current journals in his fields, administrative duties, attending examinations for advanced degrees, attending committee meetings and faculty meetings. The duties of no two men are the same.

The evaluation of research work is very difficult. Relatively few men in even our greatest institutions are really men of great research ability. Those who really are able research investigators should have as ample time for this work as possible. On the other hand, it is undesirable to release men of indifferent research ability from other work on account of research. It is difficult to discriminate sharply between the two types of men, but it is too often true that much university time is spent in research by men of indifferent ability who will yield meagre returns.

The trustees could well define some policies relative to teaching load, research, and administrative work, that would strengthen the hands of the deans and president in administering the intricate work of a university.

As a general standard the following may be considered reasonable maximum teaching loads: for one who teaches only graduate students, 120 student-class-hours; for one who teaches only juniors and seniors, 240 student-class-hours; for one who teaches only freshmen and sophomores, 360 student-class-hours. Where one teaches in two or three of these areas an intermediate figure would be reasonable.

Sabbatical Leave

"Sabbatical leave" is generally accepted as meaning leave of absence, one year in seven on full salary, for study. However, many modifications of this are in operation.

Any professor, fully engaged in his work, year after year, is apt to settle to a routine, and he may allow his teaching to grow out of date. The younger men on the staff—instructors and assistant professors—are fresh from the universities, but the older men—professors and associate professors—are usually a good many years away from this stimulus. If wisely administered, an occasional leave of absence on pay, granted to the permanent staff members, is well repaid by better service.

While leave on full salary for one full year every seven years is ideal and most desirable, it is beyond the means of many institutions. The cheapest modification is leave on half salary. Usually with some reorganization of the work for the year, a young substitute can be secured for not much more than the other half of the salary regularly paid. This costs the college practically nothing, and while half-pay is inadequate for most professors with a family, it is often a great boon to eager scholars, and occasionally may be supplemented by foundation grants in aid.

Some institutions offer the option of a half year on full pay or a whole year on half pay. The former plan will cost the institution for a substitute about one-fourth the professor's salary, and the latter practically nothing.

Various other modifications result in economies to institutions obliged to regard them. Some institutions grant leave of absence one year in ten or twelve. Some adopt a rule that only two or three professors may be granted leave on pay in the same year. Such regulations avoid any heavy expense in any one year for leaves of absence.

There should always be a clear understanding that a sabbatical leave is not a vacation, but a period for increasing the value of the service of the individual to the institution. A wise restriction is to require the professor eligible for leave to submit to the president his plans for spending his leave, for approval by the trustees.

Whether the time is to be spent at some center or centers of

learning in study or research, or in travel for some specific scholarly aim, it should stand the consideration and win the approval of the president and the trustees. A sabbatical leave devoted to golf and swimming at a winter resort scarcely conforms with the purpose of the leave.

The trustees of every institution could well study this matter and try to devise some plan under which at least some members of their teaching staff could occasionally leave their routine duties for some contact with other centers of learning.

Retirement

Retirement at 65, 68, or 70 from full teaching and administrative duties is now the general rule. While occasionally a man maintains his full intellectual power and value beyond these ages, it is more and more widely recognized that at 65 he has earned the right to relief from the strenuous demands of full responsibility. Also in the great majority of cases, work suffers if full regular work is expected of a man over 65 or 70. In fact, an administration should have the authority to retire teachers from full work at any time over 60 if their failing usefulness warrants.

A problem of increasing importance in America, as retirement of all professors at 65–70 becomes more common, is the best way to utilize the value of men in retirement. While many men cease to be useful at 65 or earlier, many still have great powers, and while certainly they should give way to younger men, their value should be utilized as far as possible. It is certainly desirable to provide retired staff members with offices or at least desk room, and encourage them to continue to write or carry on research. To be of any creative or productive value it is usually essential for them to retain an effective academic connection, and usually the institution will profit by providing this connection.

The trustees should define a policy relative to retirement of

staff members. Possibly the most satisfactory plan allows retirement for cause after 60, optional retirement of teachers at 65, and obligatory retirement at 68 or 70.

In the case of all administrative officers obligatory retirement from *administrative* duties should be not later than 65. In many cases administrative duties should be surrendered earlier. In all of these cases the individual should be transferred to other work, where his services will be most useful and his presence will in no way be an embarrassment to his successor.

Pensions and Other Provisions for Retirement

As it is impossible to drop faithful employees in their old age without some financial provision, and as old age pensions are now generally paid in all fields of employment, the problem of pensions is closely tied up with the retirement policy.

Pensions are almost universally paid for jointly by the professor and the institution, 4 per cent or 5 per cent of the professor's salary being deducted monthly and the institution contributing approximately the same amount. Roughly 10 per cent of the salary compounded for 35 or 40 years will pay an annuity of about half the *average* salary on which 10 per cent has been paid. It is exceptional for a pension of over \$3,500 to be paid.

Pensions are generally financed through the Insurance Department of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. They can be financed as above through any insurance company. Where a pension system is in force every member of the teaching staff should be obliged to participate.

In those states having a state teachers' retirement system open to teachers in the state university and colleges, teachers are usually retired on the basis of teachers in the public school system with a maximum pension of \$1,000 to \$1,200. In some

states enjoying this arrangement the state institutions provide some supplementary pensions.

In some institutions where pensions are not provided, staff members at from 65 to 70 are put on half-time work and half pay, the work being adjusted between teaching, research, or administration so as best to accommodate the individual and the institution. This plan has the definite advantage of retaining the older men in close connection with the institution. In case this plan is followed, a pension should be provided at age 75, as the value of men beyond this age cannot be large. Such a system, of half-time work and half pay from 68 or 70 to 75, with a pension of \$1,200 to \$1,500 after 75, would not be costly and would prove acceptable at many institutions unable to adopt a more generous policy.

The trustees should certainly adopt some policy under which older teachers who cease to be useful can be relieved of their duties with dignity.

Insurance. In many institutions today the institution, alone or on a participating basis, carries group insurance on all staff members. This usually provides insurance equal to the teacher's annual salary. Additional insurance, up to twice this amount, may be carried at the expense of the insured. Usually the maximum allowed is not over \$10,000.

Efficiency of Deans and Heads of Departments

A great deal depends on the leadership, helpfulness, and sympathetic understanding of deans and heads of departments. Much depends also upon their ability to judge and encourage good teaching and valuable research. In many, many cases throughout the country, departments and colleges are seriously handicapped by men in positions of leadership who do not lead.

These administrative positions are too often regarded as permanent positions. A new attitude ought to be built up,

emphasizing the professorship as the permanent post and the administrative work as necessary and very important but not permanent, the appointee holding the post while his services prove highly useful there, but returning to his previous rank of professor when his service in administration becomes less useful. Such a transfer back to the professorship should not be regarded as a demotion, but as a relief from burdensome administrative work; and as a reward for services rendered, the salary drawn as dean or department head should, if possible, be continued to the age of retirement. This salary arrangement will take most of the sting out of giving up the administration work, and the increased freedom it will give the president in replacing the least valuable administrative officers with abler men will be very cheap at the price.

Again and again one familiar with higher education finds departments of ten to thirty or more members, employed at an expense of \$25,000 to \$100,000, limping along inefficiently because of poor or inadequate leadership. With an able, competent, acceptable leader the level of work will be greatly raised.

Not only is the efficiency and enthusiasm of the whole institution immensely improved by competent leadership, but the young staff members who are *entitled* to good and helpful leadership profit by it. Trustees rarely appreciate their responsibility, when authorizing the employment of young teachers at low salaries, to give these teachers adequate and capable leadership to stimulate and develop their best abilities.

Inevitably and properly a considerable part of the responsibility for new appointments to the staff falls on department heads and deans of colleges. Unless these posts are held by able, active men, who are keenly aware of the great importance of securing the best possible men, many vacancies will be filled by persons of inferior ability, poor personality, and of

small value as teachers. It is always hard to find and secure the best man available at a given salary. The most desirable men are rarely hunting new positions. They are busy with their present work. It is tiresome to canvas the whole country for a first-class man when by writing to an agency or to a few institutions, a man can be found with the proper degrees who may be passable. Again and again in studying new appointments in institutions, persons are found who are far below the best who are available at the salary. This fault reflects not only on the president, but largely on deans and department heads.

To the end that the leadership throughout the institution may be maintained at the highest possible level, the trustees should have an annual rating of all administrative officers similar to that described for teachers, and the president should be pressed to replace each year those deans and department heads who are not giving a service of high value. It is always an unpleasant and difficult duty to remove deans and department heads, and unless pressed to it by the trustees, it is far easier to allow ineffective leaders to remain. Nothing is more detrimental to the institution. Ineffective administrative heads mean poor appointments under them, unwise promotions, and various sins of commission and omission that destroy morale and weaken the services of the staff.

It is certainly an important responsibility of the trustees to adopt policies which will insure a high level of leadership in deans and department heads, and in the various administrative posts in the business offices.

Tenure and Academic Freedom

This is one of the most widely discussed subjects in the academic world. It is essential that trustees and administrative officers understand the points at issue.

To this end it would be most profitable to read "The State-

ment of Principles, 1938, of Academic Freedom and Tenure" in the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Vol. XXV, pages 26–28, as well as the discussion of "Academic Freedom and Tenure" by Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University, in Vol. XXV, pages 328–43 of the same publication.

The usual ranking of college and university teachers is in four grades: professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors. In the best practice professors and associate professors are employed for life or until the accepted retirement age. Usually assistant professors are appointed for a term of two, three, or six years. At the end of this period, by giving due notice of at least three months, it is understood that the institution can properly terminate the appointment. Instructors are usually appointed for one or two years at a time, with the understanding that unless they win promotion within a stated time, usually three to six years, their connection with the institution automatically terminates.

The status of the assistant professor and instructor becomes greatly confused when either is continued in employment beyond six years. Their positions are not usually regarded as permanent, but continued employment tends to give them permanent status. Harvard University proposes to make no further appointments to the rank of assistant professor and promote instructors directly to the rank of associate professors. The Association of University Professors in the "Statement of Principles" cited above, urges that after a probationary period of not to exceed six years, a full-time instructor or assistant professor is entitled to permanent status.

On the whole there is sound reason in these several practices. It is very unusual for a man to be appointed to a professorship or associate professorship until he is recognized as an experienced teacher, until he has made a record of his ability in teaching and research, of his attitudes and character.

It is assumed that before appointing a man to such important positions, he has been fully investigated and that the institution is satisfied with him. Such a man usually has a satisfactory position when he is invited to accept a professorship or associate professorship, and there is sound reason to suppose that the institution calling him is offering him a permanent post. Harvard fully recognized this responsibility. It is stated in the University Catalogue that professors and associate professors are permanently appointed. No man holding such posts at Harvard has been dismissed for many years.

Usually when trouble arises about such appointments it is due to one of four causes:

1. The appointment was made without adequate investigation. The dean or president responsible failed to find out what sort of a man he was appointing. The institution was responsible. Later undesirable characteristics in the appointee were discovered and the appointment was regretted.

2. The appointment made under one administration did not meet the approval of the succeeding administration. The new dean or president finds the appointee unsatisfactory and wishes him removed.

3. Occasionally a professor who was satisfactory when appointed, changes as years pass, either through developing an attitude offensive to the administration on some current matter, or through neglect of his work, and becomes undesirable on the staff.

4. The professor makes statements in class or in public addresses which are offensive to the president or trustees, and which they regard as seriously prejudicial to the interests of the institution. Statements at which offense is taken are usually in the fields of religion, politics, and social science. It is this last cause which has produced most discussion and embarrassment.

Every professor feels that he has the right and the duty to

teach his subject in the classroom as he understands it, and as he believes it to be the truth. He also feels that as a citizen he has the right to speak in public as he pleases. In both points he is correct so long as he is restrained by common sense, and the feeling for the fitness of things a gentleman should recognize.

If the expression of certain views is not tolerated by an institution it should be made clear in writing at the time of discussing the appointment. Very few professors would accept appointment where ideas they cherished were not acceptable. On the other hand many professors have made unnecessarily irritating statements on subjects outside their special fields. It is generally true that a reasonably thorough investigation of the man by the institution before appointment will avoid the difficulty.

Considering that there are 1,700 colleges and universities in the country employing over 112,000 teachers, it seems probable that relatively few teachers are dismissed unfairly. However, Harvard and quite a number of other institutions feel that more harm results to the institution by dismissing seemingly undesirable men than by retaining them. It is believed that the absolute certainty of appointments and entire freedom from fear of dismissal adds more to the efficiency of the staff as a whole than the replacement of an occasional undesirable teacher by a superior man. It is probably true also that in institutions comparable with Harvard in academic standards, there is great social pressure within the staff itself to keep a man in conformity with accepted standards.

While it is true that every institution should earnestly endeavor to follow the example of our old and leading institutions in making all appointments with great care and regarding such appointments as sacred obligations, it is undoubtedly true that many institutions fail to do so.

Among such public institutions in which political pressure

bears on the university, and among colleges which have, or have had, incompetent executives, situations often develop in which occasional dismissals of professors seem inevitable. Usually the men dismissed from such institutions should look upon it as a fortunate release, but this is not always the case. Such dismissals are usually traceable to politics or unwise appointments by incompetent executives. They certainly always reflect unfavorably on the institution.

Usually such dismissals can be avoided by a full acceptance of responsibility by the institution. If the president frankly tells the individual that he does not wish to retain him permanently, but that he will be retained until he can find another post, the professor in question will usually secure other employment within a few years.

It should certainly be the policy of trustees to maintain the permanency of appointment of professors and associate professors. Any tendency to violate it should raise a serious question as to the wisdom and judgment of the president.

Instructors usually have the masters or doctors degree, and little or no teaching experience when appointed. An appointment as instructor is definitely a temporary appointment at a relatively small salary. However, it has very often happened that an annual appointment has been repeated again and again until the recipient is a fixture as an instructor at a very low salary. It is due to a recognition of this frequent occurrence that within recent years it has become increasingly common to make these appointments for 1, 2, or 3 years with a fixed limit beyond which an instructor may not serve, unless he is promoted in rank. Three to six years are the common periods of service of an instructor. At the end of this period four alternatives are possible: he may be promoted, he may secure an appointment at another institution at the same or higher rank, he may return to graduate school for further study, or he may drop out of the teaching profession.

It is the responsibility of the trustees to assure themselves that weak, inadequate teachers are not permanently retained as instructors. In some instances it seems wise to try to retain good teachers with the rank of instructor. It would seem however, that a really capable teacher on permanent appointment should receive a reasonable salary, and if he is intentionally retained permanently with rank of instructor, his salary should be above that of the grade.

Assistant professors are neither inexperienced teachers, as many instructors must be, nor are they usually men of established reputation as teachers and research workers. Instructors of marked promise are promoted in rank to assistant professors and receive a salary between that of an instructor and an associate professor. Their appointment is customarily for some fixed period, usually three years. It is accepted as good practice to limit reappointment to a second three-year term, six years in all. If no opening for promotion develops, the assistant professor is given ample notice and is expected to find another opening elsewhere at the end of his term.

The promotion to an assistant professorship is an encouragement and a challenge. It is supposed to be an opportunity for a promising young teacher to prove himself. If he really does prove himself to be an able person, promotion in his own institution or elsewhere is pretty sure to follow.

The trustees should assure themselves that a sound, fair policy relative to teachers in this rank is being carried out, that every appointee understands his status in tenure and in department esteem each year.

Relative to the whole matter of tenure it may be said that where the president and deans are competent and keep themselves fully informed about the work and status of each staff member, trouble rarely develops. It is usually the result of negligence, hasty, thoughtless action, lack of consideration for others, or stupidity.

Academic Freedom

Freedom of speech is such an important matter to a college teacher, and today it is given so little thought by most people, that it warrants some further discussion. In the United States speech is ordinarily so very free that most people accept it as they accept air and light, without any thought. They express any opinion that comes to mind freely, and thoughtlessly, regardless of its effect.

Today college and university teachers, clergymen, and newspaper correspondents are the only classes of people whose employment is likely to be placed in peril through saying what they think in discharging the duties of their employment.

Formerly it was the Church itself which put people to death who made statements contrary to established teachings. More recently the wealthy exerted their powerful influence to suppress those who opposed great concentrations of wealth. Socialistic, communistic, and anti-church views still arouse strong antagonism. It is only under our modern dictators, however, that freedom of speech has been entirely stifled.

The college and university teacher, dealing with fairly mature students, and urged continually to teach the truth and teach the students to think, resents most emphatically any check on his freedom to state and discuss the truth as he sees it in his own field. He maintains that the college is the national custodian of the truths of the ages and of the most recently discovered truths. That it is his special duty to pass on the truth to the youth of the land. That only his peers in his own field of knowledge are competent to judge his statements.

In mathematics, physics, chemistry, geology, and astronomy, free expression is not now questioned. In zoology and botany, and in Greek, Latin, French, German, and other foreign languages and literature, speech is relatively free. But in religion, philosophy, economics, sociology, history, govern-

ment, and psychology, many people think they know enough to judge truth from error, and they are quick to take exception to opinions differing from their own.

These very fields in which our knowledge is less exact, where we know relatively less than in the sciences, where further advances are most needed by society, is where freedom of speech is most often denied. It is essential that our most able men search out the truth in these fields. It is on the discovery and effective application of the truth in these fields that our very civilization and the life of our race depends. Here, also, men must feel free to work and think and speak. Mistakes must be made and corrected, theories must be stated to be proved wrong. Here, as in the sciences, many mistakes must be made and many wrong theories defended, before the truth emerges. What we do not know about government, money, trade, business, human relations, labor and capital, and international relations, is proved on every hand by the terrible state of the whole world. We must discover the truth in all these fields, painful though it may be.

It is gratifying that among so many institutions and so many teachers, so few are under criticism. It speaks well for the wisdom and judgment of both the teachers and the trustees. Usually, as long as teachers confine their discussions to the field of their specialization, they are guarded in their statements by their earnest desire to be accurate. Teachers, like other people, speak most freely where their knowledge is less complete, and on the border of their field they are more likely to make statements really open to criticism.

Trustees do well to respect freedom of speech and not to bring pressure for the dismissal of teachers on such grounds as are discussed above. The reputation of an institution for academic freedom is more valuable than a reputation for restricted teaching. While occasionally a thoughtless professor makes a foolish and unfortunate statement, it is soon forgotten.

There is always so much good and so much strength in every college that nothing much can injure it seriously except limiting freedom of speech or political control.