

A Report of the University of Chicago Committee on the Criteria of Academic Appointment
© 1972 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved. Reprinted with permission
from *The University of Chicago Record*, Vol. IV, No. 6 (December, 1970), and Vol. VI,
No. 1 (January 31, 1972).
Second Impression 1973

The Committee

The Committee on the Criteria of Academic Appointment was appointed by President Levi on July 15, 1970. The members of the Committee are:

S. Chandrasekhar, the Morton D. Hull Distinguished Service Professor of Astronomy and Physics.

Dr. Roderick Childers, Associate Professor of Medicine.

John Hope Franklin, the John Matthews Manly Distinguished Service Professor of History.

Arthur Friedman, Distinguished Service Professor of English.

Jacob W. Getzels, the R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Education and Psychology.

Harry G. Johnson, Professor of Economics.

Saunders Mac Lane, the Max Mason Distinguished Service Professor of Mathematics.

Edward Rosenheim, Professor of English, *Secretary*.

Edward Shils, Distinguished Service Professor of Sociology and in the Committee on Social Thought, *Chairman*.

John Simpson, the Edward L. Ryerson Distinguished Service Professor of Physics.

Lorna P. Straus, Assistant Professor of Anatomy and Biology.

H. G. Williams-Ashman, Professor of Biochemistry and in the Ben May Laboratory for Cancer Research.

Fourteen meetings were held in 1970—July 15, 24, and 28; August 4; October 6, 13, 20, and 27; November 3, 10, 17, and 24; and December 1 and 8.

The Committee was asked to reconvene on December 2, 1971 to elaborate its views on political criteria; a report of that meeting appears as section V of this report.

I. Introduction

The existence of The University of Chicago is justified if it achieves and maintains superior quality in its performance of the three major functions of universities in the modern world.¹ These functions are: (1) the discovery of important new knowledge; (2) the communication of that knowledge to students and the cultivation in them of the understanding and skills which enable them to engage in the further pursuit of knowledge; and (3) the training of students for entry into professions which require for their practice a systematic body of specialized knowledge.

In intellectual matters, at least, the whole amounts to more than the sum of the parts in isolation. A university faculty is not merely an assemblage of individual scientists and scholars; it must possess a corporate life and an atmosphere created by the research, teaching, and conversation of individual scientists and scholars which stimulates and sustains the work of colleagues and students at the highest possible level. Research, teaching, and training are the work of individuals. These individuals depend for their effectiveness, at least in part, on the University's provision of material and administrative services which enable their work to go on; they depend also on the maintenance in the University of an atmosphere of stimulation, tolerance, and critical openness to new ideas. The function of appointive bodies is to bring to the academic staff of the University individuals who will perform at the highest level the functions of research, teaching, and training and the maintenance of the intellectual community of the University. A university which does not perform at this level will lose its standing in the world and therewith its power to attract outstanding faculty members and outstanding students. Its failure to attract them will in turn reduce the quality of its performance. Every appointment of a mediocre candidate makes it more difficult to bring outstanding students to the university. This is why scrupulous insistence on the most demanding criteria in the act of appointment is so decisive for the University.

The conception of the proper tasks of the University determines the criteria which should govern the appointment, retention, and promotion of members of the academic staff. The criteria which are to be applied in the case of appointments to The University of Chicago should, therefore, be criteria which give preference above all to actual and prospective scholarly and scientific accomplishment of the highest order, actual and prospective teaching accomplishment of the highest order, and actual and prospective

¹In view of the invidious implications of the use of the masculine pronoun in all cases, it should be clearly understood from the beginning that where that pronoun is used, the reader of this report should understand it to refer to both sexes. Henry James once said, "When I say 'Oxford,' I mean 'Oxford and Cambridge.'" We are, *mutatis mutandis*, in the same position.

When the term *department* alone is used, it should be understood to refer to department, committee, institute, and school.

When *appointment* alone is used, it should be understood, unless it is otherwise clear from the context, that this means appointment, promotion, retention, or extension.

When we speak of "senior members" of the University faculty, we mean those on permanent appointment; when we speak of "junior members," we mean those not on permanent appointment.

The University of Chicago is generally referred to in the text as "the University."

contribution to the intellectual quality of the University through critical stimulation of others within the University to produce work of the highest quality.

The University of Chicago should not aim to be a pantheon of dead or dying gods. Appointments to the University should not be made solely on the basis of past achievements but only to the degree that past achievements promise future achievement.

The tradition of The University of Chicago has defined it, primarily but not exclusively, as a research university of the highest international standing. The University of Chicago is, by its tradition, an institution where research is done by academic staff and where students are trained to do research, by induction into the state of mind and disposition to do research on important subjects and with original results. Undergraduate teaching at The University of Chicago has been and must be conducted in a way which arouses in students their capacity for discrimination and disciplined curiosity so that upon reaching the latter years of their training they will have the skills, knowledge, discrimination, and motivation to make original discoveries or will begin to be ready for the effective performance of roles in society where these qualities will bear fruit.

In the performance of its functions in research and in professional training, it becomes necessary to appoint supporting staff who are indispensable to the performance of these functions but who are not qualified for appointment to the University faculty. This raises serious problems for the University in its effort to keep to its major tasks at the level its traditions and aspirations demand.

II. Procedural Matters

A. CRITERIA

Any appointive body must have a standard by which it assesses the merits of the alternative candidates before it. Academic appointive bodies in general, and at The University of Chicago in particular, must have clearly perceived standards which they seek to apply to particular cases. They must seek to choose candidates who can conform most closely with these standards in their most exigent application. The standards to be applied by any appointive body should be those which assess the quality of performance in (1) research; (2) teaching and training, including the supervision of graduate students; (3) contribution to intellectual community; and (4) services.²Distinguished performance in any one of these categories does not automatically entail distinguished performance in the others. For this reason, weighting of the various criteria cannot be avoided by appointive bodies. The Committee thinks that the criterion of distinction in research should be given the greatest weight.

B. THE APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

All academic appointments to University faculties must be treated with great seriousness.³ They should, wherever it is at all possible, be made on the basis of careful study by members of the appointive body of the publications and other written work of the candidate, and of written assessments, where desirable, by outside referees or consultants

²The criteria for academic appointments sometimes are distorted or degraded by pressures from the faculty or administration as a result of the need for special talent to carry out supporting services of the University or to fulfill a commitment made by the University to perform certain services.

³According to Statutes 13 (a) and (b) of the *Statutes* of The University of Chicago (pp. 41-43), the following categories do not possess membership in the University faculty: (1) Research Associates and (2) Field Work Personnel:

13. (a) *The Members of the University Faculties* are classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. Every person holding one of these titles shall be a member of the Faculty with status as defined in this Statute. . . .

(b) *Other academic personnel.* Membership in the University Faculties is restricted to persons holding appointment as prescribed in the preceding section of this Statute. Others, regardless of courtesy rank or stated rank equivalence, shall not be members of the University Faculty to which they are attached. They include the following:

(1) *Research Associates and Associates.* Research Associates are classified as follows: Research Associate (Professor), Research Associate (Associate Professor), Research Associate (Assistant Professor), Research Associate (Instructor), and Research Associate. The normal period of appointment of Research Associates shall be one year, and reappointments may be made without limitation as to number of reappointments in any rank. Connection with the University ceases at the end of appointment unless reappointment is provided.

Associates of Departments and Schools may be appointed to designate courtesy relationships. At the end of the term of appointment the connection with the University ceases unless reappointment is provided.

(2) *Field Work Personnel.* In the School of Social Service Administration and in the Department of Psychiatry appointments may be made to the following additional positions: Field Work Professor, Field Work Associate Professor, Field Work Assistant Professor, and Field Work Instructor. Appointments may be made for periods of one to three years, and reappointments may be made without limitation as to number of reappointments at any rank. Connection with the University ceases at the end of appointment unless replacement is provided.

which assess originality, rigor, and fundamental significance of the work and which estimate the likelihood that the candidate is or will become a leading figure in his field. They also should be made on the most careful consideration of his teaching ability, which includes the ability to contribute effectively to the research of graduate students. Appointive bodies should take into account the observations and written opinions of those who have observed or experienced the candidate's teaching or who have observed its results in the accomplishments of his students. They should be made on the basis of the best available information about the candidate's contribution to the intellectual activity of the university where he has worked previously in addition to his publications and his success with his students in their doctoral and subsequent research, as attested by their dissertations and publications.

All appointments, whether they are first appointments to instructorships or assistant professorships, or reappointments to assistant professorships, or promotions to permanent tenure at the level of associate professorship, or promotions from the rank of associate professor to that of professor, or appointments from outside the University to associate professorship, or extension beyond the age of normal retirement, must be conducted with the same thorough deliberation, the same careful study of relevant documentation and other evidence, and the same process of consultation. No decisions to appoint, retain, or promote between any grades should under any circumstances be regarded as "automatic."

Junior appointments of candidates who have just finished graduate work to instructorships or assistant professorships do, however, have a character of their own. The candidate's written work is likely to be scanty and may not even be available. There may be little or no evidence of his teaching, and it may be difficult to disentangle his originality from that of his professors. In such cases, all available evidence must be examined just as in other cases, but there cannot be the same certitude of judgment. For this reason, appointive bodies must always be quite explicit in stating that such an initial appointment is for a limited term.

There must be no consideration of sex, ethnic or national characteristics, or political or religious beliefs or affiliations in any decision regarding appointment, promotion, or reappointment at any level of the academic staff.

Particular care must be taken to keep "inbreeding" at a minimum. "Inbreeding" at the level of appointment to the rank of instructor and assistant professor is a temptation because the internal candidate is already known to the appointive body. The arguments against "inbreeding" are: (1) the dangers of relaxation of standards; (2) the dangers of narrowing and stereotyping the intellectual focus of the department in question; and (3) the dangers of appointing candidates who are excessively dependent intellectually on their former teachers' ideas and even presence. These are arguments to be taken seriously by appointive bodies. Nonetheless, the barrier against "inbreeding" should not be insuperable. Whenever an "inbred" candidate is considered, great pains must be taken to identify and examine with the utmost care the credentials of external candidates of high quality so that internal candidates can be properly compared with external candidates. Special emphasis should be given to external assessments in decisions which entail "inbreeding." Where, after severe scrutiny, the internal candidate is very clearly superior in his estimated potentiality as an original scientist or scholar to any of the external candidates, and if he is not only superior to his immediate competitors but is deemed likely to become an

outstanding figure in his subject, the objections to “inbreeding” should be overcome in that instance.

Decisions regarding retention or promotion must deliberately eschew considerations of convenience, friendship, or congeniality. No decision to retain or promote should permit the entry of considerations of the avoidance of hardship which might confront the candidate if a favorable decision is not made. Similarly, favorable decisions to retain or promote should not be rendered on the grounds that evidence is not sufficient for a negative or positive estimate of future accomplishment. The insufficiency of such evidence is in such cases indicative of the candidate’s insufficient productivity.

No appointments should ever be made in which the chief or major argument is that “outside” funds would accompany the appointment sufficient to relieve the regular budget of the cost of the appointment. Similarly, no appointment should ever be made on the initiative of a person or body from outside the University who offers to defray all expenses, salary, etc. on condition of a particular person’s appointment.

Care must be taken to avoid undue regard for the rights of seniority in promotion. Consideration should be given only to quality of performance, and age should be disregarded. Thus the fact that an older member of a department or one with a longer period of service remains an associate professor should not be permitted to inhibit the promotion of a younger person to full professorship; similarly, in promotions of assistant professors the age of the candidate in relation to the age of his colleagues at the same rank should not be considered in any decision.

Great caution must be exercised by appointive committees themselves to prevent their being “stampeded” by the prestige or influence of contemporaneity. There has for some years been an increasing tendency for universities to concern themselves in their teaching and research with contemporary events — especially in the social sciences and humanities — and it is perfectly understandable that this should occur. With this focus of attention, however, there has also been a corresponding tendency to regard participants in the contemporary events as qualified to become academic staff members on the ground that their presence in the university will bring to the university the immediate experience of those events. Appointive bodies must remember that universities are, insofar as their major intellectual functions are concerned, places for scientific and scholarly analysis and training in such analysis, not theatres for the acquisition of vicarious experiences. Proposals to appointive bodies urging them to consider present or recent public notables for academic appointments must be responded to by strict adherence to the criteria of academic appointment. Where rare exceptions to this rule are permissible, such appointments must not be classified as appointments to the faculty.

These observations should not be interpreted to mean that a candidate who hitherto has not been wholly or at all in the academic profession should be automatically excluded from consideration. It means only that appointive bodies must be certain to apply the same high standards of distinction of scholarly and scientific performance to these candidates as they would to any others.

C. MODE OF ARRIVING AT DECISIONS

At present there is a wide variation among the various schools and departments of the University in the composition of their appointive bodies and in the sequence of stages of the appointive process. There is no need for uniformity, other than that recommendations for appointment (retention, promotion, extension) should originate within departments and schools, pass to the dean of the division or school, and thence to the Provost and President for approval or rejection or reference back for further consideration.

The Committee recommends that departments, schools, and committees in the University make arrangements whereby all faculty members, irrespective of rank within the department,⁴ possess a voice in the appointment of new members. When it is a matter involving reappointment or promotion of existing faculty members, e.g., the reappointment or promotion of assistant professors, it is reasonable for those at the same level or below not to have a voice in the decision. The same documentation on prospective appointments which is available to senior members and external assessors should normally be available to junior members of the academic staff.

The Committee recommends that the various departments and schools of the University should establish rules which they regard as appropriate in inviting and considering the assessments of candidates for appointment made in a consultative capacity by students. The Committee is of the view that advisory student assessment of candidates for appointment should be taken seriously, particularly with regard to teaching performance and graduate supervision. The *Statutes* of the University and the obligations of the departments and schools in the performance of the three main functions of universities preclude the membership of students with voting powers on appointive bodies.

External assessors should be selected very meticulously. They should not be chosen perfunctorily or in anticipation of an assessment favoring a particular candidate. The Committee does not recommend that external assessors be invited to become formal members of appointive bodies or that they be invited to be present at interviews of candidates. It does recommend that the external assessors be provided with full documentation such as bibliographies, offprints, etc., just as provision should be made for all members of appointive bodies. At the same time, it points out that external assessors are sometimes more indulgent in their view of candidates for appointments at other universities than they are at their own. One procedure which might be followed is to request the external assessor to indicate whether he would support the appointment of the candidate at his own university to the same rank for which he is being considered at The University of Chicago. Supplementary oral consultation with assessors by telephone would be useful.

The Committee suggests that some designated members of appointive bodies, whenever an appointment is to be recommended, present their assessments of competing candidates in independently written statements as well as orally. These written assessments, together with the vote taken in the appointive body, should be sent to the dean of the division together with the recommendation.

⁴Not necessarily including those persons on expressly terminal appointments.

Appointive committees should not consider only one candidate at any one time for a given appointment. It should be a firm rule, followed as frequently as possible when there is an appointment to be made, that several alternative candidates be considered. Although difficulties might be encountered because not all the candidates considered might be willing to accept appointment, this practice would lend rigor to appointive procedures. This same procedure should always be followed when an assistant professor is being considered for reappointment for a second term or for promotion to an associate professorship. At this point, he should be considered as if it were a new appointment. It should be made clear that no appointments carry with them the assurance of reappointment or promotion.

The decision to appoint an assistant professor for a second term (of two or three years) should be made only if there is reasonable confidence that at the end of that period he is likely to be qualified for promotion to the rank of associate professorship. In considering internal candidates for retention or promotion (or extension), members of appointive bodies must be willing to recognize that their earlier assessments might have been wrong. The effectiveness of the University in the performance of its intellectual functions would be diminished by the repetition of earlier erroneous assessments.

D. SPECIAL SITUATIONS

The foregoing remarks accept the principle that the power of formal recommendation of appointment rests with the faculty members of departments and committees and schools. This is the general practice, established by tradition and convention, and it should be adhered to. There are, however, occasionally special situations where deviation from this practice is necessary.

Where the quality of work of a department, school, or committee has declined over the years, special weight should be given to the views of external assessors regarding any candidate whose appointment has been internal proposed. Where a field, subject or department is expiring because first-class intellects are not available to constitute its staff, the discontinuation or suspension of the department should be considered.

One way to deal with the situation of a deteriorated department or, what is quite a different situation, of a department which has too few professors to make the necessary judgment about optimal lines of development, is for the dean of the division to appoint an ad hoc committee of distinguished persons from other universities and from adjacent departments in The University of Chicago to canvass the field and make recommendations for appointments and promotions. Another way is for the president or provost to appoint a new chairman with powers greater than those ordinarily enjoyed by chairmen.

E. TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

Initial appointments to the rank of instructor or assistant professor should be treated variously. In some cases the evidence at hand may be strong enough to indicate that the candidate may well be a strong prospect for permanent tenure. In this case an initial appointment as assistant professor for a term of four years is advantageous. (This is

within the present provision of the University *Statutes*.⁵) This would have the advantage that the next decision would be taken after a period of three years rather than the present period of two years for a three-year term of appointment. The latter term is often too short for the accumulation of sufficient evidence on the intellectual promise of the candidate.

In other cases, an initial appointment is based largely on recommendations of the candidates from outside graduate schools so that an initial appointment for two or three years, given the possibility of reappointment, may be most appropriate. In some departments it should be possible as a matter of general practice to offer junior appointments with the explicit understanding that the appointment is strictly a terminal appointment and that most or all of those so appointed will leave the University at the end of that term. Such arrangements have certain advantages in promoting a flow of young talent, in taking care of certain teaching and service obligations, in training young postdoctoral students here, and in assisting the flow of scholarly information. Moreover, the University remains free to appoint the very best of such persons in more permanent ways.

In many ways, the promotion to rank of associate professor and to permanent tenure is the one requiring greatest care and consideration.

Promotion to the rank of professorship from associate professorship should not be automatic either on the basis of seniority or after the lapse of a specified period of time. Promotion to professorship within the University should be made on the basis of the same procedures as appointments to full professorship from outside the University.

The Committee believes that on approaching the age of 65, members of the academic staff might be considered for reappointment for a three-year period. Each case should be considered by essentially the same procedures and with the same intensive and rigorous scrutiny as appointments at earlier ages and at lower ranks. The main criteria in the assessment of the faculty member in question should be teaching, research, and contribution to the intellectual accomplishment of his colleagues. Once a faculty member has reached the age of 68, he may be considered for subsequent reappointments of one year. Each such appointment should be considered in the light of the same criteria which are applied to earlier appointments. If the age of retirement should ever be raised to 68, post-retirement appointments should be made for one year at a time. Each reappointment should be subjected to the same criteria and procedures as other appointments.

In this connection, it is sometimes important to take into account the effect of retirement upon the general strength of the department. If, for example, several retirements are scheduled to take place concurrently and prospects for adequate replacement are not favorable, the department involved might be threatened by serious depletion of its staff

⁵*Statutes*—13 (a) (2), p. 41:
(2) *Assistant Professors*: The appointment of an assistant professor normally shall be for a term of either three or four years of full time service in one or more Faculties of the Departments, College, and Schools, provided that no person shall be appointed to serve in this rank for (a) a total of more than seven years, nor (b) a total of more than six years if he previously had an appointment for full time service in the rank of instructor for as long as four years. . . .

within a single year. In such cases, it may be desirable to “stagger” the retirement of senior faculty members by appropriate extension of their appointment.

In view of the fact that academic members of the University sometimes make arrangements several years before the age of normal retirement to resign in order to go to another university where the age of retirement is later, it might be desirable for the University that such decisions regarding extension may be made as many as two years prior to the age of normal retirement. (The arrangement for the supervision of dissertations also counsels a decision prior to the last year of normal tenure.)

The Committee discussed the possibility of an age of “early retirement” with modified pension provisions. It also discussed instances in which, for various reasons, a faculty member’s association with the University should be terminated before the statutory age of retirement. The Committee noted precedents for such a procedure in other universities and recommends that where a faculty member on permanent tenure shows no promise of continuing usefulness to the University, the termination of his appointment be given serious consideration. Such “early retirement” may be made possible through either modified pension provisions or the “commutation” of full-term appointment by a lump-sum payment of anticipated future salary.

The Committee recommends that there should be a category of strictly temporary appointment for which there is not only the usual terminal contract of appointment but explicit statement to the appointee that the appointment will not extend past a particular date. These short-term appointments should be used only on special occasions, such as emergencies where there is no regular member of the academic staff available to teach a particular subject which must be taught. If a person is on an emergency short-term appointment and is considered for regular appointment at the end of the period of his emergency appointment, his candidacy should be treated like any outside candidacy. (These observations do not apply to the short-term appointments of visiting professors and lecturers. To these appointments the same criteria apply as to normal appointments.)

F. CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENT

All academic appointments, when confirmed by the provost, president, and Board of Trustees, should be notified by letter to the appointee, stipulating that his acceptance of the appointment places him under obligation to “conduct and supervise research, teach, and contribute to the intellectual life of the University.”

G. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

A question has repeatedly been raised concerning the differing standards which seem to be applied to faculty members whose primary duties are in the College and those whose primary duties are in the divisions. Those in the latter category are judged primarily by their research accomplishments. The application of these same criteria for promotion and permanent tenure to those who are burdened with teaching does not seem to be fair. The existence of dual standards cannot be avoided as long as these two categories exist. The only way to abolish the dual standard is to abolish one of the categories by abolishing the differences in the kinds of tasks performed by members of the faculty.

The three criteria for appointment to The University of Chicago—distinction in research, distinction in teaching, distinction in intellectual contribution to the University as an intellectual community—should be applied in all situations in which appointments must be made. In general, as has already been stated, the criterion of distinction in research should be weighted most heavily. The University of Chicago faces a peculiar dilemma, however. It arises from the fact that at least since the 1930s, and more acutely over the past quarter of a century, there have been integrated into the structure of the University, two not wholly harmonious modes of weighting the criteria of research and teaching. Appointees to the University faculty posts in divisional departments, schools, and committees have been selected primarily according to the criterion of distinction in research; the other criterion was applied but given secondary significance. Appointees to the College have in certain fields been selected primarily according to the criterion of prospective teaching performance and promoted in accordance with evidence of distinction in teaching. The research criterion has not been disregarded, but it has not been given primacy or even equal weight.

These divergent weightings of the criteria have resulted in a degree of stratification in the University which is injurious, and various efforts have been made to overcome this stratification by various departments. Some of these efforts have apparently been successful; in others they have introduced an unassimilated mass of persons who do not share the intellectual aims of their colleagues and who believe they have no future in the University. In still others, stratification has been contained with good grace on both sides, but even in such fortunate outcomes, the fact remains the same: the criteria have been applied with different weightings and they have, therefore, constituted two different sets of criteria.

The Committee believes that normally appointment should involve both teaching and research and that candidates should be judged on both qualities. Appointive bodies should discourage appointments for research alone or for teaching alone. In particular, College appointments should not carry teaching loads so heavy as to preclude productive research activity.

H. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

It is one of the merits of The University of Chicago that it has often led in the development of new subjects through the freedom of its members to conduct interdisciplinary research and teaching. "Joint appointments" have been one of the devices

by which this kind of work has been fostered, and the Committee views such arrangements with favor. These joint appointments have, however, sometimes led to grave difficulties for both the individual holding the appointment and for the University. Primarily because of administrative problems and faculty politics, there have been cases where persons have held appointments with full privileges in one department but were denied the privileges associated with the appointment in another department. Joint appointments should enjoy the full privileges of the respective organizations, according to the level of appointment. Appointments initiated by institutes, interdisciplinary committees, etc. should be made as joint appointments with one of the teaching departments, and no members of the faculty should be able to find shelter from teaching by virtue of institute or committee appointments alone.

Joint appointments often present difficulties for junior members at the time of their reappointment or promotion. They find themselves in “double jeopardy.” Each department applies the criteria for advancement in its own way, and each exacts its own full set of demands independently of the other. Hence it is important to protect the joint appointee by not demanding twice the commitment of service on committees, examinations, etc. expected of normal appointments in a single department.

The Committee wishes to emphasize that when such appointments are made, each department participating should treat the appointment, whether it is from within or outside the University, with the same stringency as it would treat an appointment entirely within its own jurisdiction. The Committee is especially concerned that the fact that a department’s share of a joint appointee’s services in research and teaching is not paid for from its own budget should not cause the appointive process to be treated perfunctorily. Agreements to share in a joint appointment of a candidate wholly paid for from another unit’s budget should not encourage its treatment as a matter of “courtesy.” Research associates are not members of the University faculty entitled to the prerogatives of faculty members, except where as holders of joint appointments, they enjoy the title of “research associate (with rank of . . .)” in one of the departments.⁶ Research associateships do, however, fall into the category of academic appointments. For this reason, the Committee believes that their appointments should be reviewed periodically by the appointive bodies of departments, to ensure that the criterion of distinction in research is strictly adhered to. This would also render less likely the possibility that a research associate will become so “embedded” in the department that he is retained until the age of retirement or until he is recommended for faculty appointment.

⁶The University *Statutes* [13 (b) (1), p. 43] state: The normal period of appointment of research associates shall be one year, and reappointments may be made without limitation as to number of reappointments in any rank.

III. Criteria

A. RESEARCH

The criteria of appointment are implicit in the definition of the aims of The University of Chicago. The traditions of The University of Chicago in which these aims are contained place it under the obligation to be in the first rank of the universities of the world in all those subjects and fields in which it is active. This means that appointive bodies must seek to recruit to its staff and to retain on its staff persons whose accomplishments and potentialities are adjudged to be of the very highest order in research and in teaching and in the creation of an intellectual environment in which research of the highest order is done and in which students of distinguished intellectual potentiality are formed and guided.

The Committee regards distinction in research accomplishment and promise as the *sine qua non* of academic appointment. Even where a candidate offers promise of being a classroom teacher of outstanding merit, evidence should be sought as to the promise of distinction in his research capacity. Even if his research production is small in amount, no compromise should be made regarding the quality of the research done.

The appointment of academic staff members must, therefore, place in the forefront the criteria which will populate the University with persons capable of research at the most advanced level and of the highest quality.

It is imperative that in every case the appointive body ask itself whether the candidate proposed, if young, is likely in a decade to be among the most distinguished scientists or scholars of his generation; if middle-aged whether he is already in that position and whether the work which he is likely to do in the remainder of his career will be of at least the same quality.

In the recruitment of new staff members, emphasis should be placed upon the recruitment of younger persons who have not yet reached the height of their potentialities

Young staff members should be encouraged to do research in spite of the importance and pressure of their teaching. At the same time, appointive bodies must be on the alert against the dangers of appointing young persons in a way which forces them into research projects in which they have no genuine interest.

To offset the handicaps which might arise from concentration on undergraduate teaching, University departments should make a more determined effort to rotate their undergraduate teaching responsibilities so that junior members of the faculty can be provided with more time for research, especially when it is requested.

When older, very distinguished persons outside the University are considered for appointment, the major emphasis should be on their prospective intellectual influence in the University through teaching and informal contact with colleagues and students, as well as on the likelihood of a continued high quality of their own research. These same observations apply in general to candidacy of any person well past his middle age.

While stressing the preponderant importance of the appointment of young persons, the Committee recognizes that exceptions must sometimes be allowed. Thus, sometimes if there has been a disproportionate number of retirements or resignations by eminent senior members of a department, candidates at the same level of seniority and eminence might be sought by the appointive body. The need to maintain the prestige of the department and to render it attractive to outstanding younger persons would justify making this exception to the recommended emphasis on the appointment of younger persons.

It is obvious that sheer quantity of scholarly or scientific production, if of indifferent quality, must never be permitted to be counted in favor of any appointment. In assessing the research accomplishments of a particular candidate, adequate regard should be given to the extent to which his original intellectual or research accomplishments are contained in the work of research students and junior colleagues. Nonetheless, it is the quality of the actual publications, or the likelihood of such, which must be given the primary weight in assessment of research accomplishment and potentiality.

Appointive committees, in seeking out candidates and in making their decisions, should bear in mind the prospective development of the subjects on which the candidates have been working. They must seek to appoint a sufficient number of members of the department whose interests and skills are complementary to each other's, so that students will obtain a well-rounded training in their respective fields and so that there will be sufficient mutual stimulation within the department. At the same time, the appointive committees must be alert to the dangers of narrowing the range of intellectual interests represented in their respective departments.

Appointive committees in considering candidates should reflect not only on the candidate's capacity for development to eminence in his subject but the prospective vitality and continued significance of the candidate's main interest. It is important that departments should not become graveyards for subjects which have lost their importance. Thus, appointive committees in seeking out and considering candidates should, while regarding present or prospective distinction as indispensable, attend to the needs of the department in the various subfields within the discipline or subject and the capacity of those subfields for further scientific or scholarly development. Just as research projects should not be undertaken simply because money is available for them in substantial amounts, so there should be no academic appointments simply to staff a particular project.

B. TEACHING

Teaching at various levels and in various forms is one of the central functions of the University. No person, however famous, should be appointed to the University faculty with the understanding that he will do no teaching of any sort. Considerations regarding appointment should include the requirement that a candidate be willing to teach regularly and the expectation that he will teach effectively. Appointive bodies must bear in mind that teaching takes numerous forms. It occurs in lecture rooms, in small discussion groups, in research seminars, at the bedside in medical school, in laboratories, in reading courses, in the supervision of dissertations, and in the guidance of research assistants, postdoctoral

students, and residents in hospitals. It should be borne in mind by appointive bodies seeking to assess the teaching accomplishments of candidates that no one is likely to be equally competent or outstanding in all the different forms of teaching.

The Committee regards the success of the student in learning his subject and in going on with it to an accomplishment of intellectual significance as the best test of effective teaching. Assessment of performance in teaching should not be unduly influenced by reports, accidentally or systematically obtained, about the popularity of a candidate with students or his "being an exciting teacher." Other evidence of teaching effectiveness such as arousing students' interest in a problem, stimulating them to work independently, clarifying certain problems in the student's mind, etc., must be sought by appointive bodies. The assessment of teaching should include accomplishments in curriculum planning, the design of particular courses, and other teaching activities which go beyond the direct face-to-face teaching of students. The teaching of introductory courses should count to a candidate's credit no less than the teaching of advanced courses. (The responsibility of teaching an elementary course should be recognized by reduced teaching schedules as compensation.)

There should be no appointment in which the appointed person is expected to spend most of his time on classroom teaching.

C. CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTELLECTUAL COMMUNITY

The University is not just an aggregate of individuals performing research or a collection of teachers instructing students at various levels and in various fields. It is an institution which provides the services, auxiliary services, and facilities for research and teaching. The University must be administered and it must have financial resources to enable its academic staff to perform the functions for which they have been appointed.

In addition to being an institution with an administration and financial resources which provide the framework and facilities for research and teaching by academic staff members and students, it is also an intellectual community and a constellation of overlapping intellectual subcommunities built around, but not bounded by, committees and schools. It is an intellectual community in which interaction is about intellectual matters. The contribution which a member of the academic staff makes to the work of his colleagues and students by his own work, by his conversation in informal situations and by his criticizing and reading of their manuscripts, by his discussion of their research and of problems in their own and related fields is of great importance in creating and maintaining the intellectual quality of the University. He also contributes through his role in devising and revising courses of study (curricula) and other activities which go beyond his own teaching.

To what extent should these contributions be considered by appointive bodies?

First, regarding administration, members of the academic staff are not appointed to fill administrative roles. The fact that a candidate for appointment has been an excellent dean or is a good "committee man" or willingly serves on departmental committees or has been or might be an excellent department chairman adds to the merit of a member of the

academic staff. But it is a “gift of grace” and it is not pertinent to discussions about appointments, which must concentrate on intellectual performance, actual and prospective.

Although in principle younger members of the academic staff should be enabled to serve on committees and perform departmental duties other than their teaching and research, the decision regarding their reappointment or promotion should not be affected by their having or not having done so. The performance of some of these departmental chores often being at the expense of research, an appointments policy which accords importance to accomplishments of this sort might be injurious to the young staff member’s development as a scholar or scientist.

Universities require financial resources to support research, teaching, and administration of the university. Nonetheless, the capacity or incapacity of a candidate to attract financial resources or to “bring them with him” should not be a criterion for appointment. The acquisition of financial resources should be a task of the administration and a derivative function of the distinguished scientific or scholarly accomplishments and capacities of the members of the University faculty. If this rule is not observed, the University will be in danger of becoming an aggregate of affluent mediocrities.

The intellectual contribution of the academic staff member to his colleagues and students is a different matter. It is partly a function of his research and teaching accomplishments, but it also goes far beyond them. If a candidate is known to greatly stimulate his colleagues and students by his conversation and his criticism of their work, so that their individual performances are thereby improved, this should weigh in the consideration of a candidate for appointment.

Influence on the intellectual life of the University as an institution can be negative as well as positive. A member of the academic staff might be an impediment to the University’s performance of its intellectual functions, quite apart from his own performance as a research worker and teacher.

It should go without saying, therefore, that all appointees to the academic staff of the University should possess the requisite “academic citizenship.” By this the Committee means that appointive bodies are entitled to expect that persons whom they appoint to the academic staff will contribute what they can to the intellectual life of the University through their research, teaching, and intellectual intercourse in the University, and that they will abstain from deliberate disruption of the regular operations of the University.

The University must operate as an institution in order for its individual members to pursue their research and teaching. Deliberate obstruction of the work of the University through participation in disruptive activities cannot claim the protection of academic freedom, which is the freedom of the individual to investigate, publish, and teach in accordance with his intellectual convictions. Indeed, the only connection between disruptive actions within the University and academic freedom is that the disruptive actions interfere with the very action which academic freedom is intended to protect. Appointive committees, concerned with the maintenance or improvement of the intellectual quality of research and teaching in the University, must expect that those whom they appoint will enjoy the protection of academic freedom and that they will also be the guardians of that freedom. It is pertinent at this point to affirm what was said above about the irrelevance of political or religious beliefs and affiliations to decisions regarding appointment.

D. SERVICES

1. University Services

a) Services integral to research and training outside medicine. There are various kinds of services performed by members of the University. The first of these is the service which is indispensable for the performance of the central functions of the University in research and training. For example, faculty members in the physical sciences often require the collaboration of engineers for the conduct of their research. Such persons are normally highly qualified and could hold senior posts in engineering faculties or in industry. Their contribution is integral to research and although not members of the faculty they must therefore be accorded emoluments and privileges comparable to members of the University faculty of similar accomplishments and professional standing. Similarly, the training of social workers requires that supervisors be provided for their training in field work. Those performing these services are not defined by the University *Statutes* as members of the University faculty.⁷

b) Health care and the medical school. University service functions in the medical realm are those which do not *ipso facto* serve the primary functions of the University, viz., research and teaching. They include the provision of health care by the medical school to both the community at large and the student body. The staff who deliver these services are University faculty members in clinical departments, other academic personnel,⁸ and perhaps additional persons not specified in the *Statutes*.

It must be emphasized that though delivery of health care may be solely a service function (as in student and employee health clinics), more frequently it is an integral part of the University as an academic institution. It is such when it involves the teaching and training of medical students, interns, residents, and fellows. Of fundamental importance is the fact that teaching and care at the bedside on the one hand and medical research on the other are mutually interdependent and continuous activities, both of which provide intellectual tasks of the highest order. The commitments of members of the University faculty in the clinical departments (unlike those of members of the faculty in the basic medical and biological sciences) are therefore threefold. The training of outstanding physicians requires that faculty members deliver the best of medical care in addition to their research and teaching activities. For many reasons, it is practically impossible to ensure that every appointment in clinical departments reflects a similarly balanced excellence in all three areas. Thus, appointments to various academic faculty ranks in the clinical disciplines usually embrace a wide range of personnel, ranging from research workers of acknowledged excellence whose contributions to patient care may be outstanding, good, or slight; physicians whose respective contributions are equally meritorious but not of the very first rank; and clinicians whose dedication to research is modest. Some clinical departments also appoint a relatively small number of distinguished investigators who may or may not have a medical degree and who do not participate at all in clinical care.

⁷See *Statutes* of the University, 13 (b) (2), p. 43, quoted in footnote 3 of this report.

⁸*Ibid.*, 13 (b) (1), pp. 42—43, quoted in footnote 3 of this report.

The Committee believes that a great university medical school rapidly loses its eminence if it ceases to have a considerable number of outstanding investigators on the faculty of its clinical departments. Nevertheless, a medical school which cannot provide excellent care to the patients in its wards and clinics will produce only poor physicians and will fail to attract students, interns, and residents of high intellectual potentiality.

Physicians engaged in purely clinical work, who make no serious contributions to research or teaching, should under no circumstances be given any form of faculty rank or have any formal voice in recommendations for academic appointments. Many such clinicians who are not members of the University faculty are at present given the title of “research associate.”⁹ This term may be a misnomer inasmuch as these persons are not engaged in research and the title is also used as an additional designation for bona fide faculty members who hold joint appointments in two or more departments. The title of “clinical associate” might better describe persons involved in purely clinical service functions.

In situations where the financial competitiveness of private (or nonacademic) medicine has helped to deplete the academic pool of a clinical department, its resuscitation should depend more on attractive competitive stipends than on lowering the standards for academic appointments.

(c) *Concluding observations on University services.* The likelihood of appointments for purely “service” purposes is increased whenever the University undertakes, for whatever reason, the extension of services not related to its research and teaching functions. Such enterprises by definition require expertise and performance of a different kind from those expected of regular faculty members, and appointments to meet such needs should never be appointments to the faculty (as defined by the University *Statutes*). Decisions to extend medical and other services which do not involve either teaching or research or both should be made in the awareness that whatever persons are appointed will not be granted the status of members of the University faculty.

2. External Services¹⁰

a) *Public services.* There is a second type of service in which members of the academic staff become involved. This is public service, i.e., service for the federal, state, and municipal governments and for civic and voluntary associations. To what extent should appointive bodies consider accomplishments in such services as qualifications for appointment? The Committee is of the view that such services should not be considered as qualifications for academic appointment unless the service has a significant intellectual or research component. Thus, membership in a governmental body which does not perform research or make decisions regarding the promotion of research should not be regarded as a qualification for appointment. Membership in an advisory body which organizes, supports, and oversees research should be regarded as a positive qualification. Proximity

⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁰The *Statutes* of the University (Statute 16, p. 61) state that:

A member of the Faculty during the quarters of his residence may not engage in consultation, teaching at other universities, regular compensated lecturing, compensated editorial activities, or other substantial outside employment, unless such activity is consistent with his obligations to the University, is not inimical to the fullest development of his scholarly activities, and meets with the approval of his Chairman and Dean.

to the design and execution of the research program and its quality must be taken into account.

Incumbency in elective or political office, whether it be the presidency of the United States or the prime ministry of a country, should not be regarded as a qualification for appointment to the academic staff of the University.

Participation in the “delivery” of services for the non-University community should be considered in decisions regarding academic appointment only when there is an increment to knowledge or a valuable function in instruction or training arising from the “delivery.” Certain of these “deliveries” are undertaken as part of the “public relations” of the University or because government or civic bodies have not taken the initiative or responsibility which are properly theirs.

Nothing in the foregoing paragraphs should be interpreted as a judgment on the merit of the various public services or the appropriateness of their performance by members of the academic staff in their capacity as citizens. On the contrary, such services are often very important for society—local, national, and international. They must not, however, be counted as qualifications for academic appointment.

b) Academic services. Among the service activities sometimes performed by members of the academic staff are those performed on behalf of learned and scientific societies which the Committee designates as “academic services.” A threefold distinction can be made between (1) honorific services, e.g., presidency of a learned or scientific society; (2) intellectual services, such as editorship of a learned or scientific journal; and (3) administrative services, e.g., secretaryship of a learned or scientific society.

The first is a distinction conferred on persons who by their research have made and are making valuable contributions to their subjects. In most instances, such honorific offices represent a confirmation of the major criteria of academic appointment, namely distinction in research, and they may therefore be taken into positive account by appointive bodies.

The second, the editorship of a learned or scientific journal, is a contribution to the intellectual community in a particular discipline beyond the confines of the University. It is a contribution to the maintenance of standards of excellence in the discipline. It too should be taken into positive account by appointive bodies. Membership on advisory panels, e.g., National Institutes of Health (NIH) “study sections,” is an intellectual service; it is similar to editorship of a learned or scientific journal and is a contribution to the national and international learned and scientific communities. It should, accordingly, be taken into positive account by appointive bodies.

The third academic service, the secretaryship or a similar administrative function on behalf of a learned or scientific society, on the other hand, is a time-consuming activity which does not entail contributions to teaching or research; this type of service should not be taken into positive account by appointive bodies.

c) Private services. Consultative services for private industry are admissible as considerations in academic appointments only if they entail an enhancement of the

scientific accomplishments of the person involved. This is the aspect which should concern appointive bodies.

IV. Conclusion

The positive task of appointive bodies, i.e., the appointment of persons of the highest abilities, has been the main focus of attention in this report. There are, however, also negative tasks; these are the refusal to make appointments. These negative tasks fall under three headings. The first is relatively simple; it is to refuse to make appointments when there are no available candidates of sufficiently high quality. The only excuse for appointing a candidate of acknowledgedly undistinguished qualifications is that certain necessary teaching must be done if students are to be prepared for their degrees. This necessity can be met by the expedient, referred to in the body of the report, of explicitly temporary appointments for particular teaching tasks. The irregular situation should be under constant review so that it can be restored to a regular condition through appointments of the proper quality.

Where there is no particular teaching task of great urgency, in situations where there are no candidates of sufficiently high quality, actual or prospective, no appointments should be made. It is better for the University to allow a field to lie fallow than to allow it to be poorly cultivated. Appointments should not be made just because there is a list of candidates and funds to pay their salaries.

Appointive bodies have a second negative function, and this is to exercise a stern scrutiny over expansion. This responsibility, of course, they cannot exercise alone; they depend heavily here on the support and cooperation of the dean of the relevant division, the provost, and the president of the University.

Great care must be exercised in expanding the staff in established fields or in reaching into new fields of academic work. One of the great advantages of The University of Chicago in the present situation of universities in the world is that it is relatively small. There are many things which universities do, some of which are useful and admirable, but which need not be done by The University of Chicago. There is a great temptation, both when financial support is plenteous and when it is scarce, to take on new members, new fields of study and research, and new service functions because financial support is available. Some of these might be properly done by The University of Chicago where the University has a tradition which would enable them to be very well done or where there are clear and important intellectual and institutional benefits to be obtained from doing them. But to allow expansion and new appointments simply because financial resources are available to support them would be an error which would be wasteful of resources and damaging to the University.

The judicious performance of this negative task must not, however, be permitted to prevent the taking up of important new fields of study and research about which there are genuine and well-based intellectual convictions in the University and outstanding intellectual capacities to do them outstandingly well. Even where a field is intellectually important, the University, and this also means appointive bodies, should not venture into them simply because other outstanding universities are working in them. The expansion into the important new field should be undertaken only if appointments at a high level of quality can be made to provide the necessary staff.

There is a third negative function, already referred to in the body of this report. This is the problem of dealing with fields in decline because the subject has become exhausted within the country or in the world at large or because not enough young persons of sufficient potentiality for distinguished accomplishment wish to enter them.

The last three tasks are negative only in the sense that they involve the refusal to make appointments when the quality of the candidates is not sufficiently high. In fact, however, these negative functions, if properly performed, are as positive in their outcome as the more obviously positive tasks. It is indeed only if equal attention is paid to both—i.e., to the need for adamant refusal to be tempted into making appointments just because appointments can be made, as well as to the firm insistence on appointing candidates of actually or potentially great merit—that The University of Chicago will be what it ought to be. Only by an undeviating adherence to the criteria set forth in this report can The University of Chicago maintain and enhance its reputation among the universities of the world as a university of the first rank in certain fields, regain that position in others in which it has declined, and open up important new fields which no other universities have yet entered.

V. A Later Elaboration on Political Criteria

On 2 December 1971, the Committee on the Criteria of Academic Appointment was asked by President Levi to reconvene so that it could elaborate its views on political criteria in decisions regarding academic appointment, reappointment, and promotion.

In the *Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Academic Appointment* we said: “There must be no consideration of sex, ethnic or national characteristics, or political or religious beliefs or affiliations in any decision regarding appointment, promotion or reappointment at any level of the academic staff” (see above, “The Application of Criteria,” pp. 6-7). Further on in the Report, in connection with “academic citizenship,” we affirmed the earlier statement about “the irrelevance of political or religious beliefs and affiliations to decisions regarding appointments” (see above, “Contribution to the Intellectual Community,” pp. 25-26).

We now wish to elaborate the foregoing statements as follows:

In discussions and decisions regarding appointments, promotions, and reappointments, appointive bodies should concentrate their consideration of any candidate on his qualifications as a research worker, teacher, and member of the academic community. The candidate’s past or current conduct should be considered only insofar as it conveys information relative to the assessment of his excellence as an investigator, the quality of the publications which he lays before the academic community, the fruitfulness of his teaching and the steadfastness of his adherence to the highest standards of intellectual performance, professional probity, and the humanity and mutual tolerance which must prevail among scholars.

There are, accordingly, certain matters which when they do not unambiguously and demonstrably bear on the application of the foregoing criteria, must be studiously avoided in discussions about academic appointment. These matters include a candidate’s past and current associations and the objectives of his past or current employer, the sources of the funds which support his research and the uses to which third parties might or have actually put its results independently of his desires. It behooves all members of The University of Chicago to do all they can to ensure that the standards set forth above are strictly observed in discussions and decisions regarding academic appointments.