

REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON POLICIES  
AND PROCEDURES ON TENURE APPOINTMENTS

Report to the Executive Committee of  
the Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Policies  
and Procedures on Tenure Appointments

*Yale University, 15 June 1965*

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on Policies and Procedures in  
Tenure Appointments

D. Allan Bromley  
Richard N. Cooper  
Robert A. Dahl, *Chairman*  
William C. DeVane  
E. Talbot Donaldson  
George S. Fayen, Jr.  
William J. Foltz  
Timothy H. Goldsmith  
Charles A. Porter  
Charles E. Rickart  
Henry A. Turner, Jr.

*Dear Dean Miller and Dean May:*

I herewith transmit to you the final Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Policies and Procedures in Tenure Appointments. Our report represents the joint work of the entire Committee; it goes to you, I am happy to say, with our unanimous endorsement.

Although there were some important questions that we could not explore adequately in the short time available to us, the Committee interpreted its assignment broadly. Again and again we found ourselves returning to a question that, so it seemed to us, is central to all the main issues of tenure and appointments at Yale. Can Yale, or for that matter can any university, achieve and sustain greatness today both as an undergraduate college and as a university?

The answer is very far from clear or certain. Nonetheless, I think I speak for every member of the Committee in saying that the more we examined the issues involved, the more convinced we became of four conclusions. First, only a handful of institutions of higher education in the United States – or in the world – stand much chance of either acquiring or maintaining the highest quality in the two roles of university and liberal arts college. Second, Yale is unquestionably one of these. Third, Yale should accept this extraordinary challenge with full awareness that the task is going to be difficult. Fourth, without the understanding and support of each of the elements that most directly shape the character of Yale – in particular the faculty, the administration, the students, and the alumni – we shall surely fall short of greatness in the one role or the other.

But with understanding of and support for these goals in all parts of Yale, no other university has so bright a prospect of sustaining true excellence in both the College and the University.

*August 3, 1965*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Robert A. Dahl*

*To the Ad Hoc Committee on Policies and  
Procedures in Tenure Appointments:*

The Executive Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences is grateful for the thoughtful report of the *ad hoc* committee of junior and senior faculty members appointed by the Deans of the College and of the Graduate School to reappraise policies and procedures governing appointments to tenure in the faculties of Arts and Sciences.

The thoroughness and dispatch with which this work was undertaken is an important service to the University.

The Executive Committee is in accord with all the major recommendations of the faculty committee and with the thinking expressed in the Report.

After receiving the benefit of faculty comment and discussion, the President and the Provost would expect to recommend substantially all the committee proposals for approval by the Corporation.

The only point about which the Executive Committee has reservations concerns the suggestion that all Associate Professors with tenure be promoted to Professorships at the age of 65.

Unless the faculty recommends otherwise, the Executive Committee would not think it worthwhile to appoint another committee to pursue the question of the evaluation of teaching. Many plausible suggestions along this line have been considered by the faculty committee and the Executive Committee with the aid of student and faculty discussion. While the problem deserves continuous consideration by everyone concerned, the Executive Committee proposes to take two steps now as a result of last spring's consultations and deliberations with faculty members and with students.

First, upon completion of his course of study at Yale each student receiving departmental honors in Yale College and each recipient of a terminal degree in the Graduate School shall be invited to submit to the Chairman of the Department or

Program in which he concentrated and to the appropriate Dean a written appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of his educational experience, including the quality of instruction in lecture courses, discussion courses, and seminars.

Second, when a Department recommends a candidate for permanent appointment, the recommendation shall include a detailed statement in writing specifying the candidate's teaching experience record and an evaluation of his effectiveness as a teacher. The record and evaluation shall be part of the documentation of any recommendation forwarded to the Boards of Permanent Officers, or to the Corporation.

*Georges May*

*John Perry Miller*

*Charles H. Taylor, Jr.*

*Kingman Brewster, Jr.*

### *Table of Contents*

Yale's Role: University and College, 11

Excellence in Scholarship, 12

Some Requirements, 12

The Evaluation of Scholarship, 14

Excellence in Teaching, 15

The Varieties of Teaching, 15

The Evaluation of Teaching, 16

Ways to Improve Teaching, 17

Tenure, 18

Reasons for Tenure, 19

The Timing of Promotions and Tenure, 21

Criteria for Tenure Appointments, 22

Standards, 22

Openings, 24

Procedures, 25

General, 25

A Proposed Statement of Policy on

Tenure Appointments, 26

Prospects for Promotions and Tenure, 28

Special Problems, 29

Tenure Associate Professors Approaching

Retirement, 29

Variations within the University, 30

Interdisciplinary Programs, 30

Appendix: Consequences of Yale's Faculty

Structure for Promotions and Tenure, 32

### Yale's Role: University and College

Possibly the greatest of the nation's colleges in the nineteenth century, Yale was a reluctant participant in the university movement which swept the country in the last quarter of the century. The Faculty and Administration were unwilling to risk diluting the excellence of the college, and Yale was to remain even into the twentieth century a powerful collegiate institution, surrounded by a number of graduate and professional schools of less than first-rate quality. There had always been men of great eminence at Yale; one need only mention Willard Gibbs in science, William Graham Sumner in the social sciences, and William Dwight Whitney in the humanities. It was not until the reform of 1919, however, and the advent of James Rowland Angell as President in 1921 that Yale assumed the responsibility imposed by its national prestige and strength and became a comprehensive and complex university with both a strong university college and first-rate graduate and professional departments and schools. To keep its parts excellent and the whole in balance has been the ambition of Yale since that time.

Recent national and international pressures have somewhat dislocated the functions of the college and university in many of the nation's most eminent institutions. Briefly stated, the teaching function – which is the primary function of the college as it prepares its students for entrance to life or to further education – has suffered eclipse from the university's primary emphasis upon the advancement of knowledge. Both activities are essential to a healthy institution, and support one another.

It has been the good fortune of Yale to retain much of the strong teaching tradition which has distinguished the College as the University increasingly improved its eminence in research. These major functions must be kept in balance and proportion. It is sometimes assumed that production of new knowledge through research must necessarily conflict with the transmission of knowledge through teaching and that an institution cannot simultaneously sustain excellence in teaching and

excellence in research. Although the relationship between these two central functions of a university is highly complex, we are convinced that it presents no real conflict. We are also convinced that only through striving to maintain excellence in both research and teaching will Yale seize the opportunity that lies before us. Unusual imagination, ingenuity, and resources must be brought to bear on the pursuit of excellence in both of these functions.

Beyond this, the University must look to the cohesion and continuity of its communal life, and remember steadily its comprehensive responsibility to the life of the nation and the world. If Yale can keep these goals clearly in mind, it has an excellent prospect of becoming unique among America's educational institutions in its high distinction both as a university and as a university college.

#### Excellence in Scholarship

Greatness both as a university and as a university college is not going to be easy to maintain.

*Some Requirements.* As a university, Yale's future will be determined by the extent to which she is able, in a highly competitive market, to keep and to attract distinguished scholars. The criteria for judging excellence in scholarship and research are developed within the various disciplines themselves. Since these disciplines are national and international in character, it follows that Yale must assert itself in contributing to the definition and development of these criteria. But it also follows that an insistence on excellent undergraduate teaching as a condition for tenure, without a rigorous adherence to scholarly criteria, could lead to a deterioration in Yale's scholarly contribution and hence its national and international stature as a university.

In order to maintain excellence in scholarship and research, Yale must offer an environment favorable to such activity. This is a highly competitive matter and the precise conditions

are changing all the time. The standard teaching load in most good universities, for example, is probably in the neighborhood of half of what it was before World War II. And there can be no uniformity of conditions among the various disciplines: teaching hours in mathematics at the University of Chicago are far more important to the Department of Mathematics at Yale than teaching hours in any other department at Yale.

Since Yale is deeply committed as a university college to a strong undergraduate program, most of the faculty will be involved in one capacity or another with undergraduates. This program, as an important part of the university environment, must be brought into closer accord with Yale's character as a great university; it must be an asset to our larger purposes and responsibilities. Continuous reappraisal of admission and recruitment policies is essential to insure that Yale's undergraduates will be especially prepared to benefit from association with distinguished scholars. The Committee recommends that:

*The resources and opportunities which a great university affords should be made clear during the introductory week of the freshman year by the faculty advisers and by the freshman counselors. They should be clarified particularly by the alumni who represent the University in interviewing prospective applicants.*

It is important, then, that the character of Yale as a University – including the ways in which the University and the College enrich one another – be emphasized and strengthened. This is particularly vital for the sciences and mathematics. A university-college need not and should not strive for exactly the same qualities in its undergraduates as independent colleges; indeed, Yale should seize and exploit the potentialities of a liberal education in a university-college. Because the re-making of undergraduate Yale from a college to a university-college is one of the most important changes in the long history of this "Collegiate School," and because this change is still in process, the Committee feels strongly that the faculty and



the administration should give particular attention to clarifying, to ourselves and to all who are interested in Yale, the particular assets and the special requirements of Yale as a university college.

*The Evaluation of Scholarship.* The final responsibility for building and maintaining excellence in scholarship and research at Yale must normally rest on the individual departments with help and guidance from the divisional committees and the administration. Because the departments inevitably play a major role in guaranteeing that their members fulfill the highest standards of scholarship, one of the most serious obligations that must be assumed by every senior member of every department is to evaluate the qualifications of candidates for promotion. The divisional committees assist in this process; they are not a substitute for responsibility within the department itself. This is also true of testimony from outside Yale. Letters from distinguished scholars who know a candidate and his work are indispensable. But this practice can be abused in three ways. First, because the professors in a department are expected to know more about a colleague than most outside experts, outside letters may contribute to a department's judgment but they should never substitute for it. Second, the usefulness of outside letters is negligible if a department or a divisional committee is unable to appraise the standards, candor, or prejudices of the writer. Third, the practice of ranking scholars in numerical order of merit suggests that the methods of evaluation are more quantitative and precise than, in our view, they actually can be.

On the whole, the system of appraisal is working well and, in our view, it should be supported. We should like to encourage the practice – sometimes employed in the past by the divisional committees – of soliciting advice from outside Yale independently of the departments. We think too that departments and divisional committees should recognize that someone other than the chairman might in some cases be the most qualified person to present a case to a divisional committee. A depart-

ment chairman who wished to do so should feel free to invite another colleague to present the case. Finally, the Committee recommends that as many members of the faculty as possible should be involved directly or indirectly in the work of the divisional committees, for wider experience with the workings of these committees will, we believe, raise standards within departments. This constant raising of standards together with superior salaries and good working conditions will go far toward strengthening and maintaining a high level of scholarship and research at Yale.

### Excellence in Teaching

Excellence in teaching is central to the purposes of Yale as a university. The requirements for maintaining this excellence are constantly changing and in need of immediate review.

*The Varieties of Teaching.* Increasingly, at every level, the curriculum and structure of courses should recognize the varied conditions under which learning occurs and should encourage even further all the varieties of teaching. Within the familiar forms, lecture or seminar or tutorial, it is essential that teaching strive to convey, beyond the necessary data or basic skills, some of the attitudes and powers of mind which are active in the development of the discipline.

There is, moreover, a considerable amount of teaching outside the classroom and laboratory. It includes the directing of doctoral dissertations and theses of intensive majors and Scholars of the House as well as the planning of inter-departmental and divisional programs. It includes the preparation of experiments and exhibits, the improvement of permanent research facilities and collections, and the development of new research facilities in the natural and social sciences. It extends to many important but less tangible contributions to the corporate intellectual life of the colleges and community.

Any attempt to evaluate and improve teaching, or to relate it to tenure decisions, must take into account the different re-

relationships between these varieties of teaching and the many kinds of research and scholarship. Introductory courses in some areas, for example, may at first be the simple exposition of fundamentals; for the instructor there will obviously be a gap between classroom and research. Many departments, however, find it is not only possible but desirable to keep the methods of handling elementary material closely in touch with the implications of more advanced techniques and problems. Sometimes a more difficult question can be explored as an instance of how basic principles apply and operate at the further reaches of research. Conversely, in more specialized courses it is often necessary to emphasize wider relevance and to indicate some sense of coherence in proliferating, highly detailed knowledge; an overview is needed. For the instructor, this will provide a chance to discuss the place of advanced work within a whole field and perhaps also to renew his own perspectives. It will permit him to demonstrate by his own example the precision and flexibility of training in the discipline. Teaching of this variety is a vital source of scholarship. As such, it may be assumed to bear on promotion and tenure.

*Evaluation of Teaching.* The problem of evaluating teaching is one for which no solution seems altogether satisfactory. Teaching may be evaluated for two purposes, and it is important that these two be sharply distinguished. One purpose would be to appraise teaching in order to improve it; the teacher himself might, for example, want a means for evaluating his own performance so that he could become more effective. A second purpose would be to provide a department or faculty with evidence for judging a candidate's qualifications for appointments or promotion. Techniques of evaluation that could be useful for the first purpose might be, and some almost certainly would be, useless or even vicious for the second.

The Committee has received a number of proposals for evaluating teaching. All involve attempts, systematic or casual, to take into account the opinions of students about the performance of their teachers. Some would rely on questionnaires

which the instructor on his own initiative and for his own information could distribute to his classes. Some would rely on soliciting the views of specific groups of students: responsible undergraduates of strong academic record, representative graduating majors, and recent graduates.

The Committee is divided as to whether any of these efforts to improve teaching may be effective. For the purpose of appointments and promotions, the Committee is skeptical concerning the usefulness of all the proposals that have been brought to our attention. In fact, we think some of them could entail great risks of abuse and could generate an unhealthy climate in the classroom.

Even though the Committee believes that a recommendation about how exactly to evaluate teaching is beyond the immediate scope of tenure policies and procedures, we are troubled by the problem and the absence of any solutions which we could confidently recommend. We believe too that Yale has resources for outstanding teaching within its present ranks that are not fully tapped, and that developing and using these resources represents one of the major challenges which the University now faces. Consequently the Committee recommends:

*That a faculty committee be appointed, to address itself not only to the question of evaluating teaching but also to the problem of maintaining and improving the quality of teaching at Yale by both tenure and non-tenure faculty.*

*Ways to Improve Teaching.* For reasons we shall set out later, it is our view that excellence in teaching should not be sought by means of a separate "teaching faculty" created by granting tenure appointments solely on the basis of teaching. In our opinion Yale provides a great deal of excellent teaching. The Committee does, however, believe very strongly, as we have just noted, that much more could be done than at present to encourage effective, stimulating teaching on the part of the scholars who make up the Yale faculty. For example, channels of communication within departments can be improved so that

our senior faculty will be encouraged to share its wealth of information and experience about teaching with beginning instructors to a greater degree than is now the case. Or, to take another example, undergraduate teaching can often be made more varied and challenging to students and faculty alike by narrowing the gap between the introductory stages of instruction and the frontiers of scholarship. Desirable revisions in the college curriculum could be encouraged by releasing faculty members from their normal duties long enough to allow them to prepare new courses and new instructional materials. Finally, this Committee wishes to emphasize the necessity of making more time and energy available for teaching by reducing the number of course preparations and the burdens of departmental administration borne by our faculty. This is especially important for younger faculty members, since it is during the initial and formative years of their teaching that they develop the classroom techniques and habits they carry with them throughout their careers. The faculty committee we have proposed would be expected to examine these and other ways of evaluating and improving teaching which, in the short time available, we have been unable to pursue adequately.

### Tenure

Like other institutions of higher education in the United States, Yale adheres to the venerable academic practice of making certain appointments with no limitations on length of term, other than compulsory retirement at 68. A faculty member so appointed will not be discharged except in certain extraordinary circumstances, such as gross immorality, criminality, outright refusal to perform his duties, and the like.

In the perspective of non-academic institutions in the United States, the idea of "permanent tenure" is an anomaly. Although many other organizations do in fact grant something like tenure to some of their employees, colleges and universities are apparently unique in adhering to the practice as a mat-

ter of definitely stated and, for all practical purposes, unassailable policy. Some of the disadvantages of making what is in effect an appointment for life are obvious. A university usually does not get rid of its mistakes until they retire. Senior men may block the way of better young men. Whole departments may fall into decay. If these were the only considerations, then obviously tenure would long ago have been abandoned. But there are a number of arguments in its favor, and some of these are strong enough so that Yale should not — as in fact it cannot — abandon the practice.

*Reasons for Tenure.* One of the early grounds for "tenure" was elementary justice. College and university teachers, it was thought, should be compensated by this special form of economic security for their low salaries and the resulting risks of financial hardship and disaster. Our appraisal of the academic market, and Yale's place in that market, impel us to conclude that this argument is no longer a relevant justification for tenure at Yale. To maintain its position as a great university, Yale will have to meet the highest salaries in the country; these are, and will remain, well above the level of genteel poverty that might once have justified the special economic security of a tenure appointment. Moreover, the kind of scholar Yale will seek for her professorships will have little difficulty in commanding an equally high salary at other institutions.

If tenure is an economic anachronism at Yale, should Yale abolish it altogether? We have seriously weighed this possibility; but the additional arguments in favor of tenure are compelling ones. There is, in particular, the matter of academic freedom; this is the second ground on which the practice is usually justified. An institution of higher learning should create an environment in which a faculty member can pursue his own vision of truth — in whatever direction and at whatever pace he believes necessary — without the corrosive fear that others whose vision differs from his own may punish him by causing him to lose his job. In some universities and colleges, the dangers are likely to stem more from outside than from in-

side the institution. At Yale, the tradition of independence is strong, honored, and not likely to be imperiled; yet even at Yale our traditional independence from outside pressures is probably fortified by the mere existence of tenure. In any case, not all potential threats to the intellectual independence of the teacher-scholar come from outside; dangers can also arise within a university community: from senior colleagues, departmental chairmen, directors of programs, deans, and others who might be tempted – in the absence of tenure – to rid themselves of a colleague whose ideas they rejected.

Aside from its importance in helping to maintain freedom in teaching and research, it would be highly unwise for Yale to abandon the practice even if one were to make the debatable assumption that because of her traditions, the eminence of her faculty members, and the present demand for distinguished scholars, Yale without tenure might be almost as free intellectually as Yale with tenure for its senior faculty. For the very existence of the academic market means that if Yale were to abandon tenure, we should have great difficulty in appointing the scholars we need for our faculty, since many of them regard tenure as highly important, and they would not change their views simply because we at Yale had changed ours. Yale would then have to offset lack of tenure with extraordinary salaries and fringe benefits.

Finally, universities like Yale help to set the standards for American higher education. A decision by Yale to abandon tenure would have repercussions throughout academia; and many weaker institutions where tenure is a decisive and often the only protection for intellectual freedom might well be encouraged to imitate Yale's example.

The full consequences of tenure appointments are, of course, complex. A wish for brevity prevents us from discussing the complexities of the problem at greater length. But it seems clear to us that the balance is clearly in favor of maintaining some system of tenure appointments at Yale. But if so, three questions arise: (1) At what stage should tenure begin? (2) What criteria should control appointments? (3) What pro-

portion of the faculty can reasonably expect to hold tenure appointments?

### The Timing of Promotions and Tenure

A candidate for promotion, whether to a tenure position or not, needs time to display his capacities, his promise, and his achievements. Too short a time is a disservice both to the candidate and to the university. Too long a time is unfair to the man; it encourages departments, and the man himself, to procrastinate in making difficult decisions. Furthermore, given the competition for good teachers and scholars, it may set off a flight of good young faculty members to other institutions. Is there an optimum? The American Association of University Professors advocates seven years. At Yale the average time spent in a non-tenure position is probably around six or seven years; but Yale practice is to allow a maximum of 10 years, after which a person normally must be promoted to a tenure position at Yale, or leave. Given different rates of maturing in different fields, the likelihood that the full ten years is required only in a minority of cases, and the fact that those who leave Yale usually move to excellent posts in the better institutions, we think that the ten-year maximum is fair, and should be retained. But departmental chairmen, the divisional committees, and the provost and deans need to exercise very great care to insure that the longer period is not used merely to delay unpleasant decisions. Candidates should be told as soon as possible what their prospects are – particularly if their prospects for remaining are poor.

The question arises: ten years (or seven years) from what point? It is anomalous that the starting point is not at all clearly defined, even within Yale. We therefore propose the following general statement of policy:

*No one shall be employed in the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor on term for longer than a total of ten years. This period shall be*

*reckoned on the basis of years of full-time teaching with Ph.D., including the academic year within which the degree is received. Up to three years of such teaching at institutions other than Yale shall be included in this ten-year period. No one who is a candidate for a Ph.D. shall teach full-time in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences for more than two years without the Ph.D.*

### Criteria for Tenure Appointments

*Standards.* Since Yale's function continues to be, as it has always been, to educate and to push forward man's intellectual frontiers, a scholar at Yale will contribute to the knowledge of his field both by imparting to others in writing the results of his original work and by his teaching. Hence the statement of policy that we propose below avoids the distinction commonly made between a "scholar" and a "teacher" and assumes that at Yale a scholar will be, by definition, both. It follows, as we have already suggested, that the Committee does not recommend the establishment on the one hand of Research Professorships or on the other hand of Teaching Professorships. Since the Committee recognizes that every case for appointment or promotion to tenure is unique, our proposed Statement of Policy allows for a large measure of flexibility in balancing scholarly writing with teaching, and also permits a candidate's general contribution to the intellectual life and to the operation of a democratically governed university to be taken into account.

Since the Committee's objective in the first paragraph of the Statement of Policy is to prescribe standards for balancing scholarship, teaching, and contributions to the corporate life of the University, it may be helpful to say something about our intentions, particularly since we found it impossible to formulate the standards in words of perfect precision. In trying to state our intentions clearly during our own discussions, we sometimes resorted to the metaphor of a yardstick or scale, one for measuring excellence in written scholarship, another

for measuring excellence in teaching (*keeping in mind the manifold varieties of teaching mentioned earlier*), perhaps a third for performance in the obligations of university life. If we assume as the Committee does, that a permanent member of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences must be both scholar and teacher, and if our aim is excellence in both, then clearly a candidate for appointment who falls below some minimum level on either scale would not qualify for an appointment. The minimum levels cannot be precisely described; it would be foolish to make the attempt. But each must be high enough so that, in combination, the candidate possesses "scholarly distinction of a high quality as demonstrated both by his written work and by his teaching." Above the basic levels of excellence, then, great achievement in scholarship may offset lack of great distinction as a teacher. For a candidate whose scholarship is sound but not necessarily pre-eminent, unusually effective teaching will help to meet the requirement for "scholarly distinction of a high quality."

The Committee received a number of suggestions for the establishment of Teaching Professorships. It rejected these because it is convinced that original scholarly work is the surest proof of intellectual distinction and the surest guarantee that intellectual activity will not cease. It believes that even the most excellent teaching is likely to deteriorate if the teacher fails to contribute actively to his field of knowledge. What is more important, it would be undesirable since it would weaken the morale and cohesion of the faculty by creating a kind of second-class citizenship. Against this position the proponents of Teaching Professorships have a very strong *ad hominem* argument in that they are able to adduce four or five names of men who remained effective teachers despite their neglect of research and writing. To counter the argument based on these undoubted examples of excellent teachers, one is put in the position of having to catalogue non-productive scholars who became mediocre or poor teachers, an invidious task that no one will readily accept. The Committee is convinced, however, that such a catalogue would be large enough to make those

named as examples of the great teacher-poor scholar seem like exceptions so rare as to be impossible to accommodate specifically in the statement of policy.

The Committee believes that recommendation to an Associate Professorship with tenure necessarily implies on the part of the sponsors their confident expectation that the candidate will advance to a Professorship within a reasonable period of time. It therefore subscribes wholeheartedly to the intention of the Memorandum of October 1964 in this regard, but it feels that the five-year period named in the Memorandum is so specific that it fails to allow for all individual cases and is subject to misunderstanding and abuse. The Committee recommends that:

*The Tenure Appointments Committee should require sponsoring Departments to make an estimate of the period of time anticipated for each individual, and the Appointments Committee should consider the implications of the estimate carefully in making its own decision. The Divisional Committees should keep watch on the status of Associate Professors with tenure and act to prevent Departments from unduly deferring decisions or from failing to notify one whose future progress in the University seems doubtful. Nothing in this statement is to be construed, however, as permitting any conditions to be attached to the granting of tenure, which is by its nature never granted with any limitation or qualification whatsoever.*

*Openings.* It seems to the Committee wise to mention the matter of openings in the proposed Statement of Policy, for events during the year have shown that candidates for tenure have unrealistically been led to believe, or have led themselves to believe, that even when no opening was visible one would automatically be made for them, or that they would surely be given tenure even when their special field of interest was more than adequately covered by scholars with tenure. The Commit-

tee recommends that the Executive Committee make it as clear as it can to the Departments what openings may be expected for three or four years into the future in order that non-tenure members of the faculty may have a more accurate estimate of their future in the University.

*Procedures.* We propose that the Statement of Policy emphasize the necessity for Departments to consult other parties in the University that may have reliable evidence concerning the qualifications of a candidate for tenure. Our proposed statement of policy does not allow for the initiation of promotion by groups other than the Department, but the Committee believes that it is the function of the Divisional Committees to consider such irregular recommendations and, if they seem meritorious, to mediate between the Department and the sponsoring group.

While the Statement of Policy should not discourage a department from recommending the promotion or appointment to tenure of a candidate whose achievement in written scholarship is less impressive than his achievement as a teacher, it should prevent the advancement of one whose written work is undistinguished in its own right.

*General.* The Committee feels that problems arising from the matter of tenure occur less often as a result of lack of clarity in the rules than as a result of abdicating responsibility and taking refuge in the letter of the law. It might therefore be useful to call attention to the question of scholarly obligations in the Policy Statement itself.

In view of these considerations and other matters the Committee has discussed, we propose the following as statement of policy.

## A Proposed Statement of Policy on Tenure Appointments

### I. Standards

*A candidate for appointment or promotion to a tenure position, whether at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor, must possess scholarly distinction of a high quality as demonstrated both by his written work and by his teaching. His ability to contribute generally to the intellectual life and the efficient functioning of the community will also be given consideration. While the several manifestations of intellectual distinction are prerequisite to a candidate for tenure, it is recognized that the balance among them may vary from individual to individual and from field to field, and that there may be variation in the quantity of the written work, though the quality must always be high. Unusually effective teaching or an unusually large contribution to the community's well-being will serve as strong supports for the evidence of quality provided by the candidate's scholarly writing, but cannot compensate for a total absence of the most tangible and enduring demonstration of a scholar's distinction.*

*The criteria for appointment or promotion to an Associate Professorship with tenure differ from those for a Professorship in degree rather than in kind. It is expected of an Associate Professor with tenure that he will continue to develop and mature the qualities of scholarship which earned him his permanent appointment, so that within a reasonable period of time his value to the University and his national or international standing will be such as to make him a suitable candidate for a Professorship. A candidate should be recommended to an Associate Professorship with tenure only if the sponsoring Department is confident that he will merit a Professorship within a specifiable period. From time to time departments will be asked by the appropriate Divisional Committee to review the status of an Associate Professor with tenure in order to determine whether he has become a suitable candidate for a Professorship, and, if promotion cannot be recommended, will be asked to give him and the Committee an estimate of his future progress in the University.*

*It is expected of a Professor that he will continue to develop and mature the qualities of scholarship which earned him his appointment.*

### II. Openings

*Because the University's funds are not unlimited and because in many departments the teaching function requires a large number of young scholars, there will not always be tenure openings available even for fully qualified candidates. A tenure position cannot therefore be regarded as a due reward for past services, no matter how valuable. On making recommendations to permanent positions, the departments will be asked to make clear the suitability of the candidate for filling the educational needs of the Department and the University. It is, however, the University's duty to make every effort to accommodate scholars of exceptional distinction.*

### III. Procedures

*The Department will recommend a candidate for an Associate Professorship with tenure to the appropriate Tenure Appointments Committee after consultation with all parties who are able to contribute reliable evidence concerning the candidate's qualifications, including, in the case of a candidate for promotion, the directors of inter- or extra-departmental programs in which the candidate has served. The opinion of outstanding scholars in the candidate's field is highly desirable, and in all cases the confidence in the candidate of the Department's own experts will be of great importance to the progress of the recommendation.*

*The procedure for appointment or promotion to a Professorship is the same as for an Associate Professorship with tenure. In the case of a Professorship, the candidate's national or international distinction in his scholarly field will be readily establishable.*

### IV. General

*The continued preeminence of the University depends not on guidelines to policy but on the wisdom and integrity of those responsible for recommending appointments and promotions to tenure positions. This is a responsibility that scholars at Yale have long jealously guarded and will continue to exercise with scholarly discrimination and care, whether in their capacity as members of Departments, of Tenure Appointments Committees, or of the Board of Permanent Officers.*

### Prospects for Promotions and Tenure

The existence of tenure is a part, but only one part, of a larger problem created by structure, size, and rate of growth of the faculty. The problem is, very simply, that there are more qualified candidates for tenure positions than there are tenure positions available. Only a fraction of the instructors and assistant professors can ever be promoted at Yale to the rank of full professor, no matter how high their qualifications might be. If the number of Professorships is not to be expanded indefinitely at Yale, the problem would exist to some degree even if tenure did not. But since tenure does exist, it is useful to consider the problem from the aspect of tenure.

At Yale the proportion of junior faculty members who can reasonably expect to be promoted to tenure positions is necessarily small. According to the best estimate we can make from recent experience, less than a third of the non-tenure faculty members at Yale will be promoted to tenure positions at Yale.\*

That such a low proportion of non-tenure faculty members can reasonably look forward to promotion at Yale raises questions about those who do not get promoted here. What assistance do they receive from their departments in finding new positions? Where do they go? How well does their departure serve the interests of Yale, of the institutions to which they move, of the country at large, and of themselves? The Committee has canvassed the various departments for information on the destinations of non-tenure faculty members leaving Yale during the past five years. This information cannot be easily summarized, but it is apparent that most of those who leave, far from "perishing," move on to higher positions at good universities. The founding of many new colleges and universities throughout the country, and the rapid expansion of staff in many existing institutions, creates a demand for experienced faculty members which those leaving Yale help to fill, and which they can often fill with distinction. At the same time,

\* The basis for this estimate is explained in the Appendix.

Yale is served by preserving the balance between tenure and non-tenure faculty which is most beneficial to productive scholarship.

The rapid growth of higher education in the United States – much more rapid than Yale itself can expect to grow – not only makes it relatively easy for those leaving Yale to find attractive positions elsewhere; it makes it difficult for Yale to retain even those junior faculty members which it would like to retain. Rapidly growing institutions, in great competition for qualified faculty, can and often will offer tenure positions to relatively young men. They hope to capture the allegiance of bright scholars before they become nationally known, and they are confident that continuing growth will reduce to negligible proportions the cost of occasional mistakes in judgment.

If Yale is to attract and retain young faculty members of the calibre it desires and needs, without at the same time lowering its standards for tenure to compete with other universities, it must compensate its junior faculty for their somewhat modest prospects of promotion at Yale. The most attractive compensations are outstanding salaries and facilities, first-rate students, and the highest quality of tenure faculty members, who as colleagues provide the main attraction for young members in any profession.

### Special Problems

*Tenure Associate Professors Approaching Retirement.* For a variety of reasons, some Associate Professors with tenure appointments are not promoted to the rank of Professor. The Committee feels that a person who has devoted the major portion of his professional life in service to Yale should not forever be denied a Professorship. We therefore recommend that:

*Every Associate Professor be promoted to the rank of Professor at the age of 65, or if he retires before the age of 65, at the time of his retirement.*



*Variations Within the University.* While granting the desirability, in principle, of establishing uniform standards for promotion and appointment to tenure posts in all divisions and departments of the University, the Committee recognizes that certain salient differences do exist.

It has long been established, for example, that the rate of scholarly maturation in the natural sciences is significantly greater than that in the humanities. Therefore the decision to grant or withhold tenure will ordinarily be faced at an earlier age for candidates in the natural sciences.

As a further example, the pattern of promotion to tenure ranks from within the faculty or of appointments to these ranks from outside the University will depend in considerable measure upon the reputation of the particular department involved. For departments of nationally recognized excellence it will be relatively easy to attract younger, non-tenure faculty of the highest calibre; a significant number of these, although far from all, will be expected to meet the criteria for promotion to tenure. In less favored departments, perhaps in a phase of building or rebuilding, tenure posts will more often be filled by appointing distinguished candidates from other institutions.

To encompass differences like these equitably within the framework of the overall policies of the University requires flexibility and wisdom, particularly in the Divisional Committees. Although the three present Committees for the Natural Sciences, the Social Sciences, and the Humanities are of rather recent origin, they are already of signal importance in matters of this kind. We look to them to provide vigorous and informed leadership in mediating between the policies and needs of the University as a whole and the specific requirements of its different parts.

*Interdisciplinary Programs.* The growth of interdisciplinary programs of teaching and research, particularly the Area Studies and the undergraduate Divisional and Directed Studies programs, poses special problems for the appointment process.

Much of the work of a man participating in one of these programs may lie outside the bounds of his departmental program of instruction; yet it is his department that must propose him for promotion. The danger may arise that a candidate not receive the recommendation of his department because it has overlooked the scholarly contributions he has made to a broader University program. Hence it is imperative to assure that these extradepartmental considerations are fully recognized and appreciated at the departmental level as well as at the level of the divisional committee. Although the deans of the Graduate School and Yale College, the Executive Secretary of the Concilium on International Studies, and the three divisional directors all assume some of the responsibility for bringing these considerations to the attention of the departments, it is desirable that a regular procedure be established.

We therefore recommend that:

*At the beginning of every academic year each department chairman should give the director of the relevant divisional committee the names of all individuals about whom tenure decisions are likely to be made by the department during the course of that year—together with a list of their various functions within the University. It should be the responsibility of the divisional director to inform the head or the senior members of an interdepartmental program when one of their colleagues is likely to be considered for a tenure post. Members of an interdepartmental program who wished to do so should be encouraged to furnish written statements evaluating the candidate's contributions. The director of the divisional committee should forward these statements to the chairman of the appropriate department for use in its deliberations.*

### Appendix: Consequences of Yale's Faculty Structure for Promotions and Tenure

In any university, the chance for the average junior faculty member to secure a tenure position depends upon the rate of growth of the faculty, the average length of time spent in non-tenure and in tenure positions, the proportion of tenure appointments made from outside the University, and on the faculty profile—the distribution of faculty among the various ranks. The more rapidly a faculty is growing and the longer the average length of time spent in non-tenure positions, the better will be the chances of the junior faculty for promotion to tenure. The longer the average length of time spent in tenure positions, the larger the proportion of the faculty in non-tenure positions, the worse will be their chances.

During the past decade the total faculty at Yale has grown by 25 per cent, an average of 2.3 per cent per annum. This increase reflected partly an increase of 17 per cent in total student enrollment (from 7369 in 1954–55 to 8614 in 1964–65), partly an increase in the number of fields which a modern university must include in its curriculum and research, and partly a growth in research time being made available to Yale's faculty, both in residence and through leaves of absence. It seems reasonable to expect, on the basis of present plans, that the growth of the faculty will not exceed this rate in the future, and may well fall somewhat short of it.

The average age at which tenure appointments are made to the Yale Faculty of Arts and Sciences is 37, although this of course varies from department to department. A man remaining until retirement can thus spend 30 years in a tenure position. Since some tenure members retire earlier or resign for employment elsewhere, the average length of time spent in a tenure position is perhaps around 25 years. Under Yale conventions, the average length of time spent in a non-tenure position cannot normally exceed ten years and is probably closer to six or seven years, since some non-tenure members leave before they are up for promotion.

Table 1. A Profile of Yale's Faculty of Arts and Sciences

	1954–55	1959–60	1964–65
Tenure .....	190	262	293
Professor .....	140	161	213
Associate Professor .....	50	101	80
Non-Tenure .....	269	256	281
Associate Professor .....	40	19	43
Assistant Professor .....	111	133	181
Instructor .....	118	104	57
Total .....	459	518	574

At present, 51 per cent of the total Faculty of Arts and Sciences hold tenure positions (Table 1). This marks a substantial increase from the 41 per cent of ten years ago, and some further increase in the proportion of tenure positions is probable, though not to the same degree as in the past decade.

If the rate of growth of the faculty and the average length of time spent in tenure and non-tenure positions are the same in the future as they have been in the recent past, and if the tenure faculty remains at 51 per cent of the total faculty, then the tenure openings available in any year will number only about two-fifths of the non-tenure faculty coming up for promotion. Moreover, roughly one-third of the present tenure faculty was appointed from outside the University, and if this proportion persists, only two in seven non-tenure faculty members at Yale will be promoted to tenure positions at Yale.

These figures depend very much upon the proportion of the total faculty who occupy tenure positions. For example, the ratio of new tenure positions to non-tenure faculty members eligible for promotion would rise from two-fifths to one-half if the proportion of tenure members on the faculty were stabilized at 56 per cent rather than at 51 per cent. With the past proportion of outside appointments, one-third of the non-tenure faculty members could then expect promotion to tenure at Yale. During the transitional period, when the number of tenure positions was rising more rapidly than the total faculty

(as it did from 1954 to 1959), the ratio of tenure openings to those eligible would be even higher.

These calculations represent averages for the entire faculty of arts and sciences during a period of steady growth. The rate of growth and the faculty profile of course vary greatly from department to department and from time to time. A few departments have actually declined in size during the past decade, while others have doubled. There is similarly a wide variation in the ratio of tenure positions to total department membership, from a low of one-third to a high of one hundred per cent. Some of these variations reflect temporary situations, others reflect important differences in the characteristics of the various fields. Thus the representative calculations given above cannot be applied mechanically to every department. Growth may be so low in some departments, and retirements so few, that even outstanding junior faculty members cannot look to promotion. Other departments may grow rapidly enough to promote all of their qualified junior members. The calculations merely give some indication of the overall characteristics of the faculty, and underscore the large proportion of junior faculty who must move to positions away from Yale.