

**Academic Senate Agenda
February 10, 2005
3:00 p.m. I-330**

I. ROUTINE MATTERS

1. Approval of Revised Academic Senate Summary for November 11, 2004 ([pages 2-3](#))
2. Approval of Academic Senate Summary for December 9, 2004 ([pages 4-5](#))
3. Approval of discipline for Monica Marshall ([page 6](#))
4. Confirmation of Election: Adjunct Senator John Albert

II. REPORTS/INFORMATION

5. Commencement Review Committee

III. ACTION ITEMS

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6. Proposal for Grades on major-required courses ([page 7](#))
7. Calendar Committee discussion
8. Academic Freedom Statement
 - a. Introduction ([page 8](#))
 - b. Current Board Policy ([page 9](#))
 - c. Possible new Academic Freedom Statement ([pages 10 - 11](#))
 - d. Background Material ([pages 12 - 15](#))

Open Forum/adjournment (anticipated time 4:30/4:45 p.m.)

Academic Senate Summary
November 11, 2004

REVISED SUMMARY

ALL REVISIONS FROM 12/19/04 MEETING ARE IN BOLD

Attendance: Michael Dermody, Pamela Williams-Paez, Deanna Davis, Chelley Maple, Sam Salvatori, Stan Wright, Steve Dixon, Fred D'Astoli, Mike Gunther, Miriam Golberg, Ruzanna Baytaryan, Kevin Anthony, Joan Jacobson, Edel Alonso, Pamela Borrelli, Michael Sherry, Sherrill Pennington, **and Wendy Shaner.**

The on-line approvals of the curriculum summaries for September 2, 16, and October 7 were confirmed. This was an unusual situation that required some flexibility by the Senate.

The consent calendar, with the Academic Senate meeting summaries for October 14; as well as the Curriculum Summary for October 21, 2004 was approved.

Statewide Senate Resolutions were discussed by Michael Dermody. As he had predicted the State Wide Senate decided to wait until Spring 2005 to vote the key issues of raising the Math and English requirements statewide. If you are interested in a full packet of the resolutions please contact Michael to get a copy of all the resolutions.

Questions regarding PAC-B were brought before the Senate. It was reported that PAC-B would be reviewing its own procedures to be sure that they are still appropriate, especially in regards to issues of communication with the campus constituency. This discussion also segued into a discussion of faculty and administrative roles in the curriculum process. It was pointed out that the curriculum committee will be developing a set of standard operating procedures, and the question of who can be a "gatekeeper" will be addressed in that process.

The Commencement Review Committee has met, and will continue to report to the Senate on possible revisions and suggestions.

Bomb Threats was the unexpected hot topic of the meeting. Edel Alonso, reporting on a recent MAC meeting, reviewed the discussion on procedures the campus will **use** for reported bomb threats. It was noted that we have a member of the security staff who, as a former LAPD officer, has had many years of experience with bomb threats; the discussion also mentioned that there were several on-campus training sessions on how to deal with these situations. Faculty members were reminded that they should contact security whenever they see something that looks suspicious.

In case of an actual bomb threat (or even a "bomb threat drill"), when an alarm goes off faculty members should move their classes out of and as far away from buildings as possible., However, do NOT go into the parking lots – we don't want students run over by emergency vehicles entering the campus or by panicking students fleeing the campus!

The Senate voted to Clarify Catalog Rights. A student can utilize any new catalog requirements for their major without forfeiting their right to use their older catalog rights for general education requirements.

A spirited discussion was held on “Section 508”. It was stressed that all college web sites must be in compliance with accessibility standards set by federal and state law. We will be establishing a compliance committee that will assist faculty members and departments in ensuring that their web sites are Section 508 compliant. A website might be **removed** from the college server if it is deemed to be out of compliance, and is not updated within a reasonable time. Due to the number of websites on the campus server, implementation of “Section 508” will be phased in over a period of time.

For questions on what is (or is not) “Section 508 compliant”, or questions/concerns on how to bring a website into compliance, please contact Wendy Shaner.

A faculty member brought up concerns on making on-line class material compliant. However, since the discussion focused on web pages and not on-line delivery methods, it was decided that this was another topic for discussion at a later meeting.

Proposed changes in the Hiring Procedures were discussed. A key factor would be **to** expand the “window of time” which would require an adjunct to go through **the** entire re-application process after a spell away from the college. Another controversial discussion was over the necessity of requiring letters of reference for adjunct applications. This will be discussed at the next Senate meeting.

Deanna Davis spoke briefly about Program Review. It was suggested that, in light of upcoming SLOs, the program review cycle be changed from annual to once-every-three years. This issue will return for discussion.

The Student Senate reported that they are working on a survey of students regarding a smoke-free campus. To ensure the integrity of the survey, they want to be sure that it is not influenced by faculty members (although they said this with the greatest of respect and politeness!). However, a faculty member could contact the ASG office if the faculty member would appreciate the students in his/her class being given the survey.

The students also discussed their plans to provide wireless access throughout the “S” building.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

**Academic Senate Summary
December 9, 2004**

Attendance: Pamela Borrelli, John Bartke, Wendy Shaner, Deanna Davis, Edel Alonso, Michael Dermody, Barry Gribbons, Fred D'Astoli, Steve Dixon, Joan Jacobson, Patty Robinson, Chelley Maple, Sam Salvatori, Phil Marcellin, Mike Wilding, Mike Gunther, Miriam Goldberg, Lea Templer, Anaïd Palmer, and Sherrill Pennington.

The consent calendar was approved, which included the Senate and Curriculum meeting summaries, as well as the discipline assignment for Anthony Michaelides. Typographical changes were made to the Senate summary, including changing the word "sue" to "use", and adding Wendy Shaner as being present.

The Commencement Review Committee provided an update. The committee had discussed alternative locations for graduation ceremonies, including the upper field by the PE building which could provide more room, parking, as well as fewer structures for children to climb up upon. Although the football stadium was considered, it was not well received as a sight for graduation. The committee also discussed the faculty serving as an "honor guard" for students during the processional and the recession. The committee will reconvene in the Spring Semester.

Edel Alonso gave a review on the last Board of Trustees meeting. The Board will be reviewing Board Policy, as well as work on Board communication.

Revisions to the Adjunct hiring process were reviewed.

Under the existing policy, adjuncts that do not teach at COC for two consecutive semesters are removed from the eligibility pool. To re-enter they must complete the entire application and interview process. Under the proposal, adjuncts that do not teach at COC for two consecutive semesters could re-enter the eligibility pool by completing an "updated resume" form. However, adjuncts that had not taught at COC for more than three years would have to go through the entire application/interview process. **The Senate approved this revision.**

A second revision was also accepted. This was a provision created a form that indicated when an adjunct was interested in teaching for additional disciplines here at COC.

A third proposal was NOT accepted. Since no one came to champion the idea to change letters of recommendation from "mandatory" to "highly recommended", the Senate did not approve that proposal.

The Senate accepted a Curriculum Committee proposal regarding "D-" grades. Although COC does not issue "+/-" grades, some schools do issues these grades. Datatel is now able to process "+/-" grades on transcripts from other schools. The Curriculum Committee proposed that classes with a grade of "D-" would NOT be used to fulfill any general education requirements.

Calendar Issues were brought up in a discussed led by Mike Wilding.

Santa Monica is using a “compressed calendar” that might be useful in approaching the high enrollment growth that COC will soon be facing. However, institution of a “compressed calendar” would necessitate discussions on a host of related issues, including: time blocks, room utilization, impact on non-teaching faculty, viability of spring break, classified holiday schedule, lack of down time for facilities and maintenance, additional classified staffing requirements, FLEX schedule, athletic programs and payroll operations.

A compressed calendar could increase the total number of class minutes per week, which would be needed to retain the total number of class minutes per semester.

If adopted, a compressed calendar could also make it easier for students’ attending other colleges to have their schedules more closely aligned. It could also make it easier to hire adjuncts, whose schedules at different colleges could be better coordinated. Although summer break would be shorter, winter breaks would be longer.

Discussion was also held on the possibility of an expanded winter intersession that could generate additional FTE. It is suggested that we could move an intersession into the Spring 2006 semester by a couple of weeks (shrinking the summer session of 2006).

Currently this is only a proposal. Lea Templer will report back to the Senate.

The Section 508 committee (Web Accessibility) has met. As a subcommittee of the Senate, they will be presenting a policy proposal at the next senate meeting. For additional information, please contact Mike Gunther or Wendy Shaner.

In the Open Forum, Steve Dixon spoke of a new Fire Tech Regional Fire Academy. If created here at COC, it would require a great deal of curriculum writing, as well as help to increase our FTE.

Adjourned at 4:20 p.m. Have a wonderful winter break. We will see you February 10, 2005.

Date: January 19, 2005
To: Michael Dermody, President, Academic Senate
CC: Diane Fiero, Vice President, Human Resources
From: Kelly Natoli, Human Resources
Subject: Discipline Assignment

The following information is provided for discipline assignment:

Marshall, Monica

Current discipline(s) on file: **No Discipline Placement**

The following information is provided for discipline assignment:

- Bachelor's Degree in Human Development (obtained 6/28/04) plus 5 years of related experience

It would appear that Ms. Marshall meets the minimum qualifications for the discipline of **Child Development/Early Childhood Education** under equivalency #5.

TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Curriculum Committee:
RE: Proposal on Grades required for Courses in Associate Degree Majors

The Curriculum Committee accepts the recommendation of the Degree Audit Committee on the matter below and asks the Senate to approve this proposal:

Proposal:

It is proposed that student must receive a minimum grade of “C” in all courses required for an Associate Degree major.

Rationale:

As part of a continuous effort to upgrade the integrity of the Associate Degree, a recommendation was made by the Degree Audit Committee on January 13 to require that a C grade be required in all courses required for the major for the Associate Degree. This will make the Associate Degree major requirements equivalent to the COC certificate requirements in which students must earn at least a C in every course and the policy that most universities have that courses in the major must be completed with a minimum of a C grade.

DISCUSSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Board's policy on academic freedom was adopted 23 years ago (March 15, 1982). In the intervening time, there have been occasions when the faculty has reviewed that policy, with an eye to see if there were any suggestions or revisions that could be made.

The policy was reviewed in the late 1990's, and again in spring of 2002. Both times, the faculty felt that the existing policy was sufficient and did not need to be substantially reviewed.

It is now appropriate to review the District's policy on Academic Freedom. In this discussion, there are some key questions that we might want to keep in mind:

1. The current policy tends to address general issues. Is it too vague, or does the current statement allow enough flexibility to respond to challenging issues as they arrive?
2. Are there areas that need to be addressed that the current policy does not address?
3. Is the current policy acceptable, but to "invisible" – should steps would we need to take to make the policy more visible.

Attached are three documents:

- A. Current Board Policy
- B. Draft Proposal for a new Policy on Academic Freedom
- C. Backup material from the American Association of University Professors.

While there is obviously a vital faculty interest in Academic Freedom, this is not a parochial issue for one segment of the college community. In many ways, this goes to the heart of the institution, and is of interest to all segments of the college community.

Happy reading!

CURRENT BOARD POLICY ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

614. Study of Controversial Issues

A. Assumption Basic to District Policy

1. That free discussion is a 'right extended to thoughtful citizens, but that no one has the right to abuse this freedom by advocating the overthrow of the government by force.
2. That a free society functions efficiently only if its citizens have the right to discuss, to debate, and to disagree constructively.
3. That the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech is meaningful only to the extent that the majority is willing to hear honest expressions of unpopular ideas by minority groups.
4. That an educated citizenry, fully aware of all the evidence, is best able to preserve the valuable heritage of American democratic institutions.
5. That the College has an obligation to its community to promote healthy discussion as an education force.
6. That our way of life is attractive enough and our institutions are sturdy enough to stand comparison with any which exist in any culture.
7. That the truth will prevail in the market place of ideas.

B. District Policy

1. Within the framework of the orderly processes of our democratic Constitutional society, the faculty of the College will have freedom to consider all issues which will contribute to the development of its students. The criteria to be followed in selecting issues for study will be:
 - a. The issue should contribute to the prescribed course of study and the general education program of the College.
 - b. It should be of sufficient interest to encourage participation by the students.
 - c. It should provide opportunity for critical thinking, tolerance and understanding of conflicting points of view.
 - d. It should be one about which sufficient information is available to allow for discussion and evaluation on a factual and reasonable basis.
2. Pursuant to this adopted policy, presentation in open forum of speakers with varying points of view in current issues may be undertaken by the Board and the administration of the Santa Clarita Community College District in fulfilling its obligations as an educative force in its community.
 - a. In such a forum, any program involving an issue or a person deemed to be controversial or extreme will follow the pattern of joint discussion', care being taken to insure a balanced presentation.
 - b. Approval of campus speakers is a function of the Superintendent-President. The Superintendent-

President will be responsible for maintaining a balanced program of free and open discussion.

Adopted d 4/15/82

PROPOSED STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Colleges are established by society to perpetuate the values of a democratic social order, to seek new perspectives and solutions, and to develop citizens capable of separating right from wrong, fact from falsehood, profound from profane.

As an individual, the college student expects to learn to understand her/his environments, her/his heritage, and those of others. Basic to this endeavor is the right of all participants in higher education to pursue truth. Since truth is elusive and, when faced squarely often painful, the quest for it must be protected from those both within and without the institution who would narrow the scope of learning and teaching. To this end the following principles are enunciated:

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Academic freedom is an obligation, not a mere privilege. Our mandate is not to seek "some truth" or "safe truth," but to seek truth.

The scholarly pursuit of knowledge rests on the obligation to question, to analyze, and to evaluate the old and the new, the practical and the theoretical, the accepted and the controversial. The obligation to question brings with it the obligation to be questioned in the marketplace of ideas. No idea, person, or institution is immune from responsible scrutiny. However, the irresponsible, the insensitive, and the fearful must not be allowed to deny, limit, or distort the freedom of inquiry which is at the very heart of a democratic society and is the essence of higher education.

Intrinsic to these concepts is the understanding that unpopular political opinions, taboo sexual behaviors and unorthodox religious viewpoints may be part of course content. It is recognized that an essential function of education is a probing of received opinions and an exploration of ideas that may cause some students discomfort.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND OBLIGATIONS

Academic freedom implies responsibility and fairness. In a pluralistic society no one has the right to impose his own version of the truth on others. All serious theories have a right to be heard. The job of the teacher in dealing with conflicting concepts is not to endorse one view but to help the student acquire scholarly methods of investigation and evaluation.

However, the teacher will lose the respect of her/his students if he/she appears to be either a dogmatic pedant or a moral cipher. An occasional expression of opinion, so labeled, is consonant with scholarly virtue.

Those who enjoy freedom must be worthy of trust. In the classroom the teacher must know the boundaries of one's subjects and exercise care in handling controversial matters about which one is not professionally qualified to speak. As in other aspects of life, one must observe the canons of good taste. Self-criticism and self-control are the essence of professionalism.

Freedom to seek truth is pointless if the search is not carried on actively. The community college instructor is not expected to engage in advanced research -- although one should be free to do so -- but the absence of tangible reports and monographs does not excuse one from the need to develop knowledge of one's subject and one's skills as an instructor.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND SUPPORT

An education which seeks to shield students from unpopular ideas, unpleasant facts and unwelcome problems does a disservice to the students and is a discredit to the community which supports the institution on the assumption that the purpose of study is a free, fearless and unbiased pursuit of knowledge

The freedom of all faculty to inquire, to teach controversial content, to model and encourage critical thinking, and to present all viewpoints in the teaching and learning process can only be guaranteed by institutional support of academic freedom.

Correspondingly, the freedom of all students to inquire, to have access to the full range of information available, to explore difficult and controversial material, to develop and practice critical thinking skills, to operate in a classroom climate free of intimidation and censorship must be similarly guaranteed.

Faculty rights to give and student rights to receive grades free from political influence, business oriented productivity standards or threat of lawsuit are secured by the institutional processes which support academic freedom.

The willingness to take risks in the assignment of textbooks, student learning activities and honest feedback to students requires insulation from the threat of political or personal attack. Both students and faculty need the opportunity to take risks in a supportive environment.

Finally, academic freedom must be extended to all faculty, tenure, contract, and adjunct. Faculty members have the duty to inform new faculty of their academic freedom rights and responsibilities.

IDENTITY

**BACKGROUND MATERIAL:
ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure With 1970 Interpretive Comments

(NOTE: This statement was also adopted by the Statewide Academic Senate of California Community Colleges)

In 1940, following a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges agreed upon a restatement of principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This restatement is known to the profession as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The 1940 Statement is printed below, followed by Interpretive Comments as developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges during 1969. The governing bodies of the associations, meeting respectively in November 1989 and January 1990, adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to assure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher (The word "teacher" as used in this document is understood to include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties) or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights. [1] (numbers in square brackets refer to Interpretive Comments which follow.)

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

a. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

b. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their

subject.[2] Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.[3]

c. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution. [4]

1940 INTERPRETATIONS

At the conference of representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges on November 7-8, 1940, the following interpretations of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure were agreed upon:

1. That its operation should not be retroactive.
2. That all tenure claims of teachers appointed prior to the endorsement should be determined in accordance with the principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.
3. If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph (a)(4) of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

1970 INTERPRETIVE COMMENTS

Following extensive discussions on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with leading educational associations and with individual faculty members and administrators, a joint committee of the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges met during 1969 to reevaluate this key policy statement. On the basis of the comments received, and the discussions that ensued, the joint committee felt the preferable approach was to formulate interpretations of the Statement in terms of the experience gained in implementing and applying the Statement for over thirty years and of adapting it to current needs.

The committee submitted to the two associations for their consideration the following "Interpretive Comments." These interpretations were adopted by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in April 1970 and endorsed by the Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting as Association policy.

In the thirty years since their promulgation, the principles of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure have undergone a substantial amount of refinement. This has evolved through a variety of processes, including customary acceptance, understandings mutually arrived at between institutions and professors or their representatives, investigations and reports by the American Association of University Professors, and formulations of statements by that association either alone or in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges. These comments represent the attempt of the two associations, as the original sponsors of the 1940 Statement, to formulate the most important of these refinements. Their incorporation here as Interpretive Comments is based upon the premise that the 1940 Statement is not a static code but a fundamental document designed to set a framework of norms to guide adaptations to changing times and circumstances.

Also, there have been relevant developments in the law itself reflecting a growing insistence by the courts on due process within the academic community which parallels the essential concepts of the 1940 Statement; particularly relevant is the identification by the Supreme Court of academic freedom as a right protected by the First Amendment. As the Supreme Court said in *Keyishian v. Board of Regents* 385 U.S. 589 (1967), "Our Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom."

The numbers refer to the designated portion of the 1940 Statement on which interpretive comment is made.

1. The Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors have long recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. Both associations either separately or jointly have consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in their utterances as citizens, in the exercise of their responsibilities to the institution and to students, and in their conduct when resigning from their institution or when undertaking government-sponsored research. Of particular relevance is the Statement on Professional Ethics, adopted in 1966 as Association policy. (A revision, adopted in 1987, was published in *Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP* 73 [July-August 1987]: 49.)

2. The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is "controversial." Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject.

3. Most church-related institutions no longer need or desire the departure from the principle of academic freedom implied in the 1940 Statement, and we do not now endorse such a departure.

4. This paragraph is the subject of an interpretation adopted by the sponsors of the 1940 Statement immediately following its endorsement which reads as follows:

If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph (a)(4) of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges the administration should remember

that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

Paragraph (c) of the 1940 Statement should also be interpreted in keeping with the 1964 "Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances" (AAUP Bulletin 51 [1965]: 29), which states inter alia: "The controlling principle is that a faculty member's expression of opinion as a citizen cannot constitute grounds for dismissal unless it clearly demonstrates the faculty member's unfitness for his or her position. Extramural utterances rarely bear upon the faculty member's fitness for the position. Moreover, a final decision should take into account the faculty member's entire record as a teacher and scholar."

Paragraph V of the Statement on Professional Ethics also deals with the nature of the "special obligations" of the teacher. The paragraph reads as follows:

As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of other obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

Both the protection of academic freedom and the requirements of academic responsibility apply not only to the full-time probationary as well as to the tenured teacher, but also to all others, such as part-time faculty and teaching assistants, who exercise teaching responsibilities.

5. The concept of "rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank" is intended to include any person who teaches a full-time load regardless of the teacher's specific title. (For a discussion of this question, see the "Report of the Special Committee on Academic Personnel Ineligible for Tenure," AAUP Bulletin 52 [1966]: 280-82.)

6. In calling for an agreement "in writing" on the amount of credit for a faculty member's prior service at other institutions, the Statement furthers the general policy of full understanding by the professor of the terms and conditions of the appointment. It does not necessarily follow that a professor's tenure rights have been violated because of the absence of a written agreement on this matter. Nonetheless, especially because of the variation in permissible institutional practices, a written understanding concerning these matters at the time of appointment is particularly appropriate and advantageous to both the individual and the institution. (For a more detailed statement on this question, see "On Crediting Prior Service Elsewhere as Part of the Probationary Period," AAUP Bulletin 64 [1978]: 274-75.)

7. The effect of this subparagraph is that a decision on tenure, favorable or unfavorable, must be made at least twelve months prior to the completion of the probationary period. If the decision is negative, the appointment for the following year becomes a terminal one. If the decision is affirmative, the provisions in the 1940 Statement with respect to the termination of services of teachers or investigators after the expiration of a probationary period should apply from the date when the favorable decision is made.