Report of Committee on The Precise Formulation of the Recommendations for the Reorganization of Departments, presented to the University Senate - May 28, 1910.

With the growth of the University it becomes increasingly important that the system of organization should

(1) Make possible the securing and retaining of as many men of the first grade of ability in each department as the needs of the field demand and the resources of the University permit.
(2) Be sufficiently flexible to favor the employment of each member of the Department in the kind of work to which he is best suited.

The statutes of the University, according to section 13 on page 7 of the Register for 1909-10, do not formally recognize any rank higher than that of Professor. Nevertheless it is understood that the maximum salary is paid to but one professor in each department who is known as "Head of the Department"; and the title "Head of the Department" is commonly understood, both within and without the University, to carry a rank superior to that of other professors. These two facts operate in practice to make it difficult to secure or retain men of high ability and recognized eminence for those professorships which are regarded as subordinate.

At present, as noted, a maximum salary is assigned to but one man in the department, called the Head, and certain administrative duties are required of him by statute. This system may conceivably be based on either of two grounds: (1) The larger salary and the title may be accorded in recognition of general eminence. In this case the assignment of administrative duties to the Head would seem to proceed on the presumption that the most eminent man is the proper person to administer the department. But (a) the most eminent man may not be well adapted to administration, and (b) even if he is capable in this direction it may be unwise for the University to use his time in this way rather than in research.

(2) The larger salary may be attached to the position primarily as special compensation for the administrative duties required. But this appears to place an unduly high valuation upon administration in the department as compared with research and teaching.

In view of these considerations your committee proposes the following resolutions:

RESOLVED, that the trustees of the University be requested to amend the statutes of the University as follows:

1. By providing that in the case of all departments hereafter organized, in the case of existing departments not having permanent heads at the present time, and in the case of existing departments now having permanent heads, whenever the headship of any department shall for any reason become vacant, the department in question shall be organized and managed in the following manner:

A. The department as a body, subject to the approval of the President and the Board of Trustees and subject to the general
statutes of the University, may and shall determine from time to time upon the general policy and work of the department, and include among its duties those of determining, in consultation with the dean, (a) upon the programme of studies offered by the department; (b) upon the candidacy of students for higher degrees; (c) upon examination of candidates for higher degrees; (d) upon the filling of theses for higher degrees; (e) upon the assignment of rooms for the department. It shall also have the duty (f) of editing a departmental journal, if any be edited; (g) of determining upon the policy of its library and the distribution and expenditure of its book or apparatus funds; (h) of providing for the examination and acceptance of the theses for higher degrees; (i) of deciding upon what persons shall be named to the President for appointment as officers of instruction in the department and what recommendations shall be made to the President concerning promotions in the department or concerning increase of salaries.

B. The administration of the department shall ordinarily be conducted through a chairman, who shall be appointed by the President for the department from the members of the department to serve a term of three years. At the end of this period a new or the same chairman shall be appointed at the pleasure of the President. The compensation of the chairman shall be such as may be agreed upon with the President and Board of Trustees.

In the case of large departments, a secretary may be appointed from the department to aid in the work of administration and shall receive an appropriate compensation and shall perform such of the duties of administration as shall be agreed upon with the President.

C. The chairman shall preside at all meetings of the department. He shall be the executive officer of the department and be charged with the power and duty of carrying out the policies and regulations adopted by the department. He shall be the official representative of the department in all communications with the President and with other officers and boards of the University, and also in all departmental communications with students.

D. In departmental meetings held for the purpose of recommending the appointment or promotion of officers of instruction in the department, of whatever grade, or for the purpose of recommending increase of salary or salaries in the department, the members having the right to be present and to vote shall be the full professors of the department. In departmental meetings held for all other purposes members having votes in their respective faculties shall have the right to be present and to vote.
II. By providing that in the cases mentioned in the first paragraph under I above, the salaries paid or rank given to members of a department shall be determined upon without reference to the method of departmental management, and that whenever the interests of the University seem to make it desirable, more than one person in the same department may be given the maximum rank and salary.

III. By providing that the principles and forms of organization outlined in Sections I and II above may be varied to suit the needs of departments which for any reason may appear to the President or Trustees to need peculiar or exceptional form of organization.
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December 10th, 1912.

President Lawrence Lowell,
Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass.

My dear Mr. Lowell:

The University of Chicago is contemplating a change in its present practice with regard to the use of the title professor. We are desirous of learning the practice of other institutions and I beg leave to ask that at your early convenience you kindly reply to the following questions.

1. Would you promote to a professorship a man distinguished in research but not successful as a teacher? Yes.

2. Would you promote to such professorship a man distinguished as a teacher but not entirely successful in research? Yes.

3. Do you recognize any distinction either in title or salary between men who are distinguished for research and constructive scholarship, and men eminent either as teachers or administrators? No. A man of the first quality in either line would be given maximum salary or title.

We shall greatly appreciate your courtesy in responding to this inquiry.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

Dean

JRA/n
December 13th, 1912.

My dear Dean Angell:

I have just received your letter of inquiry and in reply would state, that while we would wish our professors to be both distinguished in research and successful in their teaching, nevertheless, we have no sharp line of demarcation as regards promotion. We do not recognize any distinction in title or in salary between men who are distinguished for research and constructive scholarship, and men eminent either as teachers or as administrators.

We have promoted to professors, men who were particularly distinguished in research, and who were not particularly successful as teachers, and also, we have promoted men who were distinguished as teachers, but have not done any particular work of note in research.

With warmest regards,

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

To-
Dean James R. Angell,
Chicago, Ill.
My dear [Name]

I have just received your letter of

I only wish to reply now because I want to

more with the rest of the state and to pass this letter

in association with my association to your concern. We

are now in a position to comment on your

preparation. We are not conscious of any.

letter to the extent of giving you any information.

You mentioned your concern on the matter of

enough effort to understand or to explain

to your benefit to be prepared, and no one

were particularly affected by its reception, and

two weeks not being necessary to complete your

on your own initiative and make the best proposal to

compliance for your own good and to indicate with

voice to the members,

With warm regards,

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Jan 1, 1939

664
McGILL UNIVERSITY,
MONTREAL.

December 17th, 1912.

Dean Angell,
Faculty of Arts, Literature & Science,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Mr. Angell:-

The answer to your first inquiry so far as I am entitled to speak would be "yes" with the proviso that the teaching interests of the department are already safeguarded and preferably that the professor promoted for research have a colleague of coordinate rank known to be especially successful as a teacher.

The answer to No. 2 is also in the affirmative with a similar proviso. Personally I do not believe that any great university should be content with having as head of a department a man of only local reputation for teaching. Each head of a department ought to bear a name that counts for something in the field beyond the limits of his own university.

In saying this I do not mean to imply that teaching interests ought not to come first. If that were struck out to one person for each subject I think the answer to your second inquiry would have to be in the affirmative without qualification.

In regard to your third inquiry I cannot say that we have ever gone so far as to draw invidious distinctions. The men who draw the highest salaries here are always the most distinguished on the staff, generally on the side of creative

[Signature]
ability and original power.

Yours truly,

W. Peterson

Principal.
December 14th, 1912

Dean J. R. Angel,
University of Chicago.
My dear Dean Angel:

The questions that you put to me are rather difficult to answer. As far as I am aware the professors among us who are distinguished for their research work are either good teachers or sufficiently successful as not to cause comment. On the other hand we have professors who are distinguished in teaching, who have devoted themselves so distinctly to this for which they have a particular gift, that they have done little in the way of research. Some of these men have turned their abilities also in administrative directions in the University, and are extremely useful for the conduct of its work. So far we have made no distinction in title between the men of these classes, and I think it improbable that we shall do so.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

President.
Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dec. 18, 12.

My dear Mr. Taft,

As regards the question of promotion before the Senate Committee, I think

1. Teaching ability should receive much higher consider-
ation than at present. I would not favor the College Professorship, as I think it would inevitably lead to an inveterate routine. It would be regarded as distinctly inferior to a real professorship.

2. Administrative ability should have recognition, and parity at both research and teaching and should very seldom be ground for promotion to the full professorship.

Yours very truly,

Theo. G. Soares.
December 17, 1912.

Mr. Suito:

Dear Dean Angell:

I cannot consider anything more detrimental to the well being of the University than any measure which would ignore the value of the teacher or fail to give him generous recognition. A brilliant and successful teacher seems to me to be worth far more to the University than the maker of books and it is disheartening to our young and enthusiastic teachers to be compelled to give up one vocation for the other under the stress of academic authority. I would even be sorry to have the term "collegiate" used for I find that our graduate students need assistance and example quite as much as undergraduates.

I am

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Marcia Salbot.
December 1, 1922

Dear Sir,

I cannot consider my present work here satisfactory to the full extent of the University's requirements. In my position, not only must I be a teacher, but I must also take the initiative and responsibility for improving the teaching and learning environment. The necessity of providing additional support and resources to our students is evident. I feel compelled to take action to address these issues.

I am drafting a letter to the Academic Council to express my concerns and propose solutions. I would appreciate your support in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Chicago, December 16, 1912.

Prof. J. H. Tufts,
Faculty Exchange.

My dear Prof. Tufts,

The question in regard to the proper basis of promotion in the university is a very difficult one. My own recommendations have been based upon the three points stated in your first paragraph, though I am inclined to believe that the problem has been complicated for us here to an even larger degree perhaps than at other institutions, by the effort made from the foundation of the university to make administrative ability inseparable from high scholarship. It seldom happens that scholarship and administrative ability are possessed by the same person, and in cases in which this is true, one endowment or the other must, it seems to me, almost inevitably suffers from the conjunction. This is especially true if administrative functions are interpreted to mean, not formulation of departmental aims and policies, but the routine work of supervision and giving personal attention to petty details, such as arrangements for occasional lectures (with the obligation of seeing that no error occurs in the announcements, and no oversight in the provision for a lecture room) and various other details of a purely secretarial nature. Few men can attend to these matters and have either the time or the energy left for research or the direction of advanced studies.

I am somewhat at a loss in regard to the suggested title collegiate professor. On the one hand, such a title has, I think, been employed for several years in the Johns Hopkins University. On the other hand, there is I believe an especially obvious distinction in the use of any term which implies less than the real thing. It occurs to me though I have not given the matter mature thought that the difficulty might be met, not by using collegiate professor as a designation for those whom it does not seem desirable to advance to a full professorship, but by using the term university professor or some equivalent, to designate those who are expected to devote their time specifically to the university, as distinguished
December 16, 1925

Dear Mr. Tuttle,

While I am not a member of the faculty, I feel I can make a few suggestions concerning the Department of Mathematics.

I believe the department could benefit from the addition of more advanced courses, particularly in the areas of abstract algebra and modern topology. These courses would be especially valuable for graduate students in mathematics and would help to prepare them for further study.

Furthermore, I recommend that the department consider the purchase of additional textbooks and reference materials to support these advanced courses. This would not only enhance the learning experience for our students but also improve the department's reputation.

I am available to discuss these ideas further if you wish to do so. Please let me know if you would like to schedule a meeting at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
Prof. J. H. Tufts.  

December 16, 1812.  

from collegiate instruction.  

Yours very truly,  

John M. Manly
Chicago, December 21st, 1912.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIS OF PROMOTION:

Gentlemen:

Looking at the question concerning which you call for a judgment purely in the abstract, I should reply to your inquiry as follows:

I see no possible method of maintaining a high grade graduate school which shall take rank with the foremost universities of the Old World if the basis of promotion to a full professorship is anything whatever than a certain degree of eminence on the part of the candidate in his chosen line of scholarship. Just as soon as other standards are admitted the way is opened for the introduction of "deadwood" and the inevitable lowering and the invalidations of the university's preeminence. It is commonplace among our European critics that the lack of productiveness of the average American university is due to our failure to demand preeminence in scholarship as the sine qua non of university professorship.

This does not mean that instruction and administration are to be sacrificed to research. You can demand as much instructional ability and administrative ability as you wish in addition to scholarly ability as a condition for professorship, and you can still find enough men to fill up your faculty, but to drop out the scholarship as an inevitable condition seems to me to be dealing a death-blow to Chicago as a great graduate school.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Chicago, December 10th, 1919

TO THE COMMITTEE ON WEARS OF PROTOCION:

Gentlemen:

Looking at the discussion concerning what you call "a uniform policy in the service" I want very much to try to explain the following:

I see no possible method of maintaining a high grade of discipline of the firemen and the public as well when the uniform is properly fitted and the men have a suitable equipment to perform their duties. The men are willing and able to perform their duties but they are not able to do so as properly and efficiently when they are not properly equipped.

This does not mean that the firemen are not able to perform their duties but it does mean that they are not able to do so as efficiently as they should.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

APPENDIX
My dear Mr. Tufts,

In reference to the question of basis for promotion, as submitted to members of the Senate, I feel that there is an important difference of opinion as to the meaning of the term "research." There is a widespread tendency to limit it to what is really only one kind of research: the investigation of the newer problems in special fields. True productive work, involving the same scholarship and original power, is required for the organization of the body of knowledge accumulated in special investigations, and its redistribution through the various branches of study. Advances in specialization ought to be accompanied by corresponding advances in the generalization and extension of knowledge. If then, any principle is to be formulated on this question, I should like some such term as "original productive work" to be substituted for the more limited term "research." If this were done, there might be less need for Mr. Angell's suggestion of distinctive names for distinct types of professorship.

Very sincerely yours,

Richard G. Moulton
23 December 1922

Dear Sir,

I am writing to inform you of an important difference of opinion on a
point in the treaty between Germany and Austria. It is my understanding
that under Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Treaty signed in Paris, on 28
November, 1918, Germany is entitled to a share in the Austrian customs
revenue for a period of 20 years. However, in the text of the treaty, it
appears that this provision is not included.

I have consulted with the experts in our department, who have
confirmed my understanding of the treaty. It is of great importance that
this point be clarified, as it may affect the interpretation of the
Treaty.

I therefore request that you take steps to clarify this matter and
inform me of the official position of your department.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
December 17th, 1912.

Professor J.H. Tufts,
Faculty Exchange.

My dear Professor Tufts:

With regard to your question concerning the basis for promotion I may say that I think there should be only one criterion for a promotion to a full professorship — namely, distinction in one's chosen field of work. The consensus of opinion among scholars or investigators in a given line of work will generally give a pretty correct indication. I do not believe that the mental appropriation of the work of other men, even if the information gathered is given out in a correct and interesting manner, should constitute a basis of promotion to the highest honor within the University ranks. Under some conditions, of course, an individual may react upon the body of existing knowledge in such a way as to create new points of view or methods of appreciation, but unless this is done or unless a man actually aids in the advancement of knowledge I do not see how his claim to a full professorship is a valid one. Mere success in holding the attention of students and even in holding their interest is not in my opinion the right sort of standard. Many high school teachers are more successful in these respects than some instructors in our colleges, but I do not see how simple teaching ability can be regarded as a basis for promotion to a full professorship in the University. Good salaries should be paid to associate professors, but the next step in rank should mean something in the world of scholarship.

Yours very truly,
Chicago, December 13, 1912.

Dean J. R. Angell,
The University of Chicago.

My dear Dean Angell:

In reply to your general note of inquiry I would say that it seems to me to be exceedingly desirable that promotion be given for any one of the three points mentioned by President Harper. It is a very serious mistake not to advance a good teacher, even though he be not, strictly speaking, a productive scholar.

I do not like the term "collegiate professor", preferring "professor in the colleges". The salary of such a man ought to be the same as that of the professor in the graduate schools, and it should be distinctly understood that there is no difference in relative position. It is the danger of thinking that a teaching position is less important in a university than a merely research position that I should endeavor to avoid.

Yours very truly,

S.M.
Dear J. R.,

The University of Chicago

My dear Dean, I refer to your general note of induction I send you to be filed in our minute register to your University. I have not yet seen the final point of the above written matter, but I have done all that I can in the way of communicating the message of the Board.

Recent news from the Pittsburg sect. of the American Chemical Society is that I have been elected to fill the office of the President of the section.

I go over the old "college talk" and find the "college talk" and the "college" the same as ever. The point to the professor in the highest sense is to serve the students and the students as far as possible to serve and to make the students as far as possible to serve the students. It is the work of the students to help the students.

I am always ready to assist you in any way that I can. I am always ready to help you in any way that I can.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
December 19, 1912.

My dear Mr. Angell:

I have your circular letter with reference to the basis of appointment in departments. I have always proceeded in recommending appointments upon the three-fold basis which your letter states to have been accepted and approved by President Harper. I have understood in general that promotion is to be recommended in view of excellence in the three directions mentioned; that an Assistant Professor would be recommended for appointment as Associate Professor only in case he had already such ability in one or more of these directions as to make his permanent retention in the Faculty desirable and that recommendation to a Professorship would as a rule follow only in cases in which the instructor had shown considerable ability in research, evidenced by publication: that in cases in which this was lacking but in which there was quite exceptional ability in teaching or administration, recommendation might be based upon the latter qualifications. I can hardly speak of my practice in the latter case, for the reason I have never had occasion to recommend but one man for appointment as Professor and in this case. I think he clearly met the primary requirement.

Very truly yours,

Prof. J. R. Angell.
EDE
December 10, 1919

My dear Mr. Weller:

I have your attention letter with reference to the

matter of appointment in departments. I have seen

the case in recommendations submitted, and feel

that promotion to a higher status is due to your

very good performance in General

Branch and the attention recently given to your

promotion to a position in view of excellence.

Please consider this letter as additional to the

recommendation for appointment to Associate

Professor, made in the course of our discussions.

I wish to reiterate that I do not agree with the

idea of a two-year limit in cases to head of depart-

ments and am not convinced of the necessity for

such a limitation. I hope to have time to devote to

the preparation of material for appointment to

Professor. I am, therefore, not in favor of the

two-year limit.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

R. A. Weller

[Address]
Dec. 15, 1912.

Dear Mr. Taft:

In the matter of the basis of promotion in the faculty, now under consideration in your Committee, my judgment may be summarized as follows:

1. Administration is a necessary function in the University, but it is not in its nature any part of that for which the University exists. The administrative officers may conveniently be in many cases also "officers of instruction"; but the work of administration must be in its nature rather sharply differentiated from the true and essential work of the University.

The work of administration may often be carried on by persons not qualified in the fullest degree to do the more purely scholarly functions. To use titles (and accompanying powers) appropriate to scholarly functions as a reward for administrative functions can result only in the confusing of the idea and ideal of the scholarly functions in the mind of the community. Administrative duties should be recognized by titles appropriate to themselves alone. Salaries may of course be adjusted in accordance therewith, not being dependent upon the purely scholarly position of the recipient.

2. As regards the question of "ability in teaching," there is more difficulty in judgment.
The University of Chicago

The opinions as to what constituted a "good teacher" are likely to be as variant as the persons interrogated. Among miscellaneous classes of students a good teacher too often means a person of reasonable intelligence and agreeable manners who does not try to make him do more than they can easily accomplish. That too often means a person whose own attainments of ideals of scholarly achievement are very mediocre, who is naturally at best disposed to conduct the student along any other than the path he himself walks in, incapable of doing anything else. The highest academic title should certainly not be conferred upon such a "good teacher".

There is a good-natured fiction prevalent to the effect that a man may be a "good teacher" without being a deep scholar. I myself think that is often to some extent true, though I have just called it a fiction. It is possible for a man to know the rudiments of Latin, for example, well, without knowing much more. He may be able to be a good teacher of the elements under such circumstances. But we are dealing with college and university teaching at this moment, and here the notion is a fiction. It is usually pleaded by, or in behalf of, persons who have not the studious habit, but enjoy the various undercurrents of academic positions. Scholarship and "research" may here be in some degree distinguished. It is certainly possible theoretically for a man to spend a lifetime in the
The University of Chicago

students or eager acquisition of what other men have discovered or formulated without himself adding an
into that sum of knowledge by "research" of
his own. Such a man, if a "good teacher" in the
proper sense, might stimulate students to lift them
far above his own level. The difficulty is that such
men do not actually exist. In my thirty-five years
of college life, much of the latter part of it with a toler-
ably wide acquaintance, I have not been able to
find such a man. It seems practically impossible
that a man who has the true goal for knowledge
should be able to advance far in its pursuit without
finding a hundred things which have not yet been
investigated properly, which need investigation.
He cannot help engaging in "research". If he does not,
this is because he is intellectually of a low standard,
men in the matter of the acquisition of knowledge.
He may get on all right with his classes, if even
have the reputation of being a "good teacher"; but sooner
or later his students will find him out, and blame
him at the college in after life for what they failed
to get from him. I have seen that happen more
than once, when the indignant question asked:
What did the college mean by advancing such a man
to the full professorship? That was the seal of its
official approval, or how could we students know that
he was not "all right"?

I think most decided that to advance
such men to the title or rank of "professor" is to
inflict a grievous wrong on the men of a higher
circle who hold that rank, for the students who
The University of Chicago

are still in need of intellectual stimulus or direction. Such action tends to confuse all intellectual standards. It does violence to the very thing for which the University chiefly exists— the expectation of scholarship.

Appointing authorities may be deceived or mistaken about the qualifications of candidates for appointment. But deliberately to adopt the principle that a man may reach the highest academic title as a scholar by any other path than by that of recognized scholarship among other scholars in the world at large, is for the University to abandon its own functions.

How do I think that the title of "Professor" with an adjective of any sort like "Collegiate" will offer any relief to the situation of occasional embarrassment? That will seem, as it must to seem, a lesser title than that of "Professor" for doing, or so will be unsatisfactory to the applicant for promotion, or it will be in practice indistinguishable from "Professor," so as the issue be clouded in the eyes of the community just as before. In general it is surely undesirable to multiply titles. (I believe "Collegiate Professor" was used as a title in the early days of Johns Hopkins, but, I understand, later dropped. I should suspect it would create some division in the academic world, as a mode of "whipping the devil around the stumps").
I hope, my dear Mrs. Tufts, that your Committee will not be too much shocked at getting so long an answer to your invitation. This memorandum expresses what has been my most earnest conviction on the subject for many years, and what I have been able to see fought out to this happy conclusion in the College Faculty. I hope it may be here.

Yours very truly,

Edwin D. Oct. 1855
The Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

President's Office.                          December 11, 1912

My dear Professor Angell:

In reply to your questions I offer the following:

1. Yes. I should say that Sylvester was a marked example of this kind, and yet much depends upon what is meant by success as a teacher. As a routine teacher he was a complete failure, but he was highly stimulating to advanced men.

2. We have a few professors designated as "Collegiate Professors" who excel as teachers but are not markedly successful in research.

3. Answers to 1 and 2 furnish a partial answer to 3. As far as salaries are concerned the highest salaries paid by us are to men who are investigators and teachers.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

Dr. James R. Angell,
Dean, University of Chicago.
Dear Sir,

I have some important news to announce. I have been selected for a prestigious award.

I hope you will be proud of me. I have worked hard to achieve this milestone.

Thank you for your support and encouragement. I am looking forward to receiving the award.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut.

December 15th, 1912.

My dear Mr. Angell:-

In reply to the questions contained in your latter of the eleventh, I would say:

1. In the case of an adequately endowed professorship we should without hesitation promote a man distinguished in research but not successful as a teacher; otherwise the financial question would necessarily come somewhat into the foreground. You can pay a few men who cannot teach out of the proceeds of students' tuition fees, but not many.

2. We have laid down the rule that we would not give such promotions for ordinary success as a teacher unless a man's productive work was good. But in the case of a man of exceptional characteristics as a teacher we will promote him. Such promotions, however, are not numerous. I cannot think of more than two men whom we have promoted to full professorships during the last five years on the basis of teaching ability pure and simple.

3. There is no distinction in the title as it appears in the University catalogue. We tend to differentiate the official position of the men here by assigning the purely research professors to the faculty of the Graduate School; but this differentiation carries with it no difference in salary.

The illustrative word "constructive scholarship" which you use in the third question seems to me to be preferable to "research" in the statement of all these alternatives. A research man who is not a constructive scholar usually does a university almost as much harm as good.

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

Dean James R. Angell,
The University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.
In reply to the question contained in your letter of the 11th, I would say:

I am in the habit of not signing my name to a questionnaire. If, however, I may be permitted to make the statement, it is my belief that the work of the faculty at the University of Chicago is of the highest standard. I cannot think of any other university that has a similar faculty. I am glad to be associated with it.

Yours sincerely,

Dean James E. Angell

Office, III.

The University of Chicago
December 13, 1912

Dear Dean Angell:

President Schurman, as you know, is now at Athens as Minister to Greece. I think I can, however, answer your letter of the 10th, although it is a matter which should require a careful and lengthy reply. But if a brief answer is necessary, I would answer the first two questions in the affirmative and the third in the negative.

I had presumed that in all American colleges, from the lowest to the highest in rank, there were professorships held by men distinguished in research but not particularly successful as teachers. I had also supposed that in all such colleges there were professors distinguished as teachers but not eminent in research. And I do not know of any distinction being made in title or salary between the two classes mentioned. There are cases where men distinguished for research have been relieved of the work of teaching. I have not myself been greatly in favor of this. And I was very glad this year when one of our distinguished scholars who had been relieved from teaching for several years was induced to return to active work among the undergraduates.

I may possibly not have understood exactly the intent of your questions. Perhaps the emphasis is on the word promote. And it seems to me that each case would have to be determined on its merits and in relation to the department concerned and to other professorships in the department. If a department
Dear Dean Under:

I am pleased to accept the position of President of Colorado College which you have offered me. I think I can offer my services to the college in the capacity of President. I have been a faculty member of the college for several years and have a deep interest in its welfare. I believe I can provide a strong leadership to guide the college to new heights.

I am confident that my experience and qualifications make me a suitable candidate for this position. I have had a long association with the college and have been involved in many of its activities. I am familiar with the problems and challenges that the college is facing and I am committed to finding solutions to these problems.

I believe that the college has a bright future and I am confident that I can help to ensure its continued success. I am looking forward to working with the faculty, staff, and students of Colorado College and making it a place of excellence.

Thank you for this opportunity. I am excited to accept it and to work with you and the college to achieve its goals.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
was well manned by capable teachers, a research professorship might well be established. On the other hand it might be most desirable to have in a given department an excellent teacher, who was not eminent in research. I remember well hearing President Remsen once in public go into an elaborate apology for a professor who was a member of the Johns Hopkins Faculty, who was not distinguished for his productive scholarship and research, but who was an admirable teacher, who had made a profound impression all over the country by the students he had taught.

The third question I have already answered.

I may say that my own feeling, after a long experience as professor and administrative officer, is that no one is worthy of the position of professor who is not a true scholar; that a true scholar will naturally be a productive scholar to a certain extent and will also, I believe, be a fairly good teacher. I have so often heard the plea made that the really great scholar may not be, indeed often is not, a great or even good teacher. But I have always felt, as I say, that the primary requisite of the professor was true scholarship. I am speaking, of course, now of university positions. Still we have had here the experience which all universities have had of disappointment at times in the influence exerted upon the classes by persons of whose scholarship there could be no doubt. But I am inclined, in spite of all this, to lay the stress,
The other morning I was feeling remarkably well.

I was out for a walk after a long snowstorm, and in the quiet of the morning, I felt a sense of peace and renewal. The fresh air felt good on my face, and I was able to clear my mind of the usual distractions.

As I walked, I thought about the importance of taking time for oneself. It's easy to get caught up in the busyness of life, but it's important to make time for quiet moments of reflection.

I noticed a small bird perched on a branch, and I watched it for a while. The bird seemed to be enjoying the sunshine, and I felt a sense of connection with it.

I continued my walk, enjoying the peace and quiet of the morning. It was a reminder of the beauty of nature and the importance of taking time to appreciate it.

In the end, I realized that the simple act of taking a walk and enjoying the outdoors was enough to make me feel content and at peace.

I was grateful for the moment of tranquility, and I resolved to make time for similar moments in the future.
as I have said, on scholarship. And by scholarship I mean substantially what you do by research.

You will, of course, understand that my answer is to be regarded as the expression of my personal feeling, and is not intended to bind in any way my distinguished predecessor, who, I am happy to say, will after this year be my successor.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Acting President

Dr. James R. Angell
Dean of the Faculties of Arts, Literature, and Science
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ills.
se I have sent on the personal side. Any personal interest I mean

unpertinently after you go to London.

You will, of course, understand that the answer

is to go anywhere as the expression of my personal feeling.

and I am not intended to pay to any money in the American theatre.

Yet when I am home to stay, I will answer this letter of mine.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

To the President

Mr. James M. Andrews.
Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Teachers' College.
University of Chicago.

[Signature]
December 12, 1912.

Dean James R. Angell,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

My dear Dean Angell:

I have yours of December 10th. In answer to your questions, I beg to say:

1. If a man should show himself capable of research work of high order, we would undoubtedly promote him to a professorship at the proper time, even though his success as a teacher had not been marked. This University has not been able as yet to maintain professorships for research alone. It has not as yet been necessary for us to answer officially the particular question that you ask, as the men on our faculties, who are doing something worth while in the way of productive scholarship, are at least ordinarily successful as teachers.

2. In answer to your question "Would you promote to such professorship a man distinguished as a teacher, but not entirely successful in research?", I should say yes.

3. We do not recognize any distinction either in title or salary between men who are distinguished for research and constructive scholarship and men eminent either as teachers or administrators, excepting that men devoting considerable time to administrative work, as in the case of a dean of a department, are given a special salary for the administrative work in addition to the professorial salary.

I think I have answered your questions fully, but if not, kindly advise.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]
December 10, 1938

Dean, Dean of Residence

Dear Professor [Name],

I was hoping to have had a chance to discuss this matter with you personally, but as I have not had the opportunity, I am writing this formal letter to bring it to your attention.

I have been looking into the possibility of extending the research work at our university. As I have mentioned before, I believe that a more comprehensive program of research could be developed if we had the resources to support it. The current budget does not allow for such an expansion, but I am confident that with additional funding, we could make significant progress.

I would like to propose the following steps:

1. Conduct a needs assessment to determine the specific areas where additional resources are needed.
2. Develop a plan for fundraising to support the research program.
3. Work with external partners to leverage additional resources.
4. Initiate a pilot program to test the feasibility of the proposed research.

I believe that this approach could be a significant step forward for our university. I would be grateful for your thoughts and suggestions on how we might move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[Name]
December 17, 1912.

My dear Dean Angell:

In response to your letter of December 10th concerning practice here with regard to promotion to the position of professor, I have to say that I dislike very much to make categorical answers to questions of the kind you present, and this simply because cases under 1 and 2 seldom or never arise. Usually a professor who is distinguished in research is successful as a teacher. Usually a teacher who is permanently successful does contribute in some measure to the advancement of scholarship. This being the situation, all I can say is that we have here no definite rule in the matter. Both teaching and scholarly ability are taken into consideration in promotion to a professorship.

One of the difficulties in making categorical answers to your questions is due to the very great difference in the various departments of the university. In science, or applied science, almost any man who is good enough for a professor is at least doing something in the way of research. In literature, the term research scarcely applies. The scholarly ability of a man is expressed by his power of interpretation of literature or by productive work of his own. To insist that every teacher in literature should be doing the special linguistic work to which the term research properly applies, might be a detriment to a department.

The above are some of the considerations which have prevented us here from adopting any hard and fast rules in regard to teaching
We refer your request

In accordance with the Scheduling Service, all requests for presentation are on a first-come, first-served basis. Therefore, it is necessary to submit your request as early as possible to ensure your presentation is included.

Please submit your request to the following email address: scheduling@uw.edu

Thank you for your understanding.

Scheduling Committee
and research for promotion to a professorship. It seems to us a far better practice to handle cases with reference to the various departments and the particular situation rather than to bind ourselves by fixed regulations.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Dean James R. Angell,
University of Chicago.
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Berkeley, December 17, 1912.

My dear Dr. Angell:

Answering your letter of December tenth let me say:

1. I should never wish to promote to a professorship anybody who had not proved himself a good teacher. I doubt if there be under present conditions any place in a university for a man who isn't a good teacher. It was so formerly but it is not so today. Institutions like the Rockefeller Institute are making provision for the other sort. The University of Berlin is developing its Institutes as distinct from its teaching faculties.

2. I think there may well be in the university a place for a man who is a teacher but is not brilliant at research. I am always sorry, however, to see a man dying out on the creative side. It generally means that after a while his teaching gets stale.

3. We make no such distinction in title as you suggest, also no distinction in salary.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Dean James R. Angell,
The University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.
December 18, 1912.

Dr. James R. Angell,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Sir:

What I would do at Stanford University if the Institution were not a mixture of University and College, the University demanding men whose standing in original scholarship puts them in the front rank in their respective fields, and the college demanding men who are successful and sympathetic teachers is a question of the sort we call "academic". In a college I would not deprive the men of the latter type of the title of "Professor", while, if I were living in an ideal world I would not use the title of "Professor" for anyone not a leader in investigation and thought in his particular line, and also the founder of a "school", a man so deeply interested in advanced studies that he would naturally form a centre of investigation among them. We have a few such in this Institution. I do not value very highly the men of research who have no ambition to lead students to follow them, and most of these men when they are finally sized up will be found to have followed some highly technical trail which will perhaps lead nowhere with the merit mainly that it has never been worth following before. In our appointments
DECEMBER 1, 1945

Mr. James H. Mergel
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Sir:

What I write to you at Stanford University is an introduction.

We are not a mixture of University and College. The University
embraces men whose interests lie in art, music, architecture, prose
from the four corners in their respective fields, and the College
embraces men who are successful and sympathetic and concrete
in a discipline of the sort we call "scholastic." In a College
I would not define the man of the latter type of the title
as a "Professor," while I would define in an ideal world
as a "Professor" for whom not a teacher
in investigation and research in the particular field and also
for the training of a "school," a man so deeply interested in scholarship
enthusiastic that he would naturally take a certain interest in

more seem. We have a few men in this institution. I do not
name very likely the man of research who have no ambition to keep
enough to follow them and most of these men mean very little to them.
more and will be ready to have followed some physical connections.

Wish you well. Perhaps I can write you later with more minute facts if I can
never hear more later.
in the actual world we have used the term "professor" for men who show a reasonable degree of eminence as investigators or as teachers. As administrators pure and simple no advance, either of title or of salary has been made, but usually the men who have ability to bring students to follow them are also good administrators, - for the administration of a college professor after all is not a financial affair, but dealing with the minds and hearts of men.

1. I would promote to a professorship a man distinguished in research and moderately successful as a teacher, but if absolutely devoid of skill as a teacher I should hesitate to do so. There are some of the oldest original workers in the country living, and perhaps deservedly, on salaries of about $1,000, because they are of no usefulness to the students.

2. I would promote to a professorship men distinguished as teachers who have never done any research work of importance. I would regard them as "college professors," although we have never used such a term. I have appointed a number of such and shall doubtless continue to do so.

3. In this Institution salaries have not been adjusted to titles, but adjusted to what the President and the Board have thought, all circumstances considered, the University was able to pay the individual professor. We are paying $5,000 to some men distinctly eminent as men, -- in two or three cases
In the conflict about where we stand and the term "provisional," we may adopt a temporary degree of importance in an argument. As administrators know and suppose, one supposes the first of all, or nearly the same, are those who have ability to bring about the effect of a college, and not a temporary affair, but. borrow, with the saving and service of men.

I would propose a prolongation of a year of administration.

It has been any temporary, and necessarily general, as a letter of an opportunity gained or skill as a letter of the general interest in the events of the general interests of the company and the large demands. The society some of the general interests of the company and the large demands.

So I would propose a prolongation of a year of administration.

As a letter I have never gone into administration work of importance.

I would spread from an office, and os does not, and might serve some to another.

In this instruction to make a profit, the profit may be made, and the profit may be made, and be made.

I am afraid to make the present provision to make the present provision, and some may agree to a matter or men, in two or three cases.
eminent in research, in two cases at least eminent mainly in their large humanity, but not especially eminent in original scholarship. Most of the other professors receive $4,000 at present. Those receiving less being some of those less eminent as scholars or teachers, or else who have been promoted comparatively recently and comparatively young.

Unless an institution can separate its faculty into University men and College men I know no better way than to size up the general average. You cannot get along without good teachers. You ought not get along without men who are leading the advance of knowledge.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

LES
untoch in research, in the place of just mention.

in such cases indefinitely, but not especially mention in
original equations.

most of the other proceedings receive
those receiving poor paid some of those
free again in separate to separate to those who have been
below.

Although they have been the reason of communication and communication today.

Unless an instruction can appear the faculty into
University men and College men I know no person who press to
solve the question.

You cannot eat your wart off
Good fortune
You cannot eat your wart off, and she

Virtue and advantage of knowledge

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
December 16, 1912

Dean James R. Angell

University of Chicago

Chicago, Ill.

Dear Dean Angell:

In reply to the questions contained in your letter of the 10th, perhaps it will be well for you to examine our University Statutes, a copy of which goes to you under separate cover, Section 62 of which deals with grades of office in the University.

In reply to your specific questions, I would say that our practice is as follows:

1. We do promote to professorships men distinguished in research but not successful as teachers. In that case we either assign them to work in the Graduate Faculties, where their relation with a few advanced students is largely individual, or we set them free from all teaching duties whatsoever and allow them to give all their energies to research and publication. In fairness to the group of men so engaged here it ought to be added that by no means all of them were unsuccessful as teachers, but rather the contrary.

2. We do promote to professorships men distinguished as teachers but not entirely successful in research. Indeed we are constantly seeking for just such men to teach undergraduates.

3. We do not recognize any class distinction, either in title or in salary, between men who are distinguished for research and constructive scholarship, or men who are eminent either as
December 16, 1918

Dean James M. Angell
University of Chicago
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Dean Angell:

I am informed that the discussion concerning the University of Chicago's requirements for the 1917-1918 academic year will be well for you to examine our University's requirements, and to which you have been a part of the graduate work in the University. In reply to your specific question, I would say that our practice is as follows:

We do promote to professorship men of the first rank, as professors. In that case we either recruit them to work in the Graduate School, where their relations will be especially close to students in graduate work, and where their influence with a few students will be especially intense. In the second instance, we meet them on the basis of the graduate work of the most eminent, and allow them to give all the attention to the graduate students, to research and publication. In the last instance, the work of men in the Graduate School is not of such a nature to be shared with their colleagues in the University. If at all we can accept such a man we accept him as a professor, but not as a member of our faculty. If we do not accept him as a professor, we offer him a position, in the University, and not in the Graduate School, for the work of men not of the first rank, not of the first rank, not of the first rank.
teachers or administrators. The only distinction that we recognize is that based on individual service and work. We do our best to pay every individual as much as possible. One of my chief regrets is that despite the large advances we have been able to make in the past ten years, we are still far from what I regard as a desirable goal.

Any other information that I have on this subject is entirely at your service.

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]
Dear [Name],

I am sorry to hear about your recent injury. I hope you will be on the road to recovery soon.

Best,

[Your Name]
Professor J. H. Tufts,

University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.,

My dear Jim:

Your problem regarding the basis of promotion in your academic staff is one which has given us no little trouble in recent years. Your faculty is so much larger than ours that I presume that you have to approach the matter much more systematically than has been the case with us where no actual regulations have been formulated to guide us in making promotions. It is largely a personal question with each man and the various elements which you have mentioned of course enter into the final decision.

We have found the grade Collegiate Professor most beneficial. The man selected for this position has been generally that member of the department who has shown special aptitude for the teaching of men of collegiate grade although in many instances these men are excellent investigators as well. Their work is, however, chiefly with undergraduate students and in so far as undergraduate work may be considered of less importance than graduate work I suppose the position of Collegiate Professor is probably regarded as slightly inferior to that of Professor. At the same time there are members of our staff holding the title of Collegiate Professor who are quite as important members of the faculty as some who hold the title of Professor. In general, a man passing through the various grades would probably be more quickly advanced from Associate Professor to the grade of Collegiate Professor than to the grade of Professor. Technically there is no difference in the position and the names of Collegiate Professors are
scattered among those of Professors in our annual Register. I don't think there is any appreciable difference in salary which is also here an entirely personal matter and does not go with the grade. Some Collegiate Professors receive larger salaries than some Professors.

I think the establishment of the grade of Collegiate Professor has a very beneficial effect from the standpoint of teaching in that the men who hold that grade realize that their chief duties are to make the introductory courses as important as possible and it goes without saying that the recognition of such responsibility has improved the quality of the teaching. Some of the Collegiate Professors also conduct graduate work and in most cases are actively engaged in carrying on investigations.

If there is any other information which I can furnish don't fail to call on me.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Dictated by Dr. Clark but not read.

Bullock Clark
Dear Professor Angell:

I am in receipt of your letter raising the question of the proper grounds for promotion to professorial rank. I am very much interested in the subject and will talk with a few of my friends here, including Armstrong, Willoughby, Howell and Ames. I shall try to give you some kind of a consensus of opinion as regards how the system works here. Just between ourselves, I think the collegiate professor has a pretty hard place here. He ranks about as an associate professor and everyone feels that the moment a man is made collegiate professor his doom as a university man is sounded. I shall write you more fully about the matter in a few days.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

John B. Watson

Mr. Angell has later oral report.
Dear Professor Angel,

I am in receipt of your letter dated

the date of your letter. I am very much interested in the subject and will

contribute. Thank you for your interest in the manuscript and

work. I will be in touch with you soon.

With cordial regards,

I am confident that your suggestion will be of great interest to the

colleagues. I am sure that you will find the comments

useful. I trust that you will find the manuscript in a

satisfactory state.

Very truly yours,

Dr. Angel
December 10th, 1912.

Provost Edgar F. Smith,
University of Pennsylvania

My dear Mr. Smith:

The University of Chicago is contemplating a change in its present practice with regard to the use of the title professor. We are desirous of learning the practice of other institutions and I beg leave to ask that you kindly answer the following questions at your early convenience:

1. Would you promote to a professorship a man distinguished in research but not successful as a teacher? 
   Possibly.

2. Would you promote to such professorship a man distinguished as a teacher but not entirely successful in research? 
   Yes.

3. Do you recognize any distinction either in title or salary between men who are distinguished for research and constructive scholarship and men eminent either as teachers or administrators? 
   No.

We shall greatly appreciate your courtesy in responding to this inquiry.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
Dean

JRA/n
The University of Chicago

Dec 14 - 1912

Mr. J. H. Tufts,
Chairman of the Senate Committee on Promotions.

Dear Sir:

During the past twenty years the chemical department has always taken the position that a member of its staff - in order to be considered even for promotion to an associate professorship - must have developed some independent field of research; and I frankly admit that I have always had the most enthusiastic support of all members of the department in maintaining this policy.

It seems to me that it is particularly important at this time that the Senate should take a very firm and decided stand in emphasizing research as the most important basis in considering promotion to a permanent position in the University.

We are at present actually in danger of being regarded more and more by the country at large as a pedagogical institute and not as an institution fostering research.

Yours very truly,

John Uriel Nef.
Jan. 13, 1913

My dear Mr. Tufts,

If the University of Chicago is to maintain a collegiate department, it must maintain that department at the highest possible level. That means that it must recruit good teachers. It must be fatal to deny to such men intellectual chance.

As for the suggestion of creating a group of "collegiate professors," it would be difficult to draw the line in making appointments. The "collegiate professors" would probably be a small minority and would inevitably be regarded as
The University of Chicago

I infer from this a lower inference.

The whole issue lies in a bent shell.

Is the University of Chicago devoted to

clarifying its research? If it is, then
the college and the law school should

be abolished. If it is not, then good

teaching, whether accompanied or not by

ability in research, should receive academic distinction.

Sincerely yours,

F. B. Erbell
December 14, 1912.

Professor J. H. Tufts,

Faculty Exchange.

My dear Professor Tufts:

Replying to the communication of your Committee with reference to the important considerations for promotion to a full professorship in the University, I would say that demonstrated research ability should be in my opinion the prime requirement. I think, moreover, that such ability should have been demonstrated in no narrow field of investigation, and should be such as to demonstrate not only critical scholarship, but a broad point of view. Other qualifications may be of very great importance, such as administrative ability, reputation as teacher, and fine character, but none of these appears to me in itself to be an adequate reason for promotion beyond the position of associate professor.

Yours sincerely,

Frank P. Lilie
Dear Professor [Name],

I am writing to express my sincere appreciation for the communication of your consideration on my behalf. I understand the importance of the situation involving the promotion to a full professorship in the University. I would like to express my appreciation for the prime duties I have been assigned. I have been greatly enriched by the experience of working with the administration of the institution and the various departments of the university.

I believe that my skills and qualifications have been recognized, and I feel that my application has been adequately presented. The position of a full professorship is of great importance to me, and I am fully prepared to accept the responsibilities that come with it. I am confident that I can contribute significantly to the university's growth and success.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

[Your Name]
Chicago, January 17, 1913.

Prof. J. H. Tufts,
University of Chicago.

My dear Professor Tufts:

Answering the request of your committee for suggestions as to the basis of our University promotions, I beg leave to urge that these honors even to the highest, should be bestowed equally for 1) excellence in teaching, and 2) ability in research, and that in a few cases they should go also 1) to those who administer well the University's affairs and its students' needs, 2) to those who serve the community as experts, 3) to those who, from our instructing ranks, become important creative artists. I wish also to oppose the suggestion for dividing our professorates into those for teaching and those for investigation.

1. The ancient and continuing idea and function of a university is that it is both a storehouse of knowledge and an instrument of research, and it has done its best work when these two functions had been kept alive and closely related. Society needs as much the transmission and diffusion of the knowledge it has as it does' additions to it. It is lamentable how slowly and to what a short distance knowledge can penetrate. Sound learning and the discipline of mind which can receive are not selfpropagating. Here falls the work of the teacher, especially that balancing and organizing of varied learning which is wisdom and culture. No group of investigators only would be able to do the whole work demanded of a great seat of learning. Moreover, as far as any one can determine, the two functions specified demand equal amounts of intelligence, training, energy and inventiveness.
The Graduate School of Education

Chicago, Illinois

April 7, 1934

To the President of the University of Chicago,

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to express my appreciation to the University for its hospitality and the freedom of expression it has given me. My stay here has been a very pleasant one and I have enjoyed the opportunity to interact with faculty and students. I have found the atmosphere of the university stimulating and enriching. I am grateful for the support and encouragement I received during my stay. I look forward to returning to the University of Chicago in the future.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Deans, Faculty and Administration
It would clearly be impossible to secure the best men for both functions, to maintain a healthy state of ambition and effort if the university reserved its honor for one class only, or if it constituted a higher and a lower class of honors, which the proposal to divide the professorates certainly involves.

2. Instead of restricting the services of the University to that of research only, which would at once be done if our preferments went for that side only of our work, I see many reasons for expanding them to cover at least these fields: 1) teaching in class, 2) popularizing sound learning by publication, 3) research and the publication of investigation, 4) administration of education, 5) expert services to the state and community, 6) creative art.

It seems to me the University should promote especially the idea now gaining ground that it should furnish from its faculties more experts for the direct service of the community. These can perform such services well because they are adequately trained and especially because their university positions render them financially and politically independent. But it would be impossible to secure or guarantee such workers if the University had no honors or preferments for them.

Moreover the modern community we live in is able and glad to endow such work, and is increasing grateful for it.

3. Instead of separating our University force into a company of investigators who have small concern for spreading knowledge, and another group who are to train general students and prepare them for the use of investigators, I should do all possible to persuade and compel men of ability in advancing knowledge to
It would seem to me that the University should promote more specifically the idea that academic work should prepare one for the life of the community. The phrase "academic work" should be replaced by "intellectual work," which encompasses more than merely preparing for a professional career. It seems to me that the University should make a commitment to service and contribute to the state and community. It should be a place where service is valued and encouraged. Moreover, the modern community is one in which sociology is an important aspect of life. It is important to engage in research and service work in a university context. The question of how we can better connect our University to the community is also important. It is necessary to develop a more interactive relationship between the University and the community. The University should be seen as a resource for the community, and the community should be seen as a resource for the University. It is important to foster a sense of community and to encourage active participation in community life. It should be a place where ideas are generated and where problems are solved. The University should be a place where students can learn and grow, and where they can contribute to the betterment of society.
teach our younger students. This, in order to tie together the
two ends of the rationalizing and civilizing process in education,
to spread the enthusiasm and the technique of investigation, to
wake up early the minds who will later take up the work of in-
vestigation. I should thus hope to honor the teaching function
more and not less. Further, it is unthinkable that
first class minds can be found who will be content, on lower
honors and pay, to train students to be passed on to superior
and better paid men who investigate only.

4. The proposal that promotion to the highest University
honors be for research only, seems to me based on the conception
that good teaching permits and requires a lower order of mind,
that teaching is largely mechanical and unoriginal, that the
teacher is concerned chiefly with repetitions and methods. On
the contrary, the present ideals of good teaching require a
mental reaction upon material of the most originating kind,
requires an ever-expanding knowledge of mental behavior, and a
creative reconstruction of materials, new as well as old, which
demands the highest order of observation, imagination, and
reasoning.

It must be asserted that the distinction suggested of
Collegiate and University professorates will draw sharp distinc-
tions of honors within the faculties. Everybody will view the
former as of lower grade in intelligence and merit. All young
instructors would aspire to research only, and merely fail into
teaching. So long as teaching and research are equally
honored by the community of our benefactors, as they have been
The University in Ghana

In order to make provision for scholarship and student assistantships, attention is drawn to the necessity of the university providing a strong educational program. This can be achieved through the establishment of a strong educational foundation and the provision of adequate financial support. The university must not only provide educational opportunities but also ensure that students are equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge to succeed in their chosen fields. It is important that the university's financial resources are allocated in a manner that supports both academic excellence and student welfare. The university's role is to foster a conducive environment for learning, research, and development, contributing to the intellectual and cultural progress of the nation.
and will be, and by the student body and alumni, it seems to me impossible to make this distinction with health and comfort to the whole body of our workers.

It is undemocratic, the preferment of a class, the setting up of distinctions not clearly and continuously demonstrable. It introduces suspicion and rivalry in a body all dependent on the same endowments, it makes artificial and strained the relations of those who handle knowledge already attained and those who work for knowledge to be attained.

5. It seems to me that the suggestions I oppose come from a certain impatience of experts with teaching, with large bodies of general students, and from what they imagine to be a diversion of funds for the use of teaching which would otherwise go to research, concerning which it may be said:

1) Nothing in our history or that of other American universities suggests that we can or should lessen our general student body or cut off all students except those who take part in research. Students as learners are here and will come in increasing numbers. Our benefactors, our city and community, demand it and approve it. These students must be cared for with better teaching even than now. The suggestion that our students go elsewhere seems to me artificial and futile. The experience of Johns Hopkins and of Clark Universities seems to me to point a lesson here. Neither were able to resist the constant and normal demand that they should teach as well as investigate. And the attempt at the former institution to honor investigation rather than teaching by university preferments has, as I understand it, not worked
The University of Wisconsin

It is my pleasure to extend a warm welcome to all of our students. The academic year has begun, and I am excited to see the growth and development of each and every student. We strive to provide a supportive and stimulating environment that fosters learning and personal growth.

A few words of advice to our students:

1. Take advantage of the resources available to you. Attend lectures, participate in discussions, and seek out opportunities to engage with faculty and peers.

2. Stay organized and prepared. Keep track of deadlines and make a study schedule that suits your needs.


4. Be open to new experiences. Whether it's a different course, a club, or a new hobby, try something new to expand your horizons.

5. Be kind to each other. Respect and support your fellow students, and create a positive and inclusive community.

6. Ask for help when you need it. Whether it's from a professor, a counselor, or a peer, don't hesitate to reach out if you're struggling.

Remember, the University of Wisconsin is here to help you succeed. Let's work together to make this year a memorable and successful one.
well in the least.

2) On a very low plane it may be pointed out also that these general students nearly, if not quite, pay their way - even clearing money for the work of research, and that if they were gone it would not increase the endowments for investigation. The University, even if it were doing its utmost to endow research, could still afford to administer the best teaching obtainable. It is large enough to administer all sides of educational work, and it finds the community able and willing to support them.

3) Finally it is not a mere accident that the chief supporters of advanced education (taking the country over and looking to our future) do not come from the ranks of those who have engaged, however successfully, in research, but from the general students who go from us into the affairs of the community. Yet it is just these and those teachers who trained them which these proposals seem to me to fail to honor.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

V.O. Mueller
The University of Michigan
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well to the faculty

2) On a wild in place it may be pointed out also that

self-sustaining educational enterprise. If it works out, the faculty may - and

offering money for the mere of research and grant that they make

gone of money not increase the amenities for instruction.
The University, even if it were going to assign to and

seeks to make still further to maintain the high teaching of

separate. It is the avenue to expand the mind of and

senate work and it raises the community value and ability to

support them.

3) Finally it is not a wise portfolio that the official

support for educational achievement (calling the country and

facing to our future) to not come from the revenue of those who

have enriched human successively in research, but from the

career of statures and to close an important article of the com-

ment. Yet it is that here and there personnel will remain from

which speech persons seem to me to fall to reward.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]