



Statement on Academic Freedom

September, 2009

The State of Academic Freedom at CUNY and What We Can Do About It

Contents

Historical Examples:	3
What is Academic Freedom?	4
Academic Freedom Rests on Four Propositions	5
The 1915 AAUP Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure	5
The 1940 AAUP Statement and Beyond	6
Academic Freedom, Peer Review, and Due Process: The Academic Freedom of Contingent Faculty	7
Political Pressures on Academic Freedom	7
Academic Freedom, Shared Governance, and the CUNY Classroom	8
How You Can Respond to Threats Against Your Academic Freedom	9
Infringements on Academic Freedom:	10
CUNY Affirms Academic Freedom	12
How Fragile These Promises?	13
Protecting Academic Freedom at CUNY	13
Selected Resources	14
Credits	16

“The responsibility of the university as a whole is to the community at large, and any restriction upon the freedom of the instructor is bound to react injuriously upon the efficiency and the *morale* of the institution, and therefore ultimately upon the interests of the community.”

—American Association of University Professors (AAUP),
1915 Declaration on Academic Freedom

University Faculty Senate Statement on Academic Freedom

The State of Academic Freedom at CUNY and What We Can Do About It

Historical Examples:

- The Philosophy Department at City College, newly empowered in 1938 by the Board of Higher Education (the predecessor of the current CUNY Board of Trustees) to govern itself in personnel and curricular matters, recruits Bertrand Russell in 1940, setting off a firestorm of opposition in the conservative press and religious circles. The clamor from outside the college affects the political climate, and the mayor kills Russell’s appointment by eliminating his budget line. The mayor’s action sets the unfortunate precedent of partisan interference in faculty governance and of substituting political judgments for those of the faculty.
- The Rapp-Coudert Committee, established in 1940 by the New York State Legislature, investigates “subversion” in the schools and colleges, identifies faculty and staff suspected of belonging to the Communist Party, and demands that the Board of Higher Education adopt a policy forcing its personnel to testify before legislative committees on penalty of dismissal. The Board of Higher Education accedes to this demand, and over 50 members of the City College faculty are dismissed or not reappointed as a result. This incident sets the precedent of a political litmus test for personnel and so violates not only the academic freedom of those affected but also their First Amendment right to freedom of association.

Among experiences that CUNY faculty members reported to their campus governance body or to the Professional Staff Congress (PSC) as actual or potential violations of their academic freedom are the following: A professor was permitted to teach the course he had been assigned only if he adopted a dean's syllabus and text. A sociologist elected to chair his department withdrew his name when an administrative committee announced its intention to investigate him following press attacks. The organizers of a faculty teach-in following September 11 were criticized first in the press and then by top CUNY leadership. An adjunct writing instructor was told that she would no longer be engaged to teach writing at that college following external political pressure. A college administration ignored a department's hiring recommendation, substituting its own candidate. Numerous adjuncts have not been reappointed without reason or explanation after years of service, some banned from further teaching without due process.

The concept of academic freedom remains a much contested matter in the first decade of the 21st century, with some critics alleging that faculty members abuse it in order to "indoctrinate" their students, and defenders across the political spectrum rejecting such charges (none of which has been verified by administrative or legislative investigating committees). Those who defend the academic freedom of the faculty in turn charge that their critics want to cast "a pall of [political] orthodoxy" over the academy in the 1967 words of the Supreme Court.

What is Academic Freedom?

Academic freedom is the indispensable condition for the faculty to carry out its work: the responsibilities of teaching, research and publication, and of participating in college governance. Without the ability to control their work, faculty members will find themselves laboring under conditions closer to those of a corporation than the academy.

Academic freedom is a professional right of the faculty. It is grounded in the faculty's qualifications for the position as reviewed by their peers. It consists in the freedom to teach, research, write, and to speak in their public capacity without restraint by the administration. As a professional right, academic freedom differs from the Constitutional right to freedom of speech and assembly guaranteed by the First Amendment in the sense that academic freedom is the necessary condition for faculty members to fulfill their professional obligations and responsibilities as teachers, researchers and writers.

Academic freedom protects faculty members from reprisals by employers for exercising free speech rights outside the classroom, a protection not afforded most Americans. Academic freedom further protects faculty members when they participate in the governance of their institutions or speak out on matters of educational policy, particularly when opposing the views of the administration.

For full-time members of the faculty, tenure is the main shield against attacks on academic freedom. However, most teaching in the United States, as in the City University, is now done by part-time or contingent faculty not eligible for tenure. Protection of academic freedom therefore

rests on the twin bases of the professional staff's Collective Bargaining Agreement, on the one hand, and on the governance charters of the individual colleges in the University, along with the University Faculty Senate, the faculty governance body of the University.

How is academic freedom justified? How can it be protected? To shed light on these issues, the University Faculty Senate, with the assistance of the PSC-CUNY Academic Freedom Committee, has prepared this short handbook.

Academic Freedom Rests on Four Propositions

The best traditions of higher education rest on the professional freedom of university faculty and researchers in the academy. Academic freedom is meant to conserve those traditions in order to maintain the appropriate role of colleges and universities in a democratic society.

- Colleges and universities exist as public trusts, to serve the common good.
- Institutional autonomy protects colleges and universities against political, religious and corporate pressures.
- Academic freedom protects the faculty members in their performance of research, writing, teaching, and extramural speech.
- Tenure, faculty governance, and due process also protect faculty members against improper pressures and arbitrary decisions on reappointment and tenure.

The 1915 AAUP Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure

The first statement of academic freedom by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is its 1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, which sets forth a powerful and prescient rationale for academic freedom. The 1915 Declaration begins with a set of principles, addressed primarily to boards of trustees: colleges and universities “constitute a public trust. The trustees are trustees for the public.” Faculty members are appointed by trustees, but they are not the trustees’ employees: “The responsibility of the university teacher is primarily to the public itself, and to the judgment of his [or her] own profession” (Resources, 5).

Since the purpose of the academic institution is to advance human knowledge, to instruct students, and to “develop experts for various branches of the public service,” the teacher must have “complete and unlimited freedom” of research and publication and of utterance in the classroom.

One of the cardinal principles of the Declaration is that “the responsibility of the university as a whole is to the community at large, and any restriction upon the freedom of the instructor is bound to react injuriously upon the efficiency and the *morale* [original emphasis] of the institution, and therefore ultimately upon the interests of the community.”

A university is not “an ordinary business venture.” It must be protected from “private or class interests” and from “political considerations.” The Declaration asserts “not the absolute freedom of utterance of the individual scholar, but the absolute freedom of thought, of inquiry, of discussion and of teaching, of the academic profession.”

Without such independence to pursue the truth within his or her own discipline, the Declaration states no faculty member “can be a successful teacher unless he [or she] enjoys the respect of his [or her] students, and their confidence in their intellectual integrity. It is clear, however, that this confidence will be impaired if there is suspicion on the part of the student that the teacher is not expressing himself [or herself] fully or frankly, or that college and university teachers in general are a repressed and intimidated class who dare not speak with that candor and courage which youth always demands in those whom it is to esteem.”

The 1940 AAUP Statement and Beyond

The AAUP has always been careful to justify academic freedom in the context of the functions of the university and to ground it in the due process protections that make academic freedom a reality in the lives of faculty members. The AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure states in its preamble that “Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the unfettered search for truth and its free exposition.” Therefore, the 1940 Statement explains that “teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results,” a statement since endorsed by 209 scholarly and professional associations (Resources, 6).

Regarding classroom conduct, “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.” The caution here is placed on what is relevant to the course, a standard to be determined by the faculty, rather than on what may be regarded as “controversial.”

Indeed, in today’s charged partisan atmosphere, some students may feel offended when their closely held beliefs are challenged in class. When faculty fear the threat of a complaint and reprimand so much that they censor themselves to avert any “controversy,” then they unwittingly subvert the public mission of the academy. If professors cannot speak the truth as they understand it in their disciplines, then they are kept from doing their job and are likely to lose the respect of their students in any case. The 1940 Statement did not intend that result.

While academic freedom is not simply the free speech rights of university faculty, the Supreme Court has nevertheless recognized academic freedom as an important condition for the Constitutional right to freedom of speech and assembly to flourish in the nation as a whole. In *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (1957), Justice Felix Frankfurter affirmed the “four essential freedoms” of a university: “to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study.” In *Keyishian v. Board of Regents* (1967), the Court described academic freedom as “a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom.”

Academic Freedom, Peer Review, and Due Process: The Academic Freedom of Contingent Faculty

At the time of the AAUP’s founding in 1915, the unionization of faculty was just beginning. Protection of academic freedom under collective bargaining was then unavailable. For that reason, the 1915 Declaration concludes with a series of “practical proposals” to ensure academic freedom, including faculty committees to determine appointments, reappointments, tenure, and dismissal. However, in light of the enormous growth in the use of contingent, mostly part-time, faculty in recent years, the AAUP in 2006 adopted a new Recommended Institutional Regulation governing such contingent faculty (Resources, 10).

Under prevailing American legal doctrine, employment is “at will” unless otherwise protected by collective bargaining agreements or civil service rules. “At will” means that an employee can be let go for “any reason, no reason at all, or a reason morally wrong.” Academic tenure was meant to set college and university faculty apart from that doctrine. But as American colleges and universities come under increasing pressure to raise private funds as they move toward a more corporate structure and business practices, reliance on vulnerable contingent faculty subject to “at will” employment is no longer uncommon. And without the protection of tenure, contingent faculty, now the majority of faculty in the United States, as well as a clear majority throughout CUNY, are especially vulnerable to academic freedom violations.

In response to the threat to academic freedom posed by this trend, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) released a statement, “Academic Freedom in the 21st -Century College and University: Academic Freedom for All Faculty and Instructional Staff” (2007), forcefully arguing that the rights of academic freedom and faculty governance embrace all non-tenure track faculty and instructional staff (Resources, 14).

Political Pressures on Academic Freedom

Organizations such as Students for Academic Freedom, The American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), Campus Watch, and others which support the highly controversial “Academic Bill of Rights” monitor colleges and universities for political purposes. Instead of encouraging students to engage in discussion, some of them have recruited students to report on

their professors. Administrators, trustees and legislators are thus pressured to use political litmus tests for faculty appointments and curricular decisions. Faculty at some CUNY colleges have reported that they have felt threatened in their classrooms. Academic freedom is threatened under circumstances that necessarily intimidate instructors (Resources, 13 and 23).

Academic Freedom, Shared Governance, and the CUNY Classroom

Academic freedom rests on shared governance—on the principle that faculty, through their department, college, university, governance bodies, and professional disciplinary organizations have primary responsibilities for the following, as recognized by CUNY Board of Trustees (BoT) Bylaw ¶8.6: academic standards of admission, retention, grading and graduation requirements, curriculum, textbook selection, and pedagogies.

Together with tenure, shared governance is a buttress for academic freedom. It is another accepted principle of academic life endorsed in 1966 through a joint statement of the AAUP, The American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Shared governance provides for the faculty's primacy in areas that depend on its professional training and abilities. The 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities defines these as "curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process." In the area of faculty status, faculty have primary responsibility for appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion and dismissal, and a president or board of trustees should accept faculty judgment "except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail." The faculty exercises these responsibilities through departmental, college and university committees (Resources, 7).

AAUP regards this central role of faculty in governance as "necessary for the protection of academic freedom," as it explained in 1994 in "On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom." Where it is absent, experience shows that there "is a potential for, and at times the actuality of, administrative imposition of penalties on improper grounds" (Resources, 12).

In support of these principles, AAUP has developed specific procedures to promote due process in academic freedom cases. Many colleges and universities have incorporated these procedures in whole, or in large part, into their handbooks and governance structures. Yet "a good governance system is no guarantee that academic freedom will flourish." That requires not only a proper governance structure, but acceptance of academic freedom as a central principle of institutional life, as well as the constant vigilance of faculty, individually and through their committees and other faculty organizations.

In the absence of formally adopted department-, college- or university-wide policies, the faculty member retains the right to make individual academic decisions. The authority of the faculty members to teach, research and speak on their subject is grounded in their professional qualifications as judged by the standards of their discipline and their peers. Having met those qualifications, it is therefore the right and responsibility of the faculty to determine the curricula and syllabi, to select the texts, exams, and other instructional materials, and to establish grading

standards for their courses free from pressures from college administrations, outside organizations, politicians, or the media. Where a department or faculty governance body has approved course curricula, textbooks, teaching methods, grading standards, prerequisites, course sequences, and course requirements, however, the individual faculty member is expected to follow these policies.

The AAUP's "Freedom in the Classroom" statement in *Academe* (September-October 2007) responds to recent legislative efforts to mandate "balance" or "diversity" in university classrooms. To the claim that faculty "indoctrinate" students, the statement replies that "It is not indoctrination when, as a result of their research and study, instructors assert to their students that in their view particular propositions are true, even if these propositions are controversial within a discipline." To insist upon neutral balance in the classroom "is fundamentally to misconstrue the nature of higher learning, which expects students to engage with the ideas of their professors." Faculty however may not engage in partisan or religious proselytizing in their classrooms. They should respect their students' opinions and encourage students to express those opinions, and should be fair and objective in assessing student work. However, while treating their students respectfully, faculty members remain responsible for the interpretation of their disciplines (Resources, 13).

Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility after 9/11: A Handbook for Scholars and Teachers, prepared in 2006 by the Task Force on Middle East Anthropology, suggests the following steps that might be taken by faculty before a course begins: be familiar with the AAUP statements on academic freedom and with your college's code of student conduct; distribute a syllabus with your expectations and guidelines on classroom participation and discussion; set the tone for vigorous but respectful class discussions; set up debates or small-group discussions; consider in advance how you might handle potential hot topics or disruptive students (Resources, 16).

In January 2007, the CUNY Board of Trustees established "procedures for handling student complaints about faculty conduct in formal academic settings." The Board's explanation for its action was to address student complaints alleging "incompetent or inefficient service, neglect of duty" and similar concerns. The CUNY administration asserted that "The University respects the academic freedom of the faculty and will not interfere with it as it relates to the content or style of teaching activities." It further stated that the procedures address "faculty conduct that is not protected by academic freedom" (Resources, 15).

Nevertheless, some fear that these procedures will open up undefined areas which will promote a climate of intimidation threatening to academic freedom. The new procedures do, however, include some due process protections. In addition, every faculty member accused of misconduct and facing disciplinary charges is guaranteed due process hearings and union representation under the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

How You Can Respond to Threats Against Your Academic Freedom

If you think your academic freedom has been violated or is at risk, the very first thing to do is call the PSC-CUNY (212-354-1252) and ask to speak to a grievance counselor. Many violations of academic freedom are also violations of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (the contract).

Infringements on Academic Freedom:

In *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (1957), U.S. Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter affirmed the “four essential freedoms” of a university: “to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study.” Colleges and their faculties are to be free of interference in the making of those judgments and the actions following from them. Despite the ambiguity in the use of the word “university,” Justice Frankfurter’s opinion recognizes the faculty’s right to exercise these “freedoms,” for without a faculty, there is no university.

The faculty are to make the definitive academic judgments as to appointments, reappointments, tenure, and promotion of all members of the instructional faculty through a process created and ratified by faculty through the college’s approved governance plan and its by-laws.

As recognized by CUNY BoT ¶ 8.6 and local college governance, faculty members are responsible for recommending faculty appointments, reappointments, tenure and promotion, and setting student standards of admission, curriculum, retention, grading, and graduation.

Concerning what is to be taught, the faculty are the judges of curriculum: programs, degrees, certifications, courses, and syllabi.

Concerning how a subject is to be taught, faculty are the judges of teaching methods, class size and needed materials, including texts, databases, and artistic works.

Some violations of academic freedom include:

- Interference by the central CUNY administration or a local college administration with the faculty role in appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion processes.
- Direct appointment of faculty without faculty participation in searches or personnel review.
- Any demands that a faculty member use a particular textbook or other resource in teaching that has not been so designated by the faculty member, unless determined by his or her department.
- The removal by an administrator of a faculty member, fulltime or adjunct, from a classroom without due process.
- The establishment by administrators of pre- and co-requisites of courses without faculty approval.
- The unilateral establishment by a university’s or college’s administration of admissions criteria for a college or a degree program without faculty governance approval.
- Administrative demands that a faculty member teach using a particular methodology (e.g., group projects, writing intensives, web enhancement) that has not been approved by the faculty member unless determined by his or her department.
- The determination by the administration of what credit-bearing courses shall be offered at the college in any of its programs (including continuing education) without the approval of the appropriate department.
- Any prohibition by an administrator of the offering or display of creative works of art at the college in any of its programs, including continuing education.

Grievances of contractual violations are, however, “time limited.” That is, they must be filed officially within 30 working days of the date you or the union becomes aware of them. A grievance simply protects your rights and allows you to consider the best way to address your concerns, both as an individual and collectively on your campus. So don’t wait to file!

Nationally, the organization Free Exchange on Campus, a coalition of groups including the AAUP, ACLU, AFT, and the United States Student Association, works to support the academic freedom of faculty and to counter political attacks on academic freedom. The AFT has set forth standards of academic freedom in teaching, research and publication, participation in institutional governance, and freedom in public life. The AFT urges faculty to protect and defend their academic freedom by initiating dialogues on campus and among policymakers and the public, as well as negotiating practices that support academic freedom and political and legislative work (Resources, 4).

The University Faculty Senate recommends that each college establish its own local academic freedom committee. Such a committee can monitor cases brought under the new procedures for handling student complaints and can provide a pool of faculty to serve on the appeals committees provided for in the procedures. Campus committees can also monitor, examine and report annually to the faculty on the status of academic freedom at their colleges, investigate possible violations, and address issues and make recommendations regarding academic freedom. Faculty members can also bring cases of possible academic freedom violations or relevant inquiries to the Academic Freedom Committee of the University Faculty Senate and to the Professional Staff Congress of CUNY (PSC-CUNY) (Resources, 2 and 3).

Academic freedom is a major concern of the Professional Staff Congress as well. The PSC has an Academic Freedom Committee which monitors University policy and practice in this area, and which answers questions regarding academic freedom concerns and works with individual faculty and faculty governance bodies in protecting faculty rights (Resources, 2).

The PSC’s Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and its grievance procedures offer the most effective protections available for academic freedom. The Agreement’s preamble pledges that both management and the union will protect academic freedom: “Whereas, CUNY and the PSC seek to maintain and encourage, in accordance with law, full freedom of inquiry, teaching, research and publication of results, the parties subscribe to Academic Freedom for faculty members. The principles of Academic Freedom are recognized as applicable to other members of the Instructional Staff, to the extent that their duties include teaching, research and publication of results, the selection of library or other educational materials or the formation of academic policy.” Contractual remedies for alleged violations include due process in disciplinary cases, the requirement to provide reasons in negative personnel decisions, and the CBA Article 8 guarantee of adherence to nondiscrimination and other Federal laws. Alleged academic freedom violations can also be addressed using faculty governance authority recognized in CUNY BoT Bylaw ¶ 8.6.

Faculty members should familiarize themselves with Article 21, “Disciplinary Actions,” of the CBA (<http://psc-cuny.org/>), and with Section 7, “Academic Due Process,” from the CUNY BoT Bylaws (<http://policy.cuny.edu/toc/btb/>).

If you think that your academic freedom is under attack or is being violated, please consult your campus academic freedom committee, the UFS office, your campus or PSC grievance counselor, or the PSC Academic Freedom Committee. You should do this without delay, as certain

remedies, such as the filing of a grievance, have a 30-day deadline. The UFS and the union are pledged to assist you in whatever ways they can. Faculty members can also bring violations of academic freedom to the attention of the AAUP (800-424-2973) (Resources, 1).

CUNY Affirms Academic Freedom

CUNY has affirmed its support for academic freedom five times since 1946:

- On June 8, 1946, according to the Calendar of the Board of Higher Education (predecessor body of the CUNY BoT), “The following principles of academic freedom as expressed by the American Association of University Professors in its 1940 Statement of Principles were approved by the Administrative Council after consultation with the faculties.” [The Administrative Council was the predecessor of the current Council of Presidents.] The statement above was followed by a citation of the first six paragraphs of the 1940 AAUP Statement.

- On November 12, 1973, according to the Council of Presidents Minutes, “The Council of Presidents reaffirmed the principle that City University should remain a forum for the advocacy of all ideas protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution and the principles of academic freedom.”

- On October 26, 1981, according to the Minutes of the Board of Trustees, the Board formally apologized for the firing of over 50 faculty and staff members in the 1941 Rapp-Coudert purge (see p. 3), stating that CUNY “pledges diligently to safeguard the Constitutional rights of freedom of expression, freedom of association, and open intellectual inquiry of the faculty, staff and students” (Resources, 24).

- On September 24, 2001, the Board of Trustees unanimously endorsed the statement of then Vice Chair and subsequent current BoT chair Benno Schmidt about the controversy over a teach-in about the World Trade Center tragedy: “Academic freedom, freedom of inquiry in the search for truth, the freedom of thought to challenge and to speak one’s mind, these are the matrix, the indispensable condition, of any university worthy of the name. The City University of New York has a proud tradition of academic freedom. We will defend the academic freedom of our faculty and students as essential to the preservation of the University. That these are prized American values, as well as central to the academic mission, only makes their defense in times of crisis the more essential.”

- On October 13, 2005, Chancellor Matthew Goldstein formally endorsed the following definition of academic freedom issued by the first Global Colloquium of University Presidents: “the freedom to conduct research, teach, speak and publish, subject to the norms and standards of scholarly inquiry, without interference or penalty, wherever the search for truth and understanding may lead.” Chancellor Goldstein observed that “The principle of academic freedom is so essential to colleges and universities that it could be said to be part of the genetic code of higher education institutions.” He concluded that “it is our insistence on academic freedom that makes possible our ability to work together toward our most difficult and important task: the creation and dissemination of knowledge.”

How Fragile These Promises?

CUNY has been censured twice by the AAUP for academic freedom violations, and been subject to several additional inquiries by the organization. In 1973 the administration of Queensborough Community College was censured following the suspension and dismissal of three faculty members in the absence of due process protections (Resources, 8 and 9). In 1977, following CUNY's 1976 declaration of financial exigency, thousands of faculty and staff were summarily retrenched. CUNY was subsequently censured based on the "severely deficient" procedures that it had followed. In 1982, following the appointment of Chancellor Joseph Murphy, a new set of financial exigency procedures was worked out with the AAUP and the PSC, after which the AAUP voted in 1983 to remove CUNY from its list of censured institutions.

However, recent concerns have arisen from public attacks and pressure from outside groups or college administrators on faculty members at a number of CUNY colleges. In one case this pressure resulted in the banning without faculty consultation by a college president of an adjunct instructor from future employment at the insistence of an outside association. In another case, a newly-elected department chair withdrew his name following a threatened investigation of his personal beliefs by an administrative committee after he had been attacked in the press. Such attacks from without and within the colleges have, unfortunately, continued. The AAUP has resolved to continue to monitor the conditions of academic freedom in CUNY.

Note that the 1973, 1977 and later academic freedom cases involved violations of due process. The AAUP reasons, as Matthew Finkin (Professor of Law at the University of Illinois-Champaign) said at a UFS conference on academic freedom in 2005, that "Academic freedom—freedom *of* teaching—is rendered meaningless if an instructor may be denied access to students *to* teach, absent legitimate cause [emphasis original]."

Protecting Academic Freedom at CUNY

Faculty, who form the core of the University, must be free from a climate of intimidation.

Remember, if you believe that your academic freedom has been or is being threatened or violated, contact the UFS at 212-794-5538 (or by email at CUNYUFS@gmail.com) and the Professional Staff Congress at 212-354-1252 immediately, and alert your faculty governance leader and your campus academic freedom committee. An attack on any one faculty member's academic freedom is an attack on all and on the institution itself.

Selected Resources

Organizations

1. American Association of University Professors. <http://www.aaup.org/>. (800-924-2973) Accessed 7/22/09.
2. Professional Staff Congress/CUNY. <http://www.psc-cuny.org/> (212-354-1252) Accessed 7/22/09.
3. University Faculty Senate. <http://www.cunyufs.org>. (212-794-5538) Accessed 7/22/09.
4. Free Exchange on Campus. <http://www.freeexchangeoncampus.org>. Accessed 7/22/09.

Statements by the AAUP

5. 1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1915.htm>. Accessed 7/22/09.
6. 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. 1940, 1969, 1989, 1990. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm>. Accessed 7/22/09.
7. Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. 1967, 1990. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/governancestatement.htm>. Accessed 7/22/09.
8. 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings. 1958, 1989, 1990. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementon+proceduralstandardsinfaculty+dismissal+proceedings.htm>. Accessed 7/22/09.
9. Statement on Procedural Standards on the Renewal or Non-Renewal of Faculty Appointments. 1971, 1989. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/nonreapp-stmt.htm>. Accessed 7/22/09.
10. Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure. See especially Section 13, "Part-Time Faculty Appointments." 1957, 1968, 1972, 1976, 1982, 1990, 1999, 2005, 2006. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/RIR.htm>. Accessed 7/22/09.
11. Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students. 1967, 1990, 1991, 1992. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/stud-rights.htm>. Accessed 7/22/09.
12. On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom. *AAUP Policy Documents & Reports*. Tenth Edition. Baltimore: AAUP and Johns Hopkins UP, 2006. 141-144.
13. "Freedom in the Classroom." *Academe* September-October 2007, 54-61. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/A/class.htm>. Accessed 7/22/09.

Other Statements and Procedures

14. "Academic Freedom in the 21st-Century College and University: Academic Freedom for All Faculty and Instructional Staff." The AFT Statement on Academic Freedom. September 2007. <http://www.aft.org>. Accessed 7/22/09.
15. The City University of New York—Student Complaint Procedure. 2007. <http://tiny.cc/5k8x9>. Accessed 7/22/09.

Selected Works on Academic Freedom

16. *Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility after 9/11: A Handbook for Scholars and Teachers*. Task Force on Middle East Anthropology. 2006. <http://www.meanthro.org/handbook.htm>. Accessed 7/22/09.
17. *AAUP Policy Documents & Reports*. Tenth Edition. Baltimore: AAUP and Johns Hopkins UP, 2006. (the “Red Book”)
18. Baumrin, Stefan. “Foundations of Academic Freedom and Tenure.” *Annals of Scholarship* 11 (1981).
19. Bousquet, Marc. *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation*. New York: NYU Press, 2008.
20. Hofstadter, Richard. *Academic Freedom in the Age of the College*. New Introduction by Roger L. Geiger. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1955.
21. Kaplan, Craig and Ellen Schrecker. *Regulating the Intellectuals: Perspectives on Academic Freedom in the 1980s*. New York: Praeger, 1983.
22. Leberstein, Stephen. “Fragile Promises: Academic Freedom at the City University of New York.” In Malini Johar Schueller and Ashley Dawson, eds. *Dangerous Professors: Academic Freedom and the National Security Campus*. Michigan UP, 2009.
23. Leberstein, Stephen. “The mis-named ‘Academic Bill of Rights.’” *Clarion*. September 2005, 10. <http://www.psc-cuny.org/Clarion%20Sept%2005.pdf>. Accessed 7/22/09.
24. Leberstein, Stephen, “Purging the Profs: The Rapp-Coudert Committee in New York, 1940-1942.” In Michael Brown, et al., eds. *New Studies in the Politics and Culture of U.S. Communism*. New York: Monthly Press, 1993.
25. Metzger, Walter P. *Academic Freedom in the Age of the University*. New York: Columbia UP, 1961.
26. Schrecker, Ellen. “Academic Freedom in the Age of Casualization.” In Monika Krause, et al. *The University Against Itself: The NYU Strike and the Future of the Academic Workplace*. Temple UP, 2008.
27. Schrecker, Ellen. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.

Credits

Lenore Beaky, University Faculty Senate Vice Chair; Professor, Department of English, LaGuardia Community College; Executive Committee, National Council, AAUP

Stephen Leberstein, Frederick Ewen Academic Freedom Fellow, 2008-2009; Chair, PSC Academic Freedom Committee; Member, AAUP Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, 2000-2006

Irwin Yellowitz, Chair, Committee A, AAUP New York State Conference; Retiree, CCNY

Philip Pecorino, University Faculty Senate Executive Committee; Professor, Department of Social Sciences, Queensborough Community College

UFS Executive Committee:

Officers -- Manfred Philipp (Chair); Martha Bell (Secretary), Karen Kaplowitz (Treasurer).

Members at large -- Stefan Baumrin, Sandi Cooper, Anne Friedman, and Leslie Jacobson.

PSC-CUNY Academic Freedom Committee:

Aaron Barlow, NYCT; Robert Cermele, NYCT; Blanche Wiesen Cook, JJ and Grad School; Ann Davison, QC; William Friedheim, BMCC Retiree; Stephen Leberstein, CCNY Retiree, Chair; Gerry Markowitz, JJ and Grad School; Marcia Newfield, BMCC; Shirley Rausher, BMCC; Clarence Taylor, Baruch

University Faculty Senate Academic Freedom Committee:

Judith Barbanel, Queensborough CC

Lenore Beaky, LaGuardia CC

Philip Belcastro, BMCC

Rosalind Carey, Lehman College

Daniel Habib, Queens College

Richard Kaye, Hunter College

Philip Lerman, LaGuardia CC

Marie Marianetti, Lehman College

Costas Panayotakis, NYC College of Technology

Rick Repetti, Kingsborough CC

Stephen Stearns, College of Staten Island, Chair

Kathryn Talarico, College of Staten Island

Robert Viscusi, Brooklyn College

EbenWood, Kingsborough CC

Richard Woytowich, NYC College of Technology

September 2009