

1: Faculty Freedoms and Institutional Accountability: Interactions and Conflicts. ERIC Digest

Academic freedom is protected by society so that faculty and students can use that freedom to promote the larger good. This document articulates an ideal that is based on historic conceptions of academic freedom and extends those precepts to include responsibilities for the holistic education of students.

Love asks for affection and commitment to be given without constraint; the acceptance of truth requires a willing examination and reception of evidence and argument; justice demands respect for personal rights and freedom. The presence of these elements within the Church nurtures the spirit of unity for which our Lord prayed John 17: Seventh-day Adventists have derived their distinctive world view from the Old and New Testaments. They believe that Biblical truth and freedom of conscience are vital issues in the great controversy between good and evil. By its very nature evil depends on deception and falsehood, and sometimes force, to maintain itself. It would be inconsistent for the Church to preach that truth and freedom cannot exist without each other and then to deny its workers the right to freely investigate all claims to truth. This means, therefore, that the Church will not obstruct the quest for truth but will encourage its workers and constituents to engage in serious study of the Scriptures and to appreciate the spiritual light they disclose Psalm Although the worker is free to pursue his studies, he may not assume that his personal, limited perspective does not need the insights and corrective influence of the Church he serves. What he thinks to be truth may be regarded by the larger community of believers to be error. And workers and members are called upon to be in agreement on essential points "that there be no divisions" in the body of Christ 1 Cor 1: Freedom for the individual Christian grows out of his belonging to the community of Christ. No one is free in the Biblical sense who is out of relationship with God or others. Theological truth, therefore, is affirmed by community study and confirmation. No member or worker can ever serve as an infallible interpreter for anyone else. Inasmuch as deceptive teachings, harmful to the eternal welfare of souls, may at times arise from within the Church itself of Acts Even a genuine insight into truth discovered by a worker may not be acceptable to the corporate body upon first exposure to it. If such a teaching is divisive, it should not be taught or preached until evaluated in the manner described above. The apostles themselves provide an example of this approach of Acts Once that principle was accepted by the Church, he was willing to make concessions on matters of less significance Rom Allowing a principle or a new truth time to translate itself into the daily life of the Church shows respect for the integrity of the body of Christ. But where shall the line be drawn between freedom and responsibility? He is expected to expound the Word of God conscientiously and with Christian concern for the eternal welfare of the persons under his care. Such a privilege precludes the promotion of theological views contrary to the accepted position of the Church. Should a worker violate this trust, the Church must move to maintain its own character Acts This is particularly so because the worker, being in the service of the Church, is accountable for the preservation of its order and unity of Mark 3: In the interest of genuine progress in spiritual understanding 2 Peter 3: Listening to alternatives will always advance truth. Either the alternative will strengthen and enlarge upon the truth, or it will stand exposed as false, thereby confirming present positions. To ensure fairness and a mature assessment, therefore, the following guidelines are to be followed by the administrations concerned when dealing with a worker alleged to hold conflicting views on doctrine. Churches, Conferences, X Institutions, and Nonacademic Institutions The Church reserves the right to employ only those individuals who personally believe in and are committed to upholding the doctrinal tenets of the Church as summarized in the document, "Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists" Such individuals are issued special credentials by their respective church bodies identifying them as continuing workers in the Church. As church members, employees continue to be subject to the conditions for church membership as stated in the Church Manual. This document also relates to employment as salaried workers. There are corporate church rights as well as individual freedoms. If a hearing is necessary, the following process is recommended: Consultation should be in a spirit of conciliation allowing the worker every opportunity to freely express his convictions in an open and honest manner. If the worker voluntarily initiates a consultation and informs the chief executive officer of his theological uncertainties, and if his attitude is open to counsel

without compulsion to promulgate his doubts and views, the following course of action is recommended: The worker will continue to function at his post and will render a written report of his position before the end of six months. If within that period the matter is satisfactorily resolved, no further action is necessary. See below for its composition and function. If the worker actively promotes his divergent doctrinal opinions and his chief executive officer is obligated to initiate the consultation, the following course of action is recommended: The doctrinal views of the worker shall be submitted by him to the review committee in writing previous to the meeting. At the time of review he shall be available for discussion with the committee. The review committee shall conduct its business with serious purpose, complete honesty, and scrupulous fairness. If agreement is not reached within the committee, a minority report shall also be included. If the review committee finds that the views of the worker are compatible with the Fundamental Beliefs of the Church, no further action will be necessary. To restudy his theological position in the hope that this will eliminate his theological divergence. To refrain from the promulgation of his divergent doctrinal views. If the worker is unable to reconcile his theological views with the denominational positions and also feels constrained by his conscience to defend his views both privately and publicly, the review committee shall recommend to his executive committee that his credentials be withdrawn. Any recommendations of the union conference division, if in a division institution appeal committee shall be referred to the union conference division executive committee. The union conference division officers through their chief executive officer shall notify the worker of their collective decision. A last appeal may be made by the worker to the executive committee of the division of the General Conference in which he resides. During the period of hearing, review, and appeal, the worker shall refrain from public discussion of the issues involved.

Academic Freedom in Seventh-day Adventist Institutions of Higher Education All learning and all teaching take place within the framework of a world view of the nature of reality, man, knowledge, and values. This is the goal of Seventh-day Adventist education. In the Seventh-day Adventist college and university, as in any institution of higher learning, the principle of academic freedom has been central to establishing such aims. This principle reflects a belief in freedom as an essential right in a democratic society, but with a particular focus in an academic community. It is the guarantee that teachers and students will be able to carry on the functions of learning, research, and teaching with a minimum of restrictions. It also applies to the atmosphere of open inquiry necessary in an academic community if learning is to be honest and thorough. For the church college or university, academic freedom has an additional significance. It is more important than it is in the secular institution, not less, for it is essential to the well-being of the Church itself. This places a responsibility on the Christian professor to be a self-disciplined, responsible, and mature scholar, to investigate, teach, and publish within the area of his academic competence, without external restraint, but with a due regard for the character and aims of the institution which provides him with credentials, and with concern for the spiritual and the intellectual needs of his students. Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, therefore, subscribe to principles of academic freedom generally held important in higher education. These principles make possible the disciplined and creative pursuit of truth. They also recognize that freedoms are never absolute and that they imply commensurate responsibilities. The following principles of academic freedom are stated within the context of accountability, with special attention to limitations made necessary by the religious aims of a Christian institution.

The Freedoms

1 Freedom of Speech. While the right to private opinion is a part of the human heritage as creatures of God, in accepting employment at a Seventh-day Adventist college or university the teacher recognizes certain limits to expression of personal views. As a member of a learned profession, he must recognize that the public will judge his profession by his utterances. Therefore, he will be accurate, respectful of the opinions of others, and will exercise appropriate restraint. He will make it clear when he does not speak for the institution. In expressing private views he will have in mind their effect on the reputation and goals of the institution. The Christian scholar will undertake research within the context of his faith and from the perspective of Christian ethics. He is free to do responsible research with proper respect for public safety and decency. The teacher will conduct his professional activities and present his subject matter within the world view described in the opening paragraph of this document. As a specialist within a particular discipline, he is entitled to freedom in the classroom to discuss his subject honestly. However, he will not introduce into

his teaching controversial matter unrelated to his subject. Academic freedom is freedom to pursue knowledge and truth in the area of the individual's specialty. It does not give license to express controversial opinions on subjects outside that specialty nor does it protect the individual from being held accountable for his teaching.

Shared Responsibilities Just as the need for academic freedom has a special significance in a church institution, so do the limitations placed on it reflect the special concerns of such an institution. The first responsibility of the teacher and leaders of the institution, and of the Church, is to seek for and to disseminate truth. The second responsibility is the obligation of teachers and leaders of the institution and the Church to counsel together when scholarly findings have a bearing on the message and mission of the Church. The true scholar, humble in his quest for truth, will not refuse to listen to the findings and the advice of others. He recognizes that others also have discovered and are discovering truth. He will learn from them and actively seek their counsel regarding the expression of views inconsistent with those generally taught by his Church, for his concern is for the harmony of the church community. On the other hand, church leaders are expected to foster an atmosphere of Christian cordiality within which the scholar will not feel threatened if his findings differ from traditionally held views. Since the dynamic development of the Church depends on the continuing study of dedicated scholars, the president, board of trustees, and Church leaders will protect the scholar, not only for his sake but also for the cause of truth and the welfare of the Church. The historic doctrinal position of the Church has been defined by the General Conference in session and is published in the Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook under the title, "Fundamental Beliefs. Truth, they will remember, is not the only product of the crucible of controversy; disruption also results. The dedicated scholar will exercise discretion in presenting concepts which might threaten church unity and the effectiveness of church action. When expressing such differences, a teacher will be fair in his presentation and will make his loyalty to the Church clear. He will attempt to differentiate between hypotheses and facts and between central and peripheral issues. When questions arise dealing with matters of academic freedom, each university and college should have clearly stated procedures to follow in dealing with such grievances. Such procedures should include peer review, an appeal process, and a review by the board of trustees. Every possible care should be taken to insure that actions will be just and fair and will protect both the rights of the teacher and the integrity of the institution. The protection of both is not only a matter of justice but on a college or university campus it is also a matter of creating and protecting collegiality. It is also a protection against the disruptive, the servile, and the fraudulent.

2: Accountability - Wikipedia

Abstract: In , interference with academic freedom dominated public discourse in Hong Kong. This article provides an analysis of academic freedom in Hong Kong, addresses some systemic problems, and engages the debates between academic freedom and accountability of publicly funded institutions.

Dwivedi, and Joseph G. Jabbara list 8 types of accountability, namely: Political[edit] Political accountability is the accountability of the government , civil servants and politicians to the public and to legislative bodies such as a congress or a parliament. Hirschman makes substantial contributions to accountability theory, positing exit or voice as pivotal accountability mechanisms. The literature connects this disposition of autonomy or dependence to its fiscal capacity. States that are most responsive adjust to exit or voice. All three of these sufficiently broad categories present ways and means of holding the state accountable. Recall elections can be used to revoke the office of an elected official. Generally, however, voters do not have any direct way of holding elected representatives to account during the term for which they have been elected. Additionally, some officials and legislators may be appointed rather than elected. Constitution , or statute , can empower a legislative body to hold their own members, the government, and government bodies to account. This can be through holding an internal or independent inquiry. Inquiries are usually held in response to an allegation of misconduct or corruption. The powers, procedures and sanctions vary from country to country. The legislature may have the power to impeach the individual, remove them, or suspend them from office for a period of time. The accused person might also decide to resign before trial. Impeachment in the United States has been used both for elected representatives and other civil offices, such as district court judges. In parliamentary systems, the government relies on the support or parliament, which gives parliament power to hold the government to account. For example, some parliaments can pass a vote of no confidence in the government. Beyond that institutions can act as credible restraints on autocracy as well. Researchers at the Overseas Development Institute found that empowering citizens in developing countries to be able to hold their domestic governments to account was incredibly complex in practice. However, by developing explicit processes that generate change from individuals, groups or communities Theories of Change , and by fusing political economy analysis and outcome mapping tools, the complex state-citizen dynamics can be better understood. As such, more effective ways to achieve outcomes can hence be generated. The researchers concluded that CSOs are most effective when they draw in a broad web of actors from across the accountability system, including the media, auditors, donors, the legislature, executive insiders, and political parties. Social accounting and Environmental accounting Within an organization, the principles and practices of ethical accountability aim to improve both the internal standard of individual and group conduct as well as external factors, such as sustainable economic and ecologic strategies. Also, ethical accountability plays a progressively important role in academic fields, such as laboratory experiments and field research. Debates around the practice of ethical accountability on the part of researchers in the social field “ whether professional or others “ have been thoroughly explored by Norma R. Administrative[edit] Internal rules and norms as well as some independent commission are mechanisms to hold civil servants within the administration of government accountable. Within department or ministry, firstly, behavior is bound by rules and regulations; secondly, civil servants are subordinates in a hierarchy and accountable to superiors. Nonetheless, there are independent "watchdog" units to scrutinize and hold departments accountable; legitimacy of these commissions is built upon their independence, as it avoids any conflicts of interests. The accountability is defined as "an element which is part of a unique responsibility and which represents an obligation of an actor to achieve the goal, or to perform the procedure of a task, and the justification that it is done to someone else, under threat of sanction". For example, the use of unique user identification and authentication supports accountability; the use of shared user IDs and passwords destroys accountability. Individuals within organizations[edit] Because many different individuals in large organizations contribute in many ways to the decisions and policies, it is difficult even in principle to identify who should be accountable for the results. This is what is known, following Thompson, as the problem of many hands. If individuals are

held accountable or responsible, individuals who could not have prevented the results are either unfairly punished, or they "take responsibility" in a symbolic ritual without suffering any consequences. If only organizations are held accountable, then all individuals in the organization are equally blameworthy or all are excused. Various solutions have been proposed. One is to broaden the criteria for individual responsibility so that individuals are held accountable for not anticipating failures in the organization. Another solution, recently proposed by Thompson, is to hold individuals accountable for the design of the organization, both retrospectively and prospectively. Moreover, the government is obliged to empower members of agencies with political rights to run for elections and be elected; or, appoint them into the public sector as a way to make the government representative and to ensure that voices from all constituencies are included in policy-making. Legal scholar Anne Davies, for instance, argues that the line between public institutions and private entities like corporations is becoming blurred in certain areas of public service in the United Kingdom, and that this can compromise political accountability in those areas. She and others argue that some administrative law reform is necessary to address this accountability gap. The study of account giving as a sociological act was articulated in a article on "Accounts" by Marvin Scott and Stanford Lyman, [28] although it can be traced as well to J. Communications scholars have extended this work through the examination of strategic uses of excuses, justifications, rationalizations, apologies and other forms of account giving behavior by individuals and corporations, and Philip Tetlock and his colleagues have applied experimental design techniques to explore how individuals behave under various scenarios and situations that demand accountability. Recently, accountability has become an important topic in the discussion about the legitimacy of international institutions. The Charter 99 for Global Democracy, [31] spearheaded by the One World Trust , first proposed that cross-sector principles of accountability be researched and observed by institutions that affect people, independent of their legal status. One paradigmatic problem arising in the global context is that of institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund who are founded and supported by wealthy nations or individuals and provide grants and loans, to developing nations. Should those institutions be accountable to their founders and investors or to the persons and nations they lend money to? In the debate over global justice and its distributional consequences, Cosmopolitans tend to advocate greater accountability to the disregarded interests of traditionally marginalized populations and developing nations. On the other hand, those in the Nationalism and Society of States traditions deny the tenets of moral universalism and argue that beneficiaries of global development initiatives have no substantive entitlement to call international institutions to account. The One World Trust Global Accountability Report, published in a first full cycle to , [32] is one attempt to measure the capability of global organizations to be accountable to their stakeholders. Accountability in education[edit] Student accountability is traditionally based on hang school and classroom rules, combined with sanctions for infringement. Test results typically are used to judge accountability, and often consequences are imposed for shortcomings. Freedom of choice, freedom of action, freedom to bear the results of action are considered the three great freedoms that constitute personal responsibility. Students are given complete responsibility for their own education and the school is run by a direct democracy in which students and staff are equals. Congressmen who are less covered by the local press work less for their constituencies: Federal spending is lower in areas where there is less press coverage of the local members of congress. The following year, "fewer candidates ran for municipal office in the Kentucky suburbs most reliant on the Post, incumbents became more likely to win reelection, and voter turnout and campaign spending fell. To train people to conduct these kinds of investigations, Charles Lewis has proposed "the creation of a new multidisciplinary academic field called Accountability Studies. They address issues affecting governance, business models and organizational strategy, as well as providing operational guidance on sustainability assurance and stakeholder engagement" [47] Humanitarian Accountability Partnership HAP standards. A standard for humanitarian organizations to help them "design, implement, assess, improve and recognize accountable programmes" [48] In addition, some non-profit organizations set up their own commitments to accountability: Freedom is only part of the story and half of the truth. Freedom is but the negative aspect of the whole phenomenon whose positive aspect is responsibility. In fact, freedom is in danger of degenerating into mere arbitrariness unless it is lived in terms of responsibility.

3: Defining Academic Freedom

Accountability in Research, p. Reprinted with permission of publisher Taylor and Francis. ACCOUNTABILITY AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM The Battle Concerning Research on Cold Fusion at.

Association for the Study of Higher Education. Faculty Freedoms and Institutional Accountability: For nearly three-quarters of a century, academic freedom has protected college faculty in the United States from external control over or inquiry into their teaching methods, the content of their classroom lectures, and the research topics they choose to investigate. The increasingly complex environment in which colleges and universities now operate, however, has spawned a set of requirements for accountability with which institutions, and through them faculty, must comply. Limitations are being enacted on the amount of time faculty may spend and, in some cases, the amount of money that can be earned in outside consulting. Faculty relationships with students are becoming a legal and a moral issue on campus. The rapidity with which these requirements have arrived on campus, and their pervasiveness, suggest a clash with the traditional academic freedom and autonomy enjoyed by college faculty. Academic freedom and tenure provide important protections to faculty members; they are of special importance to the maintenance of the intellectual vitality and creativity of American colleges and universities. Tenure ensures the economic security of the professor and guarantees that due process will be afforded the faculty member should the position be threatened. While academic freedom and tenure provide important protections, those protections are not unlimited. Faculty with tenure can be removed for cause or in times of financial distress. For example, academic freedom protects faculty from retaliation for the expression of unpopular political or religious beliefs, but it does not immunize faculty against charges of insubordination, neglect of duty, or interference with the efficient operation of the institution. Teaching and classroom discussion are protected by academic freedom, but research fraud or other forms of dishonesty in designing, conducting, and reporting research do not fall under the protections of academic freedom. And while academic freedom permits a faculty member to exercise all the rights that other citizens enjoy, it does not forgive the violation of civil or criminal laws, the abuse of students, gross insubordination, and private misconduct, often labeled "moral turpitude. Institutions today face a myriad of new pressures and responsibilities. Foremost among them is the need to account for monies received from private donors, state legislatures, and foundations. To meet these heightened responsibilities, institutions are developing new measures of faculty work and implementing new regulations over faculty time and effort. Several areas in particular have been the focus of institutional rule making. Because faculty outside institutional rule making. Because faculty outside work performed during the academic year is viewed by the external business community as subsidized competition and by state legislators as a form of double dipping, institutions have enacted limitations on permissible levels of outside consulting. The most common practice is to limit remunerated consulting to no more than one day per calendar week. Consulting in excess of this limitation has been held to be a valid basis for termination of appointment. The prohibitions on use of inappropriate criteria for academic decisions, such as those that fall into the category of sexual harassment, further circumscribe the internal conduct of faculty. Driven by the need for more revenue and a fair financial return for providing a conducive and creative environment, colleges are increasingly exercising their rights of legal ownership over the work product of faculty. Inventions that may be patented and software that may be copyrighted no longer solely belong to the creator or author but are the property rights of the university. The pressures to regulate time, effort, and behavior also force institutions to examine the substantive performance of faculty. Simply fulfilling the objective time requirements of the job does not ensure quality of performance in assigned duties. The most common criticism of tenure is that it provides a sinecure for the incompetent faculty member. It is one way for institutions to document that the expenditure of salary funds is proper and to guarantee to students that the education they receive is of appropriate quality. Colleges and universities, in response primarily to external constituencies, are being compelled to promulgate and enforce limitations in areas of traditional faculty autonomy. Regulations governing outside consulting, conflict of interest, ownership of patents and copyrights, sexual harassment, and periodic reviews of faculty competence all may

be perceived to confine the traditional freedoms of faculty. Moreover, violations of these rules become valid cause for the discipline or dismissal of faculty. The overall effect of increasing regulation makes higher education a less desirable environment in which to work. Intrinsic factors such as autonomy and freedom contribute most to faculty satisfaction. Yet while these new limitations may be legal, necessary, and not technically inconsistent with academic freedom as it has evolved, they do seriously affect job satisfaction. The need to adopt such rules is unavoidable, however, and the answer to lessening their negative impact must therefore lie in the manner in which the rules are formulated and adopted. Faculty should be actively involved in the creation or modification of institutional policies or structures designed to address requirements for accountability. Association for the Study of Higher Education, Commission on Academic Tenure. Agathon Press, in press. University of Chicago Press, Further, this site is using a privately owned and located server. This is NOT a government sponsored or government sanctioned site.

4: A Statement on Theological and Academic Freedom and Accountability

This article discusses the legal and policy issues associated with the academic freedom claims that might arise in the current atmosphere of increased accountability and diminished autonomy for teacher education programs.

Over the course of decades, a great many books, essays, and policies have been written and published about academic freedom. We have learned how to apply it to pedagogical, technological, cultural, and political realities that did not exist when the concept was first defined. Not only faculty members, administrators, trustees, and students, but also parents, politicians, and other members of the public, would now benefit from a concise summary of its major features. But many within and without higher education are not well-versed in all the protections it does provide. What it does do

1. Academic freedom means that both faculty members and students can engage in intellectual debate without fear of censorship or retaliation. It preserves the intellectual integrity of our educational system and thus serves the public good. Academic freedom in teaching means that both faculty members and students can make comparisons and contrasts between subjects taught in a course and any field of human knowledge or period of history. Academic freedom gives both students and faculty the right to express their views “ in speech, writing, and through electronic communication, both on and off campus ” without fear of sanction, unless the manner of expression substantially impairs the rights of others or, in the case of faculty members, those views demonstrate that they are professionally ignorant, incompetent, or dishonest with regard to their discipline or fields of expertise. Academic freedom gives both students and faculty the right to study and do research on the topics they choose and to draw what conclusions they find consistent with their research, though it does not prevent others from judging whether their work is valuable and their conclusions sound. To protect academic freedom, universities should oppose efforts by corporate or government sponsors to block dissemination of any research findings. Academic freedom means that the political, religious, or philosophical beliefs of politicians, administrators, and members of the public cannot be imposed on students or faculty. Academic freedom gives faculty members and students the right to seek redress or request a hearing if they believe their rights have been violated. Academic freedom protects faculty members and students from reprisals for disagreeing with administrative policies or proposals. More broadly, academic freedom encompasses both the individual and institutional right to maintain academic standards. Academic freedom gives faculty members substantial latitude in deciding how to teach the courses for which they are responsible. Academic freedom guarantees that serious charges against a faculty member will be heard before a committee of his or her peers. It provides faculty members the right to due process, including the assumption that the burden of proof lies with those who brought the charges, that faculty have the right to present counter-evidence and confront their accusers, and be assisted by an attorney in serious cases if they choose. Academic freedom does not mean a faculty member can harass, threaten, intimidate, ridicule, or impose his or her views on students. Student academic freedom does not deny faculty members the right to require students to master course material and the fundamentals of the disciplines that faculty teach. Neither academic freedom nor tenure protects an incompetent teacher from losing his or her job. Academic freedom thus does not grant an unqualified guarantee of lifetime employment. Academic freedom does not protect faculty members from colleague or student challenges to or disagreement with their educational philosophy and practices. Academic freedom does not protect faculty members from non-university penalties if they break the law. Academic freedom does not give students or faculty the right to ignore college or university regulations, though it does give faculty and students the right to criticize regulations they believe are unfair. Academic freedom does not protect students or faculty from disciplinary action, but it does require that they receive fair treatment and due process. Academic freedom does not protect faculty members from sanctions for professional misconduct, though sanctions require clear proof established through due process. Neither academic freedom nor tenure protects a faculty member from various sanctions “ from denial of merit raises, to denial of sabbatical requests, to the loss of desirable teaching and committee assignments ” for poor performance, though such sanctions are regulated by local agreements and by faculty handbooks. If minor, sanctions should be grievable; if major, they must be preceded by an appropriate hearing. Neither

academic freedom nor tenure protects a faculty member who repeatedly skips class or refuses to teach the classes or subject matter assigned. Though briefly interrupting an invited speaker may be compatible with academic freedom, actually preventing a talk or a performance from continuing is not. Academic freedom does not protect a faculty member from investigations into allegations of scientific misconduct or violations of sound university policies, nor from appropriate penalties should such charges be sustained in a hearing of record before an elected faculty body. These points are mostly adapted from nearly years of American Association of University Professors policy documents and reports. Since its founding, the AAUP has been the primary source of the documents outlining the basic principles of faculty rights and responsibilities. It is also the source of perhaps the single best statement of student rights. Putting the principles above into practice, of course, requires a goodly amount of additional detail, information the AAUP continues to provide and update. He is the author, most recently, of *No University Is an Island*:

5: Academic Freedom Requires Academic Accountability - Bacon's Rebellion

3 Academic Freedom, Political Interference, and Public Accountability Johannes M. M. Chan and Douglas Kerr For a long time it was essentially a migrants' town, and only in the s and s did there develop a.

6: Academic Freedom, Excellence and Accountability

Academic Freedom, Accountability, Autonomy: MS Page 2 of 4 programs. AWhat@ of academe. \$ Procedural autonomy is the power to determine the means by which those goals and.

Tobacco investigations in Ohio. Angolan civil war causes 7.3 Indirect Field Oriented Control. The nautical almanac and astronomical ephemeris, for the year 1789 Blue Mound to 161 Records of North American Big Game, 11th Edition The curse of Calvin Keen The underground rail road Carcinogens Mutagens in the Environment Naturally Occuring Compounds Endogenous Formation Modulation Controlling Corporeality The growth of Canadian policies in external affairs Beth Manners Magic Spanish for Kids The internal organisation of the Merchant Adventurers of England Littles Give a Party Tim hortons employment application form Excursion of the Putnam phalanx to Boston, Charlestown and Providence, October 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th, in Communication Between Cultures (with InfoTrac (Wadsworth Series in Speech Communication) Sedimentary Provenance and Petrogenesis The way home linda howard Random House Parent and Child Puzzles, Volume 2 (Other) Barriers to leadership as service Christensen Brothers Pro/ENGINEER Wildfire MECHANICA Structure Tutorial Four: War and persecution Persuasion in the French personal novel Zecharia sitchin 12th planet The New Simply Delicious/Fast and Easy Vegetarian Recipes (Essential Rose Elliot) Period 1. Roman Iron Age and the Migration Age The law and economics of dispute resolution in India Memoirs of a Jewish Revolutionary 50 years behind the scenes in advertising American Government and the Vision of the Democrats Back to Basics: The Perfect Paragraph Abandon every fear, ye that enter : the X-men journey through Dantes Inferno Don Leibold Cape Ann North Shore, Cape Cod the islands, bicycle map: With recreation features Master shots Insurance commander Decree of Council of Trent quoted 66 Dinosaurs and other extinct animals Psychiatric education on the inpatient unit Cynthia A. Pristach and Subhdeep Virk