

IN THEIR OWN VOICES:
*Students Discuss the State of Intellectual Diversity & Tolerance on
Colorado's College Campuses*

**December 18, 2003
Issue Backgrounder 2003-I**



**A Report from the Campus Accountability Project
Independence Institute
14142 Denver West Parkway, Suite 185
Golden, Colorado 80401**

A MESSAGE FROM CAP DIRECTOR JESSICA PECK CORRY

In recent months, a debate has surfaced in Colorado, and around the country, about the status of intellectual and ideological diversity and tolerance on our taxpayer-funded college campuses.

Public discussion, ignited following a visit to Colorado by outspoken conservative activist David Horowitz, centers around his proposed "Academic Bill of Rights," model legislation designed to protect individuals from persecution based on ideology or political beliefs.

In the days, weeks, and months following Mr. Horowitz's visit, students approached the Campus Accountability Project, eager to have their stories heard and asking how they could help to tell the truth regarding discrimination on Colorado's campuses.

This project is the culmination of such requests. On the following pages, concerned students from around the state describe—in their own voices—what life is like at Colorado's institutions of higher learning. These testimonies have been compiled by the Campus Accountability Project not to promote the passage of specific legislation, but rather to serve as a resource for all community members, including university administrators and professors, students, parents, and legislators, in learning how to best address discrimination and a lack of diversity on our campuses.

Readers will find that three key themes run through this collection. First, students contend that intellectual discrimination is real. They offer stories of professors attacking them, and in some cases, silencing them in their efforts to address discrimination on, or bring diversity to, campus. Second, universities make little or no effort to keep and record legitimate data on intellectual and ideological discrimination. Third, venues designed to address discrimination are largely inadequate or inaccessible to students.

"Academic Freedom", a term today largely associated with a professor's right to freely express views and concepts in the classroom without fear of retribution, has a proud academic tradition encompassing a professional ethos dedicated not only to the rights of the professor, but also the rights of students.

As the debate moves forward, it is appropriate to reflect on this tradition, as seen in the American Association of University Professors' 1940 "Statement on Principles on Academic Freedom & Tenure."¹

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.

¹ Obtained from American Association of University Professors on December 15, 2003, www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/1940stat.htm, includes 1970 interpretive comments.

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

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

- a. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
- b. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.
- c. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

Ultimately, every great institution has a responsibility to see its obligation to present and respect a diversity of viewpoints in the classroom. True and critical thought occurs in the classroom only when all are challenged to think and evaluate a diversity of perspectives relevant to the course work. Unfortunately, based on what the Campus Accountability Project has uncovered on Colorado's campuses, there simply isn't adequate tolerance for this type of diversity. Tragically, somewhere along the line, the podium became a pulpit and universities began expressing indifference to teaching students to think critically.

In closing, it is important to acknowledge that the students who have lent their voices to this project have risked their reputations, and in some cases, their academic futures. Their quest is simple: to encourage and foster a respect for intellectual diversity on our campuses. If we cannot provide a learning environment that respects a plurality of views, then we have not only failed today's students, but also the taxpayers of Colorado and future generations of Colorado scholars.

Corry is the director of the Campus Accountability Project, a non-partisan education policy center housed at the Independence Institute in Golden. She earned her undergraduate degree in journalism from the University of Colorado at Boulder and her master's degree in government from the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland. She can be reached at Jessica@i2i.org or by telephone at 303/312-1582 or 720/252-5311.

Several of the accounts presented on the following pages were presented by the authors at a special hearing called by Senate President John Andrews at the Colorado General Assembly on December 18, 2003. They have been edited for space and clarity.

NATE STRAUCH, University of Colorado at Boulder

ERIN BERGSTROM, Colorado State University

DANIELLE ROBINSON, Metropolitan State College of Denver

WESTERN STATE COLLEGE STUDENT, name withheld

TAMARA LOUDEN, University of Colorado at Denver

ANNE CLODFELTER, Metropolitan State College

FLUX NEO, University of Colorado at Boulder

CAROL VERNON, Denver University

GEORGE CULPEPPER, Metropolitan State College

KELLY WEIST, Metropolitan State College, adjunct faculty member

MARK J. DALEY, Colorado State University

BRIAN M. GLOTZBACH, Metropolitan State College

NICK BAHL, Metropolitan State College

KIRK HAMM, University of Colorado at Denver/Boulder

NATE STRAUCH: *Nate is currently a junior majoring in political science at the University of Colorado in Boulder. He is from Flagler, Colorado. Below, Nate discusses what he sees as a disregard for intellectual diversity in the classroom.*

During the height of the civil rights movement, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. proclaimed that, "Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter." Few things matter more in this country than maintaining an environment where people can voice their opinions without fear of retribution. For decades, liberal universities have used liberal professors to silence conservative students. This process has been accepted as the status quo for nearly a half-century. Finally, a brave collection of lawmakers, students, faculty, and administrators has come forward to say, "It is time to break the silence."

I have attended the University of Colorado at Boulder for two and half years now, and in that time I have seen first hand the liberal indoctrination that collegiate officials claim does not exist. As a political science student, one would expect that I have sampled some of the worst cases of intellectual unilateralism. Ironically enough, the worst bias I have seen came not in a political science class, but in a course on macroeconomics.

The professor who taught 500 of my fellow students and I in the spring of 2002 was an excellent educator – his ability to convey knowledge was truly a testament to what good teaching should be. Unfortunately, this professor used his course not as a learning experience, but rather as a soapbox for liberal indoctrination. Day after day, class after class, the professor would forgo the finer points of economics in lieu of opinionated diatribes berating the President and his fellow Republican legislators. I approached this professor numerous times throughout the semester, questioning his political motivations, and pleading with him to stick to economics. The professor told me that he was simply "calling things as he saw them."

Biased lectures I could deal with. His exam questions I could not. Although I may have disagreed with his opinionated lectures, at least I still had the option of dissent. When it came to his tests, however, I was given no such option. Numerous test questions forced students to either agree with his political opinions, or be penalized for disagreement. In my mind, this crossed the line of mere political ranting, and moved in the realm of discrimination. I contacted the professor and implored him to stick to the facts. Again I was dismissed. Towards the end of the semester, even liberal students in the class were beginning to complain of his vendetta against Republicans. Our objections fell on deaf ears. This professor continues to conduct his lectures in the same fashion, attempting to indoctrinate yet another freshmen class.

In my time at CU Boulder, I have had many professors. The vast majority of these educators are good teachers who check their biases at the door. But it is teachers like the one described above who make the college environment uncomfortable for conservative students. It is professors like him who must be held accountable.

I do not want to see free speech limited in the name of conservative student's feelings. What I do want to see is a system that holds professors liable for maintaining an intellectually diverse classroom environment. I do not believe that maintaining this accountability is as difficult as it may seem. On the Boulder campus, a system of accountability already exists for professors and teaching assistants. Faculty Course Questionnaires, or FCQ's, are a series of questions that students fill out regarding a professor and course at the conclusion of each semester. Making professors more

accountable on the Boulder campus could start as simply as an extra question regarding the instructor's treatment of students with divergent opinions. Similar questions already exist regarding treatment of minority students. An intellectually diverse board could be established to field all complaints. Surely other colleges around the state have similar accountability infrastructure.

The critics of this push towards intellectual plurality have made the ludicrous claim that we advocating affirmative action for conservatives. This ridiculous, knee-jerk reaction from the left is nothing more than a desperate play on semantics to attempt to salvage the last stronghold of liberal indoctrination.

The civil rights movement of the 1960's was not about affirmative action. It was about providing each and every person with an environment where they would be treated as equals, regardless of their skin color. That is not so different from what we, the conservative students of Colorado, desire. We don't advocate forcing universities to hire more conservative professors. We don't hope to see the liberal point of view extinguished from academic dialog. We simply wish to make the colleges of Colorado places where students from all sides of the political spectrum can share their views without fear of retribution from professors. I wouldn't expect anyone, least of all liberals, to be against that.

ERIN BERGSTROM: *Erin is currently a Regis University student and is also the parent of college students. Below she reflects on her experiences while taking courses at Colorado State University following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks.*

On the morning of September 11, 2001, I was standing with other students in the Lory Student Center at Colorado State University. We watched in horrified silence as the Twin Towers burst into flames and collapsed from within. The terrorists had finally acted on their threats of destruction. America would never be the same.

A few days later President Bush addressed our nation from the National Cathedral. His rhetoric was inspiring. For example, he said: "This world He (God) created is of moral design. Grief and tragedy and hatred are only for a time. Goodness, remembrance, and love have no end, and the Lord of Life holds all who die and all who mourn." President Bush also encouraged us to be strong and courageous. In response to the deceitful and destructive intent of the terrorists, he said: "This nation is peaceful, but fierce when stirred to anger. This conflict was begun on the timing and terms of others; it will end in a way and at an hour of our choosing."

President Bush's rhetoric contrasted sharply with what I was hearing in one of my university courses: "Rhetoric in Western Thought." Rather than strength and certainty, we explored themes of moral relativism. About 70 students were enrolled in this sophomore level course.

Dr. Greg Dickinson was the only instructor. It was required for speech majors, so that made me part of a captive audience.

I approached this course from the perspective of a taxpayer, the mother of college students, and as a tuition-paying student myself. I expected a respectful and unbiased presentation of a variety of viewpoints. However, the professor seemed to consistently promote postmodernist ideals and disparage conservative perspectives. This bias was often evident in the professor's statements regarding politics and religion. For example:

-On September 26th he said that "Reliance on absolute truth nearly always gets us into trouble, such as the bomb, the Holocaust, and war machines . . . we have problems being human, humane, rhetorical." He made these statements authoritatively and without qualification.

-On September 27th he was one of the presenters at a campus "Teach-In." A flier distributed in class stated the purpose: "Establishing Context on the World Trade Center Attacks" (see attachment). Faculty was encouraged to send students to this program. It explored economic, political, religious, and other aspects of this conflict. To my knowledge, this eleven and one-half hour "Teach-In" did not include any mainstream, conservative perspectives.

When discussing themes of sexuality in rhetoric the professor also displayed a postmodernist bias:

-During a discussion about Greek culture he said that sex between a man and a boy is not necessarily child abuse—values are culturally based and cultures change.

-His final lecture was about the essay *Bodies of Knowledge*, written by Dr. Karen Elizabeth Altman (excerpt attached). One of Altman's theories is that rhetorical enlightenment could

be gained through orgiastic sex. Perhaps there is a place for this theory in the study of discourse, but I do not believe that it is appropriate for a captive audience in a sophomore-level course.

In my opinion, our professor did not adequately evaluate the maturity level, needs, or feelings of his young audience when he chose his course content. The sexual themes, and the way they were presented, could even trigger a harmful emotional response in the percentage of his students with sexual abuse in their background. I spoke to the Dean of the Speech Department, Dr. Dennis Phillips, about my concerns. He informed me that there is no standard code of ethics for professors. If I filed a complaint, and I eventually did, it would be discussed and put in a drawer. He stated that if enough complaints accumulated, the speech department might choose to do something about it. To my knowledge, they did not.

I learned that freedom of speech gives professors the license to freely promote their personal beliefs and biases, or those of the prevailing university culture. This can create a hostile learning environment for students who do not share those beliefs. Even though our professor let me speak and was not openly disrespectful, other students rarely asserted themselves. Several of my young, conservative classmates thanked me for speaking out and saying what they were too afraid to say. They did not want to incur the professor's disfavor or risk discrimination in grading. They talked of "playing the game" and answering exam questions in a politically correct manner. This process, from a biased presentation to students parroting back on an exam what they think a professor wants to hear, does not promote critical thinking. It diminishes the value of higher education.

As a parent and a taxpayer, I object to professors arbitrarily deciding which beliefs they will present in the classroom. We live in a republic; we celebrate the democratic ideals of equality and diversity. A university should serve as a free marketplace of ideas, where the strengths and weaknesses of opposing views are objectively presented and freely discussed.

Young college students are at the threshold of life. The decisions they make now regarding their identity and relationships, particularly their morals, values, and political and religious beliefs, will set the course of their futures. Collectively, their decisions will determine the destiny of our nation. Students deserve to explore all of their options in a learning environment that is supportive and unbiased—not disrespectful and one-sided.

Colorado students should not be subjected to the deliberate suppression and control of information and ideas in our university and college classrooms. This is intellectual tyranny.

However, oppression does not have a political affiliation. Whether promoting the ideals of George W. Bush, or preferring the teachings of Karl Marx, all of us have a responsibility to choose how to use authority, and when to guard our tongues. I believe that the American principles of fairness, civility, and true diversity should guide us. All ideologies deserve respect.

DANIELLE ROBINSON: *Danielle is currently a junior at Metropolitan State College in Denver. Below she discusses her experiences as a member of the ROTC on campus.*

I knew that when I started going to college I would be experiencing a lot, but one thing I never thought would happen was being attacked for my political views by professors.

College should be about experiencing new subjects presented from a variety of viewpoints. Earning a degree should always be at the top of a student's list, not standing up and fighting teachers because of differences in political or intellectual beliefs. The experiences I have had over the past year illustrate a lack of tolerance of diverse viewpoints.

At the start of my sophomore year, I joined Air Force ROTC, because I believed it would help me get my future job of going into politics or the FBI. I felt that wearing the uniform was the greatest honor that I had the opportunity to have. Little did I know that my professors would attack me for being a member of the military.

As a requirement of being a ROTC student, we had to wear our uniforms for class or certain activities. I was a member of the recruiting team and sometimes wore my uniform to school because I had a recruiting event thereafter. While sitting in my philosophy class, my professor started attacking President Bush for his stance on the current war in Iraq. She called members of the military "baby killers," adding that innocent people should not die for an unjust war. As a member of a military service, I felt very uncomfortable.

This same teacher also made it a requirement to the class to see Michael Moore's *Bowling for Columbine*, a movie in which Moore attacks President Bush and America for their stance on guns. I asked the professor if I could see a different movie and that I didn't see the connection between *Bowling for Columbine* and philosophy. I was then told that if I didn't see the movie that I would receive a failing grade for the semester. I saw the movie and wrote my opinion paper and was given a low C because I proved Moore wrong and many of his statements, especially the one made about the Air Force Academy and a plane given to the Strategic Air Command, and for showing my support toward our constitutional right to own a gun.

If we must endure propaganda like this, at least we can hear propaganda from both sides. And if we disagree, we should be evaluated not on our ability to please the professor, but on the basis of our ability to make a strong, concise argument relevant to the subject at hand.

My second encounter with the liberal bias on campus was in my human geography class. My professor knew that I was in Air Force ROTC, and respected me as a student. Since it was a human geography class, we would often talk about what was going on in the world, especially the war, it was nice seeing students speak their minds. But in one instance my professor invited a member from Amnesty International, a human rights group. This member spoke about how the United States had the worst human rights record in the world. She then went on to say that she didn't understand why we needed a terror alert scale and thought it was stupid. This individual then went on to attack President Bush for attacking Iraq for unjust reasons. While she spewed lies, the professor remained silent. I asked the individual about what she thought of Saddam killing his own citizens if they spoke out against him and the rape rooms that his sons carried out, the gassing of Shiite Muslims and the mass graves being discovered. I also asked her if she supported former President Clinton for attacking Iraq during the impeachment hearings. No answer. I had enough of the military bashing and Bush bashing that I walked out of class.

Students should not have to make their way through college in such a hostile environment. I, for one, am in college to learn so I can get my degree and move on to bigger and better things. I could handle liberal bias if at least the conservative side of things was represented. This rarely, if ever, happens.

I feel that college professors think that because they stand in front of a captive audience of students, they have the right to preach their political ideologies. If a conservative student was to speak out, that student would be attacked. It's no wonder why more conservative students don't stand up--they are afraid of speaking their views in class, and the fear of failing the class for their views. Despite such threats, I feel that it is important for all students to speak their views no matter what ideology they uphold.

Finally, I would like to thank Senator Andrews for attempting to ensure that our colleges serve their role as institutions of learning instead of a battleground between conservative students and liberal professors. To me this whole debate is pretty simple; college campuses are hostile to conservative students. We don't want special treatment, just the respect and dignity that all students are entitled to.

NAME WITHHELD-WESTERN STATE STUDENT: *This student attends Western State College in Gunnison. He is a severely disabled veteran with more than 10 years of Honorable service, including combat duty in places such as Somalia. He was a decorated Military Intelligence Collections Operator and Analyst who had a higher-than-Top Secret security clearance. He now attends Western State under Chapter 31, Vocational Rehabilitation. Below, he discusses his fear of losing his educational benefits for speaking out and his distain for bias and indoctrination. Out of respect for his concerns, CAP has agreed to withhold his name.*

I started classes at Western in the Spring semester of 2003. I plan to be a Physical Therapist so that I can someday help other young veterans who have been injured, as well as better understand my own injuries. Two of the classes that I had in my first semester were basic Kinesiology courses taught by Sophie Mabry. They were freshman level *Lifetime Wellness* and *Intro to Kinesiology*.

During the course of her lectures, Ms. Mabry made several blatantly liberal, inflammatory comments. With all due respect for free speech, this consistent liberal commentary was not even remotely relevant to the course work. Most of these comments were so outrageous that many kids in the class questioned her and her motives. She spoke out against private ownership of firearms, stated that black athletes are always persecuted while white athletes always get off easy, and displayed open and flagrant bias towards female students. Even female students have commented on this.

When I went to Professor Mabry in private and complained that I felt it was my right to have an objective class without her personal politics she stated that *"this is a liberal college"* and that things would go badly for me if I didn't *"go with the flow"*. When I asked her why she interjected her personal politics into the lectures, she said she was merely trying to stimulate debate. I countered that she only provided one point of view and that she presented these views as fact and not opinion. I also told her that I felt that there is a difference between education and indoctrination.

It was shortly after this meeting that my grades took a nose dive. I certainly was not a perfect student, and sometimes did not understand her assignments, but I received a C+ and D- in her 100-level classes whereas I am on the Dean's list this semester in much harder classes than hers. Sophie Mabry's comments were so full of blatant errors and bias that I was joined by several other students in complaining on numerous occasions to the Kinesiology Department Chair, Darla Deruiter (sp).

Absolutely nothing resulted from these complaints, and in fact, the morning after I talked with Dean Deruiter, I heard her telling Professor Mabry that *"We all know you are doing a great job."* Professor Mabry not only puts a leftist slant on every detail in her classes, but the information she provides is routinely incorrect. She cannot even pronounce nor spell many technical terms that are imperative to laying the foundation of the Kinesiology major at Western.

Every student here must pass through Ms. Mabry several times in order to get their degree in Kinesiology, and I told the registrar's office as well as my student advisor that I would never again take another class with this woman, even if it meant changing my major. I was so distraught with the circumstances that I nearly gave up my educational benefits and quit school.

Every student here at Western deserves an objective education and to learn in an environment free of anti-male bias. We, our parents, and the taxpayers of Colorado are paying for a "professor" who is so offensive, incorrect, and biased that even the female students have noticed her bias towards them. In one private meeting I had with her, she told me that because of my extensive military service that I "don't know anything about the real world". She even chastised me for leaving her class too often because the pain medication that I have to take every day makes me have to use the restroom frequently.

A female student who had a class with Professor Mabry recently told me that Ms. Mabry stated in front of a class that men are incapable of caring for children! I am the proud father of a 4-year-old boy and couldn't believe that this was being stated in public by someone who is supposed to be a leader. I am not alone in my feelings. Students have joined together to discuss their views at www.ratemyprofessors.com.

It is not my intention to get anyone in trouble, nor do I harbor any grudge, but I do feel that I have the right to get an objective education at a public college, and that because of my male, conservative, military identity I have been discriminated against.

Many other students here at Western have similar feelings, but because they don't want to risk repercussions, they don't say anything, especially after seeing that complaining doesn't change anything. I'm certain that a review of Professor Mabry's student critiques would be of great interest to anyone concerned with the quality of education that we are getting here at Western.

In closing, I feel it is very important to let everyone know that in general, Western State professors conduct themselves with the utmost dignity and respect. I have enjoyed my time here and have learned a tremendous amount. The weaker professors, like the one I mention above, are the exception. I am optimistic that we can work together to address problems within the system to make sure that the rights of every professor and student are protected and respected.

TAMARA LOUDEN: *Tamara is currently completing her joint degree (JD/MPA) at the University of Colorado at Denver and the University of Colorado at Boulder. She will complete her degree in May, after which she will take the bar examination and seek work. She earned her undergraduate degree from Rice University, where she studied opera. She discusses the subtle nature of the intolerance she has faced and witnessed as a student.*

I came to law school from the south part of state – a ranch outside of Trinidad, Colorado, that my grandfather homesteaded in 1901. My family has raised cattle on this land since that time and continues to do so today.

I've enjoyed the learning process that each institution has offered me. I have, however, found the last three and half years extremely frustrating. I cannot cite to you overt examples of professors saying that if my beliefs did not coincide with theirs (only one of which, in three and a half years, was conservative) that my grade would suffer. Outside of a few comments disparaging Republicans as extremists, fundamentalists, or rich white men, my experiences have been far more subtle.

My grades in classes with professors with the most extreme political views always suffered. However, they suffered not because the professor "had it in for me" because of my views, but rather because constantly hearing that one side of a legal issue was "right" and the other (always the more conservative) was "wrong" became extremely wearisome for me. Strong legal argumentation turns on subtleties. While I may know broadly why I believe what I believe, I have not been given the tools to make the strong arguments on subtle points that win Supreme Court cases. I cannot make those arguments because they were never presented to me in class. Broad, general, conservative points were discussed, but never to the depth of the liberal point of view. What I know of the conservative point of view, I've learned on my own, outside of the classroom setting. It is certainly a less full understanding, and one that will handicap me when applying for work in surroundings that I would seek out.

There is one final example within the administration of the university that I'd like to mention. It's really my husband's (Flux Neo) tale, but I don't believe he is mentioning it in his testimony. We were exiting a student government meeting last fall. The meeting was a politically charged one, as members of the community at large had come to speak against a ballot issue dealing with the manner in which Spanish-speaking students would be taught in the public schools. As we exited the room in the University Memorial Center, a crowd of individuals was present in the hallway, making passage out slow. One of these individuals confronted my husband demanding, "aren't you the guy that has the Heil Hitler tattoo?" A former president of the Black Student Alliance, this individual, at the time he made his comments, was an employee of the University, working in the sports medicine division at Wardenburg, the student health center. My husband turned and left. Astounded that a member (although as a CU staff member, he was officially a *former* member) of an organization which promotes tolerance and diversity would be so quick to prejudge another upon the basis of their looks, I stayed to explain what Flux's tattoo says.

My husband, of Mexican decent, has a Sanskrit tattoo around his neck that translates that "there is no religion higher than truth." The backs of his arms say Hard and Core – a reference to a style of techno music he enjoys. He has shaved his head since his early teens as an aesthetic choice, not a political or social one. This individual's only response was that there had been swastikas graffitied around the campus by some Nazi skinhead and that he was going to break the legs of that person. No apology for his inference that Flux was that person. No recognition of any kind of the intolerance that his comments displayed.

While this individual's actions were hateful, what was most deeply disturbing was the total avoidance of any form of action on the part of the administration. When told, they merely expressed dismay and suggested that we just forget about it. I guarantee you if the situation had been reversed, with a slur being leveled towards this individual, a formal action would have been brought. But, because Flux is an outspoken conservative who was running for Regent as a Libertarian at the time (I emphasize his conservative characteristics because I assume/hope it wasn't because he looks more "white" than Hispanic), the administration did nothing.

I believe the administration's total unwillingness to even speak to this individual about the inappropriateness of his actions speaks volumes about being a conservative on the CU campus. Your views will be trivialized. Your concerns will be given only lip-service (if that). You will be called a racist, or a Nazi, by student government members, university staff, and probably even faculty. While I do not know of a faculty member who has said such things specifically, one need only look to the comment from Professor Marty Walters of the Mathematics Department in reaction to the academic bias discussion to see the seeds of intolerance of conservative views.

"[I]t's an embarrassment to have this going on when you're trying to hire faculty," He went on to note that persons considering employment at the university might think twice if they believe they will have to teach creationism. As the daughter of the namesake of one of this state's finest archeology museums (The Loudon-Henritze museum on the campus of Trinidad State Junior College), I found his comments insulting, absurd, and the same form of extremism he was seeking to condemn. I wonder if the idiocy and insulting nature of his comments were pointed out to him. Probably not – free speech and freedom of thought goes only one-way on the CU campus: to the left.

ANNE CLODFELTER: *Anne is a sophomore history major at Metropolitan State College in Denver. Below she discusses reasons she believes a lack of tolerance on campus for diverse ideologies may ultimately turn her away from a teaching career.*

I am a sophomore at Metro State College and am currently pursuing a history major. I am working toward a career as a historian, researcher or even a college professor. I am concerned about the level of liberal bias relating to commentary and curriculum regarding lawmakers, presidents and history that I see in my school. Most professors are excellent teachers and it is a pleasure to be taught by them. However, some professors see the classroom as an instrument with which to liberally indoctrinate the students.

The professor I had for American History in the fall semester 2003 was a very qualified teacher. Unfortunately, there was no room in her class for conservative points of view. Every day she used the classroom as a sounding board as she insulted the President, his policies, as well as Republican lawmakers. One day she got up in front of the class and told us that a person could not be a historian and a Republican at the same time. This hurt me very much because I am a conservative and I want to be a historian. Instead of spending time on history, my professor spent a significant amount of time lecturing on current problems with Republicans and the President.

When my peers or I tried to question or argue against her ideas, she responded by ridiculing the person who asked the question. One of my more outspoken conservative peers began skipping classes because, as she told the teacher, she was afraid to come to class. The teacher refused to acknowledge this student's fears.

The political talk was one thing—I would not have to deal with it after that class was over—but I had a hard time dealing with the political bias toward history. The book she chose to use for the class called President Reagan's philosophy on the use of tax cuts to boost the economy a "naïve" plan. When the tax cuts worked to boost the economy, the book stated that it was "good luck."

The book and the teacher portrayed the Rosenbergs as martyrs and Stalin and his successors in the Soviet Union as persecuted by the United States. This bias toward history affects me as a History Major because I want to leave college with an understanding of the conservative viewpoints of history as well as the liberal ones. I want to get the whole picture.

I am deeply discouraged about the idea of becoming a college professor because of what I see on campus. The severe lack of conservative faculty at my college and the way the conservative faculty are treated has led me to believe that I will have a hard time finding a position if I do decide to become a college professor. I have given serious thought about teaching at the collegiate level but currently I do not see that as a realistic possibility until the hiring and firing practices are free from discrimination.

The majority of professors on campus are good teachers and they leave their biases out of the classroom. However, professors like the one I had this fall need to be made accountable for their statements and how it affects their students. Professors are already made accountable for how they treat racial minority students in their classrooms. I do not think the way the treat students of differing political affiliations should be any different.

FLUX J. NEO: *Flux is a senior at the University of Colorado at Boulder, double-majoring in political science and communication. He is 27, married, expecting his first child in March, and says the following about himself, "I am extremely engaged in my education. I don't miss class except in the most dire of circumstances. I prepare thoroughly for every final and class discussion, and I do so because I'm there to learn."*

I came to the university later than most, beginning at an age when most students were graduating. Prior to school I traveled extensively both domestically and abroad. I've working as a first mate on a yacht touring the Mexican coast, as a migrant worker picking blueberries in Maine, and a techno deejay in Western Europe, among many other varied positions. The breadth of my experiences made it such that my mind was developing long before my "education" began.

Since arriving on the campus I have been as involved outside the classroom as in. I've served as an Executive Board Member on the UMC (University Memorial Center) Board, Chairman of Campus Libertarians, and Vice President and Program Coordinator of Federalist Society. This is the fourth year that I've hosted BioBass, a show on KVCU Radio 1190 (the campus radio station) focusing on hard-core techno music. I've also taught courses on being a deejay for at-risk teens through the Boulder YMCA. Finally, last fall, I ran for CU Regent as a Libertarian.

Because of my involvements in so many groups, I am very well known throughout the community. But it is my outspoken nature within the classroom that has made me the most recognizable. While it is my nature to be extroverted and open to speaking up, I've had to be even more so because of the political climate on the CU Boulder campus.

I've witnessed educational bias on three different levels: overt, in class material, and in class discussions.

Overt examples for me include those where professors' commentary explicitly denounces the non-liberal viewpoint, or where they actively seek to cut off discussion of topics or themes that were not of a liberal persuasion. For example, on September 12, 2001, the day after the World Trade Towers and Pentagon disasters, a professor of mine in the Communication Department stopped class to discuss the need to be particularly sensitive to the Muslim students on campus because of concerns of future retribution. While not disagreeing with this, I felt that it was also important to be sensitive to those with family and friends dead or still missing in the New York and DC regions, a far more immediate concern than the possibilities of future anger towards persons of the Muslim faith. There were even some students present in classroom that day were still unable to contact loved ones.

The professor's first reaction was to become angry as I pointed out that she was overlooking the group that was most in need at the moment. "I'm not even going to go there," she said, clearly irritated that I had even brought these families up. I dropped the issue there because it was clear she would have thrown me out of class had I continued.

The second level is in the actual material chosen for study and presentation in class. Much of it, especially in the Communication Department has a liberal bent. Even the material that seems fair-handed in written form, is presented with a liberal slant in class discussion. Further, a majority of class time is given to the more left-of-center information than that which is more conservative or even simply unbiased.

For example, again, in the Communication Department, I had a professor who presented a film for us to do a rhetorical analysis of. The film subject was battered women. These were women who were convicted to life in prison or sentenced to death. The film was extreme in its presentation of their stories, focusing on their injuries only, with no real look into their character, circumstances, or court case. The film was a one-sided take implying that the justice system is biased against women such that they can't get a fair trial.

Following the film, the professor started speaking about the video as if we were all obviously in agreement. The film had suggested that these women had no cause to be sentenced as they were. I asked how we could just assume that when only one side of the issue was shown. What was the dead man's situation? What did the children have to say? What went into in the court case such that 12 persons found this person guilty? The film did nothing to address any of these questions.

What is most frustrating is that this was assigned as a rhetorical analysis, in a rhetoric class where we are supposedly being trained to find assumptions and recognize one-sided tales and the language that produces them. But when attempting to do just that, the professor was simply shocked – shocked that there was any critique to be made. He continued to speak as if the entire class was in agreement with no further look at the subject – a sensitive one to be sure, but certainly an appropriate challenge in a upper division rhetorical criticism class. Apparently, not at CU.

The final area is within class discussion. In my experience at CU, student ideas that are liberal are repeatedly affirmed in class, so often that students with a more conservative leaning are less willing to speak up. To do so would subject them to the professor disaffirming their viewpoint or to such demands that they practically have to be prepared to cite literary and analytical sources. However, if you are promoting a perspective that is more left, you can get away with a statement as simplistic as "that's a stupid way of looking at things" with no further support of the "argument." Essentially if you're a conservative student your viewpoint will be dismissed or marginalized, by the class members and more importantly by the faculty.

CAROL VERNON: *Carol is currently a graduate student entering her final semester of graduate work at the University of Denver's School of Social Work. Below, she discusses a variety of subject areas, including proven ways to address discrimination on campuses.*

I realize that D.U. is a private institution and therefore not one of our state's 29 public universities that are currently being asked by Senator Andrew's office to respond to questions concerning protection of academic freedom on their respective campuses. However, I would like to share with you how we have grappled with the issue of intellectual diversity on our campus.

When I chose to seek a Master's degree in social work, I was aware that the social work field is dominated by a liberal ideology and that I could expect my professors to share this ideology. What I was not prepared for was the amount of disrespect that was directed towards conservative elected officials (from local government to the Presidency) or conservative thought in the classroom, by professors and students alike. The underlying assumption seemed to be that you must be a moron to be a conservative. There have been some fairer-minded professors, to be sure, and I have let them know how much I appreciated the inclusive environment they fostered in their classrooms. For the most part, however, there is little discussion of other viewpoints on social issues, whether conservative, moderate, or otherwise.

From classroom discussions I wrongly ascertained that I was the only conservative on campus, and therefore needed to carefully articulate my comments, "choose my battles", and settle for open discussions only in small groups or outside the classroom. I felt my views were unwelcome in the classroom setting, as conservative views were often mocked or distorted. I walked out of many classes feeling like I had just attended a political rally. I was disappointed that some of my professors were abusing their power by using the classroom as a bully pulpit to get across their pet causes or viewpoints to the detriment of other perspectives.

As time went on, I began to meet other conservatives students, as well as those with varying viewpoints, who shared with me their experiences of feeling disrespected, excluded, or unwelcome from full participation in the classroom. Most had decided not to speak out in the classroom, either because they had "tried it" and felt disrespected or unsupported, or because they did not feel it was worth the perceived risks. My conclusion from my own experience, as well as the experiences of other students, is that the culture at GSSW does not promote or foster an environment of intellectual diversity and inclusion. As such, viewpoints outside of mainstream liberal thought are rarely considered in classroom discussions or lectures, nor are multiple solutions to social problems explored. This made the issue much larger for me than a liberal-conservative issue. Those holding "other" views were often excluded, as well.

It is a basic premise that academic institutions are established for the purpose of imparting the necessary theory, skills, and knowledge for practice in a specific field. According to the American Association of University Professors, these institutions endorse the idea of academic freedom as necessary to the free pursuit of truth. As such, no one political party or ideology can make a claim to possessing all truth, or in social work terms, to having the full and complete answers to all social problems. Therefore, in a student's pursuit of knowledge, he/she must be presented with a diversity of viewpoints and solutions to develop his/her own answers through careful study, critical thinking, and reasoned analysis.

I clearly believe it is our professors' academic responsibility to present a plurality of perspectives and methodologies regarding social issues and solutions, and to create an atmosphere of inclusivity, fairness, and civility in the classroom. Through increased exposure to differing ideas and challenges to our own views, we as students can be enlightened, challenged, and strengthened as critical thinkers and future practitioners. My vision is to see a climate created at my school where intellectual pluralism is valued and supported, to create venues whereby respectful dialogue on differing viewpoints can be expressed, to include as a component of our social work education skill-development in areas necessary to function in a diverse society, such as negotiation, conflict resolution, learning how to work with clients and colleagues with differing worldviews, and how to garner bi-partisan support as social activists.

As I contemplated changes I thought were needed at my school, I kept referring back to our school's mission statement, which says that "the school aspires to be (...) a center of stimulating intellectual development where critical thinking and analysis are prized; a leader in creating a highly diverse and multicultural environment; an advocate for an integrated and inclusive model of social work". If this is truly our philosophy, it needs to be supported in the classroom environment and in faculty and administrative practices. I also referred to our own Social Work Code of Ethics, which states "social workers should avoid unwarranted negative criticism of colleagues (...) [including] demeaning comments that refer to (...) individuals' attributes such as race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, political belief, religion, and mental or physical disability". As social workers, we may often find ourselves working with clients or colleagues with differing values or ideologies. In areas of community organizing and policy advocacy, we will also need the skills to build bridges of relationship and cooperation between differing groups and individuals. This skill development should be an important component of our social work education.

Clearly, we are not just to tolerate diversity, like a pebble in our shoe, but to value it.

I was interviewed in a column by Jim Spencer of the Denver Post about my ideas and strategies for change at GSSW. Because of the attention my article created, as well as media attention given to this issue at the local and federal level, it opened doors of communication and dialogue at various levels in the GSSW community and created heightened awareness about this issue. I met with our student government, as well as the assistant dean and director of the Master of Social Work program and presented my topic of the need for intellectual diversity and an inclusive classroom environment on our campus. Our deans initiated brown bag lunches in which the "intellectual climate" was discussed. My professors held classroom discussions in which we talked about the culture at our school and whether it was discriminatory or hostile to conservatives and "others". Not only did conservatives and persons with under-represented views speak up, but even more amazing, liberal students spoke up and agreed that this was a negative environment for conservatives. In fact, these liberal students suggested that they needed to be challenged in their own views, as well as learn the other sides. They began requesting a more stimulating classroom environment. It was a wake-up call to our professors and administration.

Since these meetings, several changes are being implemented. The provost has requested each department to develop a program assessment plan that includes the classroom environment. The administration is in the process of devising new course evaluations to include questions such as, did students view the classroom as a supportive and respectful environment in which all could share their viewpoints, were they treated with respect in discussions, and, when appropriate, were multiple solutions to social problems presented

from varying viewpoints. There will be a statement added to every course syllabus that diversity and/or divergent viewpoints are valued. All school open- houses and orientations will address issues of diversity, including political, religious, or ideological thought. One of our required courses, a class on multiculturalism, will include a discussion on sensitivity and respect for issues of diversity, including differing political or ideological viewpoints.

I want to give credit today to our school administrators for having the courage to address this issue. They were not afraid to investigate whether the classroom was a discriminatory place for students with divergent viewpoints. Perhaps what they found surprised them; however, they have not been afraid to work on correcting the situation. As the assistant dean and director of the MSW program has conveyed to me, this was a blind spot that needed to be brought to their attention. It is being discussed at every level in our institution, and changes are being made. He further said that what they are attempting to do is change the culture at our school, no easy task, I am sure. However, he assured me that they are making these changes, not because of political or social pressure, but because it is the right thing to do!

Again, I do not see this as a conservative-liberal issue. This is an issue that is of self-interest to the entire academic community. As students, we will grow when we learn to articulate and support our own views well, when we "learn the other sides", and when we allow ourselves to explore another view based on its own merits, rather than judging it based on which political party may have generated the idea. To be fair, if I was only being presented with a conservative perspective in my classrooms, although it may feel very comfortable, I would not be getting a complete education. Our professors need not check their own views at the door, but they do need to offer several perspectives, so that we, through our own careful and reasoned analysis, can come to our own conclusions.

As a society, and in our classrooms, it seems that we have forgotten what it is like to respectfully listen to the other side, to accept differences, to work together on an issue by setting an attitude of open, fair dialogue, negotiation, and problem-solving. The bottom line is there is more than one way to look at an issue. I think this plurality of perspectives and the freedom to voice these perspectives is one of our greatest strengths as a nation. I would like to see this freedom brought back to our educational institutions. Not because of political pressure, but because it's the right thing to do!

GEORGE CULPEPPER: *George is currently a junior at Metropolitan State College of Denver, where he is active in campus politics, including College Republicans, of which he serves as the chairman.*

Professors have a responsibility to teach the subjects they are experienced in and to educate the students who want to learn. It is essential in today's universities and colleges that they be held to those standards. However, when those standards and responsibilities are violated—action must be taken.

I am the Chairman of the Auraria College Republicans, representing the students of the Community College of Denver, University of Colorado at Denver and the Metropolitan State College of Denver. Currently, we have about 60 members from each of these schools whose majors range from Math to History; English to Nursing; Political Science to Journalism. Every member that I have spoken with has experienced some sort of bias in their classroom. This should not be allowed.

Recently, a professor of mine and the advisor to the Political Science Association, Dr. Oneida Meranto, accused the Auraria College Republicans of working with the Independence Institute to dismiss her from Metro State. This is not true. I can assure you up until a month ago; the Auraria College Republicans had NO TIES with the Independence Institute. However, due to the actions of this professor; we are now and will continue to work with the Independence Institute on this issue. This professor told the members of the Political Science Association, some whom are members of the College Republicans, that the "Republicans need to withdraw from the Political Science Association." This is very disturbing because the PSA is a non-partisan student led organization which accepts students of all political affiliations, including Republicans.

Due to this type of behavior, I immediately went to the Chair of the Department as well as the Dean asking to be removed from her class. This was in part to her behavior as the Advisor to the PSA as well as false accusations from an e-mail she sent to me calling me unfair and unethical. This caused me to feel intimidated, threatened and disturbed in her classroom based on her actions. After weeks of meetings with the Dean's office, I withdrew from her class. This was uncalled for, but was the right decision. Actions like these should not go unnoticed; the universities and colleges say they have a plan in place, but are they working? We don't think so. Had the ACR's not have been a visible organization on campus, this type of behavior, I feel, would have been "swept under the rug."

The Auraria College Republicans stands committed to addressing violations of Academic Freedom and will work diligently with all parties involved. This issue must continue to be addressed and if legislation is needed, then so be it. So, on behalf of the Auraria College Republicans, we appreciate the Senate President, members of the Senate and members of the House for allowing us the opportunity to address you on this very important matter. We hope to work closer with all of you in the future.

KELLY ANN WEIST, J.D.: *Kelly is an adjunct instructor of Political Science at Metropolitan State College of Denver. As a professor (and the only non-student testimony included in this compilation) she discusses below her views on issues surrounding academic freedom.*

My name is Kelly Weist, and I am an adjunct instructor in the political science department of Metropolitan State College of Denver. I am, of course, only speaking for myself today, and not for the Political Science department or Metropolitan State College.

I am also a conservative, and have worked for several years on political campaigns at every level. I find myself in an interesting position to assess the current debate regarding intellectual diversity on our campuses. I am finding that there are many students at our colleges who are made to feel isolated and intimidated regarding their political opinions, and this is negatively affecting their educational experience.

Students who study political science at a major or minor level should expect to be challenged on a regular basis, not only in an educational way, but in a political way as well. Politics is about human opinion. How we choose to govern ourselves, the underlying philosophies of that governance, the actual ways in which our government works, and especially, how all these things change over time, are the basis for the study of politics. Encountering a narrow range of answers to these questions does the political science student a grave disservice. However, for the non-political science major, it is beyond defense.

Students in a political science course, whether they are political science majors, or math majors, must expect their instructors to have some opinion of politics, from the basic questions of "What is the purpose of government?" to the specific issues of the day, such as "Is gay marriage constitutional?"

But they must also expect that they will be given the tools with which to assess such questions from both (or all) sides, to formulate their own opinions and to persuasively present those opinions in the larger political forum. This is simply good teaching.

Should students in other types of courses, like nursing, child development or math, expect daily exhortations of political opinions from their instructors? Is that good teaching?

What the students are telling you here today is evidence of a lack of a commitment to good teaching on the part of the faculty and/or administration of Colorado colleges. Each student here today stands in the place of several other students too fearful or apathetic to tell you their stories.

None of us is here to give you the smoking gun, the one egregious act which proves that government intervention is necessary. Instead, it is the accretion of all of these stories which should engage your attention. So much discrimination is hidden by the assertion of seemingly benign intentions. We blame the victims for being too sensitive. We accuse them of attempting to stifle other people's speech, for their assertion that their own speech is being chilled to the point of ice. We think of excuses as to why it isn't possible to find any instructors of different viewpoints, or certainly any that would meet our supposedly viewpoint-neutral criteria.

But all of this is a smokescreen. Students, the consumers in this equation, are telling you that they are not getting value for the dollar. If senior citizens were here testifying, telling

you that a senior program was not serving their needs, in fact was discriminating against certain of them, wouldn't you all leap to enact reforms?

Conservative students often begin to wonder if they are as stupid and evil as their counterparts and instructors assert, since there is no one who thinks the way they do on campus. They are often very isolated, and if they are not political people, if they are studying some non-political subject, they have no confidence in their political viewpoints.

Students are often too intimidated by the very power relationship between instructors and students to even consider that their opinions might have equal weight. When they encounter an instructor who happens to be in line with their political viewpoint, they are stunned and amazed. They feel validated. As a conservative instructor who teaches a general studies course, Introduction to American Government, I get this first hand from many students.

Those of us responsible for creating this learning environment, including the legislature which funds the state colleges, must ask ourselves if we are willing to listen to these students today and make a commitment to good teaching in our colleges. This doesn't mean mandating quotas of conservatives, or liberals, or of any persons holding a particular viewpoint. It means a commitment to hiring instructors who are good teachers, who encourage their students to take the tools offered to formulate their own way of thinking and addressing the issues of the day, regardless of the instructor's political viewpoint.

Please consider these students' testimony carefully. They are not receiving any response to their concerns at a college administration level, or they would not be here before you today. If the college faculty and administration won't help them, will you?

MARK J. DALEY: *Mark is currently a doctoral student in the department of political science at Colorado State University in Fort Collins. He is a small business owner, earned his undergraduate degree from Texas A & M, and his graduate degree from the University of Texas at San Antonio. He discusses below challenges he has faced while trying to complete his PhD.*

In my four and one-half years at CSU I maintained a 3.12 grade point average. I planned to use my PhD to teach at the university level. However, I have lost all confidence in CSU's political science doctorate program and its ability to provide me with legitimate training. I am testifying before you because I have acquired firsthand, verifiable evidence of academic bias and discrimination. My experiences at CSU have produced hardship and distress, and have delayed the completion of my career goals.

Marxism is the prevalent ideology promoted throughout the political science department at CSU. Philosophies or political theories outside the realm of Marxism are not given equal time if any at all. For an example of this please see the attached syllabus. Furthermore, with the passing of professors James Lester and David Allen, there is now not a single Republican on the faculty. Instead of political science, it seems that the department promotes political cleansing.

In my pursuit of a doctorate, I endured discrimination that qualified as minor to extreme. Here are some examples:

- In spite of degrees in political science and environmental sciences I was required to take two additional semesters of courses before I would be considered for admittance.
- I was rejected the first time I applied. I was told that my GRE scores were too low. I would later find out that many other students with lower GRE scores than mine were admitted.
- I sought and did not receive financial assistance. I have never received any explanation why my funding requests were rejected repeatedly.
- I was not awarded the benefits normally given to graduate students, such as office space and keys to the department's mailroom and computer lab. I was never given a rational explanation for this.
- A faculty member named Scott Moore announced to one of his classes that he had voted against my admittance into the program. Furthermore, a faculty/student meeting held at a professor's home, to which I was not invited, openly discussed my application without my consent.

The grading policies (or lack thereof) were particularly arbitrary and capricious and also contributed to the

perpetuation of bias. Sometimes a syllabus and subsequent grading policies were not distributed until several weeks after the course had begun. And even then, clear standards were not given. Instead of objective, fact based essays that genuinely try to contribute to the discipline my professors seemed to want a steady regurgitation of their own personal rants.

I completed my doctoral coursework in 1999 with a "B" average and proceeded on to my preliminary examinations. I believe that the evaluation process of my exams reflected significant bias and discrimination. My committee was composed of three tenured faculty members: John Straayer, Sandra K. Davis, and Charles E. Davis. My American Politics exam was deemed a pass, but I failed the Public Administration/Public Policy exam. I believe the grading of this exam was done in an unprofessional and incompetent manner.

Only two people actually graded my work. James Lester, who represents one third of the sub field, was not given my exam even though two of the questions I had chosen to answer were questions he wrote. It was only after I appealed the outcome of this exam that Lester was finally given a chance to provide his assessment. He deemed all of my answers passing. But this was meaningless because the same professors who deemed me a failure, Scott T. Moore and Charles E. Davis, were included in this appeal. They simply graded me a failure a second time making Lester's assessment moot. Let me repeat this. My "appeal" of this exam would include two professors out of a total of three who had already prejudged me and deemed my performance a failure. Further, the comments of the three faculty members contradict each other in illogical ways. I found it arbitrary, capricious, and discriminatory to be judged by professors who had already deemed my performance a failure and whose assessments were contradictory to each other.

I was very well prepared for this exam. I was never given any indication by any faculty member, including Moore and Davis, that my knowledge in this sub field would not be adequate. In fact, I was led to believe by their assessment of me in their courses that my knowledge was far *above* average. They labeled me a failure on the same material they graded as above average in their own classes.

Let me now describe the handling of the remaining exam: Environmental Politics and Policy. I will begin with the obvious. My professors: Sandra K. Davis, Charles E. Davis and Dimitris Stevis, unknowingly put questions on this third exam that were identical to questions I had previously answered for them in comprehensive final exams in their classes. I had received grades of 84%, 85% and 87% on these particular questions. I was additionally confident of success because this was an open note exam. I had an adequate answer with me for all questions on the exam. All I had to do was transcribe them onto the exam. Imagine my shock when I was given a failing grade and noticed that comments from their first exams contradicted comments made on this exam.

When I showed these professors how badly they contradicted themselves they became very defensive and offered no viable explanation. But the evidence I had was overwhelming and I expected some sort of a retraction, and frankly, an apology. This was not forthcoming. I would receive no apology and no support from inside the department in the subsequent appeals I put forth.

My case finally made it outside of the department of political science and onto the desk of Graduate School Dean James Fry who, along with Patrick Pellicane (current interim Dean), came up with this resolution. They concluded:

...the form indicating passage or failure of the preliminary examination had never been filed with the Graduate School so, technically, there was no official record of your failure...you should take the preliminary doctoral examination under a more watchful eye of your department head...

...and I add the additional requirement that another committee member with expertise in Political Science but external to Colorado State University shall be added to your graduate committee as a full voting member...This additional member must be mutually acceptable to all parties and could come for example, from the faculty of the University of Colorado, Boulder, the University of Colorado, Denver; the University of Denver, or the University of Wyoming."

No record of my failure? Then why did I have to go through appeal after appeal after appeal...?

Additional committee member from outside Colorado State University? It is not possible to recruit professors from other universities to sit on this type of committee unless I get accepted into their university programs. Dean Fry has simply put forth yet another barrier in my pursuit to be a legitimate educator at the university level.

I have extensive documentation of my experience at CSU. This has been extremely stressful and disappointing, and it has prevented me from realizing my career goal. However, your efforts and the commitment shown today by all participants, give me tremendous hope.

I am sure you enjoyed, like most, the news this past weekend regarding the United States Armed Forces capture of Saddam Hussein. The United States had a cause that was just and a reasonable plan to stay the course and follow through—that is why we were successful. Over the past 200 years many American men and women have died defeating the philosophies and theories followed by Hussein and other dictators. Unfortunately, these illogical and destructive political theories still have a place of refuge on our planet—in AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES.

American students deserve true academic freedom. This cause is just. I stand ready to assist—and so do many others. Please stay the course, ignore any fraudulent press reports, and let us help you follow through on this effort to improve Colorado's higher education.

BRIAN M. GLOTZBACH: *Brian is currently a Metro State student, and has also attended the University of Colorado at Boulder. Below he discusses what he considers to be a lack of balance in reading lists.*

An institute of higher education is supposed to be a place where a student can gain a broader understanding and knowledge of a wide array of subject matters and viewpoints. This is the mission of an institute of higher learning. When certain viewpoints are derogated or not presented at all, this makes the college's mission impossible. A college should be free of ideological intolerance and persecution. Debate should be encouraged, and all points of view should be included in this debate.

As a Metropolitan State College of Denver student, I feel that this is not happening in higher education. I feel that the left of the political spectrum is over represented on our college campuses, and that the right or conservative viewpoint is ignored, rejected or condemned more often than not by many professors. I have witnessed this first hand at the University of Colorado at Boulder, and also at Saddleback Junior College in California, where I have also attended.

Alas, this is not just a problem in Colorado, but also across the nation. I do have some second hand knowledge of this type of problem occurring at Metro State, and I will have more to say on that later.

My first experience with political bias in the classroom occurred while I was in junior college in California. While debate is to be expected and encouraged in a political science course, I felt that my instructor went too far in his ideological beliefs. These are just that, beliefs and not facts. I got tired of the constant bashing of the Republican Party, and presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush. Yet the left could do nothing wrong. Moreover, I felt the class was slanted to the left, and that there was plenty of revisionist history being taught. Of course, this was my second semester in college, so I figured that's just how college goes.

Fast forward to my time at CU-Boulder. Again in a political science course the left was over represented as being just and right, and the right was represented as being oppressors and wrong. This occurred on a regular basis. As I have said, I have no problem with engaging in debate, but I do have a problem with being talked down to when I express my own political views and have a solid foundation and argument to back it up.

I don't feel that this type of ideological bias is good for higher education. I did receive B's in both classes, but the tests were strictly essay questions and I do wonder if my political views and beliefs had something to do with my failure to receive an A. I have no idea, maybe it did, and maybe it didn't.

As for my time at Metro State, I have heard a lot of this type of stuff going on in the classroom from other students. Since I am an Athletic Training major, I don't get this type of debate and ideological speech in my classes, and honestly, I am glad for it. This type of anti-conservatism on our campuses is one reason I chose not to major in Political Science. However, I still see the proof. I work in the campus bookstore, and as an employee, I am aware of all the books that are required for readings in all the classes. I have observed that there is a distinct lack of material from any author that could be considered conservative. Liberals on the other hand are a little luckier. Somehow, Michael Moore's books have been required readings in at least three classes in the last two semesters, including a History 1000 course this semester. What Michael Moore has to do with an American History class is

anyone's guess. Noam Chomsky has been required reading. Howard Zinn is required reading all the time. Other books that could be considered leftist are required reading.

My question is this: Where are the books by Sean Hannity, Ann Coulter, and Bill O'Reilly? How come these differing points of view are not presented to our young men and women? Why do we need to limit opposing viewpoints, and thus limited the quality of the education that we students receive, and that the tax payers of this state subsidize? Why do we have instructors that neglect to tell the whole story?

These are questions that need to be answered if we are to provide students with a top notch education. I'm sure we have many fine college professors who do present both sides of the story. However, I am also convinced that we have a number of professors that use their classes and the classrooms that they are held in to push their political agenda. For so many times, we are asked to provide proof. Well, that's what we as students are doing. We are telling our story as to what we see and hear on the college campuses here in Colorado. It would be nice if the instructors in our educational system would hold themselves accountable for not politicizing their classes and presenting a balanced viewpoint that includes honest intellectual debate. Unfortunately, while some do, many do not. For this reason, we need to have some other means of ensuring academic freedom in our classrooms. That's why adoption of the Academic Bill of Rights is a good idea.

Some say that the ABOR is a witch hunt against college professors. However, those that classify the ABOR as such, are probably the ones that are guilty of preaching that conservatism is wrong and liberalism is right. After all, if they were not doing so, there is nothing in the ABOR for them to fear.

NICK BAHL: *Nick is currently a senior at Metropolitan State College of Denver. He has been a vocal supporter for addressing ideological discrimination. Below, he discusses his experience as a student journalist caught up in the midst of a fiery debate over the so-called Academic Bill of Rights.*

As a student at Metropolitan State College of Denver, I have often experienced problems within the college firsthand, problems that I strongly believe could be remedied by the Academic Bill of Rights.

On April 8, 2003, a flyer blanketed Auraria Campus that said "Nick Bahl is a hatermonger; boycott MSCD's journalistic rag "The Metropolitan."

On April 3, 2003, I wrote an editorial that appeared in *The Metropolitan* explaining the Bush Administration's preemptive war doctrine and voicing my support for it in the case of Iraq. At that time I was also interviewing Anti-War Auraria officer Melissa Hedden for an editorial. Hedden became nervous by the questions, and asked me not to publish anything she had told me. I later found out that Hedden and a friend were responsible for the "hatermonger" flyers.

Around this same time there was a group of conservative students on campus that were putting up flyers against Noam Chomsky's appearance on campus in the coming week. The group approached me and asked if they could use my name in conjunction with the campaign, because it would aid them in their tasks. I agreed, and days later *The Metropolitan's* Editorial Editor Brian Reed approached me about the flyers. He told me that he was given orders from *The Metropolitan's* Editor Jenni Grubbs, to "get rid" of me, and that I was never to write for *The Metropolitan* again. Evidently, a "higher-up" had told Grubbs to get rid of me, even though *the Student Handbook* grants *The Metropolitan* freedom of content, and I have every right as a student to be associated with any group or organization I please. I explained the situation to Reed and he stood up for me. I still write for *The Metropolitan*. But they tried to get rid of me because I was tied to the flyers.

Not more than a week later, the flyers calling me a "hatermonger" showed up on campus. They are slanderous, and as such, I took them to the administration. The administration said I didn't have a case, and that nothing would be done about them. This is a double standard, and it is politically motivated.

The Academic Bill of Rights would remedy experiences and discriminations such as the one I mentioned above at Metropolitan State College of Denver.

KIRK HAMM: *Kirk is currently attending the University of Colorado at Denver, where he is working toward his joint degree (MPA/JD). He attended both the University of Colorado at Boulder, and UC Denver as an undergraduate. Below he discusses obstacles to reporting discrimination.*

My name is Kirk Hamm. For the last six years, I have been highly involved in campus politics at CU Boulder, both as an undergraduate, and now as a law student. I began that involvement as a liberal. Because of that liberal ideology, I believed strongly in the fundamental equality of all people under the law, regardless of creed, color, gender, or sexuality. I still do. I thought that was what all liberals held to as well—but I was wrong. Sadly, I began to see that though my liberal colleagues spoke beautifully of equality and tolerance, they applied those virtues only to those who agreed with them. By the time I resigned my positions in the CU Student Union, my tenure was marked not by my pursuit of my own policy goals, but by my constant defense of conservatives' right to exist. I became the most improbable of people: A liberal defending conservatives.

I discovered that in academia, a world supposedly dedicated to the free exchange of ideas, there exists a pervasive bias against conservatives that permeates and corrupts every aspect of University life: it is in the classroom, it is in the faculty hiring process, and in the administration and student group funding process.

In the classroom, this bias might be subtle. So often I have seen professors simply omit conservative interpretations, or present them with far less substance than competing liberal philosophy. However, it can also be overt. Republicans hate minorities. They hate the environment. They hate the poor. I remember one instance in which a PSCI professor turned to the head of the College Republicans and asked, "Speaking of insanity, . . . what do you Republicans think of this issue?" Another introduced his class by stating its purpose: to teach us the evils of being Republican. Many foster class discussions in which conservative students are attacked, tokenized, and ostracized. These betrayals of classical liberal education are all common occurrences in our liberal arts classrooms. Critical thought and debate are no longer taught; students learn rather to keep quiet and agree with whatever message the professor is preaching. This is not education, but indoctrination. I for one, want a professor at a podium, not a preacher at a pulpit.

What though, can one expect from a faculty so politically slanted to the left? VC of Faculty Affairs Susan Kent flippantly tells me that CU hires the best faculty available, and that they all just always happen to be Democrats. Yet, six professors, from both Arts and Sciences and the Law School, have come to me to refute her. They tell me that hiring a conservative professor is next to impossible. Though the faculty cannot ask political affiliation, they glean it from writings, or lunch discussions. They then argue in committee that they don't want to have "that kind" of person as a colleague. Most of the professors who spoke to me are so afraid of the political repercussions of discussing the hiring process with me that they spoke on condition of anonymity. Only Dr. Sir Edward Rozek has been open in calling the hiring process corrupt. Their fear is justified. Indeed, earlier this year, a conservative graduate student in the CU history department was told to seek employment elsewhere as his ideas were not welcome at CU.

The administration is no better. Many of you have asked why these incidents are not reported if they occur. The answer is simple: there is no one to report it to. The CU dean of students did not even know that her office is listed as handling bias motivated incident reports. However, she has stated that conservatives cannot possibly be oppressed because they are in a position of societal power. Strangely, powerful is not what conservative

students feel when their groups try to obtain student fee funding for a campus speaker or event. All too often, I have watched as these conservative groups are either denied funding outright, or are forced to jump through far more beurocratic hoops than any other groups—merely because they adhere to a different political philosophy. To whom do they turn in appeal? Not the administration, they do not care. Indeed, it was the director of the CU Women’s Resource Center who objected when I, as a member of the Student Union, cast a vote in support of bringing a conservative feminist to speak at CU. She told me that sometimes, free speech must be limited in order to protect the values of multiculturalism and diversity. Thus, conservative speakers should not be permitted on campus. Their voices should be silenced.

These are but a few instances of the horrible bias I have witnessed over the years. It is a cancer in our educational systems—but it is not incurable. Universities can easily set up a working bias reporting and monitoring system to address the worst of classroom bias. The corruption in the hiring process can be expunged with greater transparency and accountability. The funding process can easily be purified with clear prohibitions against ideological discrimination. There are many solutions.