



**REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC
FREEDOM IN HIGHER EDUCATION
PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 177**

NOVEMBER 21, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>SECTION</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| Chairman’s Remarks | 3 |
| House Resolution 177 | 4 |
| Members of the Select Committee | 7 |
| Purpose | 8 |
| Committee Structure | 8 |
| Method | 9 |
| Findings | 12 |
| Recommendations | 14 |
| Appendix A: Remarks of Select Committee Members | |
| Appendix B: “University of Pittsburgh: Through One Hundred and Fifty Years” | |
| Appendix C: New Pennsylvania State University and Temple University Academic Freedom Policies | |
| Appendix D: Meeting Agendas and Transcript Copy Information | |

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

INTENTIONALLY BLANK

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE RESOLUTION

No. 177 Session of 2005

INTRODUCED BY ARMSTRONG, BARRAR, BENNINGHOFF, BIRMELIN, BOYD, CALTAGIRONE, CLYMER, CRAHALLA, CREIGHTON, FAIRCHILD, FICHTER, FORCIER, GABIG, GILLESPIE, GINGRICH, HERSHEY, JAMES, W. KELLER, KILLION, LEH, METCALFE, R. MILLER, MUSTIO, PHILLIPS, READSHAW, ROBERTS, ROHRER, SCHRODER, STERN, R. STEVENSON, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRUE, WILT, YOUNGBLOOD, DENLINGER, CIVERA, RAPP, FLEAGLE, FLICK, BASTIAN, BROWNE, HARPER AND PAYNE, MARCH 29, 2005

AS AMENDED, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 5, 2005

A RESOLUTION

1 Establishing a select committee to examine the academic
2 atmosphere and the degree to which faculty have the
3 opportunity to instruct and students have the opportunity to
4 learn in an environment conducive to the pursuit of knowledge
5 and truth at State-related and State-owned colleges and
6 universities and community colleges in this Commonwealth.
7 WHEREAS, Academic freedom and intellectual diversity are
8 values indispensable to the American colleges and universities;
9 and
10 WHEREAS, From its first formulation in the General Report of
11 the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American
12 Association of University Professors, the concept of academic
13 freedom has been premised on the idea that human knowledge is a
14 never-ending pursuit of the truth, that there is no humanly
15 accessible truth that is not, in principle, open to challenge,
16 and that no party or intellectual faction has a monopoly on
17 wisdom; and

- 1 -

1 WHEREAS, Academic freedom is likely to thrive in an
2 environment of intellectual diversity that protects and fosters
3 independence of thought and speech; and
4 WHEREAS, Students and faculty should be protected from the
5 imposition of ideological orthodoxy, and faculty members have
6 the responsibility to not take advantage of their authority
7 position to introduce inappropriate or irrelevant subject matter

8 outside their field of study; therefore be it
9 RESOLVED, That a select committee composed of the
10 Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Education Committee,
11 plus one member appointed by the Speaker of the House of
12 Representatives and one member appointed by the Minority Leader
13 of the House of Representatives, examine, study and inform the
14 House of Representatives on matters relating to the academic
15 the expression of independent thought at State-related and
19 State-owned colleges, universities and community colleges,
20 including, but not limited to, whether:
21 (1) faculty are hired, fired, promoted and granted
22 tenure based on their professional competence and subject
23 matter knowledge and with a view of helping students explore
24 and understand various methodologies and perspectives;
25 (2) students have an academic environment, quality life
26 on campus and reasonable access to course materials that
27 create an environment conducive to learning, the development
28 of critical thinking and the exploration and expression of
29 independent thought and that the students are evaluated based
30 on their subject knowledge; and

- 2 -

1 (3) that students are graded based on academic merit,
2 without regard for ideological views, and that academic
3 freedom and the right to explore and express independent
4 thought is available to and practiced freely by faculty and
5 students;
6 and be it further
7 RESOLVED, That the chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher
8 Education of the Education Committee of the House of
9 Representatives shall be chairman of the select committee, that
10 committee vacancies not affect the power of the remaining
11 members to execute committee functions and that committee
12 vacancies be filled in the same manner as the original
13 appointment; and be it further
14 RESOLVED, That the committee may hold hearings, take
15 testimony and conduct investigations within this Commonwealth as
16 necessary; and be it further
17 RESOLVED, THAT IF AN INDIVIDUAL MAKES AN ALLEGATION AGAINST A
18 FACULTY MEMBER CLAIMING BIAS, THE FACULTY MEMBER MUST BE GIVEN
19 AT LEAST 48 HOURS' NOTICE OF THE SPECIFICS OF THE ALLEGATION
20 PRIOR TO THE TESTIMONY BEING GIVEN AND BE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY
21 TO TESTIFY AT THE SAME HEARING AS THE INDIVIDUAL MAKING THE
22 ALLEGATION; AND BE IT FURTHER
23 RESOLVED, That the Chief Clerk, with the Speaker's approval,
24 pay for the reasonable, appropriate and proper expenses incurred
25 by the committee; and be it further
26 RESOLVED, That the committee make a report of its findings
27 and any recommendations for remedial legislation and other
28 appropriate action by June 30, 2006, and that the committee may
29 extend the investigation for additional time, if necessary, but
30 no later than November 30, 2006.

Members of the Select Committee on Academic Freedom in Higher Education

Representative Thomas L. Stevenson, Chairman

Representative Lawrence H. Curry, Minority Chairman

Majority Members:

Rep. Gibson C. Armstrong
Rep. Michael Diven
Rep. Patrick E. Fleagle
Rep. Lynn B. Herman
Rep. Beverly Mackereth
Rep. Bernard T. O'Neill
Rep. Thomas J. Quigley

Minority Members:

Rep. Dan B. Frankel
Rep. Richard T. Grucela
Rep. John E. Pallone
Rep. Dan A. Surra
Rep. John T. Yudichak

Representative Jess M. Stairs, Chairman of the House Education Committee, and Representative James R. Roebuck Jr., Minority Chairman of the House Education Committee, are *ex-officio* members of the Select Committee.

PURPOSE

House Resolution 177 of 2006 created the Select Committee on Academic Freedom in Higher Education and required it to:

“...examine, study, and inform the House of Representatives on matters relating to the academic atmosphere and the degree to which faculty have the opportunity to instruct and students have the opportunity to learn in an environment conducive to the pursuit of knowledge and truth and the expression of independent thought at State-related and State-owned colleges, universities, and community colleges...” (Pg. 2, Lines 13-19)

This includes, but is not limited to whether:

- Faculty are hired, fired, promoted and granted tenure based on their professional competence and subject matter knowledge and with a view of helping students explore and understand various methodologies and perspectives:
- Students have an academic environment quality life on campus and reasonable access to course materials that create an environment conducive to learning, the development of critical thinking and the exploration and expression of independent thought and that the students are evaluated based on their subject knowledge; and
- That students are graded based on academic merit, without regard for ideological views, and that academic freedom and the right to explore and express independent thought is available to and practiced freely by faculty and students.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

HR 177 specified that the Select Committee would be comprised of the Members of the Sub-Committee on Higher Education of the House Education Committee, with the Chairman and Minority Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Higher Education acting in the same capacity on the Select Committee. In addition, one member of the Select Committee was appointed by the Speaker of the House and one member was appointed by the Minority Leader. Finally, the Chairman and Minority Chairman of the House Education Committee were included as *ex-officio* members of the Select

Committee since they have *ex-officio* status on the Sub-Committee on Higher Education.

METHOD

In order to learn more about the existing policies at State-owned and State-related colleges and universities as well as community colleges, the Select Committee requested that each institution provide its policies regarding academic freedom; lodging, verification, and resolution of student complaints; a list of academic freedom complaints during the previous five years; and any actions taken to correct policies based on handling of prior complaints.

After receiving the requested information from each institution, the Select Committee staff reviewed and compiled the information for the Select Committee's future use. The staff determined that a significant number of institutions had adopted faculty academic freedom policies, but not student academic freedom policies. Based on this discovery, the staff recommended meeting with each sector of higher education and interested parties in order to determine whether current academic freedom policies are effective and applicable to students.

Because of the Select Committee's concern that "students and faculty should be protected from the imposition of ideological orthodoxy," it first heard testimony in Harrisburg from attorney David French, then-executive director of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, based in Philadelphia, and an expert on First Amendment rights as they affect academic freedom. French was asked to explain the concept of academic freedom and its relation to free speech.

Following the informational meeting, the Chairman and Minority Chairman of the Select Committee agreed to hold four public hearings at institutions throughout the Commonwealth. The meetings would focus on each sector of higher education as well as each region of the Commonwealth. For this reason, meetings were held in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Millersville, and Harrisburg. Specifically, the Committee heard testimony from the University of Pittsburgh, Penn State University, Temple University, Millersville University, The State System of Higher Education (SSHE), and the Pennsylvania Commission for Community Colleges (PACCC).

Throughout the four hearings, the Select Committee also heard testimony from interested faculty and research organizations, which included the American

Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Federation of Teachers of Pennsylvania (AFT-PA), the Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA), the Thomas Jefferson Center for the Protection of Free Expression, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), the Center for the Study of Popular Culture, United University Professionals (UUP), the National Association of Scholars (NAS), and the Intercollegiate Study Institute (ISI).

From September 19, 2005 through June 1, 2006, the Select Committee on Academic Freedom in Higher Education held hearings on the state of academic freedom in Pennsylvania's public colleges and universities. An informational hearing was held at the State Capitol, and eight days of on-site public hearings were held at the University of Pittsburgh, Temple University, Millersville University and Harrisburg Area Community College.

Based on a review of previous actions taken, it appears that these were the first statewide public hearings on academic freedom in the nations' history. However, this Select Committee is not the first Committee commissioned by the Pennsylvania House of Representatives for the purpose of studying academic freedom at a public institution of higher education. In fact, during the 1930's the House created a five member Committee for the purpose of studying the status of academic freedom at the University of Pittsburgh (an excerpt from the article "University of Pittsburgh: Through One Hundred and Fifty Years" is attached in Appendix A).

Chairman Stevenson opened the first day of off-site hearings, at the University of Pittsburgh, by laying out clear and unambiguous guidelines describing the nature and limits of the Committee's business. He stated that "[t]his Committee's focus will be on the [academic] institutions and their policies, not on professors, not on students"

Over the course of eight months, which included nine full days of hearings, not a single professor was identified by name for complaint and not a single specific class was mentioned by any witness or committee member. The focus of the Select Committee remained "institutions and their policies."

Chairman Stevenson further elaborated the Committee's goals:

"We are here to really study and inform the full House on academic freedom issues and intellectual diversity issues at our universities and colleges across the Commonwealth. Academic freedom is likely to thrive in an atmosphere and an environment of intellectual diversity that fosters independent thought and speech."

To further these goals, the Select Committee focused its attention on the following questions:

- What are the academic freedom policies at Pennsylvania's public colleges and universities?
- Are they being enforced?
- What problems concerning academic freedom issues exist at Pennsylvania's public colleges and universities?
- Are they being addressed?
- Are students aware of their academic freedom rights?
- Is there adequate grievance machinery in place to handle student complaints about academic freedom issues?
- What are the policies of Pennsylvania's public colleges and universities on intellectual diversity?
- Are they being observed?
- What reforms of present university policies and procedures are recommended for strengthening the principles of academic freedom and intellectual diversity at Pennsylvania's public colleges and universities?

The committee heard testimony from several students and faculty members at each of the four hearings. Additionally, during the public comment period provided at the end of each hearing day, the committee heard from students and faculty who were not included in the official meeting agenda.

FINDINGS

Based on testimony provided at the four public hearings, the Select Committee came to a general consensus that legislation requiring the adoption of a uniform statewide academic freedom policy, which was referenced by several testifiers, was not necessary. Instead, the Committee chose to focus on whether academic freedom violations were widespread at public institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania; student awareness of academic freedom policies; the effectiveness of existing policies including each student's ability to file a grievance and obtain resolution; the balance of political views represented on university campuses; and the ability of colleges and universities to adapt these policies.

The Committee received testimony from each sector of public higher education and determined that academic freedom violations are rare. However, questions arose regarding students' ability to report academic freedom violations when no specific academic freedom policy or grievance procedure is in place.

The Committee heard testimony from several institutions confirming that student awareness of academic freedom policies, and the grievance policies available to them, may be a concern.

Concerns regarding the effectiveness of academic freedom policies were raised during the four public hearings. However, at institutions with academic freedom policies in place, it appears the policies are effective at resolving disputes.

On the other hand, concerns were raised regarding the willingness of students to confront the professor they felt was in violation of the academic freedom policy. This concern stemmed from the common requirement that students must first report concerns to the professor, then the department head, then the dean and finally the president of the university until resolution occurs. Some students might feel uncomfortable with this process if they perceive such proceedings as affecting performance in future courses with the same professor. While such concerns could not be validated or disproved, some testifiers suggested that an alternative reporting system could encourage students who fear retribution to come forward, but is not likely to affect the integrity of the reporting process.

Additionally, the Committee heard a significant amount of testimony regarding the political atmosphere on college campuses. The testimony was in regard to several studies of the political affiliation and leanings of the professoriate and each study pointed to a greater representation of Democrats than Republicans in most fields of

study. The Committee received mixed testimony as to whether such differences in representation create a detrimental campus atmosphere. While differences in overall faculty leanings are certainly acceptable, the Committee believes it may be detrimental to university education if faculties as a whole lean extremely toward one political viewpoint, regardless of which view that might be. That being said, it is not this Committee's intent or purpose to place political quotas on universities or their faculties. For this reason, the Committee believes that our universities should evaluate whether internal efforts are necessary to encourage diverse political views on campus and to ensure that students receive a balanced and effective education.

Finally, the Committee looked at the ability and willingness of institutions to modify policies if the processing of academic freedom complaints could be improved. During the hearings, the Committee learned that many institutions have made modifications to academic freedom policies in the past. In fact, the Committee learned that Temple University and the Pennsylvania State University began making improvements to student grievance policies and procedures during the Select Committee hearing process. The Select Committee believes that the newly adopted policies may be useful to other institutions that wish to improve such policies. For this reason, each institution's new policy has been included in Appendix C of this report. Additionally, the language of Pennsylvania State University's HR 64, which is included on page 14 of this report, was recognized as a clear and concise faculty academic freedom policy. The Committee believes that this language could be used as an example by other institutions if they should find it necessary to create an effective academic freedom policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Public institutions of higher education within the Commonwealth should continue to review existing academic freedom policies and procedures to ensure that student rights and grievance procedures are detailed and readily available.
- Public institutions of higher education should make students aware of the availability of academic freedom policies and grievance procedures. This should be accomplished by providing such information during student orientation when other student rights policies and/or discrimination policies are discussed. Additionally, this information should be available in the “student” section of the institution’s website.
- In order to provide students who do not wish to complain directly to a professor with an alternative option, public institutions of higher education should allow students to file complaints with a university official outside of the student’s major. This could be best accomplished by utilizing an existing office that handles student diversity issues for the purpose of receiving and processing such complaints.
- Public institutions of higher education should review course evaluation forms, and amend them if necessary, to ensure that students may have the opportunity to share their concerns about any possible violations of the institution’s academic freedom policies.
- All public institutions of higher education should maintain a record of complaints filed under the institution’s academic freedom policy.
- All public institutions of higher education shall make a report of actions taken regarding the recommendations of this Select Committee to the Chairman and Minority Chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the House Education Committee no later than November 1, 2008.

APPENDIX A

Remarks of Select Committee Members

APPENDIX B

“University of Pittsburgh: Through One Hundred and Fifty Years”

APPENDIX C

**New Pennsylvania State University and Temple University Academic
Freedom Policies**

Pennsylvania State University:

HR 64:

“The faculty member is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his/her subject. The faculty member is, however, responsible for the maintenance of appropriate standards of scholarship and teaching ability. It is not the function of a faculty member in a democracy to indoctrinate his/her students with ready-made conclusions on controversial subjects. The faculty member is expected to train students to think for themselves, and to provide them access to those materials which they need if they are to think intelligently. Hence in giving instruction upon controversial matters the faculty member is expected to be of a fair and judicial mind, and to set forth justly, without supersession or innuendo, the divergent opinions of other investigators.

No faculty member may claim as a right the privilege of discussing in the classroom controversial topics outside his/her own field of study. The faculty member is normally bound not to take advantage of his/her position by introducing into the classroom provocative discussions of irrelevant subjects not within the field of his/her study. ”

Faculty Senate Policy 20-00:

“Students having concerns about situations that arise within the classroom, or concerns with instructor behavior in a course that violates University standards of classroom conduct as defined in Policy HR64 "Academic Freedom," may seek resolution according to the recommended procedures established under Policy 20-00, Resolution of Classroom Problems.

In every case, student concerns arising from questions about classroom situations or behavior shall be resolved in a manner that provides for equity and due process for students and for instructors. Students may attempt to resolve classroom problems with assurance that confidentiality will be maintained as appropriate.”

Temple University:

Title: Student and Faculty Academic Rights and Responsibilities

Policy Number: 03.70.02

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Issuing Authority: Board of Trustees

Preamble

As an academic institution, Temple University exists for the transmission of knowledge, the pursuit of truth, the development of students, and the general well-being of society. Free inquiry and free expression are indispensable to the attainment of these goals. As members of the academic community, students should be encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth.

Freedom to teach and freedom to learn are inseparable facets of academic freedom. The freedom to learn depends upon appropriate opportunities and conditions in the classroom, on the campus, and in the larger community. The University and the faculty have a responsibility to provide students with opportunities and protections that promote the learning process in all its aspects. Students similarly should exercise their freedom with responsibility.

Temple University therefore reaffirms its commitment to academic freedom, and adopts the following statement of academic freedom principles applicable to faculty and students:

Statement of Principles

1 Faculty are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subjects, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial (or other) matter which has no relation to their subject. The faculty member is responsible, however, for maintaining academic standards in the presentation of course materials. [It is not the function of a faculty member in a democracy to indoctrinate his/her students with ready-made conclusions on controversial subjects. The faculty member is expected to train students to think for themselves, and to provide them access to those materials, which they need if they are to think intelligently. Hence, in giving instruction upon controversial matters the faculty member is expected to be of a fair and judicial mind, and to set forth justly, without suppression or innuendo, the divergent opinions of other investigators.]

2. As members of the academic community, students should be encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for the truth.
3. Faculty members in the classroom and in conference should encourage free discussion, inquiry and expression. Student performance should be evaluated solely on an academic basis, not on opinions or conduct in matters unrelated to academic standards.
4. Students should be free to take reasoned exception to the information or views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, but students are responsible for learning the content of the course of study in which they are enrolled. The validity of academic ideas, theories, arguments and views should be measured against the relevant academic standards.
5. Students should have protection through orderly grievance procedures against prejudiced or capricious evaluations that are not intellectually relevant to the subject matter under consideration. At the same time, students are responsible for complying with the standards of academic performance established for each course in which they are enrolled.

Student Grievance Procedure

Except in cases in which a student challenges a grade received in connection with a course, the following procedures shall apply when a student believes that a faculty member has infringed upon the student's academic rights as set forth in this policy. In cases in which the student is challenging a grade in connection with a course, the student shall follow the grade appeal procedure applicable to the school or college in which the course is offered.

1. If a student grievance for an alleged violation of academic rights cannot be resolved between the faculty member and the student, or if the student does not feel comfortable in discussing the matter directly with the faculty member, the student may bring an informal complaint to the Student Ombudsperson of the school or college to try to effect an informal resolution.
2. If a resolution satisfactory to the student is not obtained through an informal mediation process with the Student Ombudsperson, the student may submit a formal, written grievance to the Dean or the Dean's designee.

3. The Dean or the Dean's designee may attempt informal resolution through discussion with the student and faculty member. If a mutually agreeable resolution is not achieved through informal discussion, the Dean shall refer the matter for consideration in accordance with the procedures for resolution of student grievances as set forth in the Bylaws of the school or college.
4. The Dean will consider the recommendation of the school or college's student grievance committee and issue a written decision and remedy. Appropriate precautions should be developed to safeguard the confidentiality of the grievance proceedings, including information about the outcome.
5. Either party to a grievance may appeal the decision of the Dean to the Provost, in writing, within ten (10) days following notice of the Dean's decision. A written reply by the other party must be filed within ten (10) days after receipt of the appeal. The Dean's decision shall be held in abeyance pending appeal. The Provost has discretion to determine the information and procedure that he/she will utilize in deciding each appeal. The decision of the Provost shall be in writing and shall be final.

Recordkeeping and Reporting

The officers should develop mechanisms and procedures for developing and maintaining records in a confidential manner of all grievances brought pursuant to this policy. In addition, the officers shall provide a report on all grievances pursuant to this policy each semester to the Chairs of the Student Affairs and the Academic Affairs Committees of the Board of Trustees, and establish a mechanism for annual reviews of this policy and its effectiveness by appropriate University officials and the Board of Trustees.

Effective Date

This policy shall become effective on August 1, 2006.

APPENDIX D

Meeting Agendas and Transcript Copy Information

Contact Information

For information regarding copies of transcripts, please contact:

Roger Nick, Chief Clerk
Pennsylvania House of Representatives
129 Main Capitol Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120-2020
(717) 787-2372

INFORMATIONAL MEETING
THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON STUDENT ACADEMIC FREEDOM
Pursuant to HR 177 of 2005

September 19, 2005
1:00 PM
Room 140, Main Capitol Building

AGENDA

1:00 PM-1:30 PM Presentation by **David A. French**, President
The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE)

This presentation will provide members with an overview of the mission of FIRE and its Individual Rights Defense program. Additionally, the presentation will provide an explanation of the process of vetting complaints made by students and professors as well as the indicators of credible claims of academic rights violations.

1:30 PM-4:00 PM Questions from members of the Select Committee.

AGENDA

Select Committee on Academic Freedom in Higher Education Public Hearings November 9-10, 2005

William Pitt Union, Ballroom
5th Avenue and Bigelow Boulevard
Pittsburgh, PA

November 9, 2005

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm | Presentation by Stephen H. Balch, President National Association of Scholars |
| 3:00 pm – 3:30 pm | Questions from Select Committee members |
| 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm | Joan Wallach Scott Professor of Social Sciences Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, NJ Former chair, American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure |
| | Robert Moore Assistant Professor of Sociology St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia, PA Former chair, AAUP Committee on Governance |
| 5:00 pm – 5:30 pm | Questions from Select Committee members |
| 5:30 pm – 6:00 pm | Public Comment |
| 6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. | Dinner – exact time and location TBA |

November 10, 2005

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 9:00 am – 10:00 am | Presentation by James V. Maher, Provost The University of Pittsburgh |
| 10:00 am – 10:30 am | Questions from Select Committee members |
| 10:30 – 11:30 am | Burrell Brown, Chairperson and Professor Department of Business and Economics California University of Pennsylvania |
| 11:30 am – 12:00 pm | Public Comment |

AGENDA

Select Committee on Academic Freedom in Higher Education Public Hearings January 9-10, 2006

Temple University Student Center, Rooms B and C
13th Street and Montgomery Avenue
Philadelphia, PA

January 9, 2006

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1:00 pm – 1:45 pm | Presentation by David Adamany , President Temple University |
| 1:45 pm – 3:15 pm | Stephen C. Zelnick , Temple Faculty Member |
| 3:15 pm – 3:45 pm | Robert M. O’Neil , Founding Director The Thomas Jefferson Center for the Protection of Free Expression |
| 3:45 pm – 4:15 pm | Dr. Rachel DuPlessis , Temple Faculty Member |
| 4:15 pm – 4:45 pm | Jeff Solow reading the statement of Dr. Jane Evans , Temple Faculty Member |
| 4:45 pm – 5:15 pm | Logan Fisher , Temple Student |
| 4:00 pm – 5:00 pm | Public Comment |

January 10, 2006

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 9:00 am – 10:00 am | William E. Scheuerman, Ph.D. , President United University Professions, SUNY William W. Cutler III, Ph.D. , Professor History and Educational Policy Studies |
| 10:00 am – 11:30 am | Anne D. Neal , President American Council of Trustees and Alumni |
| 11:30 am – 1:00 pm | David Horowitz , President Center for the Study of Popular Culture |
| 1:00 pm | Public Comment |

AGENDA

Select Committee on Academic Freedom in Higher Education

March 22-23, 2006

Millersville University
Matisse Room, Bolger Conference Center
1 South George Street
Millersville, PA 17551

March 22, 2006

- 12:00 – 12:30 Dr. Francine G. McNairy, President, Millersville University
- 12:30 – 2:00 Drs. Matthew and April Woessner
Penn State Harrisburg, Regarding Group Dynamics
- 2:00 – 3:00 Terry Christopher, Millersville University Student
- 3:00 – 4:00 Dr. Nadine Bean, Professor, West Chester University
- 4:00 – 5:00 T. Kenneth Crib, Intercollegiate Study Institute (ISI), Regarding Bias in the Classroom
- 5:00 – 5:30 Dr. Frank Bremer, History Department Chair, Millersville University
- 5:30 – 6:00 Public Comment

March 23, 2006

- 9:00 – 10:00 Mark Bauerlein, Emory University, Regarding the Law of Group Polarization
- 10:00 – 11:00 Dr. Alan Levy, Professor, Slippery Rock University
- 11:00 – 12:00 Dr. Kurt Smith, Professor, Bloomsburg University
- 12:00 – 1:00 Tom Bradley, Professor, Shippensburg University
- 1:00 – 1:30 Public Comment

AGENDA
Select Committee on Academic Freedom in Higher Education
May 31, 2006-June 1, 2006

Harrisburg Area Community College
Rooms 155-156 C. Ted Lick Conference Center
1 HACC Drive
Harrisburg, PA 17110

May 31, 2006

- 1:00 PM-1:05 PM **Welcome- Harrisburg Area Community College (HACC)**
David J. Morrison, Executive Assistant to the President
- 1:05 PM- 2:30 PM **State System of Higher Education (SSHE)**
- Dr. Peter H. Garland, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
- Dr. James Moran, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
- 2:30 PM-4:00 PM **Pennsylvania State University (PSU)**
- Blannie E. Bowen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- 4:00 PM-5:00 PM **Public Comment**

June 1, 2006

- 9:00 AM-10:00 AM **Pennsylvania Commission for Community Colleges (PACCC)**
- Dr. Dustin Swanger, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Luzerne County Community College
- Dr. John Flynn, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost, Montgomery County Community College
- 10:00 AM-11:00 AM **Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA)**
- Kathy Sproles, President

National Council for Higher Education (NEA)

Jane Munley, President
Pennsylvania Association of Higher Education (PAHE)

Jessica Sabol, Student

11:00 AM-11:30 PM **Dr. Ken Mash, Professor**
East Stroudsburg University

11:30 PM-12:30 PM **Dr. David Saxe, Professor**
Pennsylvania State University
Member, State Board of Education

12:30 PM-1:00 PM **Public Comment**