

Appendix Table B: Findings of Independent Panels

(Accompanies "Academic freedom as lived experience," in press, *Personality and Individual Differences*)

1 Pioneer Funding ban			
1a	Arbitrator, 1991	<p>"The University asserts two distinct justifications for its action, arguing that each is equally valid. First, the University set forth its own standards governing the conditions under which it may properly deny a faculty member's request for funding through the University from an external source. Those standards appear in the [Research] Committee's Report and are stated to be fairness, reasonableness, and consistency. The Committee declared flatly that these standards preclude <u>any</u> inquiry into grievants' work....In the face of these self-imposed restrictions, the Committee clearly violated its own procedures by doing precisely what is said it would not, and should not, do....The University's second argument, that public perception of the Pioneer Fund, without regard to the factual underpinnings of that perception, is sufficient to justify the University's policy with respect to the Pioneed Fund cannot stand. Academic freedom is a contractually conferred right, and public perceptions alone, without regard to the factual underpinnings of that perception, cannot ensure a procedure that is fair, reasonable, and consistent."</p>	pp. 10-12 of Attachment 1.7
1b	AAUP's Committee A, 1992	<p>"Denying a faculty member the opportunity to receive requisite funding improperly curtails the researcher's academic freedom no less than if the university took direct steps to halt research that it considered unpalatable....The university should not assume responsibility for the views or attitudes of the funding agency, just as it is not expected to endorse the content of the researcher's work."</p>	<p><i>Academe</i>, Sept-Oct 1992, p. 49. Reiterated in "Academic Freedom and Rejection of Research Funds from Tobacco Corporations," <i>Academe</i>, Sept-Oct, 2003, p. 83.</p>

2	Gottfredson promotion	<p>FW&P Committee, 1991</p> <p>"The report of the P&T Committee neither accurately nor honestly reflects the support of the outside reviewers for Dr. Gottfredson's scholarship. This distortion goes beyond any reasonable range for academic judgement. ...Dr. Gottfredson's scholarly work is praised highly by eight of nine outside reviewers, all eight of whom have impressive credentials and recommend Dr. Gottfredson's promotion without qualification. Indeed, their reviews must be read to appreciate fully the extent to which these reviewers praise her scholarly work. Yet, not one of their numerous, extremely positive comments is cited in the P&T Committee's report; this report cites only six negative comments. Moreover, these six negative comments are made to appear as if they come from a number of different reviewers when, in fact, four of the six come from a lone, negative reviewer. The other two comments are quoted out of context, making them to appear to be far more negative than they really are....In their reports on Dr. Gottfredson's work, the P&T Committee and the Chair unfairly suppress the fact that the single, negative outside reviewer states that what distresses him about Dr. Gottfredson's work are his own social values, which, strictly speaking, should be irrelevant... [T]hese facts establish a strong prima facie case that the respondents have violated Dr. Gottfredson's academic freedom....As a result of the P&T Committee's and Chair's unfair 1989 report..., her reputation as a scholar has been unjustifiably damaged within her Department, and is likely to be damaged further, both within and outside her Department."</p>	pp. 8, 9, 18 of Attachment 2.2
3	Blits promotion	<p>FW&P Committee, 1991</p> <p>"The evaluations by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair of the two recent articles that the initiator co-authored with Dr. Gottfredson are unfair, fail to provide adequate explanation for the accusation of misrepresentation, and unjustifiably threaten the initiator's academic freedom. ...[T]here is reason for serious concern that the initiator would experience a pattern of unfairness and bias ...similar to that experienced by Dr. Gottfredson, should he submit his credentials for consideration for promotion to Professor in his department."</p>	pp. 12-13 of Attachment 3.2
4	Course de-listing	<p>FW&P Committee, 1991</p> <p>"We do not believe that the Department of Sociology deliberately set out to violate Dr. Gottfredson's academic freedom, yet violate her academic freedom it did."</p>	p. 10 of Attachment 4.2
5	Continued harassment by department chair	<p>None</p> <p>FW&P Committee had to suspend operation owing to outside interference</p>	pp. 1-3 of Attachment 5.2