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Introduction:

What is a deliberative poll?

In a deliberative poll, people gather to discuss and develop informed opinions about issues that impact their lives, and then share those opinions with policy-makers who can take action based on them. Deliberative polling is a democratic decision-making process capable of articulating the informed voice of the people and potentially raising that voice to a level where it will be heard by those who make public policy. The process was developed and trademarked by Professor James Fishkin, now at Stanford University’s Center for Deliberative Democracy.

Deliberative polling has three main ingredients:

1. Balanced information about the issues
2. Discussion in small groups
3. The opportunity for participants to pose questions to a panel of experts

Campus Conversations, using the deliberative polling protocol, asks members of Carnegie Mellon’s campus community to become informed about and discuss campus-related issues, and then share their informed opinions with campus policy-makers.

These are the goals and objectives of Campus Conversations:

- Raise the level of campus-wide discussions of important issues to a new level
- Encourage students to question, expand and articulate their perspectives on their education
- Tap into our diverse student population
- Exemplify campus diversity by embedding it in students’ deliberative activities
- See students become more engaged with one another across groups that otherwise seldom come into contact
- Showcase and assess the benefits of deliberative polling

Ground Rules for Participating in a Deliberative Poll

- Please explain your own perspective
- Please listen to other peoples’ views; don’t interrupt
- Please focus on reasoned arguments, challenging experiences, and relevant facts
- Please treat your group members with respect
Background:

Academic Freedom in Contemporary US Universities

Your participation in this deliberative process will show how our campus community as a whole would think about academic freedom at Carnegie Mellon if the entire community had time to become informed about and discuss the issue with other people on campus.

Your responses to this issue will be passed on to the Student and Faculty Senate and will help them decide whether to support changes in current policy.

As you participate in this event, we hope you will

1. Learn about and understand current Carnegie Mellon policy regarding academic freedom
2. Understand the current state of the national debate about academic freedom in US universities
3. Assess Carnegie Mellon’s policy vis-à-vis the current debate

Freedom to learn and freedom to teach are concepts that have shaped the way higher education has evolved in the United States. On the one hand, these freedoms give educators control over the material they teach, while providing students with options regarding what they’d like to learn and how they’d like to learn it. On the other hand, these freedoms carry an inherent responsibility. To the extent that one is free to learn and free to teach, one is obligated to oneself and others to use that freedom in responsible and accountable ways. The current debate surrounding the Academic Bill of Rights proposed by David Horowitz is one way in which these freedoms are currently articulated and questioned.

Believing that a liberal bias in higher education has stifled free expression and oppressed conservative-minded students and faculty, David Horowitz has drafted the "Academic Bill of Rights" (Appendix A) and a second, similar document titled the "Student Bill of Rights" (Appendix B). These documents call for the representation of a broad range of intellectual perspectives in the classroom, and for administrative decisions such as hiring, firing, and promotions to be made with no consideration of political ideology. Horowitz invited universities to adopt these documents as policy. After being turned down by universities across the nation, he took his initiative to state legislatures.
In Pennsylvania, House Resolution 177 passed in July 2005. This bill, which adopts the language of the Academic Bill of Rights, established a committee to investigate whether academic hiring and firing, curricula, teaching, and campus climate require legislative oversight. If the Pennsylvania legislature moves beyond the current resolution to adopting the Academic Bill of Rights, then academic practices at state universities would come under state supervision. The legislature would monitor the environment for teaching and learning in state institutions, and state courts could be called upon to adjudicate in cases of suspected infringement.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has responded that the Academic Bill of Rights would, by requiring a broad range of perspectives, subject learning to political standards at the expense of the scholarly standards that currently determine subject matter and faculty composition. As a result, they propose, educators could be required to teach opinions and theories that may be academically unsound. Moreover, educators would be required to grade work based on these same standards, creating a situation whereby “knowledge would be reduced to opinion.” The AAUP also warns that the Academic Bill of Rights would establish university administrations or state courts as the authorities over university curricula, an authority that is currently located in educators and grounded, through them, in scholarly and professional standards.

Horowitz contends that the Academic Bill of Rights is not intended to be legislation; rather, it is intended to be independently adopted by universities at their discretion. Moreover, he states that the Academic Bill

---

Understanding the Issue: What’s your FRAME of mind?

It is always important to keep framing in mind since frames play a substantial role in how we come to understand and interpret issues. When you frame an issue in a particular way, you orient the topic or position toward particular values or concerns your audience may hold.

For example, a Subway Sandwich could be framed as a meal, on the one hand, or a path to losing weight, on the other (insofar as the “jarrod-the-subway-guy” campaign has come to define this fast food chain). In this way the sandwich can be understood either on the basis of its hunger-satisfying merit or as something to help control one’s weight (or, alternatively, as both). Thus, your preconceptions of the sandwich determine the way in which you come to understand what the sandwich is.

As you read the document to prepare for the deliberative poll, please be mindful of the ways in which the various positions, subsequent criticisms and responses are framed.

Horowitz has entitled his document the “Academic Bill of Rights,” and groups that support the initiative frame the issue in terms of student rights and, implicitly, as freedom from indoctrination. Concurrently, the response from groups like the AAUP frames the issue as one of freedom to teach and respect for knowledge of the discipline. The former framework asks whether the quality of education is being affected by ideological bias; the latter framework asks if the quality of education and the advancement of knowledge will be better ensured by relying internally on scholarly standards, or externally on administrations and courts.
Freedom to Teach and Freedom to Learn

For more than eight hundred years in Europe and the New World, universities have been self-governing institutions, small civil societies within the larger polities. Those societies have been organized as communities to support teaching and learning, the central purposes of a university. In line with those purposes, faculty and students have a common membership in the academic community, but with different roles and expectations.

What are those expectations? Universities expect that faculty will be experts in their subject matter, with an expertise created by their own research and experience. The relationship of teacher to student has more in common with that of craft master to apprentice than it does to that of seller and buyer. The student does not buy a finished product or service from a teacher who sells or delivers it. Learning is a complex interactive relationship. It makes specific and different demands on the teacher and student.

The faculty member has the obligation to be current and active at the research frontiers of a discipline or field of study and to bring knowledge from that research domain into the classroom. The goals of the teacher are many: to stimulate student interest in the field, to communicate knowledge well, to develop skills and understanding relevant to the field, and to evaluate student progress. Toward this end, the faculty member is given freedom to shape the curriculum and what goes on in the classroom. The teacher defines and pursues central topics, issues, and questions that he or she sees as central to the field. Where there are different viewpoints within the field, the faculty member is expected to recognize and share these with students. This is necessary to develop the student’s capacity to deal with evidence and argument.

Students, in turn, have the obligation to engage with the subject matter of a course, to remain current in their assignments, and to make progress in their work. Those who fall very far behind, or who substitute others’ work for their own, can be failed in individual courses and may be asked to leave the university community. Those who excel may be asked to assist the learning of others in structured ways and will be recognized for their achievement.

Teaching and learning can take place in classrooms, libraries, laboratories, studios, and a variety of off-campus sites. Some methods of presenting, developing and evaluating material will seem more congenial and appropriate to some students than to others. Different stances taken by faculty on developments within their fields will be viewed more receptively by some than by others. Given the diversity of intellectual viewpoints, value systems, perspectives, and experiences in a classroom, there is not likely to be a consensus on every issue that is raised. As a result of these differences and this variation, teachers and students alike need to pay special attention to ways in which their actions impact the climate of civility within their institutions. An open mind, sensitivity to others and toleration are as essential to a successful learning community as the competence to teach and the zeal to learn.

— Daniel P. Resnick
Professor Emeritus of History

of Rights does not call for political standards or for the introduction of unsound viewpoints, but rather it advocates a commitment to intellectual diversity, and its intent is break down the very political standards that the AAUP charges it with introducing.

The Current Students’ Rights Policy at Carnegie Mellon

Carnegie Mellon’s Students’ Rights policy appears in the “Standards for Academic and Creative Life” section of The Word, the university’s student handbook. This policy makes students aware that they have some basic rights and responsibilities as student members of the academic community. The current Students’ Rights Policy is reproduced in the box on the next page.

Proposed Amendment to the Current Students’ Rights Policy

Acting on concerns from some of his constituents regarding perceived grading bias, a 2004-2005 Student Senator came to the table with a proposal to amend
Carnegie Mellon Students' Rights Policy

The primary right of students is to pursue their education so long as they maintain their eligibility to remain a member of the community by meeting its academic standards and so long as they observe the regulations imposed by the University for the governance of the academic community.

The second right of students is to be recognized as member of the student body, with all the privileges pursuant thereto as to use of physical plant, University services and facilities.

Every student has the constitutional rights and responsibilities of any citizen under law. Conversely, a responsibility of any student is to respect these rights of any other member of the University community.

A student has the right to expect that academic and professional processes be flexible and periodically open to review and to participate constructively with faculty and administration in those processes by which the University community maintains the excellence of the standards of its curriculum and methods of instruction and the viability of its total educational program.

The student has the right to recourse through the procedures outlined in The Word/Student Handbook against unreasonable academic action.

the Students' Rights Policy. The language of the amendment, as initially introduced, was similar to that of the relevant section in Horowitz's Student Bill of Rights. At this point, the amendment stated that

The third right of students is to be evaluated on the basis of their reasoned answers and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study, not on the basis of their personal beliefs.

To generate a version that represented the concerns of everyone on campus, the amendment was introduced to the University Education Council (a council made up of students, faculty and administrators) in November of 2005. The council debated the need for the amendment, and whether it conferred a new right or repeated an existing one. After undergoing several iterations, the amendment read:

The third right of students is to have their work evaluated based on the stated course and program criteria and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study, as outlined by the relevant faculty.

It is generally agreed that this amendment seeks to clarify and state an implicit right that had previously not been made explicit: the right to be graded fairly. The Student Senate and the Faculty Senate agree that this amendment is geared toward increasing students' knowledge of existing policy.

The amendment was then vetoed by the Student Body President due to a lack of input from the student body and the fact that less than 40 percent of Student Senators voted in favor of the resolution. The Senate voted against overturning the veto, so the amendment is now off the table. The outcome of this deliberative poll will help inform the Student Senate as to whether this amendment is a course of action that should be pursued further.

Most recently, the Carnegie Mellon Faculty Senate, at its March 21 meeting, passed a resolution condemning HR 177.
Some Questions for Reflection

1. In most institutions of higher education, faculty have final responsibility over their course content. While current curriculum is often the result of departmental level discussion, some have argued that others outside the department should be involved (university administration, local/state government, federal government, religious organizations, political action committees, etc.) Who should be involved in creating, offering feedback on, or approving course content? How much authority should they exert?

2. What role do personal opinions, values, beliefs and attitudes have in the classroom? What lines can be drawn between acceptable and unacceptable expression of opinions? Should faculty express their opinions
   • about the quality of an argument in a philosophy class?
   • about a presidential candidate in biology class?
   • about stem cell research policy in biology class?
   • about an argument for the proof of God’s existence in a philosophy class?
Should students express their opinions in these same situations? Should they have the right to refuse assignments that run counter to their beliefs?
Points of View:

How Do We Preserve Academic Freedom at Carnegie Mellon?

The following discussion describes different points of view, or "voices," on what we should do here at Carnegie Mellon to protect the academic freedoms that are the foundation of university education in the US. These alternatives do not represent every possible argument or option. Instead, they attempt to show a broad range of possible courses of action. In important respects, however, the voices point in different directions and choices need to be made among them.

VOICE #1

"Adopt the Student Bill of Rights"

Carnegie Mellon should adopt Horowitz's "Student Bill of Rights" in its entirety. Adopting the policy in its entirety will ensure 1) that students receive an education that exposes them to a broad spectrum of viewpoints on the subjects examined in their courses, 2) that they are graded fairly, and 3) that campus speakers are selected with a view to ideological diversity.

Students are vulnerable to ideological indoctrination from their professors. As the Student Bill of Rights states, the university community has, from its first statements on academic freedom, "recognized the vulnerability of students in particular to political and ideological abuses of the university as an institution." Professors, by virtue of their authority over their students, have the ability to advance a particular ideology via their course design and grading policy. This version of indoctrination is a violation of the student's academic freedom.

It is not clear that universities recognize and work to mitigate this danger. The Student Bill of Rights seeks to overcome this concern by including provisions for the use of "dissenting sources and viewpoints where
appropriate” and “organizational neutrality with respect to the substantive disagreements.” Current Carnegie Mellon policy fails to include these rights explicitly in the Students’ Rights Policy, allowing faculty too much freedom to teach specific agendas.

There is a liberal bias in higher education, and this raises concerns here at Carnegie Mellon. This is not to suggest that a majority of the faculty are acting inappropriately; it is more than likely that the majority of professors teach and act in a way that is perfectly appropriate and in line with the Student Bill of Rights. For this majority, these rights would not impact the way they have to think or teach as educators.

Student Senate has proposed and voted down an amendment to the Carnegie Mellon Students’ Rights Policy that would have ensured a student’s right to be graded on subject matter. But even had it been passed, that amendment would not have gone far enough: it did not mention intellectual diversity. To provide students with the guarantees that they will be treated fairly and equally, and that their education will be free from political and ideological indoctrination, we need to adopt the entire Student Bill of Rights.

In Support

- Many people acknowledge that students already have these rights and that universities already have these responsibilities. It is crucial, however, that these rights and responsibilities be listed in the policy statements of the University. Otherwise, students may not know that they have these rights, or that they have recourse when these rights are violated.

- Students with conservative attitudes sometimes report that they feel squelched or gagged in the classroom, and that their point of view does not receive enough focus or attention. This bill may provide a remedy.

Rights Guaranteed By the “Student Bill of Rights”

The Student Bill of Rights outlines a number of fundamental rights. Four of those rights are summarized here. The entire document is in Appendix B.

1. Students will be graded solely on the basis of their reasoned answers and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study, not on the basis of their political or religious beliefs.

2. Exposing students to the spectrum of significant scholarly viewpoints on the subjects examined in their courses is a major responsibility of faculty. Faculty will not use their courses for the purpose of political, ideological, religious or anti-religious indoctrination.

3. Curricula in the humanities and social sciences should reflect the unsettled character of all human knowledge in these areas by providing students with dissenting sources and viewpoints where appropriate... [educators] should consider and make their students aware of other viewpoints.

4. Selection of speakers, allocation of funds for speakers programs and other student activities will respect the principles of academic freedom and promote intellectual pluralism and exchange. Efforts to obstruct this exchange will not be tolerated.
In Opposition

• The Student Bill of Rights would force universities to promote breadth of opinion at the expense of quality and academic soundness. Requiring a broad range of viewpoints sounds good, but there are clearly some viewpoints that are not academically sound or relevant to a particular class.

• Curricula should be determined by scholarly standards internal to the discipline, interpreted by the scholarly community that is qualified by expertise and training to establish those standards, not by courts and administrators. Giving this authority over to courts and administrators would constitute a much greater politicization of knowledge than we have ever seen in the US.

About Statistics on Faculty

Political Affiliation

One frequently used argumentative resource in the debate is “the 10-to-1 ratio of liberal to conservative professors in US universities”; this ratio has tended, recently, to be cited as established fact. The statistic comes from a study that invites methodological scrutiny. The study found that the majority of faculty were politically unaffiliated (56.9%). It made the assumption that the unaffiliated professors showed the same conservative/liberal distribution as those who identified themselves as Democrats and Republicans. This assumption is flawed. Another feature of the study is that it examined faculty in 6 departments only: Economics, English, History, Philosophy, Political Science and Sociology.

Before generalizing the findings from any single study to larger populations, it is important 1) to examine the specifics of the study, and 2) to look for other studies that have replicated the findings across multiple samples, using multiple methodologies. The quality of public debate will be higher if participants critically examine the statistics they cite, and if they are careful about the claims that the statistics can support.

VOICE #2

“Retain Current Policy”

The “Student Bill of Rights” is overkill in dealing with a set of political grievances about course content, campus atmosphere, and grading. Current policy already provides a framework for dealing with these grievances.

Regarding the potential problem of unfair grading: current policy at Carnegie Mellon already upholds a student’s right to appeal a grade perceived to be unfair, and provides a procedure for making that appeal. The current Carnegie Mellon Students’ Rights Policy states:

The student has the right to recourse through the procedures outlined in the Word/Student Handbook against unreasonable academic action.

The procedure, described in the student handbook,* and reproduced on the next page, outlines a multi-step process in which a student first attempts to resolve the problem with the faculty member who issued the grade, and then, if the grievance is not resolved at that level, has the option of appealing to the department head, the College Council, and even the Provost. In other words, the policy authorizes students who believe that they have not received a fair grade, or an adequate hearing for their appeal, to take their case for adjudication to a very high level in the university administration.

Regarding the problem of course design: the system by which course content is developed, and by which the topics, questions and issues that shape a course are generated, is a dynamic one. It relies on the expertise, training, and currency of the faculty member who has been hired to teach the course; give-and-take among faculty in discussions in the department that offers the course; and feedback from students.

* http://www.studentaffairs.cmu.edu/theworld/university/standards.cfm
It is this reliance on the expertise of people who conduct research at the frontiers of their fields that has created the extremely high quality of US tertiary education, an education which, arguably, is among the best in the world. The reliance on faculty expertise does not, however, preclude students from contributing to course design. Faculty receive informal feedback in class and in other discussions with students, and formal feedback in course evaluations (FCEs), and take action on this feedback as they revise their courses, balancing student feedback against the standards of the field and the requirements of the curriculum.

In sum, Carnegie Mellon has no need to change its current policy regarding grading or course design. It already assures a student's right to appeal a grade, and it adopts a system of course design that yields the highest-quality education available to students.

---

**Procedure for the Appeal of Grades and Other Academic Actions**

Students who believe that a grade which has been awarded to them is incorrect or that an academic action, recommended by their department and approved by the College Council, is unreasonable or inconsistent with the practice of the college should use the following procedures for prompt and equitable resolution of the grievance.

In the case of grades the student must:

1. Present the case verbally to the faculty or staff member responsible for the course in which the student believes an inappropriate grade has been awarded.
2. Present the grievance in written form with appropriate documentation to the department head of the department responsible for the course if Step 1 does not resolve the grievance. The department head will provide within 30 days a written decision and the basis for it in the matter of the grievance.
3. Present copies of all documents originally sent to the department head in Step 2 and a formal letter of appeal to the College Council of the college responsible for the course if the student believes that Step 1 does not adequately resolve the grievance or if no decision has been rendered within the 30 days provided for in Step 2. The Dean of the college, acting for the University, will respond in writing with prompt and equitable resolution of the complaint, normally within 30 days and will document the basis for the College Council's decision.

In cases in which the student believes an academic action recommended by the head of the department and approved by the College Council is inconsistent with the policies of the college or incorrect, the student should use the following procedure:

1. In writing, the student must petition the College Council to make a formal review of the appropriateness of the action, such review to take place at the next scheduled meeting of the College Council.
2. The Dean of the college will provide in writing within 30 days after the next scheduled meeting of the College Council the response of the council to the petition and the basis for it.

If, after carrying out the steps described above as appropriate, the student believes that the matter is not adequately resolved or if no decision has been rendered on the last step outlined for the particular grievance, the student must present copies of all documents and a formal letter of appeal to the Provost or another University officer designated by the President for resolution of the grievance. That officer, acting for the University, will respond in writing with prompt and equitable resolution of the complaint, normally within 30 days, and will document the basis for the decision.
In Support

- The current policy and procedure works. Students do take advantage of this right to appeal grades that they believe to be unfair, and faculty do respond to student feedback.

- It is not in the student’s best interest to be taught by a faculty that fears political consequences for its teaching and curricula. Such fear is much more likely to contract than expand the student’s education.

In Opposition

- Nothing in the current grading policy and procedure assures students the right to be evaluated according to the stated course material and criteria, rather than according to the political positions that might underlie the work they submit. While most faculty, administrators and students agree that this right is already an implicit one, a student bill of rights will make it explicit.

- The way you calibrate to the right or left is through the faculty you hire. If that faculty is already weighted to the left, how can this dynamic system adjust?

VOICE #3

“Modify Current Policy”

Add an amendment to the Carnegie Mellon Students’ Rights Policy that asserts a student’s right to be graded on subject matter rather than political beliefs or other ideology. This is the proposed amendment for a third right of students as it was co-authored by a group of student senators, faculty, and administrators:

The third right of students is to have their work evaluated based on the stated course and program criteria and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study, as outlined by the relevant faculty.

Much of the wording of the amendment is derived from existing policy, and it is generally agreed that the amendment seeks simply to clarify and state a right that exists, but that has not been made explicit: the right to be graded fairly. This amendment would increase students’ knowledge of the existing policy by explicitly stating this right.

In Support

- Adding this item to our Students Rights’ Policy would increase students’ awareness of their already-existing right to be graded fairly, and acknowledge a grievance by those who feel there is a liberal bias on campus.

- Such a small change to the current rights policy can't hurt; it can only help. It's hard to see why people would be opposed to adding this amendment.

In Opposition

- This proposed amendment adds nothing to existing student rights; it repeats what is already there. The last paragraph of the Students’ Rights Policy equals the proposed amendment.
• If anything, the amendment could narrow a right that is generally interpreted broadly: the language of the current policy—"unreasonable academic action"—has more scope than the language of the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment references only "the stated course and program criteria" and "appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines...as outlined by the faculty." So the amendment could actually reduce the circumstances under which a student's grade would be judged to be unfair.

• Adding this right to the current list could be an initial step on the road toward bending to Horowitz's ideological agenda and acceding to administrative and government control over course curricula.

Thank you for reading this document!
In small group discussions, you will be likely to address the following questions:

• What are the strong points and what are the concerns about adopting the Student Bill of Rights at Carnegie Mellon?
• What are the strong points and what are the concerns about retaining current policy here?
• What are the strong points and what are the concerns about adding an amendment to Carnegie Mellon's Students' Rights Policy?
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Appendix A:

Horowitz’s Academic Bill of Rights

Adapted from http://www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org

I. The Mission of the University

The central purposes of a university are the pursuit of truth, the discovery of new knowledge through scholarship and research, the study and reasoned criticism of intellectual and cultural traditions, the teaching and general development of students to help them become creative individuals and productive citizens of a pluralistic democracy, and the transmission of knowledge and learning to a society at large. Free inquiry and free speech within the academic community are indispensable to the achievement of these goals. The freedom to teach and to learn depends upon the creation of appropriate conditions and opportunities on the campus as a whole as well as in the classrooms and lecture halls. These purposes reflect the values—pluralism, diversity, opportunity, critical intelligence, openness and fairness—that are the cornerstones of American society.

II. Academic Freedom

1. The Concept. Academic freedom and intellectual diversity are values indispensable to the American university. From its first formulation in the General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors, the concept of academic freedom has been premised on the idea that human knowledge is a never-ending pursuit of the truth, that there is no humanly accessible truth that is not in principle open to challenge, and that no party or intellectual faction has a monopoly on wisdom. Therefore, academic freedom is most likely to thrive in an environment of intellectual diversity that protects and fosters independence of thought and speech. In the words of the General Report, it is vital to protect “as the first condition of progress, [a] complete and unlimited freedom to pursue inquiry and publish its results.”

Because free inquiry and its fruits are crucial to the democratic enterprise itself, academic freedom is a national value as well. In a historic 1967 decision (Keyishian v. Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York), the Supreme Court of the United States overturned a New York State loyalty provision for teachers with these words: “Our nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, [a] transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned.” In Sweezy v. New Hampshire (1957), the Court observed that the “essentiality of freedom in the community of American universities [was] almost self-evident.”

2. The Practice. Academic freedom consists in protecting the intellectual independence of professors, researchers and students in the pursuit of knowledge and the expression of ideas from interference by legislators or authorities within the institution itself. This means that no political, ideological or religious orthodoxy will be imposed on professors and researchers through the hiring or tenure or termination process, or through any other administrative means by the academic institution. Nor shall legislatures impose any such orthodoxy through their control of the university budget.

This protection includes students. From the first statement on academic freedom, it has been recognized that intellectual independence means the protection of students—as well as faculty—from the imposition of
any orthodoxy of a political, religious or ideological nature. The 1915 General Report admonished faculty to avoid “taking unfair advantage of the student’s immaturity by indoctrinating him with the teacher’s own opinions before the student has had an opportunity fairly to examine other opinions upon the matters in question, and before he has sufficient knowledge and ripeness of judgment to be entitled to form any definitive opinion of his own.” In 1967, the AAUP Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students reinforced and amplified this injunction by affirming the inseparability of “the freedom to teach and freedom to learn.” In the words of the report, “students should be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion.”

Therefore, to secure the intellectual independence of faculty and students and to protect the principle of intellectual diversity, the following principles and procedures shall be observed.

These principles fully apply only to public universities and to private universities that present themselves as bound by the canons of academic freedom. Private institutions choosing to restrict academic freedom on the basis of creed have an obligation to be as explicit as is possible about the scope and nature of these restrictions.

1. All faculty shall be hired, fired, promoted and granted tenure on the basis of their competence and appropriate knowledge in the field of their expertise and, in the humanities, the social sciences, and the arts, with a view toward fostering a plurality of methodologies and perspectives. No faculty shall be hired or fired or denied promotion or tenure on the basis of his or her political or religious beliefs.

2. No faculty member will be excluded from tenure, search and hiring committees on the basis of their political or religious beliefs.

3. Students will be graded solely on the basis of their reasoned answers and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study, not on the basis of their political or religious beliefs.

4. Curricula and reading lists in the humanities and social sciences should reflect the uncertainty and unsettled character of all human knowledge in these areas by providing students with dissenting sources and viewpoints where appropriate. While teachers are and should be free to pursue their own findings and perspectives in presenting their views, they should consider and make their students aware of other viewpoints. Academic disciplines should welcome a diversity of approaches to unsettled questions.

5. Exposing students to the spectrum of significant scholarly viewpoints on the subjects examined in their courses is a major responsibility of faculty. Faculty will not use their courses for the purpose of political, ideological, religious or anti-religious indoctrination.

6. Selection of speakers, allocation of funds for speakers programs and other student activities will observe the principles of academic freedom and promote intellectual pluralism.

7. An environment conducive to the civil exchange of ideas being an essential component of a free university, the obstruction of invited campus speakers, destruction of campus literature or other effort to obstruct this exchange will not be tolerated.
8. Knowledge advances when individual scholars are left free to reach their own conclusions about which methods, facts, and theories have been validated by research. Academic institutions and professional societies formed to advance knowledge within an area of research, maintain the integrity of the research process, and organize the professional lives of related researchers serve as indispensable venues within which scholars circulate research findings and debate their interpretation. To perform these functions adequately, academic institutions and professional societies should maintain a posture of organizational neutrality with respect to the substantive disagreements that divide researchers on questions within, or outside, their fields of inquiry.
Appendix B:

Horowitz's Student Bill of Rights

Adapted from http://www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org

I. The Mission of the University

The central purposes of a university are the pursuit of truth, the discovery of new knowledge through scholarship and research, the study and reasoned criticism of intellectual and cultural traditions, the teaching and general development of students to help them become creative individuals and productive citizens of a pluralistic democracy, and the transmission of knowledge and learning to a society at large. Free inquiry and free speech within the academic community are indispensable to the achievement of these goals. The freedom to teach and to learn depends upon the creation of appropriate conditions and opportunities on the campus as a whole as well as in the classrooms and lecture halls. These purposes reflect the values—pluralism, diversity, opportunity, critical intelligence, openness and fairness—that are the cornerstones of American society.

II. Academic Freedom

1. The Concept. Academic freedom and intellectual diversity are values indispensable to the American university. From its first formulation in the General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors, the concept of academic freedom has been premised on the idea that human knowledge is a never-ending pursuit of the truth, that there is no humanly accessible truth that is not in principle open to challenge, and that no party or intellectual faction has a monopoly on wisdom. Therefore, academic freedom is most likely to thrive in an environment of intellectual diversity that protects and fosters independence of thought and speech. In the words of the General Report, it is vital to protect "as the first condition of progress, [a] complete and unlimited freedom to pursue inquiry and publish its results."

Because free inquiry and its fruits are crucial to the democratic enterprise itself, academic freedom is a national value as well. In a historic 1967 decision (Keyishian v. Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York) the Supreme Court of the United States overturned a New York State loyalty provision for teachers with these words: "Our nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, [a] transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned." In Sweezy v. New Hampshire (1957), the Court observed that the "essentiality of freedom in the community of American universities [was] almost self-evident."

2. The Practice. Academic freedom consists in protecting the intellectual independence of professors, researchers and students in the pursuit of knowledge and the expression of ideas from interference by legislators or authorities within the institution itself. This means that no political, ideological or religious orthodoxy will be imposed on professors, researchers and students through the hiring or tenure or termination process, or through the grading system or through the control of the classroom or any other administrative means. Nor shall legislatures impose any such orthodoxy through their control of the university budget.
From its very first statement on academic freedom, the university community has recognized the vulnerability of students in particular to political and ideological abuses of the university as an institution. The 1915 General Report admonished faculty to avoid "taking unfair advantage of the student's immaturity by indoctrinating him with the teacher's own opinions before the student has had an opportunity fairly to examine other opinions upon the matters in question, and before he has sufficient knowledge and ripeness of judgment to be entitled to form any definitive opinion of his own."

In the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the American Association of University Professors declared: "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." In a 1970 clarification and re-endorsement of this principle, the AAUP said: "The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is 'controversial.' Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry, which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject." ["1970 Interpretative Comments," endorsed by the 56th annual association meeting as association policy.]

In 1967, the AAUP Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students affirmed the inseparability of "the freedom to teach and freedom to learn." In the words of the report, "students should be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion."

Professors are hired to teach all students, not just students who share their political, religious and philosophical beliefs. It is essential therefore, that professors and lecturers not force their opinions about philosophy, politics and other contestable issues on students in the classroom and in all academic environments. This is a cardinal principle of academic freedom laid down by the American Association of University Professors.

In an academic environment professors are in a unique position of authority vis-à-vis their students. The use of academic incentives and disincentives to advance a partisan or sectarian view creates an environment of indoctrination which is unprofessional and contrary to the educational mission. It is a violation of students' academic freedom. The creation of closed, political fiefdoms in colleges, programs or departments, is the opposite of academic freedom, and does not deserve public subsidy or private educational support.

Therefore, to ensure the integrity of the educational process and to protect the principle of intellectual diversity, the following principles and procedures shall be observed. These principles fully apply only to public universities and to private universities that present themselves as bound by the canons of academic freedom. Private institutions choosing to restrict academic freedom on the basis of creed have an obligation to be as explicit as is possible about the scope and nature of these restrictions.

1. Students will be graded solely on the basis of their reasoned answers and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study, not on the basis of their political or religious beliefs.

2. Curricula and reading lists in the humanities and social sciences should reflect the uncertainty and unsettled character of all human knowledge in these areas by providing students with dissenting sources and viewpoints where appropriate. While teachers are and should be free to pursue their own findings and perspectives in presenting their views, they should consider and make their students aware of other viewpoints. Academic disciplines should welcome a diversity of approaches to unsettled questions.
3. Exposing students to the spectrum of significant scholarly viewpoints on the subjects examined in their courses is a major responsibility of faculty. Faculty will not use their courses for the purpose of political, ideological, religious or anti-religious indoctrination.

4. Selection of speakers, allocation of funds for speakers programs and other student activities will observe the principles of academic freedom and promote intellectual pluralism.

5. An environment conducive to the civil exchange of ideas being an essential component of a free university, the obstruction of invited campus speakers, destruction of campus literature or other effort to obstruct this exchange will not be tolerated.

6. Knowledge advances when individual scholars are left free to reach their own conclusions about which methods, facts, and theories have been validated by research. Academic institutions and professional societies formed to advance knowledge within an area of research, maintain the integrity of the research process, and organize the professional lives of related researchers serve as indispensable venues within which scholars circulate research findings and debate their interpretation. To perform these functions adequately, academic institutions and professional societies should maintain a posture of organizational neutrality with respect to the substantive disagreements that divide researchers on questions within, or outside, their fields of inquiry.
Appendix C:

Reply of the American Association of University Professors

Adapted from http://www.aaup.org/statements/SpchState/Statements/BillofRights.htm
(December 2003)

The past year has witnessed repeated efforts to establish what has been called an “Academic Bill of Rights.” Based upon data purporting to show that Democrats greatly outnumber Republicans in faculty positions, and citing official statements and principles of the American Association of University Professors, advocates of the Academic Bill of Rights would require universities to maintain political pluralism and diversity. This requirement is said to enforce the principle that “no political, ideological or religious orthodoxy should be imposed on professors and researchers through the hiring or tenure or termination process.”

Although Committee A endorses this principle, which we shall call the “principle of neutrality,” it believes that the Academic Bill of Rights is an improper and dangerous method for its implementation. There are already mechanisms in place that protect this principle, and they work well. Not only is the Academic Bill of Rights redundant, but, ironically, it also infringes academic freedom in the very act of purporting to protect it.

A fundamental premise of academic freedom is that decisions concerning the quality of scholarship and teaching are to be made by reference to the standards of the academic profession, as interpreted and applied by the community of scholars who are qualified by expertise and training to establish such standards. The proposed Academic Bill of Rights directs universities to enact guidelines implementing the principle of neutrality, in particular by requiring that colleges and universities appoint faculty “with a view toward fostering a plurality of methodologies and perspectives.” The danger of such guidelines is that they invite diversity to be measured by political standards that diverge from the academic criteria of the scholarly profession. Measured in this way, diversity can easily become contradictory to academic ends. So, for example, no department of political theory ought to be obligated to establish “a plurality of methodologies and perspectives” by appointing a professor of Nazi political philosophy, if that philosophy is not deemed a reasonable scholarly option within the discipline of political theory. No department of chemistry ought to be obligated to pursue “a plurality of methodologies and perspectives” by appointing a professor who teaches the phlogiston theory of heat, if that theory is not deemed a reasonable perspective within the discipline of chemistry.

These examples illustrate that the appropriate diversity of a university faculty must ultimately be conceived as a question of academic judgment, to be determined by the quality and range of pluralism deemed reasonable by relevant disciplinary standards, as interpreted and applied by college and university faculty. Advocates for the Academic Bill of Rights, however, make clear that they seek to enforce a kind of diversity that is instead determined by essentially political categories, like the number of Republicans or Democrats on a faculty, or the number of conservatives or liberals. Because there is in fact little correlation between these political categories and disciplinary standing, the assessment of faculty by such explicitly political criteria, whether used by faculty, university administration, or the state, would profoundly corrupt the academic integrity of universities. Indeed, it would violate the neutrality principle itself. For this reason, recent efforts to enact the Academic Bill of Rights pose a grave threat to fundamental principles of academic freedom.
The Academic Bill of Rights also seeks to enforce the principle that “faculty members will not use their courses or their position for the purpose of political, ideological, religious, or antireligious indoctrination.” Although Committee A endorses this principle, which we shall call the nonindoctrination principle, the Academic Bill of Rights is an inappropriate and dangerous means for its implementation. This is because the bill seeks to distinguish indoctrination from appropriate pedagogy by applying principles other than relevant scholarly standards, as interpreted and applied by the academic profession.

If a professor of constitutional law reads the examination of a student who contends that terrorist violence should be protected by the First Amendment because of its symbolic message, the determination of whether the examination should receive a high or a low grade must be made by reference to the scholarly standards of the law. The application of these standards properly distinguishes indoctrination from competent pedagogy. Similarly, if a professor of American literature reads the examination of a student that proposes a singular interpretation of Moby Dick, the determination of whether the examination should receive a high or a low grade must be made by reference to the scholarly standards of literary criticism. The student has no “right” to be rewarded for an opinion of Moby Dick that is independent of these scholarly standards. If students possessed such rights, all knowledge would be reduced to opinion, and education would be rendered superfluous.

The Academic Bill of Rights seeks to transfer responsibility for the evaluation of student competence to college and university administrators or to the courts, apparently on the premise that faculty ought to be stripped of the authority to make such evaluative judgments. The bill justifies this premise by reference to “the uncertainty and unsettled character of all human knowledge.” This premise, however, is antithetical to the basic scholarly enterprise of the university, which is to establish and transmit knowledge. Although academic freedom rests on the principle that knowledge is mutable and open to revision, an Academic Bill of Rights that reduces all knowledge to uncertain and unsettled opinion, and which proclaims that all opinions are equally valid, negates an essential function of university education.

Some versions of the Academic Bill of Rights imply that faculty ought not to be trusted to exercise the pedagogical authority required to make evaluative judgments. A bill proposing an Academic Bill of Rights recently under discussion in Colorado, for example, provides:

The general assembly further declares that intellectual independence means the protection of students as well as faculty from the imposition of any orthodoxy of a political, religious or ideological nature. To achieve the intellectual independence of students, teachers should not take unfair advantage of a student’s immaturity by indoctrinating him with the teacher’s own opinions before a student has had an opportunity fairly to examine other opinions upon the matters in question, and before a student has sufficient knowledge and ripeness of judgment to be entitled to form any definitive opinion of his own, and students should be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion.

On the surface, this paragraph appears merely to restate important elements of AAUP policy. In the context of that policy, this paragraph unambiguously means that the line between indoctrination and proper pedagogical authority is to be determined by reference to scholarly and professional standards, as interpreted and applied by the faculty itself. In the context of the proposed Colorado Academic Bill of Rights, by contrast, this paragraph means that the line between indoctrination and proper pedagogical authority is to be determined by college and university administrations or by courts. This distinction is fundamental.

A basic purpose of higher education is to endow students with the knowledge and capacity to exercise responsible and independent judgment. Faculty can fulfill this objective only if they possess the authority to
guide and instruct students. AAUP policies have long justified this authority by reference to the scholarly expertise and professional training of faculty. College and university professors exercise this authority every time they grade or evaluate students. Although faculty would violate the indoctrination principle were they to evaluate their students in ways not justified by the scholarly and ethical standards of the profession, faculty could not teach at all if they were utterly denied the ability to exercise this authority.

The clear implication of AAUP policy, therefore, is that the question whether it is indoctrination for teachers of biology to regard the theory of evolution as an opinion about which students must be allowed “to reserve judgment” can be answered only by those who are expert in biology. The whole thrust of the proposed Colorado Academic Bill of Rights, by contrast, is to express distrust of faculty capacity to make such judgments, and to transfer the supervision of such determinations to a college or university administration or to courts. The proposed Colorado bill thus transforms decisions that should be grounded in professional competence and expertise into decisions that are based upon managerial, mechanical, or, even worse, overtly political criteria. The proposed Colorado bill also facilitates the constant supervision of everyday pedagogic decision making, a supervision that threatens altogether to undercut faculty authority in the classroom. It thus portends incalculable damage to basic principles of academic freedom.

Skepticism of professional knowledge, such as that which underlies the Academic Bill of Rights, is deep and corrosive. This is well illustrated by its requirement that “academic institutions...maintain a posture of organizational neutrality with respect to the substantive disagreements that divide researchers on questions within...their fields of inquiry.” The implications of this requirement are truly breathtaking. Academic institutions, from faculty in departments to research institutes, perform their work precisely by making judgments of quality, which necessarily require them to intervene in academic controversies. Only by making such judgments of quality can academic institutions separate serious work from mere opinion, responsible scholarship from mere polemic. Because the advancement of knowledge depends upon the capacity to make judgments of quality, the Academic Bill of Rights would prevent colleges and universities from achieving their most fundamental mission.

When carefully analyzed, therefore, the Academic Bill of Rights undermines the very academic freedom it claims to support. It threatens to impose administrative and legislative oversight on the professional judgment of faculty, to deprive professors of the authority necessary for teaching, and to prohibit academic institutions from making the decisions that are necessary for the advancement of knowledge. For these reasons Committee A strongly condemns efforts to enact the Academic Bill of Rights.

The AAUP has consistently held that academic freedom can only be maintained so long as faculty remain autonomous and self-governing. We do not mean to imply, of course, that academic professionals never make mistakes or act in improper or unethical ways. But the AAUP has long stood for the proposition that violations of professional standards, like the principles of neutrality or nonindoctrination, are best remedied by the supervision of faculty peers. It is the responsibility of the professoriate, in cooperation with administrative officers, to ensure compliance with professional standards. By repudiating this basic concept, the Academic Bill of Rights alters the meaning of the principles of neutrality and nonindoctrination in ways that contradict academic freedom as it has been advanced in standards and practices which the AAUP has long endorsed.

1 This language derives from a Concurrent Resolution (H.Con.Res. 318) proposed in the House of Representatives by Jack Kingston during the 108th Congress. It also appears in a proposed amendment to Article I of Title 23 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, 24-125.5. Both pieces of legislation grow out of a version of the Academic Bill of Rights originally drafted by columnist David Horowitz. See http://studentsforacademicfreedom.org/.
We note, parenthetically, that, while this embrace of diversity may be reasonable in some circumstances, it may make little academic sense in other contexts, as, for example, when a department wishes to specialize in a particular disciplinary approach.

Proposed amendment to Article I of Title 23 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, 24-125.5.


Appendix D:
American Council on Education Statement on Academic Rights and Responsibilities
Adapted from http://www.nasulgc.org/federal%20relations/INTELL.pdf (June 23, 2005)

Intellectual pluralism and academic freedom are central principles of American higher education. Recently, these issues have captured the attention of the media, political leaders and those in the academy. This is not the first time in the nation’s history that these issues have become public controversies, but the current interest in intellectual discourse on campus suggests that the meaning of these terms, and the rights and responsibilities of individual members of the campus community, should be reiterated.

Without question, academic freedom and intellectual pluralism are complex topics with multiple dimensions that affect both students and faculty. Moreover, America's colleges and universities vary enormously, making it impossible to create a single definition or set of standards that will work equally well for all fields of academic study and all institutions in all circumstances. Individual campuses must give meaning and definition to these concepts within the context of disciplinary standards and institutional mission.

Despite the difficulty of prescribing a universal definition, we believe that there are some central, overarching principles that are widely shared within the academic community and that deserve to be stated affirmatively as a basis for discussion of these issues on campuses and elsewhere.

- American higher education is characterized by a great diversity of institutions, each with its own mission and purpose. This diversity is a central feature and strength of our colleges and universities and must be valued and protected. The particular purpose of each school, as defined by the institution itself, should set the tone for the academic activities undertaken on campus.

- Colleges and universities should welcome intellectual pluralism and the free exchange of ideas. Such a commitment will inevitably encourage debate over complex and difficult issues about which individuals will disagree. Such discussions should be held in an environment characterized by openness, tolerance and civility.

- Academic decisions including grades should be based solely on considerations that are intellectually relevant to the subject matter under consideration. Neither students nor faculty should be disadvantaged or evaluated on the basis of their political opinions. Any member of the campus community who believes that he or she has been treated unfairly on academic matters must have access to a clear institutional process by which his or her grievance can be addressed.

- The validity of academic ideas, theories, arguments and views should be measured against the intellectual standards of relevant academic and professional disciplines. Application of these intellectual standards does not mean that all ideas have equal merit. The responsibility to judge the merits of competing academic ideas rests with colleges and universities and is determined by reference to the standards of the academic profession as established by the community of scholars at each institution.
Government's recognition and respect for the independence of colleges and universities is essential for academic and intellectual excellence. Because colleges and universities have great discretion and autonomy over academic affairs, they have a particular obligation to ensure that academic freedom is protected for all members of the campus community and that academic decisions are based on intellectual standards consistent with the mission of each institution.
Appendix E:

Pennsylvania House Resolution 177

Adapted from http://www2.legis.state.pa.us/WU01/LI/BT/0/0/HR0177P2553.pdf

PRIOR PRINTER'S NOS. 1280, 2451

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
WHEREAS, Academic freedom is likely to thrive in an environment of intellectual diversity that protects and fosters independence of thought and speech; and
WHEREAS, Students and faculty should be protected from the imposition of ideological orthodoxy, and faculty members have the responsibility to not take advantage of their authority position to introduce inappropriate or irrelevant subject matter outside their field of study; therefore be it
RESOLVED, That a select committee composed of the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Education Committee, plus one member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and one member appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, 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, including, but not limited to, whether:
(1) 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;
(2) 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
(3) 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; and be it further
RESOLVED, That the chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Education Committee of the House of Representatives shall be chairman of the select committee, that committee vacancies not affect the power of the remaining members to execute committee functions and that committee vacancies be filled in the same manner as the original appointment; and be it further
RESOLVED, That the committee may hold hearings, take testimony and conduct investigations within this Commonwealth as necessary; and be it further
RESOLVED, THAT IF AN INDIVIDUAL MAKES AN ALLEGATION AGAINST A FACULTY MEMBER CLAIMING BIAS, THE FACULTY MEMBER MUST BE GIVEN AT LEAST 48 HOURS' NOTICE OF THE SPECIFICS OF THE ALLEGATION PRIOR TO THE TESTIMONY BEING GIVEN AND BE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY AT THE SAME HEARING AS THE INDIVIDUAL MAKING THE ALLEGATION; AND BE IT FURTHER
RESOLVED, That the Chief Clerk, with the Speaker's approval, pay for the reasonable, appropriate and proper expenses incurred by the committee; and be it further
RESOLVED, That the committee make a report of its findings and any recommendations for remedial legislation and other appropriate action by June 30, 2006, and that the committee may extend the investigation for additional time, if necessary, but no later than November 30, 2006.