



Carnegie Mellon
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Coro Center for Civic Leadership, Pittsburgh



Spring 2006 Deliberative Poll Results

Demographics

	Convenience (n=10)	Random (n=12)	Faculty (n=4)	All (n=26)
Political Affiliation				
Democrat	30.0%	25.0%	50.0%	30.8%
Republican	50.0%	16.7%	25.0%	30.8%
Independent				
Green				
Libertarian	10.0%	16.7%		11.5%
No party affiliation	10.0%	41.7%	25.0%	26.9%

(Percentage of respondents)

	Convenience (n=10)	Random (n=12)	Faculty (n=4)	All (n=26)
Demographic characteristics				
Deeply religious	20.0%	41.6%	50.0%	34.6%
Actively political	60.0%	8.3%	50.0%	34.6%
Environmentally concerned	50.0%	75.0%	75.0%	65.4%
Spiritual	40.0%	58.3%	50.0%	50.0%
Aware of international events	90.0%	75.0%	100.0%	84.6%

(Percentage of those who describe themselves as being “somewhat” or “very”)

	Convenience (n=10)	Random (n=12)	Faculty (n=4)	All (n=26)
Conservative vs. Liberal positions				
Abortion	3.30	3.42	3.50	3.38
Gay marriage	3.40	3.42	3.50	3.42
Approach to issues of poverty	2.90	3.33	3.25	3.15
Approach to issues of economic disparity	2.40	3.17	2.75	2.81

(Mean values: 1=strongly conservative; 2=conservative; 3=moderate; 4=liberal; 5=strongly liberal)

Influences on Higher Education

	Convenience (n=10)	Random (n=12)	Faculty (n=4)	All (n=26)	
Influence on educational objectives				Pre	post
Students	↓*			3.50	3.35
Faculty members				3.81	3.92◇
Administration		↑◇		3.00	3.20
Local government				1.69	1.54
State government				1.80	1.60◇
Federal government		↓◇		1.83	1.54*
Churches/Religious organizations				1.31	1.19◇
Business/Industry				2.33	2.08

(Change in means scores from post- to pre-test: 1=no influence; 2=a little influence; 3=some influence; 4=a great deal of influence)

↓= negative shift in mean value from pre to post poll

↑= positive shift in mean value from pre to post poll

◇=p<.10

*=p<.05

**=p<.01

***=p<.001

	Convenience (n=10)	Random (n=12)	Faculty (n=4)	All (n=26)	
Influence on course content					
Students	↓◇	↑◇		3.00	2.92
The professor/instructor				4.00	3.96
Other faculty in dept				3.73	3.69
Administration		↑◇		2.77	2.85
Local government				1.44	1.40
State government				1.54	1.38
Federal government				1.54	1.33◇
Churches/Religious organizations				1.24	1.20
Business/Industry				2.12	1.92

(Change in means scores from post- to pre-test: 1=no influence; 2=a little influence; 3=some influence; 4=a great deal of influence)

↓= negative shift in mean value from pre to post poll

↑= positive shift in mean value from pre to post poll

◇=p<.10

*=p<.05

**=p<.01

***=p<.001

Students' Rights and the Students' Bill of Rights

	Convenience (n=10)	Random (n=12)	Faculty (n=4)	All (n=26)	
Familiarity with...					
CMU Students' Rights Policy	↑*	↑***	↑◇	2.15	3.27**
CMU grade appeal process	↑◇	↑**	↑◇	2.27	3.23*
National debate on bias in classroom	↑*	↑**		2.31	3.23*
Horowitz's Academic Bill of Rights	↑*	↑***		2.12	3.31*
2005 CMU Student Senate proposal	↑**	↑***	↑◇	1.85	3.38*

(Change in means scores from post- to pre-test: 1=not familiar; 2=a little familiar; 3=somewhat familiar; 4=very familiar)

↓= negative shift in mean value from pre to post poll

↑= positive shift in mean value from pre to post poll

◇=p<.10

*=p<.05

**=p<.01

***=p<.001

	Convenience (n=10)	Random (n=12)	Faculty (n=4)	All (n=26)	
Position on...					
SBR	↑*	↑*		3.46	4.35***
Current policy		↓*	↓◇	2.54	2.19◇
Student Senate proposal		↑*	↑◇	2.77	3.27*

(Change in means scores from post- to pre-test: 1=strongly support; 2=support; 3=neutral; 4=oppose; 5=strongly oppose)

↓= negative shift in mean value from pre to post poll

↑= positive shift in mean value from pre to post poll

◇=p<.10

*=p<.05

**=p<.01

***=p<.001

General findings.

- Demographically, our sample of students and faculty was neither extremely conservative or extremely liberal. Indeed, most indicators suggested that the group was slightly left of moderate.
- In terms of viewpoints regarding the role of various constituencies having influence on educational objectives and course content, our participants generally endorsed the influence of students, faculty and administrators. In contrast, we saw little support for the role of government, business, or religious organizations. Examination of pre-poll scores vs. post-poll scores suggests that these perspectives became even stronger after participation in the poll.
- Our data suggest overwhelming opposition for the Student's Bill of Right as proposed by Carnegie Mellon's Student Senate or by Horowitz. Moreover, the vast majority of participants endorse retaining Carnegie Mellon's current Students' Rights Policy. Participation in the Deliberative Poll resulted in greater opposition to any form of modification to the current policy.