

SAFS Newsletter

Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship

Maintaining freedom in teaching, research and scholarship
Maintaining standards of excellence in academic decisions about students and faculty

Number 67

www.safs.ca

April 2014

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES ARE BASTIONS OF CENSORSHIP

Barbara Kay

This column was drawn from opening remarks presented at a March 27 Macdonald-Laurier Institute debate in Ottawa, on the resolution: "Free speech in Canadian Universities is an endangered species."

In the past year, a wave of moral panic has swept universities over an alleged campus "rape culture," which former governor-general Michaëlle Jean went so far as to label a "disease." Whenever I express skepticism of rape culture's existence in columns, my Twitter feed lights up with abuse. I have noticed that the most retweeted invectives aren't the ones merely telling me I'm wrong; rather it's the tweets declaring, "@BarbaraRKay should be fired."

Where are these young polemicists — they are all young — taught that the proper response to dissenters is professional death? Why, at the universities, of course where it is common Marxism-derived practice to suppress "offensive" discourse through speech codes, forced sensitivity training or worse. Brave is the university student today who would deny rape culture in any campus forum.

Students are at least free to speak their minds once they leave the universities. But pity the rare faculty member at odds with the leftist echo chamber he is condemned to inhabit for decades. Faculty and administration can be very tough on their own. The epidemic "mobbing" of academics beating against the culture's near-monolithic current, at its peak in the 1980s and 90s, remains a shameful, ongoing chapter in our campus histories.

Google the names of Lucinda Vandervort, Heinz Klatt, Irwin Silverman, Martin Yaqzan (an anti-rape culturist *avant la lettre*), Alan Surovell and Kenneth Westhues,

SAFS 2014

CONFERENCE ISSUE

See page 3

For program and other information

IN THIS ISSUE

- 3. SAFS Annual General Meeting, May 10th**
4. L'affaire Flanagan Revisited
5. More Reason to Ditch Human Rights Commission
6. Human Rights Judge Fired
7. Victory for Academic Freedom
8. Racial Preferences Under Siege
10. White People Banned from Diversity Happy Hour
11. Microaggression
12. Presumption of Guilt on Campuses
14. Windsor Dean of Education Suspended for Plagiarism
16. Fake Papers Flooding Academia
17. Teaching Crisis in Universities
18. Research Collaboration and Gender Politics

Published by the **Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship**, a society open to all (whether in a university or not) who accept the principles of freedom in teaching, research and scholarship and maintaining standards of excellence in decisions concerning students and faculty.

ISSN 1704-5436

Editor: Dr. CLIVE SELIGMAN

E-mail: safs@safs.ca

Fax for newsletter submissions: (519) 661-3961

Mail for newsletter submissions:

Dr. Clive Seligman

Psychology Department

University of Western Ontario

London, Ontario, N6A 5C2

a very partial list of academics savaged by their peers and/or administrations for politically incorrect speech, or following unfounded allegations of sexism, racism or homophobia. You hear about fewer such cases now, but only because most academics got the message, and now prudently self-censor to avoid similar bouts of “re-education.”

Still, the recent mobbing of now-retired University of Calgary academic Tom Flanagan by his peers and the liberal media, the academy’s branch office, for voicing a reasonable doubt as to the efficacy of prison for pederastic voyeurs demonstrates that lust for the blood of politically wayward peers still burns fiercely in academia.

Nevertheless, free speech isn’t entirely extinct on Canadian campuses. After all, it positively flourishes for those who hold politically correct views. For anti-capitalists, anti-Zionists and members of official identity victim groups — women, gays, natives, people of colour, any religion other than Christian — speech is as free as the birds, even if it offends conservatives, Zionists, heterosexual white men or Christians.

So free speech for the “righteous,” but:

— Pro-life demonstrators have trouble getting official status for their clubs, their demonstrations are routinely disallowed, and some have even been arrested for “trespassing” on their own campuses.

— At Ryerson University in Toronto, when a men’s awareness group applied to the Student’s Union for official status, the Student’s Union quietly amended their charter to specifically exclude any men’s issues group that did not make women’s voices central,

therefore denying them speech; vandalism and disruption have attended several men’s issues campus events.

— Israel Apartheid Week is free to peddle its hateful canards every year on campuses across Canada, but when a McGill pro-Zionist club called a members’ soirée, “Israel: a Party,” a gently ironic reference to the absurdity of the word “apartheid” as applied to Israel, the Student Union threatened to take away their club status unless they changed the name. Too-onerous security fees are imposed, an indirect but blatant attack on free speech.

— Faculty, administration and student unions collude in monitoring and policing what can be said and what can’t by guest speakers. Speakers with conservative or pro-American/Israel views have received veiled threats from university presidents concerning our hate-speech laws, encouraging hostile disruptions, buildings forcibly occupied and access to speeches denied. Or too-onerous security fees are imposed, an indirect but blatant attack on free speech.

For a plethora of other examples, one has only to peruse the 2011, 2012 and 2013 Campus Freedom Index reports compiled by the Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedom, which monitors the state of free speech at 45 public universities, tracking the often enormous gulf between benign official policies and Orwellian practices.

One of the most egregious offences against freedom of speech cited in the 2013 report was the shutting down of a free-speech wall built by Students for Liberty at Queen’s University to raise awareness of free expression rights. The grounds cited for its removal were “offensive content,” but no specifics were offered. Notably, no policy or bylaw had been violated. “Free speech wall.” Ominous words. Such walls emerged in authoritarian societies such as China, where citizens quite reasonably fear speaking truth to power in a non-anonymous context. That there is an entire generation of Canadian students who think a free speech wall for anonymously written incorrect thoughts is something normal, acceptable and *necessary* in a democratic society — well, this saddens me, and scares me a little too. Campus rape culture is a social construction. “Unfree speech culture” is the real campus disease.

National Post, March 28, 2014. □

SAFS ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Saturday, May 10th, 2014, 9:00 am – 3:15 pm

University of Western Ontario, Somerville House, Room 3317

9:00 - 9:45	Informal conversation with other SAFS members
9:45 - 10:00	Welcome remarks
10:00	Albert Katz , [University of Western Ontario] “ <i>On Investigating Allegations of Academic Freedom Violations</i> ”
11:00	J. Paul Grayson [York University] “ <i>Academic Accommodations? Who Decides</i> ”
12:00 - 1:00	Buffet Lunch [in Somerville House -Michael's Garden, Room 3320]
1:00	Keynote Address: GREG LUKIANOFF President of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education [FIRE] UNLEARNING LIBERTY: CAMPUS CENSORSHIP AND THE END OF AMERICAN DEBATE
2:15	Refreshment Break
2:30 -3:15	Annual Business Meeting [members only]

Registration Fee: \$30.00 per person, may pay at the door. (Registration includes coffee and lunch, but not parking).

To confirm attendance (please reply by MAY 5^h) and for further information: E-mail: safs@safs.ca, or write to SAFS, 1673 Richmond Street, #344, London, ON, N6G 2N3. For further info contact: Daniella Chirila, e-mail: dchirila@uwo.ca, or by phone: 519-661-2111, ext. 84690.

Getting there: From the 401, take Wellington Road North to its end, then jog one block west to Richmond Street, go North to University gates (on your left), just North of Huron Street. On campus, follow this road over the bridge, turn left at the light and continue to traffic circle. **Visitor parking** is on your right next to Alumni Hall once you are almost around the circle. Rate: \$7.00 flat rate. From Highway 7, take Highway 4 South (it becomes Richmond Street) At the fork after Fanshawe Road you can either stay left on Richmond to University gates (now on Richmond Street) as above, or stay right and go down Western Road, turn left at 3rd light (Lambton Drive). *Visitor parking is on your right as you enter traffic circle.* **Somerville House is across the traffic circle.** On Saturday there is usually no one at the Information booths.

Accommodation: On-campus rooms at Western Bed & Breakfast are \$62.00 per night including continental breakfast. A modern, air-conditioned residence, located in Elgin Hall on University Drive, off Richmond St. North. (www.StayAtWestern.ca). The Station Park on Pall Mall (1-800-561-4574), and Windermere Manor (1-519-858-1414), have UWO rates at ~ \$120.00 per night. □

L’AFFAIRE FLANAGAN, REVISITED

Chris Selley

“Human politics ... is certainly different from chimpanzee politics, but not categorically different,” Tom Flanagan writes in *Winning Power*, his new book about political campaigning. The Conservative party war-room vet and University of Calgary political scientist cites, for example, “a dominance hierarchy with privileges for those at the top,” the “male obsession with attaining rank” and “lethal coalitional violence against outsiders.” In a recent interview, he compared his time in politics to “field observation or laboratory work” for his academic studies. And he’s going to unleash an interesting experiment next month, with the release of another book, titled *Persona Non Grata*.

It’s about what he calls “The Incident.” On Feb. 27 last year, in a discussion about the Indian Act at the University of Lethbridge, he tangentially remarked (having been asked about previous remarks to similar effect) that he had “grave doubts about putting people in jail because of their taste in pictures” — that is, for viewing child pornography. “It’s a real issue of personal liberty to what extent we put people in jail for doing something in which they do not harm another person,” he said.

Up it went on YouTube, and ... kablooy. Even among his conservative friends, it was a race to denounce him: “Tom Flanagan’s comments on child pornography are repugnant, ignorant, and appalling,” tweeted Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s spokesman, Andrew MacDougall. Wildrose leader Danielle Smith, whose campaign Mr. Flanagan had just finished running, declared “there is no language strong enough to condemn [his] comments. ... He will have no role — formal or informal — with our organization going forward.”

Conservative-haters, meanwhile, could hardly contain their glee: Here was the purported “man behind Stephen Harper” (as *The Walrus* dubbed Mr. Flanagan in 2004), the Prime Minister who perfected the permanent political attack machine, touching what might be the ultimate third rail in Canadian politics. For the Twittering partisans, mercy clearly seemed both inappropriate and out of the question.

To this point, it was all understandable. The story became grimly fascinating, however, as it transcended partisan politics. CBC’s *Power and Politics* axed him, saying it valued “free speech” and “a diverse range of voices,” but that Mr. Flanagan’s “comments [had] crossed the line.” Then-Heritage Minister James Moore applauded this decision and suggested the University of Calgary fire Mr. Flanagan as well. And in lieu of a ringing endorsement of academic freedom, the university put out a statement saying Mr. Flanagan’s views “absolutely do not represent” the university’s — universities have views now, apparently — and left the distinct impression he *had*, in fact, been let go. (He hadn’t.)

As artless as Mr. Flanagan freely and apologetically admitted to being, it was quite astonishing: Are differing opinions on how to sentence criminals really beyond the bounds of discussion at the national broadcaster? *At a public university?*

And then, perhaps the bitterest pill: The right-wing Manning Centre struck Mr. Flanagan off the list of speakers at its fast-approaching conference, the annual gathering of what Preston Manning calls the “conservative family.”

Mr. Manning’s event attracts a very free speech-friendly audience. (The keynote speaker was Ron Paul, who is himself something of a heretic on anti-child pornography measures.) But in his address to the conference, Mr. Manning twisted the knife, warning against “intemperate and ill-considered remarks by those who hold ... positions deeply but in fits of carelessness or zealotry say things that discredit ... conservative governments, parties, and campaigns.” He explicitly cited Mr. Flanagan — but not, pointedly, by name.

You don’t have to like Mr. Flanagan to think what happened to him was pretty hideous.

On Feb. 28, 2013, the general consensus seemed to be that Tom Flanagan had torched his career. But the furor already seemed to have died down by the time of the Manning conference. And a year later — last month — Mr. Flanagan was back on the program, on an “authors’ panel,” flogging *Winning Power*. It was as if “The Incident” had never occurred.

Before the conference, I asked Mr. Manning if he had any regrets about how he handled the affair. “There was no time to investigate it, hear both sides of the story,” he said, wistfully. (For the record, there was over a week do that.) “If we had had more time, in retrospect, that could have been handled better.”

Indeed. You don’t have to like Mr. Flanagan to think what happened to him was pretty hideous — if not in the political arena then certainly in the media and academic arenas, where free speech is supposed to be sacred. The contents of *Persona Non Grata* are under embargo, but I hope McLelland & Stewart won’t begrudge my saying it is *not* boring and has a lot to say — about free speech, about academic freedom, about political correctness.

I hope and suspect now that everyone has calmed down, it will be received in the contemplative spirit it’s intended. It will be intriguing, for example, to see if any of his denouncers publicly reconsider, if not their opinions, then the way they expressed them and the mob mentality of which they partook.

At the Manning Centre Conference, I asked Mr. Flanagan if we should worry about behaving like chimpanzees. He shrugged. “These are our cousins,” he said. “It helps to understand why ideas in themselves don’t triumph.” I suspect many of us would like to aim higher.

National Post, March 28, 2014. □

ONE MORE REASON TO DITCH THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Barry Cooper

Two weeks ago, the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) filed an appeal in the Alberta Court of Queen’s Bench. The respondents were Ladislav Mihaly and the Alberta Human Rights Commission.

This case provides additional evidence why the human rights commission needs to be abolished.

APEGA was established in 1920 to regulate the practice of engineering, much as the College of

Physicians and Surgeons does with doctors, or the law society with lawyers. Today, there are more than 72,000 members. Each year, APEGA receives around 9,000 applications, a quarter of whom are foreign educated.

APEGA developed procedures to ensure that persons designated as professional engineers are qualified. It administers “confirmatory exams,” a Fundamentals of Engineering exam, and a National Professional Practice Examination, which all applicants, Canadian or foreign, have to pass.

The complainant, Mihaly, attended the Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava and the Institute of Chemical Technology in Prague. His educational pedigree meant that he was required to write the fundamentals exam, but only three confirmatory exams instead of nine. Like everybody, he had to write the National Professional Practice Examination.

In 1999, he failed the National Professional Practice Examination. In 2000, he failed to show up for any exams. In 2003 and 2006, his file was reactivated, and again, he failed to write any exams. On Aug. 5, 2008, he filed a complaint with the human rights commission Tribunal chair Moosa Jiwaji noted that Mihaly “had some difficulty articulating his argument.” Mihaly’s e-mails, reproduced in Jiwaji’s decision, indicate he could barely write English. Jiwaji added, however, that Mihaly was adept at communicating “his emotions,” notably his “frustration” and his sense of “injury to his dignity.”

In fact, Mihaly was frustrated because APEGA applied consistent standards. By asking for special treatment, any injury to his dignity was self-inflicted.

With the third party, chairman Jiwaji, we enter a world of systematic mistakes. Jiwaji made a number of errors in law that even a non-lawyer can spot. For example, he instructed APEGA to consider exempting Mihaly from the professional practice exam, when Alberta law required the opposite.

In addition, Jiwaji made several findings that never were in evidence and several others that never were addressed either by Mihaly or by APEGA. He even made findings contrary to the evidence. He relied on the pseudo-jurisprudence of other human rights

commissions and ignored contrary (and genuine) jurisprudence by the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench.

Jiwaji's views on the law, to say nothing of his opinions of immigrants and of persons in his former homeland, Kenya, move us into very weird territory indeed.

In this decision, Jiwaji states that APEGA's "one size fits all" approach to determine professional standards was "unhelpful" to foreign-trained engineers. He preferred a "holistic" approach. This is palpable nonsense.

Engineering standards are not discretionary: bridges either stand up or fall down. Confirmatory exams and exams on engineering fundamentals are central to professional certification. Period.

Impartial standards are analogous to the impartiality of the law itself. Jiwaji announced last fall, however, that "a Constitution means DICK!!" He also thought it was a good idea to rid Nairobi of illegal immigrants: "get rid of all those individuals who are living in Kenya on fake papers. Do DNA tests on all of them." As commentator Ezra Levant observed on his TV show, this amounts to ethnic cleansing.

When she was running for the PC leadership, Alison Redford promised to reform the human rights commission, starting with the section dealing with freedom of expression. Today, the first step in reform on the way to abolition requires that Moosa Jiwaji be fired.

Barry Cooper is a professor of political science at the University of Calgary and a senior fellow at the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute.

Calgary Herald, March 4, 2014. □

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in the *SAFS Newsletter* are not necessarily those of the Society, apart from the authoritative notices of the Board of Directors.

All or portions of the *Newsletter* may be copied for further circulation. We request acknowledgement of the source and would appreciate a copy of any further publication of *Newsletter* material.

ALBERTA JUDGE WHO HANDED DOWN CONTROVERSIAL RULING ON ENGINEER PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS NO LONGER AT HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Jen Gerson

Calgary — A controversial judge is no longer employed by Alberta's Human Rights Commission after he handed down a heavily criticized ruling that could dilute the province's professional standards for engineers.

Moosa Jiwaji continues to perform legal consultancy work for Alberta Justice, according to a spokesperson. However, Solicitor General Jonathan Denis confirmed that he was no longer employed as a human rights commissioner.

"Please direct further inquiries to the commission," he said.

The HRC did not respond to requests for comment.

Mr. Jiwaji was appointed to a second term with the commission in July 2013; his tenure was to have expired in the summer of 2016.

He came under heavy fire after handing down a ruling in February in favour of Ladislav Mihaly, who alleged the local professional association discriminated against him by refusing to certify him as an engineer after he twice failed codes tests.

The former professor had been educated in Czechoslovakia, and the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) did not have an agreement that would recognize credentials from his home country. Mr. Mihaly was required to pass several exams, including a test of codes of practice and ethics, and an investigation of his technical skills.

Mr. Mihaly failed the first exam, refused to show up for a second sitting and then failed it again on the third attempt.

He then refused to sit for the examination of his practical competence.

APEGA, which says as many as a quarter of the engineers working in Alberta were educated abroad, would not certify Mr. Mihaly.

The man, who had been trying for recognition since 1999, then took the matter to the Alberta Human Rights Commission, which sided with him and suggested a long list of recommendations to help the foreign-trained engineer.

APEGA is appealing the ruling.

In the meantime, Mr. Jiwaji faced additional scrutiny for several inflammatory comments posted on Twitter. Most of them expressed strong views on the politics of Kenya.

Judges are not permitted to express political biases in public; the HRC later said it would conduct an investigation and review its social media policies.

National Post, March 21, 2014. □

SAFS BOARD OF DIRECTORS

2013 - 2014

Clive Seligman, Ph.D. (UWO) President
safs@safs.ca

Rodney Clifton, Ph.D. (U. Manitoba)
clifton@ms.umanitoba.ca

Andrew Irvine, Ph.D. (UBC)
andrew.irvine@ubc.ca

Tom Flanagan, Ph.D. FRSC (U. Calgary)
tflanaga@ucalgary.ca

Steve Lupker, Ph.D. (UWO)
lupker@uwo.ca

Mark Mercer, Ph.D. (Saint Mary's U.)
mark.mercer@smu.ca

John Mueller, Ph.D. (U. Calgary)
mueller@ucalgary.ca

Peter Suedfeld, Ph.D. FRSC (UBC)
psuedfeld@psych.ubc.ca

Past Presidents

Doreen Kimura, Ph.D. FRSC (SFU)
John Furedy, Ph.D. (U. Toronto)

VICTORY FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM: JURY RULES UNC-WILMINGTON RETALIATED AGAINST CONSERVATIVE PROFESSOR

Leah Barkoukis

A jury in North Carolina on Thursday found that the University of North Carolina-Wilmington retaliated against criminology professor Dr. Mike Adams for his political and social views.

Adams, a Townhall columnist, explained last year that despite his track record of success at the university in terms of teaching, research and service, he was denied a promotion to full professor because of the views he advanced in his opinion columns. He described the promotion process as being “replete with procedural irregularities and with direct criticism of [his] columns and [his] beliefs.”

The ACLJ, who represented Adams along with Alliance Defending Freedom attorney Travis Barham, explains further:

When Dr. Adams submitted his application for full professor, university officials rejected it through the use of a completely-fabricated promotion standard, passed along false and misleading information about his academic record, explicitly considered the content of his protected speech in promotion documents, and – incredibly – allowed a professor who’d filed a false criminal complaint against Dr. Adams to cast a vote against his application.

“[N]o individual loses his ability to speak as a private citizen by virtue of public employment,” the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit wrote in 2011. “Adams’ columns addressed topics such as academic freedom, civil rights, campus culture, sex, feminism, abortion, homosexuality, religion, and morality. Such topics plainly touched on issues of public, rather than private, concern.”

The university hired Adams, a former atheist, in 1993 as an assistant professor, and promoted him to associate professor in 1998. The “campaign of academic persecution that culminated in his denial of promotion to full professor” began when he converted to Christianity in 2000, which greatly influenced his views on social and political issues.

“We are grateful that the jury today reaffirmed the fundamental principle that universities are a marketplace of ideas, not a place where professors face retaliation for having a different view than university officials,” Barham said.

“The jury saw what we have long known to be true about the wrong done to Dr. Adams,” said Senior Legal Counsel David Hacker. “The verdict is a powerful message for academic freedom and free speech at America’s public universities.”

Update: According to the ACLJ, the verdict was only for liability. The judge will later decide Adams’ relief.

Townhall, March 20, 2014. □

RACIAL PREFERENCES UNDER SIEGE

They are vulnerable politically and bankrupt intellectually

John Fund

Two recent events, one on the West Coast and one on the East Coast, demonstrate that after half a century, support for racial preferences in college admissions is getting more and more unsustainable — both politically and intellectually.

In California, liberals have long deplored the 1996 passage of Proposition 209, which banned racial preferences at state universities. Its backers pointed out that the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which is often cited as the authority for mandating preferential treatment for racial minorities, actually forbids all racial discrimination. “It is a sordid business, this divvying us up by race,” Supreme Court chief justice John Roberts has concluded. Polls show that most Americans agree, and even after an intense negative campaign, Prop 209 was backed by 55 percent of Californians, including three-quarters of whites, four out of ten Asians, and a quarter of blacks and Latinos. In general, Prop 209 has worked well by forcing better legitimate outreach efforts by universities. The percentage of blacks and Latinos in the overall University of California system has actually increased from what it was in 1996 (while declining at the most elite UC campuses).

Nonetheless, many California liberals are determined to return to something akin to quotas. Democratic state senator Ed Hernandez used his party’s two-thirds control of the senate to push through a ballot measure that this fall would have asked voters whether to end the ban on racial preferences. The measure appeared set to fly through the assembly, which also has a two-thirds Democratic majority.

But then the public became energized. Asian Americans began agitating, as thousands of them flooded legislative offices with petitions arguing that a repeal would hurt their children’s prospects for getting into the most competitive public campuses. S. B. Woo, a former Democratic lieutenant governor of Delaware who is president of the Asian 80-20 PAC, led the effort, saying, “Asian Americans have always been picked out to be stepped on in race-conscious college admissions.”

The pressure led three Asian Democrats who had voted for the bill in the senate to withdraw their support and urge assembly speaker John Perez to postpone a vote. “We have heard from thousands of people throughout California voicing their concerns about the potential impacts,” they wrote Perez. “Many in the [Asian/Pacific Islander] and other communities throughout the state feel that this legislation would prevent their children from attending the college of their choice.”

Finding that few of the eight Asian Democrats in the assembly now favored going forward on the bill, Perez had no choice but to yank it off the calendar for this year. Opponents of racial preferences say efforts to make college more attainable for minority students are better directed at improving their local K–12 schools so they will be better prepared. They hope the Hernandez bill isn’t resurrected.

It may not be. The intellectual case for preferences is looking increasingly shaky. Last month, a packed auditorium at Harvard Law School featured an Intelligence Squared U.S. debate on whether “affirmative action does more harm than good.”

Harvard professor Randall Kennedy, the author of the book *For Discrimination*, and Columbia professor Ted Shaw, the former head of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, argued that diversity is an important and noble goal that universities must pursue. UCLA professor

Richard Sander, author of the book *Mismatch*, and University of San Diego professor Gail Heriot, a commissioner on the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, presented statistics from over 20 peer-reviewed studies that showed how the good intentions of affirmative-action supporters have had disastrous results.

The research cited by Sander and Heriot shows that universities routinely put a race-conscious fist on the admissions scale, rather than a thumb. These heavy preferences mean that the median African-American student at law school has credentials lower than those of 99 percent of the Asian and white students — and underrepresented minorities admitted to law school based on a heavy preference are two to three times more likely to fail the bar exam.

Going to any school to which a student is admitted because of race, rather than to a school better matched to the student's aptitude, isn't helpful. For example, affirmative-action students are 50 to 75 percent more likely to drop out of a science program than are regular admits. But students who attend a school where their entering credentials are similar to those of their fellow students are more likely to follow through with an ambition to major in science or engineering, more likely to decide to become a college professor, and more likely to finish law school and pass the bar. We almost certainly now have fewer minority doctors, lawyers, and business chiefs than we would have had under race-neutral admissions policies.

Professors Kennedy and Shaw didn't challenge the empirical studies on mismatch, and Kennedy even stipulated that they were true. But he said the quest for diversity is important enough to justify affirmative action: "Why would we not allow people the opportunity to advance themselves if they so desire, and if these institutions believe that it is in their interest — their institutional interest — to invite these students to come?"

But Sander and Heriot pointed out that universities go to great lengths not to give students an informed choice, actively concealing the failure rate of students who enter with lower grades and test scores. Both said they would embrace a compromise to avoid the trench warfare of political battle over the issue and would drop all objections to affirmative action if universities gave every student the career-goal success rate of prior students with their credentials at that school. Sander

said the pretense universities perpetuate, that everyone they admit has the same chance of success, is "manifestly untrue." Heriot noted that after the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights issued a report highlighting the "mismatch" problem, "there was a sad silence from the schools, no transparency, and no task forces examining the damage to minorities."

Professor Kennedy didn't argue with his opponents on their compromise: "I think that the point about disclosure is a fine point." But he continued to defend racial preferences when an Asian-American student in the audience asked about the harm they inflict on Asian Americans, even though they too have battled racism. Kennedy didn't deny that Asians are harmed by racial preferences; he simply said the benefits of diversity are worth some individual sacrifice: "We have all sorts of programs that disadvantage people." Sander replied that the "large racial penalty for Asian Americans" is "really repugnant" — Asian Americans are being "treated the way we used to treat Jewish Americans" when there was a cap on their presence at elite schools.

Given the overwhelming liberal ethos of Harvard's campus, the impact of the debate on the audience was surprising. Audience members voted by keypad before and after the debate. Among those expressing a position, opposition to affirmative action rose by nearly a third — from 31 percent before the debate to 40 percent afterward. Support dropped from 69 percent before the debate to 60 percent afterward.

Shortly before passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Urban League executive director Whitney Young called for "a decade of discrimination in favor of Negro youth." Congress unequivocally rejected that advice, opting instead for a complete ban on racial discrimination in employment and at universities that accept federal funds. Nevertheless, Young got his way — and way more. Within just a few years, universities were violating the prohibition on race discrimination by substantially lowering their academic standards for minorities. Young's "decade of discrimination" has now stretched into its sixth decade. White guilt is a terrible thing to overcome, even when there are hidden non-white victims of that guilt.

When Justice Sandra Day O'Connor provided the critical vote upholding the constitutionality of the University of Michigan's racial preferences in 2003,

she wrote that the Court expected that affirmative action would need to continue for only another quarter-century. Here's hoping the events in California and at Harvard provide the impetus for a more honest public debate that could draw the curtain on racial preferences before that deadline is reached in 2028. Too many students will see their career goals shortchanged if reform doesn't come more quickly.

John Fund is national-affairs columnist for National Review Online.

National Review Online, March 20, 2014. □

COLLEGE GROUP BANS WHITE PEOPLE FROM DIVERSITY 'HAPPY HOUR'

Paul Joseph Watson

A group of employees at South Puget Sound Community College caused outrage after they made it clear that white people would not be welcome at a planned diversity "happy hour" event.

The event was focused around an effort "to build support and community" for people of color.

"If you want to create space for white folks to meet and work on racism, white supremacy, and white privilege to better our campus community and yourselves, please feel free to do just that," stated an email which was sent out to 300 employees.

Students at the college expressed their bewilderment at why a "diversity" event would specifically exclude people of a certain race.

"This...contradicts the message they're trying to send, don't judge people based on their color but they're judging white people because they're white" said one student.

College spokeswoman Kellie Purce Braseth said the exclusion was "not condoned" by the school, adding, "If you want to come you should be able to come, that just makes a richer conversation."

However, despite being forced to apologize, Karama Blackhorn, program coordinator for the school's

Diversity and Equity Center, who helped write the invitation, seemingly doubled down.

"That space is not for white people, that space is for people of color," said Blackhorn, asserting that staff members cannot discuss race issues with white people present.

"That's not diversity, that's anti what we're preaching here," responded one student.

Indeed, Blackhorn's claim that white people should be excluded from certain spaces or events at the college is no different philosophically to how black people were similarly discriminated against during segregation.

By asserting the contrived myth of "white privilege," predominantly white liberals are attempting to rationalize the clearly ludicrous notion that it is impossible to be racist towards white people.

In reality, this mentality functions as a crass and cynical ploy to shut down debate and discriminate against the equality of a person's freedom of speech based on their skin color – which is the very epitome of racism.

Paul Joseph Watson is the editor and writer for Infowars.com and Prison Planet.com. He is the author of Order Out Of Chaos. Watson is also a host for Infowars Nightly News.

Infowars.com, March 12, 2014. □

SUBMISSIONS TO THE SAFS NEWSLETTER

The editor welcomes articles, case studies, news items, comments, readings, local chapter news, etc. Please send your submission by e-mail attachment.

Mailing Address:

Dr. Clive Seligman

Psychology Department
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, N6A 5C2
Fax: (519) 661-3961
E-mail: safs@safs.ca
Web: www.safs.ca

SEVEN THINGS TO KNOW ABOUT MICROAGGRESSIONS AND WHY 'UNCONSCIOUS RACIAL BIASES' ARE CAUSING GREAT OFFENCE

Graeme Hamilton

Until this week, most Canadians knew nothing of microaggressions, unless they got in a fight about whose turn it was to use the lunch-room microwave. McGill student politician Brian Farnan helped change that with an apology sent to the university's 22,000 undergraduates for sharing a video that had been doctored to portray U.S. President Barack Obama kicking down a door. Responding to a formal complaint from a student, Mr. Farnan said he regretted the "microaggression" of perpetuating a stereotypical depiction of black people as violent. A backlash to the backlash followed, with one student calling the whole affair "ridiculous." The Post's Graeme Hamilton has a look at how we got here:

What is a microaggression?

Columbia University psychology professor Derald Wing Sue is considered the leading expert in this emerging field. A 2007 American Psychologist paper on which he was the lead author defined microaggressions as "brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group." More recently the study of microaggressions has expanded to include gender, sexual orientation and disability.

If the offending words or actions are unintentional, how can you be sure that you have been microaggressed? Couldn't it just be a misunderstanding?

Dr. Sue, who is Asian-American, explores this question when relating an incident that occurred to him on a mostly empty flight between New York and Boston. He and an African-American colleague had been told to sit wherever they liked but were then asked to move to the back of the plane for proper weight distribution. A group of three white men who had boarded after them were allowed to stay in their seats in the front.

"In light of our everyday racial experiences, we both

came to the same conclusion: The flight attendant had treated us like second-class citizens because of our race," he wrote. After fuming for a while, he challenged the flight attendant, who was white, and she replied indignantly, saying "I don't see colour! I only asked you to move to balance the plane." Dr. Sue wrestled with who was right but concluded he had experienced a microaggression. The paper's authors noted that psychological research "tends to confirm the existence of unconscious racial biases in well-intentioned Whites" and concluded that the disempowered are best placed to identify microaggression.

The sanction issued by the Students' Society of McGill University against Mr. Farnan, who is white, appeared to follow the same logic. "The fact that a complaint did come forward does prove that someone was harmed and did feel harm," Joey Shea, the SSMU executive member responsible for equity, said.

Why are we hearing about microaggressions now?

The term was first coined by American psychiatrist Chester Pierce in the 1970s, but it has recently become more popular among academics who argue that racism and other types of discrimination have evolved from overt bigotry to more disguised forms.

Students on many U.S. campuses have embraced the theory. Universities have adopted policies for avoiding microaggression in the lecture hall, and web sites have sprung up to catalogue incidents of microaggression.

Vivian Lu, a PhD student at Stanford University, is the co-founder of the pioneering Microaggressions Project, a blog that publishes submissions from microaggression victims. "I think college campuses are a space where everyone's the same age, everyone's trying to understand each other, we all come from different backgrounds," Ms. Lu said. "Microaggression is a way to show that even in these kind of ideal places where there's a language of, 'Anyone can come,' 'We're all equal,' this kind of thing, our everyday interactions show we all carry these ideologies with us."

Are all microaggressions the same?

No. Dr. Sue and his colleagues identify three subclasses: microassaults, microinsults and

microinvalidation. A microassault is an overt act of racism, such as using a racial epithet or displaying a swastika. Microinsults are “subtle snubs,” such as asking a minority employee how he got his job or avoiding eye contact with a black employee during a conversation. Microinvalidation refers to comments that negate the thoughts or feelings particular to a person of colour, such as telling a Latino couple who received poor restaurant service not to be oversensitive.

What are some examples?

Dr. Sue and his co-authors offered dozens of examples, from asking someone of Asian origin, “Where are you from?” (the assumption is that the person is a foreigner) to a white woman clutching her purse when a black man passes. Microaggressions can also exist in the environment, the authors say, for example a university with buildings that are all named after rich, white, heterosexual men or an overabundance of liquor stores in communities of colour.

So what do proponents of this theory say is the effect of these microaggressions?

Kevin Nadal, an associate professor of psychology at the City University of New York, wrote this month on psychologybenefits.org about the toll microaggressions – such as the expression “That’s so gay!” – take on LGBT people. “Many studies have found that the more that people experience microaggressions, the more likely they are to report symptoms of depression, psychological distress, and even physical health issues,” he wrote.

Was the McGill Obama video really a microaggression?

Ms. Shea of the SSMU acknowledged that it could be qualified a micro microaggression. But the experts seem to agree that aggression is in the eye (or the ear) of the recipient. “The worst thing that we can do is to deny that someone is hurt or offended by something we said or did; in fact, invalidating their experience could be considered a microaggression itself,” Mr. Nadal wrote.

National Post, with files from Sarah Boesveld, February 21, 2014. □

ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES, A PRESUMPTION OF GUILT

Peter Berkowitz

SWARTHMORE, Pa. -- On Feb. 22, in celebration of its sesquicentennial, Swarthmore College proudly hosted “The Liberal Arts in Action: A Symposium on the Future of Liberal Arts.”

In what seemed an unrelated event, a month before, a former Swarthmore student expelled by the college in the summer of 2013 filed a lawsuit in federal court of the eastern district of Pennsylvania. The student, identified as “John Doe,” was found guilty under campus disciplinary procedures of sexual misconduct. (Pseudonyms were used to protect both the accused and the accuser.) His legal complaint alleges that Swarthmore “failed to follow its own policies and procedural safeguards” and violated his “basic due process and equal protection rights.”

The litigation was not mentioned at the high-minded, if self-congratulatory, afternoon symposium. Yet the future of liberal education is closely connected to John Doe’s assertion that in the course of expelling him Swarthmore trampled on fair process—and to the willingness of the federal judiciary to examine it.

Liberal education is the culmination of an education for freedom. Among its crucial components are the offering of a solid core curriculum, the promotion of liberty of thought and discussion, and the cultivation of intellectual diversity.

Another vital feature of liberal education consists of fostering an appreciation of the principles of due process. They are principles free societies have developed over the centuries to adjudicate controversies, establish guilt, and mete out punishment in ways that justly balance the rights of those who claim they have been wronged with the rights of those who have been accused of wrongdoing.

In cases involving serious accusations, due process requires a presumption of innocence, settled rules and laws, timely notice of charges, adequate opportunity to prepare a defense, the chance for the accused to question the accuser, and an impartial judge and jury.

Although college disciplinary procedures have been roiling campuses for decades, none of this was discussed at the Swarthmore symposium. Instead, the keynote address, “The Role of the Arts in Liberal Arts Education”—delivered by Mary Schmidt Campbell, Swarthmore class of ’69 and dean of the Tisch School of the Arts at New York University—as well as the subsequent panel discussion on “The Future of Knowledge” and the concluding panel on “Fostering a Democratic Society Through Education,” were of a piece.

The speakers—Swarthmore graduates who have risen to prominence in the world of college and university administration—properly praised the importance to liberal education of certain skills: questioning effectively; thinking critically; weighing evidence and analyzing arguments; solving problems; seeing things from a multiplicity of perspectives; taking the initiative; innovating and creating; collaborating; and working across interdisciplinary boundaries.

Yet with the notable exception of Tori Haring-Smith, president of Washington & Jefferson College, who spoke compellingly about the vigorous measures adopted by her institution to teach students the importance of listening to opinions different from their own and of learning to live with the people who hold them, the panelists spoke as if our liberal arts colleges are doing a bang-up job. The only question they raised was how to extend to broader segments of the nation the lessons of freedom and democracy that Swarthmore is purportedly already teaching so well to its own students.

John Doe’s lawsuit gives a different impression of the school’s commitment to the principles of freedom. He contends that 19 months after three separate consensual sexual encounters—a kiss, sexual conduct not including sexual intercourse, and sexual intercourse—a fellow student reported to Swarthmore the first two and claimed she had been coerced. The accuser, according to the complaint, “offered no physical or medical evidence, and no police or campus safety reports.” After a two-month long investigation, Swarthmore appeared to conclude the matter without taking disciplinary action.

Approximately four months later, according to John Doe, Swarthmore suddenly re-opened the case against him. The college did this, he maintains, in response to

public accusations—including a complaint filed with the U.S. Department of Education by two Swarthmore female undergraduates—that the school mishandled a number of sexual misconduct cases. And John Doe asserts that in the second round of hearings, which culminated with his expulsion based on a finding that he had merely “more likely than not” committed sexual misconduct, Swarthmore repeatedly and egregiously violated its own rules for disciplinary procedures explicitly set forth in the official student handbook.

John Doe’s lawsuit presents one of the nation’s finest small liberal arts colleges acting in haste and panic, railroading a young man in order to convince the public and the federal government that it had, in the words of Swarthmore President Rebecca Chopp, “zero tolerance for sexual assault, abuse and violence on our campus.”

Swarthmore, for its part, has filed a motion to have the John Doe complaint dismissed. “The College believes that the suit is without merit and will vigorously defend the litigation,” Swarthmore’s attorney Michael Baughman said in a written statement. “The College is committed, and always has been committed, to providing all students with a fair process of adjudication in student conduct proceedings.”

A trial court will determine the merits of John Doe’s allegations, but in light of the sorry condition of due process at our colleges and universities, the charges against Swarthmore are plausible.

For example, in 2006, the Duke faculty and administration were quick to treat as guilty three lacrosse players accused of rape by a black woman whom their fraternity had hired as an exotic dancer. After a year-long investigation, the North Carolina attorney general dropped all charges and took the remarkable step of pronouncing the accused players innocent.

In 2010, a campus tribunal found University of North Dakota student Caleb Warner guilty of sexual assault. The Grand Forks police department investigated the case and not only declined to charge Warner but charged his accuser with making a false report. Nevertheless, the university refused to reconsider its verdict. Only when the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education stepped in a year and half later

was the school impelled to revisit the case and eventually overturn the judgment.

Just a few weeks ago, Dartmouth Sexual Abuse Awareness coordinator Amanda Childress asked at a University of Virginia conference on campus sexual misconduct, “Why could we not expel a student based on an allegation?” To clarify where she stood on the question, Childress went on to say, “It seems to me that we value fair and equitable processes more than we value the safety of our students. And higher education is not a right. Safety is a right. Higher education is a privilege.”

Safety, however, is not a right. It is a goal. Due process is a right. Moreover, history has shown that honoring it is the best way over the long run to achieve the greatest amount of safety and security for all.

John Doe’s account of his encounter with Swarthmore disciplinary procedures suggests the invidious effects of Ms. Childress’s reasoning—and of allowing the verdicts of pseudo-judicial proceedings to stand without legal review. An honors student in high school (with an excellent record in college) who chose Swarthmore over other elite schools because his parents met and married there, Doe is now effectively blackballed from higher education. He had completed his junior year when the school abruptly ordered the second investigation. After being expelled, he inquired about admission to some 300 colleges, all of which told him that Swarthmore’s verdict rendered him ineligible for transfer to their school. Of the 19 colleges that didn’t have such bright-line rules, 18 required disclosure. Only one of those accepted him—and required him to enroll as a junior.

This case occurs in a context in which our colleges and universities have aggressively eroded due process protections for those accused of sexual harassment and sexual assault. Over and over, colleges and universities have transformed disciplinary procedures into kangaroo courts that appear to operate on the assumption that an accusation creates a presumption of guilt and the burden is on the accused to prove his innocence. Due process is equally offended, it should not be necessary to add, when universities cover up for star athletes accused of sexual misconduct.

For the sake of genuinely liberal education, faculty and administrators must get out of the business of

investigating the most serious forms of sexual misconduct, particularly sexual assault. Professors and university officials must be educated to recognize their woeful lack of the expertise necessary to properly gather and analyze evidence, establish guilt, and ensure fairness for the accuser and the accused. And they should be taught to promptly advise all students who believe they have been sexually assaulted to report their allegations to the police.

And as an indispensable element of their obligation to teach the principles of freedom, colleges and universities must be persuaded to restore to disciplinary procedures that they rightly conduct the presumption of innocence—a cornerstone of justice—and all the ancillary protections that follow from it.

Peter Berkowitz, a graduate of Swarthmore College with a major in English literature, is a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University. His writings are posted at www.PeterBerkowitz.com.

Realclearpolitics, February 28, 2014. □

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR SUSPENDS ITS DEAN OF EDUCATION UNTIL AT LEAST JUNE 2014 OVER PLAGIARISM

Dalson Chen

Clinton Beckford, the dean of the faculty of education at the University of Windsor, has been suspended over plagiarism.

In a tersely worded statement issued Monday morning, the university announced that Beckford has begun an “administrative leave” and has been suspended without pay from his position.

According to the statement, the penalty comes “in recognition of an academic integrity breach involving plagiarism.”

The suspension will last until June 30, 2014.

In a phone interview on Monday, U of W president Alan Wildeman repeatedly refused to go into specifics

about the nature of Beckford's plagiarism — such as the number of instances and the extent.

“Those are details that we're not going to talk about,” Wildeman said. “They aren't relevant to the bigger issue — which is academic integrity, and the importance of it to the institution.”

Wildeman said Beckford's publication record was brought to the attention of university administration about two months ago, and a formal investigation took place over a number of recent weeks.

Wildeman would not explain who brought the breach to administration's attention, or how exactly it was discovered.

“The breach in this particular case involved plagiarism, which means using sources ... in an unattributed way,” said Wildeman, adding: “When work appears that is not properly cited, or is not properly acknowledged as coming from a different source.”

Pressed about the severity of Beckford's plagiarism, Wildeman would only point to the fact that Beckford will eventually be resuming his duties at the University of Windsor as an indicator of the degree of the breach.

“If you look at the kind of sanctions that get imposed as a result of academic integrity breaches, there's a wide range — often times including termination of employment,” Wildeman said.

“Dr. Beckford has the ability to come back as a faculty member of the University of Windsor. He would not be extended that opportunity were we not completely confident he would be ... a contributing member of the faculty.”

But Wildeman said Beckford will not be returning to the dean of education position.

Asked if he's concerned about how this controversy reflects on the University of Windsor, Wildeman replied: “I think every university is concerned about ... the issue of academic integrity. Were we not to take academic integrity very seriously — that would be far worse.”

“We need to be seen to be vigilant about it. We certainly are vigilant about it with our students, and we

need to be seen to be doing that (with faculty),” Wildeman said. “That's the most important issue here.”

“Certainly, we want to hold everyone to the same standards in this.”

Beckford could not be reached for comment.

A PhD graduate from the University of West Indies, Beckford joined the University of Windsor's teaching staff in 2003.

His areas of research interest are listed on the University of Windsor website as: geography and environmental education, international education, aboriginal education, and education of marginalized groups such as racial minorities, immigrants, refugees and children of war.

Among his published work, the website lists 16 principal publications, three book chapters and two conference proceedings.

Many of his papers have examined teaching for ecological sustainability and Jamaican agriculture — yam farming, in particular.

He has also led students on humanitarian expeditions to the east African country of Tanzania.

Beckford became associate dean of pre-service education in 2007.

He was appointed to the top position of the faculty of education in July, with his term as dean originally to last until 2017.

At the time the appointment was announced, university provost Leo Groarke praised Beckford's experience in external partnerships, advocacy and curriculum development.

“His strengths in team building, community collaboration and international education will be an asset as the faculty of education embarks on its future course,” Groarke said in June.

Six months later, on Monday, Groarke sent a letter to all faculty of education students confirming that Beckford “will not be continuing as Dean.”

"I expect the university to appoint an Acting Dean in the very near future," Groarke wrote. "In the interim, classes, examinations and the Education program will continue as normal."

The university's annual public sector salary disclosure lists Beckford's 2011 salary — prior to his appointment to dean — as \$134,007, with \$898 in benefits.

Patricia Rogers, the dean of the faculty of education before Beckford, was paid \$250,475 in 2011, with \$1,483 in benefits.

The Windsor Star, December 10, 2012. □

HOW COMPUTER-GENERATED FAKE PAPERS ARE FLOODING ACADEMIA

Ian Sample

Like all the best hoaxes, there was a serious point to be made. Three MIT graduate students wanted to expose how dodgy scientific conferences pestered researchers for papers, and accepted any old rubbish sent in, knowing that academics would stump up the hefty, till-ringing registration fees.

It took only a handful of days. The students wrote a simple computer program that churned out gobbledegook and presented it as an academic paper. They put their names on one of the papers, sent it to a conference, and promptly had it accepted. The sting, in 2005, revealed a farce that lay at the heart of science.

But this is the hoax that keeps on giving. The creators of the automatic nonsense generator, Jeremy Stribling, Dan Aguayo and Maxwell Krohn, have made the SCIgen program free to download. And scientists have been using it in their droves. This week, *Nature* reported, French researcher Cyril Labbé revealed that 16 gobbledegook papers created by SCIgen had been used by German academic publisher Springer. More than 100 more fake SCIgen papers were published by the US Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE). Both organisations have now taken steps to remove the papers.

Hoaxes in academia are nothing new. In 1996, mathematician Alan Sokal riled postmodernists by publishing a nonsense paper in the leading US journal, *Social Text*. It was laden with meaningless phrases but, as Sokal said, it sounded good to them. Other fields have not been immune. In 1964, critics of modern art were wowed by the work of Pierre Brassau, who turned out to be a four-year-old chimpanzee. In a more convoluted case, Bernard-Henri Lévy, one of France's best-known philosophers, was left to ponder his own expertise after quoting the lectures of Jean-Baptiste Botul as evidence that Kant was a fake, only to find out that Botul was the fake, an invention of a French reporter.

Just as the students wrote a quick and dirty program to churn out nonsense papers, so Labbé has written one to spot the papers. He has made it freely available, so publishers and conference organizers have no excuse for accepting nonsense work in future.

Krohn, who has now founded a startup called Keybase.io in New York that provides encryption to programmers, said Labbé's detective work revealed how deep the problem ran. Academics are under intense pressure to publish, conferences and journals want to turn their papers into profits, and universities want them published. "This ought to be a shock to people," Krohn said. "There's this whole academic underground where everyone seems to benefit, but they are wasting time and money and adding nothing to science. The institutions are being ripped off, because they pay publishers huge subscriptions for this stuff."

Krohn sees an arms race brewing, in which computers churn out ever more convincing papers, while other programs are designed to sniff them out. Does he regret the beast he helped unleash, or is he proud that it is still exposing weaknesses in the world of science? "I'm psyched, it's so great. These papers are so funny, you read them and can't help but laugh. They are total bullshit. And I don't see this going away."

This article was amended on 27 February 2014, to cite *Nature* as the source of the story.

theguardian, February 26, 2014. □

THERE IS A CRISIS IN UNIVERSITIES: IT'S IN TEACHING UNDERGRADS

Jessica Riddell

A recent study published by Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) has started a debate about whether professors spend enough of their time teaching. Of the professors polled, a fifth were not active researchers, contrary to the claims of faculty everywhere that they cannot teach more courses because they are busy advancing knowledge in their fields.

There is no question that if there is a crisis in higher education in Canada it is in the quality of undergraduate teaching. Many universities – in response to cutbacks in funding, debt crises, and mounting costs – have grown their undergraduate enrollment rapidly and focused their resources on graduate programs and research. The funding model currently in place puts pressure on universities to grow class sizes, especially in undergraduate programs, which in turn dilutes the quality of faculty-student interactions both inside and outside the classroom.

At universities that look like the dominant university model, research-intensive institutions with large undergraduate classes, students are learning less, professors are being asked to do more, parents are upset with rising tuition costs, taxpayers are frustrated, and no one is happy.

However, these types of universities are not the only model available to students in Canada. There are a handful of primarily undergraduate universities that are dedicated to the undergraduate experience.

I am a professor at Bishop's University, a small, undergraduate university with 2400 students, located in Sherbrooke, Que. Professors teach 5 classes per year (a number quite different than the 1.8 course average), and are expected to balance teaching, research, and service but without the “publish or perish” paradigm so prevalent at larger, research-intensive universities. Average class sizes are 25 students (the Canadian average is 226 students) and 80 per cent of courses are taught by full-time professors (compared to the national average of 26 per cent). There is no hiding in the back of the classroom when there are six people in the seminar room. The majority of my colleagues are active researchers; they strive to engage their students

in their particular research fields through lectures, field trips, debates, and conferences. Research can take many forms and be extended into the community through public scholarship, community outreach, the scholarship of teaching and learning, experiential learning, or the celebration of undergraduate research (for example, I help co-ordinate an annual undergraduate conference that attracts students from across Canada and the U.S.). These contributions are harder to measure in terms of “output” or “productivity” – they are not captured by research grants from federal councils or journal articles. However, the value these kinds of activities have on our students' development is significant and arguably, more important than traditional ways of measuring research productivity.

Is every professor cut out to make teaching their primary focus? The demands on our time and energy are extraordinary. Sometimes our research portfolios suffer with a heavy teaching load and an expectation of service born out of our commitment to extend learning outside the classroom. Our desire to put the undergraduate experience first means that we have to be passionate about teaching and learning. We have to believe in this model to justify devoting our evenings and weekends to all kinds of interaction with students from art shows to sporting events. This is not the ideal model for everyone, and is certainly not the norm in Canada, but at universities like Mount Allison, Acadia, St. Francis Xavier, and Bishop's, this is our way of life.

The oft cited ratio of how a professor's job is divided – 40 per cent teaching, 40 per cent research, 20 per cent service – is nowhere to be found in our collective agreement, and feels to me like a counter-intuitive paradigm: Separating these three areas suggests they are mutually exclusive.

We need to start a conversation about how to create universities that look at these three aspects as pillars that support undergraduate education. If our current generation is going to have a competitive advantage in the workforce or in graduate school, they must have our undivided attention and unparalleled commitment to their development.

Dr. Jessica Riddell is an Associate Professor of English at Bishop's University.

Globe and Mail, March 19, 2014. □

**SENIOR FEMALE PSYCHOLOGY
PROFESSORS ARE LESS LIKELY THAN
THEIR MALE COUNTERPARTS TO
COOPERATE WITH THEIR JUNIOR, SAME-
GENDER COLLEAGUES ON RESEARCH**

Ryan Jacobs

Hackneyed gender tropes tell us that men are hyper-competitive, egoistic warriors who will fight to the death. Women, on the other hand, are deeply concerned about interpersonal relationships, so they're more likely to work together as a unit than get in fist-fights and pissing matches.

But how does intra-gender politics actually work in the real-world, beyond the lazy stereotypes? Do women really collaborate together more than men?

According to a new study published in *Current Biology* by Joyce Benenson, a psychology professor at Emmanuel College and an associate at Harvard University's Department of Human Evolutionary Biology, and two of her colleagues, the world of academia doesn't conform to these clichés. Female and male full professors at 50 university psychology departments across North America actually "were equally likely" to collaborate with same-gender, equal-rank colleagues on research papers.

But when hierarchy is folded into the equation, behavior shifts radically.

The researchers used "numbers of co-authored peer-reviewed publications" between 2008 to 2012 to measure the robustness of senior faculty members' cooperation with their younger colleagues. They calculated the expected number of publications among full professors and their same-gender, junior colleagues, based on chance and the position and gender compositions of the departments. The team discovered that female full professors came in well below the random mark for co-authorship with their younger, same-gender colleagues, while their male counterparts exceeded expectations:

There were significantly fewer publications co-authored by one senior female with one junior female than by one senior male with one junior male than would be expected. ... In contrast, analysis of co-authored publications between senior and junior co-

authors of the other gender yielded no difference.... These results show that high-ranked male professors co-published more than high-ranked female professors with same-gender low-ranked faculty.

Our results are consistent with observations suggesting that social structure takes differing forms for human males and females. Males' tendency to interact in same-gender groups make them more prone to cooperation with asymmetrically ranked males. In contrast, females' tendency to restrict their same-gender interactions to equally ranked individuals make them more reluctant to cooperate with asymmetrically ranked females.

The female preference for cooperation with equals has also been observed in other studies of chimps and human infants, adolescents, and adults. Benenson suspects there's an evolutionary basis for the behavior. "Males benefit from cooperating with groups to defeat other groups. Females invest more in kin and not in unrelated individuals, except a best friend," she explained in an email.

This lack of cross-rank cooperation seems particularly discouraging for young female professors, who already have to compete in a system full of institutionally- and societally-imposed handicaps. Recognizing and reversing this trend may be one of many ways to work against the gender imbalance among tenured professors.

Given the findings, I asked Benenson whether she wished she'd collaborated on her paper with a junior female faculty member rather than two male colleagues. She replied: "It is not so easy to do!"

Pacific Standard, March 4, 2014. □

BEQUEST to SAFS

Please consider remembering the Society in your will. Even small bequests can help us greatly in carrying on SAFS' work. In most cases, a bequest does not require rewriting your entire will, but can be done simply by adding a codicil. So please do give this some thought.

Thank you.

Elive Seligman, President

SAFS MEMBERSHIP FORM

To join **SAFS** or to renew your **SAFS** membership, please sign and complete this form and return to:

SAFS
1673 Richmond Street, #344
London, Ontario, Canada
N6G 2N3

Please make your cheque payable to **SAFS**

- ◆ Annual regular - \$25.00
- ◆ Annual retirees/students - \$15.00
- ◆ Lifetime - \$150 (*available to those 60 years or older or retired*)
- ◆ Sustaining - \$100 - \$299
- ◆ Benefactor - \$300.00

"I support the Society's goals"

_____ *signature*

Renewal	Sustaining
New Member	Benefactor

Name: _____

Department: _____

Institution: _____

Address: _____

Other Address: _____

Please specify preferred address for the Newsletter

Ph (W): _____

Ph (H): _____

E-mail: _____

*(Because **SAFS** is not a registered charity, memberships cannot be considered charitable contributions for income tax purposes.)*

VISIT SAFS WEBSITE AT WWW.SAFS.CA

SAFS OFFICE

1673 Richmond Street, #344. London, Ontario, Canada. N6G 2N3. e-mail: safs@safs.ca