



THE

AFCON

SENTINEL



Volume III, Number 3

A Quarterly of the Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska

September 17, 1999

AFCON OFFICERS

Spencer Davis
President

President-Elect
Vacant

Mel Krutz
Past President

Peggy Williams
Secretary

Cathi McMurtry
Treasurer

David Moshman
Policy Coordinator

Tom Black
Newsletter Editor

Purpose:

To promote academic freedom, defined as intellectual freedom in educational and research contexts. This includes freedoms of belief and expression and access to information and ideas.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—Spencer Davis

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND THE NUMBERS GAME

When I told one of my good friends that I was going to become an officer of AFCON, she asked me why I would want to get involved with a radical cause like academic freedom. The tone of her voice was humorous, but I thought she was serious and gave a serious reply. I told her academic freedom was important to me as a college instructor and wasn't always a political issue. I should have told her how much I felt academic freedom was now a basic working-day issue for college instructors as well as a matter of defending academics from political censorship. Without denying the reality of politically-motivated censorship, I want to suggest that the relentless pursuit of ever-increasing enrollment by college administrators constitutes a major threat to academic freedom.

Higher enrollment, and the fear of declining enrollment, is the name of the game in higher education today. Increasing enrollment and increasing retention mean diluting the curriculum and relaxing the standards of academic probation and suspension. Administrators increasingly define academic failure as the failure of instructors, not the failure of students. Several years ago I overheard a student who was failing a course complaining about the instructor that "it's his job to get me through this course." The students to whom he addressed this outburst laughed at him, as much perhaps for his honesty as his error, but today's administrators accept this as gospel. It constitutes a serious threat to the ability of any instructor to teach complicated topics and grade honestly,

It appears that administrators are implementing a new technique to help give students the courses they will like. At some institutions instructors are now required to include in the syllabus notice of any controversial topics or

material that will be presented in the course. At first inspection this seems simple honesty, but who is to define "controversial?" The policy provides the means by which administrative pressure can be used to ensure that every student is guaranteed that his or her current conceptions will never be scrutinized, his or her complacent attitudes never disturbed. This requirement is a straw in the wind. What is potent already on the widest scale is the use of student evaluations of instructors.

The only observable educational outcome from student evaluation is grade inflation, which is the result administrators secretly welcome. Evaluation forms typically ask students to judge appropriate instructional techniques. Since it is logically impossible for a student to evaluate what he or she would have learned in a hypothetical alternative situation, the question actually invites students to register their satisfaction with their grades and the entertainment value of their instructors. Instructors who want satisfactory evaluations—and that is most of us—provide what it takes to get them.

The "student services" area is the growth sector on many campuses today. Success depends on keeping students in school in spite of their current academic difficulties (and just think how severe these difficulties must be today for any student to be in academic difficulty.) Counseling, tutoring, and remedial courses are legitimate, but one also hears of pressure on adjuncts and junior faculty to give students special consideration or to tailor assignments to what remedial courses cover or to material tutors can handle.

All of this constitutes a real threat to the ability of instructors to conduct classes and assign grades based on their professional judgement. That independence is an important part of academic freedom. It is also the means to guarantee to students and the public that academic degrees are credible. The public has a very big stake in preserving academic freedom.

MINUTES of the AFCON Board of Directors

Board of Directors, June 12, 1999—President Joseph Stimpfl resigned to accept a position in St. Louis. Mel Krutz introduced Spencer Davis, Vice President, who succeeds as President.

Cathi McMurtry distributed the Treasurer's report showing a balance of \$1155.70 and a list of paid members.

Lavender was selected as the color of the new Membership Brochures. Davis will construct a master copy after making changes designated by Board members,

Tom Black volunteered to investigate a tax-exempt status for AFCON.

Discussion continued on revisions for the AFCON Constitution. The Board discussed IVa and Vd. In IIIa, "the majority of members of the AFCON Board" was changed to "the majority of seven members..." In IIIb, "The AFCON Board shall prepare the agenda for each annual meeting" was changed to "The president, upon the advice of the AFCON Board shall prepare the agenda..." In VIII, the voting power of individual (1) and organizational (6) members was retained in a motion which passed with minority voiced. Krutz suggested the Executive Committee in July and the Board in September finalize action on Constitutional recommendations with adoption to be voted on at the annual meeting, tentatively set for October 25.

Representatives of the AFCON Speaker's Bureau will make two appearances at the NEMA Conference, October 21-22. Krutz and Jeff Lofthus will present "Current Nebraska Censorship Issues and Why They Matter to Librarians" and the AFCON Actors will offer the play "The Tangled Web."

Black will reserve a table at the NSEA Leadership Conference in Kearney, July 26-29, to promote AFCON. Amy Birky, McMurtry, Black and Davis will attend the table.

Discussion of AFCON job descriptions of Board positions and policy statements on academic freedom continued. Members suggested some revisions; final drafts to be voted on at the September Board meeting.

Organizational Reports—NELAC will

hold its Fall Conference October 25 at Lincoln High School and invited AFCON to append its annual meeting to the evening dinner. Carol MacDaniels reported NHSPA has no new journalism censorship cases. Krutz reported that the Nebraska Literature Festival will be October 17-18 at Chadron. Black said over 100 NSEA members will attend the NEA Representative Assembly in Orlando, Florida, in July.

Next Meeting: Executive Committee, July 10, Gere Library, Lincoln, 10 AM-1 PM.

Executive Committee, July 10, 1999—Mel Krutz distributed copies of the AFCON Speaker's Bureau.

Cathi McMurtry presented the Treasurer's report showing a balance of \$1138.55.

Spencer Davis distributed the new membership brochure. The names of two organizational members need to be added.

Tom Black e-mailed information regarding the procedure of acquiring a tax-exempt status.

Board Members suggested changes in the language of the job descriptions of Board positions. Krutz moved that final copies be mailed to the president of each organizational member for its consideration whether or not the description meets the expectations his/her organization has for its representatives on the AFCON Board. Copies will also be mailed to each AFCON Board Member. Krutz will compose the cover letter; Davis will edit the descriptions.

Davis will contact Rosemary Shimerda about AFCON's holding its annual meeting in conjunction with the NELAC Conference on October 25.

Krutz moved that Gerry Cox and Carol MacDaniels be nominated for the Nebraska Committee for the Humanities Sower Award. NLHA, NCB, and NELAC will co-sponsor the nominations.

Next Meeting: Executive Committee, August 14, Gere Library, Lincoln. Jeff Lofthus (survey,) Dave Moshman (policies,) Black (tax-exempt status,)

and Bob Haller (Annual Meeting speakers) are invited to attend.

Executive Committee, August 14, 1999—Cathi McMurtry presented the Treasurer's Report showing a balance of \$984.96. There is no change in membership at this time.

McMurtry and Tom Black will complete the IRS tax-exempt form at the September meeting.

Peggy Williams will mail the job descriptions of Board positions when they and the cover letters are ready.

Discussion of the policy statements on academic freedom continued. Dave Moshman will present options for the proposed changes at the September meeting and also bring copies of the University Library Policy for discussion.

Discussion continued on plans for the AFCON Annual Meeting, possibly in conjunction with the October 25 NELAC meeting. AFCON is scheduled to have an afternoon meeting at the NELAC conference. The Board discussed whether or not to have a separate dinner and speaker or a Saturday meeting. Bob Haller mentioned that Dave Broader would be in Lincoln to speak at a Nebraska Humanities Council meeting. Haller will check on the possibility of AFCON sharing a state meeting with AAUP. Davis suggested a panel "Who Owns the Marketplace" and a speaker in conjunction with the business meeting at a future date.

Krutz and Jeff Lofthus will do their presentations at the NLA/NEMA Conference October 21 and 22.

Carol MacDaniels will present "Ethics and Problems of Students Writing Their Own Stories and Using Vernacular Language in English" in a morning session of the NELAC Conference October 25.

Tom Black will prepare and frame a certificate of contribution for former AFCON President Joseph Stimpfl,

Next Meeting, AFCON Board September 11, Gere Library, Lincoln.

Upcoming Events

Nebraska Literature Festival, Chadron, September 17-18
 AFCON Executive Committee Meeting, Lincoln, October 9
 NLA/NEMA Annual Conference, October 20-22
 Nebraska English/Language Arts Council Conference, Lincoln, October 25
 NHSPA Fall Conference, Scottsbluff, October 25
 AFCON Annual Meeting, October 25 (tentative)
 AFCON Board Meeting, November 13

Free Speech by Robert Haller

Senator John McCain said it so well that he is certain not to be nominated or elected. At present, we live in a political world where money talks and people with ideas keep silence.

A few years ago the U.S. Supreme Court passed down an opinion that corporate PAC's could not be blocked from expressing their opinions without a violation of the First Amendment. It mistakenly gave rights to big piles of money which by their very nature belong only to people.

Politicians have to raise huge sums of money to run for office and then have to pay back the people who gave them the money in the form of benefits provided by the laws they pass. Senator McCain pointed out that the Republican tax cut grants immediate benefits to big businesses and big estates and only years later to ordinary taxpayers.

With the huge sums of money they raise, politicians hire pollsters who discover how to express plausibly the inherently self-contradictory opinions of the "public" which these pollsters interview and organize into focus groups. Politicians make radio and television sound bites expressing these non-ideas. They often win without once committing themselves to real political positions. It is in the nature of these ideas that an elected politician can continue to profess them after being elected with the pretense that they guide policy, when in fact money is guiding policy.

Such a non-idea is the current claim that this is the time for a tax cut because otherwise the government will spend the money which rightfully belongs to the people. Every word in that sentence is a lie, including the "is," the "for," and the "the's."

The claim used to be that tax cuts encouraged savings and investment until experience proved that Americans decrease savings with every tax cut. Nobody ever said during the time of huge deficits that it was time to raise the current rates so as to save future generations. The same people who claim to be frightened by what government will do vote for increases in defense, subsidies for foreign sales, and increases in Social Security benefits.

These ideas are nicely complementary to what comes out of the "think tanks." Think tanks hire pseudo-intellectuals to

advance the ideas of those who pay them. They send out "news releases" which often get printed by lazy newspapers without editorial intervention and sometimes with the announcement that the item came from a "non-partisan, non-profit" organization as if that somehow meant objective news that existed in the public interest.

These allegedly objective think tanks advance such ideas as:

* "Scientists are divided about whether there is global warming, so we should continue to use as much gasoline as our hearts desire."

* There is no urban sprawl; we will never run out of agricultural land, and besides that's what people want."

"Academic economists are insulated from the marketplace and so advance ideas which will fail in the marketplace."

I believe that educators at all levels must be more active in the advancement of ideas simply to prevent a monopoly of money. But above all I believe that citizens should insist that the political process be separated from the domination of money, meaning as follows:

1. Political parties and PAC's will be limited to the use of money they collect from individuals in sums less than \$200.

2. Political candidates will be limited to two forums for the presentation of ideas: face-to-face presentations to live audiences; and individual presentations and debates on radio and television.

For this last, we the citizens must exact from the media, which use our air space, a large amount of time to facilitate our democratic life. The television and radio stations, of course, pretend they "own" the airwaves and deserve to be paid for the time used by politicians. We should not believe them. We need to see our politicians present their own ideas in challenging formats and with the opportunity to question them and let them explore the implications of what they do.

Every group that examines the current scandal in our electoral life makes that recommendation. It is now up to us the citizens to demand that it be carried out.

EVOLUTION IN NEBRASKA STATE SCIENCE STANDARDS

On June 4, 1999, Joe Stimpfl, then President of AFCON, and Dave Moshman, AFCON Policy Coordinator, sent the following letter to the Nebraska State Board of Education:

AFCON is a coalition of Nebraska-based organizations concerned with intellectual freedom in education. It has come to our attention that the State Board of Education is reconsidering the treatment of evolution in the state science standards. This raises at least two distinct issues of intellectual freedom: (1) formulation of the curriculum and (2) student freedom of belief. With regard to these two issues respectively, we would like to suggest the following principles:

1. It is critical to science education that the science curriculum be based on relevant scientific research and conclusions, including the well-established facts that the earth is billions of years old and that life on earth has been evolving for most of that period.

2. Students have a right to their own beliefs, including their religious beliefs about the origins of the universe and the history of life on earth, and should not be required to change their views or to profess belief in different views.

These two principles may appear to be in conflict, but we believe they are fully consistent with each other. Education, as opposed to indoctrination, is a process of providing new information, ideas, and perspectives, and encouraging reflection, not a process of coercing or requiring a change in belief. Science educators should present evolutionary concepts and associated evidence and should assess student understanding of these matters, but they can and should do this in a context in which students understand they are ultimately free to decide their own views. Students may express their own religious or other views about issues raised in the science curriculum but neither they nor their parents should expect a science curriculum that includes or excludes content on religious grounds.

We believe that with appropriate attention to these considerations a science curriculum can be simultaneously true to scientific evidence and respectful of religious liberty and diversity.

[The Nebraska State Board of Education subsequently voted 5-3 to maintain adequate treatment of evolution in the state science standards in the public schools. —The editor.]

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISAVOWS EVOLUTION

“This isn’t Kansas, Toto.” But, Dorothy, it is, and what a whirlwind of controversy you could see now! On August 11, the Kansas State Board of Education voted 6-4 to remove virtually any mention of evolution from the state-mandated science curriculum and its standardized tests and to allow school districts to substitute theories based on religious doctrine.

Kansas state law cannot force individual school districts to adopt the state standards in science. It will be up to each district to decide whether or not to follow the state board’s yellow brick road of suggestions of what should be taught in the state’s classrooms. However, the state board can control the content of its standardized tests.

Beginning in the 2000-2001 school year, the state tests in seventh- and tenth-grade science will not have questions on the theories that multiple species have evolved from a common ancestor and that the universe originated in an explosion. Questions about “micro-evolution,” defined in the state guidelines as changes in an organism’s “structure, function or behavior” will remain.

The debate between the Darwinian theory of the origin of man in a changing environment which is deeply rooted in scientific evidence and the creationist belief that a divine being is responsible as described in the Bible is now in the laps of the 304 school districts in Kansas. Some district staffs have already stated nothing will change in their classrooms while in other districts, officials hope the guidelines will lead to elements of

creationism being injected into the science classes.

In an August 13 letter to the superintendents of the 304 districts, the ACLU wrote, “The law in this area is clear. States and school districts may not adopt religious theories as standards in school curricula, nor may they restructure their curricula for the purpose of omitting accepted scientific theories which may conflict with particular religious beliefs.”

The publisher of a new textbook on Kansas history is dropping a chapter on the state’s prehistory because of the controversy; a religious leader said that such topics are “beyond a creation date that most religions use.” A Kansas State professor says he is having difficulty recruiting candidates for openings in the biology department. Science teachers in Kansas are concerned that other theories of science may come under attack. The State Board’s action has spurred interest in teaching materials on the theory of intelligent design—the idea that a superior being designed the universe and everything in it. There is concern how this will affect high school students taking the ACT and SAT tests which contain questions about evolution. One Kansas legislature will sponsor legislation requiring high school students entering state universities to have studied evolution. The president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington said, “I would not recommend anyone to take a position in biology in Kansas.”

[—the editor]

AFCON SPEAKER'S BUREAU (AS OF AUGUST 1999)

Dwayne Ball: "Academic Freedom at Universities"

Linda Beckstead: "Freedom of Student Press Issues"

John Bender: "The Nebraska Student Freedom of Expression Bill"

Spencer Davis: "Academic Freedom on the College Campus" and "Principles of Academic Freedom"

Mel Krutz: "Current Nebraska Censorship Issues and Why They Matter"

Carol MacDaniels: "Ethics and Problems of Students' Writing Their Own Stories and Using Vernacular Language in English"

David Moshman: General principles of academic freedom which could include such topics as "AFCON Policies," "First Amendment Rights," "Intellectual Rights of Children," and "Intellectual Freedom and Child Development"

Bob Haller: "Money Talks: Ideas in the Political Process" and "Religion, Intellectual Freedom, and the University"

Presentation of the Readers' Theatre production of A Tangled Web: Student Freedom of Expression (a cast of adults and students)

Jeff Lofthus: "Surveying Censorship in Nebraska"

The State Report Card for Nebraska's K-12 Public Schools Unveiled

The Nebraska State Board of Education and the Department of Education recently unveiled a prototype of the 1999-2000 State Report Card. Commissioner Doug Christensen expects the NDE to distribute the first-ever report card in the summer or fall of 2000.

Under current state law, the report card would provide the following information about Nebraska's schools:

- * Student achievement
- * Graduation rate
- * Student attendance
- * Teacher attendance
- * Teacher qualifications
- * Graduate follow-up
- * School funding
- * Teacher salaries

Student achievement information would be based on standardized test scores, American College Test (ACT) scores, and National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores. Other information would include the number of school districts, the number of school buildings accredited through North Central Accreditation, and per pupil expenditures. While the design of the report card is not expected to change, the information reported could change somewhat during the next legislative session.

NEBRASKA ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS CONFERENCE

Vision and Voice: Extending the Literacy Spectrum
October 25, 1999
Lincoln High School, 2229 J Street, Lincoln

9:00 Concurrent Sessions
10:15 Keynote Speaker: Linda Rief
12:00 Lunch at the Governor's Mansion (Limited number accepted on first come, first serve basis)
1:30 Sessions on Standards and Assessments
4:30 AFCON Annual Business Meeting
6:30 NELAC Annual Business Meeting

8:30 Registration

FOR SALE BY AFCON

Send orders to Mel Krutz, 2625 Bluff Road, Seward, NE 68434-9801

T-shirts with a Paul Fell "banned books" design; Sizes M, L, XL, XXL, XXXL; \$15.00. Packaging and postage: \$2.00 each.

Note cards with a Paul Fell design; \$1.50; four for \$5.00. Packaging and postage: \$0.75 per packet.

Reader's Theatre Script of a TANGLED ISSUE: Student Freedom of Expression. \$10.00 buys the rights to produce and duplicate. Packaging and postage: \$2.00 each.

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS, UNL CHAPTER

[The following letter was sent to all UNL Academic Senate Senators from the UNL AAUP Executive Committee. The feeling of the Committee was that the potential loss of faculty and watered-down programs have an effect on academic freedom because the process and the loss suggest diminished faculty input and governance.]

We and all informed faculty are deeply concerned about the priorities currently being implemented by the NU Administration and about the impact the current budget reallocations are having on academic programs. President Smith has taxed UNL \$2.68m “to cover system-wide deficits.” Chancellor Moeser says UNL “has chosen” to increase this tax on existing programs by about 72% this year, adding another \$1.96m for what he variously calls “unfunded campus imperatives” and “unfunded mandates.” (Who has chosen for UNL or who has issued the imperative mandates being presented as UNL’s choices is not clear to us.)

The mandated imperatives consist of five items: 1) vastly increased information technology [\$700,000,] 2) significant enhancement of the new engineering programs sited in Omaha [\$433,000,] 3) medical insurance coverage for graduate instructors [\$350,000,] 4) replacement of moneys needed to cover a deficit in scholarship grants [\$322,000,] and 5) development of diversity programs [\$150,000.] We are told that implementing these campus priorities will require a reduction in the number of full-time, tenure-track faculty and therefore an increase in class size and greater reliance on temporary instructors.

We acknowledge that Chancellor Moeser’s initiatives are desirable and appropriate. But we question whether they should be our top priorities and whether the benefits of achieving these goals could ever compensate for the widespread damage to academic programs entailed in their pursuit. We are dismayed that the administration would implement these priorities without having secured adequate funding for them from sources other than the instructional budget. Since it now appears that the primary source for funding these priorities will be dollars “freed up” by the retirement and resignations of faculty in existing programs, we believe that they should not be implemented without consideration under the procedures already in place for judicious weighing of the significant reallocation proposals.

Furthermore, we are distressed to note that the funding of these priorities from unfilled permanent faculty lines negates the effect of faculty salary increases funded by the legislature. The faculty who remain are being paid more to take over the duties of their retired, resigned, and removed former colleagues. Consequently, it would appear, the money appropriated for faculty salary increases has gone to fund old deficits or new priorities while the faculty raises come from lost lines.

We believe that in the new academic year it will become apparent that the outcome of harvesting “savings” from random-pattern attrition of faculty and staff will be significant damage to teaching and research. It is wrong to infer from published reports that there has been a setting aside of redundant faculty positions to meet the crisis. The “vacant” lines being reallocated include those of uniquely qualified people leaving for retirement or for greener pastures. Some have made public their reasons for leaving, and others have received local publicity when they resigned. Their skills left with them, skills which led to national reputations in scholarship, research, creative activity, and teaching. Their work cannot be covered from existing ranks without watering down programs. Not hiring to replace them means that the ordinary renewal of state-of-the-art expertise cannot be sustained. It means arbitrary limits on the research UNL can undertake, the teaching it can provide on all levels, and the service it can offer the wider community. It means hiring temporary faculty and increasing class size. It means the abandonment of rational academic planning: the reallocation reflects no program need, no research structures, and no enrollment demands.

We further believe that implementing these new priorities at the expense of academic programs will nullify their intended benefits. Medical benefits serve to attract and support higher quality graduate students. But what will happen when prospective students must discover that senior faculty who might work with them are gone without any prospect of replacement? Similarly, scholarships may attract students with high ACT scores, but that is unlikely to be a successful strategy when those students learn that the scholarships are offered at the

(continued on page 7)

UNL AAUP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(continued from page 6)

expense of the program quality and the first rank faculty they come for. An expanded honors program is a benefit for a cadre of top students. But funding that expansion by reducing instruction in core courses in required areas is educationally counterproductive for all students. Surely these improvements could wait until they could be adequately funded.

We find it embarrassing that this stringent retrenchment of essential UNL programs is announced at the same time that NU administrators are committing the institution to large bonuses for athletic personnel and to a campaign to raise \$9.2m in private funds to erect even more sports facilities. We realize that the athletic program has a budgetary life of its own. But if there is private money out there to support NU, this does not seem to us to be the time to seek it for athletic rather than academic purposes.

These decisions taken together offer overwhelming evidence of skewed priorities. When we observe these apparently skewed priorities, we are forced to see the crisis as arising from a substantial failure of leadership, of courage, foresight, and candor. NU Central Administrators in their budget presentations to the Unicameral last spring did not claim a budgetary crisis of the proportions now announced. They did not vigorously pursue funding for the priorities whose implementation now threatens to disrupt academic programs. How is it possible that, in a year the State of Nebraska seems to have had more discretionary funds than have been available for a generation, the administration failed to seek aggressively for the adequate funding of central missions of the University? It would seem from a report in the Chronicle of Higher Education that NU leadership similarly failed to seek the State's commensurate share of federal funding for UN programs. Nebraska was 46th out of the 50 states in appropriations by Congress this year and there has been no

announcement that we have received designated congressional funding for any of the Chancellor's priority items. This is the more disheartening when we realize that improvements in Internet capability or engineering education (priorities 1 and 2) lie in areas that have a high priority in current federal science and engineering policy.

The AAUP does not have all the information necessary to offer complete responses to the crisis, but we believe that vigorous steps should be taken to protect UNL's core. We have already observed damage to faculty strength, research quality, and service programs in many departments. The damage thus far has been random. We believe as a minimum that a plan must be devised and procedures invoked to ensure rational redistribution of the cuts in accord with sound allocation among conflicting needs across colleges and other units. We hope such a plan and such procedures will slow or stop the current reallocation process until core values can be preserved. We believe that this reallocation process should not be completed until an aggressive program of fund raising from public and private sources can assure that the new priorities will have their own sources of funding.

An educational institution is the product of an academic vision. There is every reason for UNL to have an enhanced sense of academic responsibilities commensurate with its membership in the AAU and its Research I status. We believe that the faculty of UNL are in possession of such a vision. But the faculty will not be able to realize it so long as the UN and UNL Administrations bypass the procedures in place for achieving a short and long range consensus on how to maintain and improve classroom excellence, research performance, and service contributions.

Signed, for the Executive Committee, David Lewis, Professor of Agronomy, President.

REQUEST FOR NEWS FOR FUTURE ISSUES

The editor of the AFCON SENTINEL invites all AFCON individual and organizational members to send news about academic freedom issues in Nebraska for inclusion in this newsletter and/or announcements of organizational meetings for the UPCOMING EVENTS column. Due date for submissions to the December 17, 1999, issue is November 26.

Mail copy to Tom Black, 610 West Park, West Point NE 68788, or e-mail him at tb35925@navix.net.

AFCON

515 North Thomas Avenue
Oakland, NE 68045.

Mailing
Address
Label

ACADEMIC FREEDOM COALITION OF NEBRASKA

HELP AFCON PROMOTE ACADEMIC FREEDOM

As a member of AFCON, you can help us

- ◆ support applications of the First Amendment in academic contexts, including elementary and secondary schools, colleges, universities, and libraries.
- ◆ educate Nebraskans about the meaning and value of intellectual freedom, intellectual diversity, mutual respect, open communication, and uninhibited pursuit of knowledge, including the role of these ideals in academic contexts and in democratic self-government.
- ◆ assist students, teachers, librarians, and researchers confronted with censorship, indoctrination, or suppression of ideas.
- ◆ act as liaison among groups in Nebraska that support academic freedom.

MEMBERSHIP (To become a member, send dues, organization or individual name, address, and phone number to Cathi McMurtry, 515 N. Thomas Avenue, Oakland, NE 68045)

Organizational Membership (\$100) entitles the organization to one seat on the AFCON Board and one vote in the election of officers and at the annual meeting, provides newsletter subscription for the board member to share with the organization's information director and reduced rates to AFCON conferences for its members.

Organizational Affiliation (\$25) provides newsletter subscription and reduced rates to AFCON conferences for its members.

Individual Membership (\$10) provides newsletter subscription, eligibility for office and for chairing standing committees, reduced rates for AFCON conferences, and one vote at annual meetings.

Student Membership (\$5) entitles full-time students to the same privileges as provided by the Individual Membership.

**AFCON ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS, PLEASE DUPLICATE THIS NEWSLETTER FOR YOUR MEMBERS.
INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS, PLEASE PASS THIS NEWSLETTER TO A FRIEND AFTER YOU HAVE READ IT.
ENCOURAGE HIM OR HER TO JOIN AFCON**