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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Phil Mitchell, a senior instructor in the Sewall Residence Academic Program (RAP) at the University of Colorado, Boulder, was terminated by non-renewal of his contract in the spring of 2007. Mitchell, arguably the most honored teacher in the history of the University, had previously been terminated in 2005, he claims, because of hostility by the History Department toward his conservative religious and political convictions. Mitchell publicly spoke out against his 2005 firing, an endeavor that he believes temporarily saved his job. Mitchell considers his 2007 firing an act of retaliation against his speaking out in 2005.

The Colorado Conference of the American Association of University Professors finds substantial evidence that:

- A history of antipathy toward Dr. Mitchell’s political and religious convictions existed within the CU History Department.

- CU backed off Dr. Mitchell’s 2005 termination because, when challenged by media inquiries, the administration and tenured faculty could not document cause for his firing. Their stories changed several times, as each story proved untrue.

- The 2007 documentation against Dr. Mitchell was orchestrated to justify his firing.

- A dual employment structure exists at the University of Colorado, wherein most of the faculty can be fired at any time for any reason, or for no reason, thus allowing the administration and sometimes tenured faculty to suppress the academic freedom of the majority.

- Dr. Mitchell’s termination violates numerous AAUP protections of due process, shared governance, and academic freedom.
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PHIL MITCHELL’S CAREER
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER

Until being terminated by non-renewal of his contract in the spring of 2007, Phil Mitchell was a senior instructor in the Sewall Residence Academic Program (RAP), where he had taught history classes for seventeen of his twenty-three years at the University of Colorado-Boulder. Mitchell, who has a BA and an MA in education and a PhD in history from CU, had won numerous teaching awards at CU, some multiple times. By 2007, he had won more teaching awards than the rest of the Sewall faculty combined (Attachment 1).

Mitchell's student evaluations were the highest in the History Department (for whom he occasionally taught classes in addition to the courses he taught at Sewall), the highest at Sewall, and among the highest in the history of CU. During the three-year period prior to what he considers his first termination in 2005, he received an instructor rating of A+ on student evaluations eleven times (Attachment 2).

Mitchell's four peer evaluations prior to his publicly protesting what he considers his 2005 termination ranged from admiration (Anderson) with reservations about Mitchell’s Socratic teaching style as well as the pacing of his course, to perfunctory if unqualified praise (Viehmann) to ecstatic testimonial (Ferrini, Lewis) (Attachment 3). Ferrini, who had observed Mitchell teach on several occasions, describes Mitchell as “a master teacher... [t]he sort of teacher who sticks with a person long after his or her school days are past. Each of us has had a teacher or two like Professor Mitchell. They make the education process come alive and provide meaning....” Lewis, an instructor who taught for both the History Department and Sewall RAP, concludes his report by stating that Mitchell’s “concern for his students, his enthusiasm for the course material, and his love for teaching college all shine through in his teaching.... It is an honor to work with such a fine college instructor.” On May 8, 2006, William Wei, the director of Sewall RAP prior the appointment of Ann Carlos in spring 2006, generalizes these peer evaluations on Mitchell’s 2005 annual merit form: “Dr. Mitchell is clearly the most popular teacher in the Sewall RAP. Everyone who has ever visited his class comes away impressed with the learning that goes on, the interaction between teacher and student, and the humanity of the lessons taught” (Attachment 4). As additional evidence of his expertise, Mitchell had taught graduate courses at the Denver Theological Seminary on small group instruction, in which the Sewall RAP specializes.

It is notable that Mitchell is an avowed political and religious conservative; Mitchell claims that over the years he heard on numerous occasions, from numerous sources, that many in the History Department were hostile toward his religious and political convictions. He also claims to have heard through back channels that many in the History Department felt his Sewall courses did not meet History Department standards, though what those standards were that his courses failed to meet, or what basis might exist to suggest that standards were not being met, was never expressed to him.
Mitchell claims that he was fired from the Sewall RAP in 2005 due to hostility from several faculty in History toward his religious and political convictions. After he publicly protested his dismissal—an endeavor that, Mitchell believes, temporarily saved his job—he claims he was fired again by Sewall in 2007 because his public protest of the 2005 termination embarrassed the History Department and the University administration; he also claims that Ann Carlos was hired as director of the Sewall RAP with the understanding that she would fire Phil Mitchell.

A history of antipathy toward Dr. Mitchell’s political and religious convictions existed within the CU History Department.

All courses at Sewall require approval by the appropriate disciplinary unit—in Mitchell’s case, the History Department.

According to Mitchell, on April 28, 2004, History chair Thomas Zeiler emailed Mitchell to advise him that the History Department would no longer hire him to teach courses within the History curriculum over concerns about the “religious tone” of his classes. While Mitchell considered the charge unjust and unsubstantiated, he was not altogether surprised. Among other incidences, Mitchell says that early in his career, his dissertation advisor, associate professor of history Ralph Mann, told him that the History Department would not permit Mitchell to teach the History of Christianity because the course conflicted with the then-chair’s Marxist-feminist ideology. In fact, there had been considerable resistance within the CU History Department toward permitting Mitchell to write a dissertation on Protestant fundamentalism. He also claims that when he asked William Wei, at the time the director of the Sewall RAP, why the History Department was reluctant to hire him to teach within their curriculum despite his excellent ratings, Wei told him, “Phil, you have to understand that some people hate religion.”

Mitchell met with Zeiler to discuss the "religious tone" charge. Zeiler informed Mitchell that a complaint of proselytizing had been made against him. According to Mitchell, the student’s complaint stemmed from his teaching a novel on Protestant liberalism called In His Steps by Charles Sheldon, which Mitchell calls the best-selling novel in American history and one he has taught successfully to over 1,000 students as an authentic expression of widespread 19th century views on spirituality. Never before had a student protested that he was trying to convert students to Christianity by teaching the novel. Furthermore, Mitchell, an evangelical Protestant conservative, considers Protestant liberalism to be a faith entirely distinct from his own. According to Mitchell, after discussion, Zeiler and Mitchell agreed the complaint was most likely a misunderstanding; Zeiler told Mitchell that he would withdraw his decision.

In the spring of 2005, Mitchell claimed that he alienated the director of the Hallett Diversity Program (the residential academic program in Hallett Hall, which emphasizes the goal of racial and ethnic diversity on campus) by presenting an opposing view, quoting black conservative columnist Thomas Sowell during a faculty discussion on
affirmative action. The director, Jesse Sell, according to Mitchell, berated him as a racist. Mitchell, two of whose adopted children are black, took umbrage at the ad hocinum attack.

In the fall of 2005, Ralph Mann warned Mitchell that the History Department had not abandoned its quest to see him fired, but that their efforts had taken on a new dimension: there were rumors that Mitchell was “anti-gay.” According to Mitchell, Mann told him that an investigation had been launched by some History faculty to uncover homophobic remarks by Mitchell. Subsequently, Mitchell discovered that Thomas Krainz, his teaching assistant from fifteen years earlier who was now a professor in Massachusetts, had been contacted by representatives of the History Department, to see if he could recall any remarks by Mitchell, from fifteen years before, that could be construed as homophobic.

According to Mitchell, Mann’s information was disturbing from several perspectives: 1) that the powers-that-be in the History Department were so cynical about conservative Christianity that they would assume that he was anti-gay; 2) that these professionals would conduct what amounted to a witch hunt against him; 3) that if their campaign somehow succeeded in finding somebody who remembers something Mitchell said that could be construed as homophobic, his career as a university teacher would end; and 4) that even the existence of such a rumor, though unsubstantiated, might alienate Peter Boag, the new chair of History who was required to sign off on his Sewall classes. Boag, whom Mitchell describes as an outspoken gay rights advocate, is a scholar in the field of gay and lesbian studies.

- **CU backed off Dr. Mitchell's 2005 termination because, when challenged by media inquiries, the administration and tenured faculty could not document cause for his firing. Their stories changed several times, as each story proved untrue.**

In February of 2005, Sewall Director William Wei called Mitchell to express his regret that Mitchell has been terminated from the Sewall RAP because the History Department would no long longer "sign off" on his classes. Wei told Mitchell that he would be allowed to teach classes for one more year “and then no more.”

According to the *Colorado Daily*, Dean Todd Gleeson told Wei that Mitchell was terminated for not teaching up to History Department standards and for preaching to students. According to Mitchell, when he asked Wei what the History Department standards were that he had failed to meet, Wei told Mitchell, "We [the History Department] don't have any."

In the spring of 2005, Mitchell publicly spoke out to protest his firing. He did approximately thirty-five media interviews, including appearances on *The O'Reilly Factor* and *Scarborough Country MSNBC*, claiming he was being terminated because of his conservative political and Christian beliefs.
During an appearance on *Scarborough Country*, Mitchell was informed that CU said he was not being terminated but was being given a one-year reappointment as part of a new Program policy. This was the first that Mitchell had heard of it. CU maintained that Mitchell, far from being singled out as he claims, was one of four instructors at Sewall affected by the new policy.

During the spring of 2005, CU administrators retracted their claim that three other instructors had also been given one-year reappointments, calling it a “misunderstanding.”

According to CU spokesperson Pauline Hale, as quoted in the *Colorado Daily*, Mitchell's religious and political views were irrelevant: “The decision was made in order to allow the new program director the flexibility to make personnel decisions according to his or her plans for the future of the program.”

Dean Todd Gleeson told the *Silver & Gold Record*, “There will be a new director, and it was my decision to allow the new director to tweak the curriculum if he or she thought it was in the best interests of what they [sic] were hired to do.” Gleeson also told the *Silver & Gold* a considerably different story than he had told William Wei, as reported in the *Colorado Daily*—the History Department played no role whatsoever in the reduction of Mitchell's contract: “History, through word and deed, has demonstrated that he's a viable instructor in their eyes.”

History Department chair Peter Boag echoed that sentiment, claiming that Mitchell remained “in the pool of instructors that the unit draws on when they need teaching assistance.”

- The 2007 documentation against Dr. Mitchell was orchestrated to justify his firing.

In the spring of 2006, William Wei told Mitchell that Wei had been removed as director of the Sewall RAP. According to Mitchell, a colleague, Chris Lewis, who teaches for both Sewall and the History Department, informed Mitchell that the new director was being brought in primarily for the purpose of firing Mitchell.

After Carlos recommended that Mitchell be non-renewed in Sewall RAP, Professor Christian Kopff, the director of the Center for Western Civilization (CWC), offered Mitchell a position teaching in the CWC. In his request to Dean Gleeson that Mitchell, with whom Kopff had had a long association, be allowed to teach for the CWC, Kopff pointed to Mitchell's superlative record as a teacher, as well as his record of "very favorable" peer evaluations from William Wei. “The negative evaluations in Phil's dossier consist of versions of what appears to be the same letter, signed by faculty who are less distinguished teachers and administrators [than Wei],” writes Kopff.
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Phil Mitchell was subjected to an extraordinary number of observations between September 2005 and January 30, 2007. While the established pattern had been to conduct one annual observation, Mitchell was observed seven times—by professors Tom Zeiler, William Wei (twice), Peter Boag, Padraic Kenney, and Ann Carlos (twice).

William Wei’s evaluations were overwhelmingly positive. Those of Zeiler, Boag, Kenney, and Carlos were largely negative. Kenney’s evaluation hinted that Mitchell encouraged anti-Semitism. Carlos reported that Mitchell told two female students that they could now “change their hair.” Carlos supposed this was Mitchell’s way of saying that he now “recognized their faces,” but was concerned that this could be “construed as a very gendered comment.”

The evaluations by Zeiler, Boag, Kenney, and Carlos were included by Carlos in Mitchell’s reappointment file, submitted to Dean Gleeson. Carlos also included, in the file, a 2002 evaluation by History professor Fred Anderson. In this evaluation, Anderson praises Mitchell as “an accomplished instructor who makes strong connections with his students.” However, Anderson expresses reservations about Mitchell’s “more or less Socratic” pedagogy of conducting a quiz at the beginning of class, then asking questions and building further questions (and commentary) based upon the answers.

Carlos does not include, in the Mitchell reappointment file that she submitted to Gleeson, Wei’s two very positive evaluations of Mitchell during the 10/05-1/07 time period. Wei begins one report by stating, “It was a treat to be there to watch a master at work.” He also praises Mitchell’s pedagogy of teaching from a quiz: “In effect, through personal example he illustrated how to engage in historical reasoning, achieving in his own fashion the educational goal of critical thinking and encouraging analytical thought.” Wei comments upon the difficulty many teachers have of achieving these goals, particularly in a freshman class: “It would behoove them to watch Mitchell in action.” Nor does Carlos include in Mitchell’s reappointment file, for Gleeson’s reference, the effusive prior evaluation by Lewis in January 2005. Lewis specifies the effectiveness of Mitchell’s “pedagogical strategy”: “It is through his open discussion of the quiz questions that Professor Mitchell helps the students develop an understanding of the larger issues of the course. He doesn’t just answer the question, he explains the larger logic and reasoning behind the answer. . . . [H]e is very skilled at . . . integrating that material with the larger issues of the course.” Nor does Carlos include in Mitchell’s reappointment file Gary Ferrini’s similarly positive evaluation.

In addition to selecting negative evaluations and omitting positive ones, ample evidence exists that Ann Carlos, in her February 25, 2006, letter to Gleeson, made numerous representations of fact that are contradicted by the verifiable record and thus appears to have committed serious acts of unprofessional conduct in pursuing the termination of Phil Mitchell. Because this is a grave allegation, and because it provides some context for our assessment of whether violations of procedure and academic freedom were committed in the termination of Phil Mitchell from the Sewall RAP, we will discuss it at some length.
Phil Mitchell’s Syllabi

In her letter to Dean Gleeson, Carlos writes that one of the recurring themes emerging from the five peer reviews in Mitchell’s file “concerns the structure of the course syllabi and their inadequacy.” Carlos quotes Sharon Rubin, from an article in the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program’s Memo to Faculty Series titled "Professors, Students and the Syllabus" to the effect that from a functional syllabus “students should be able to find out what they know by the end of the course, and also what they will be able to do better afterwards than before.” According to Carlos, Mitchell’s syllabi are “extremely spare in this regard.” She cites the syllabus for Mitchell’s HIST 2180 course as an example. Furthermore, Carlos writes, “This syllabus merely give [sic] a list of what chapter to read for what date. There is no guidance to the student as to why he or she is reading this chapter. What questions should he or she have in mind when reading? What might Dr. Mitchell be expecting the student to gain from this chapter?” Carlos concludes, in this section of her letter to Gleeson, “The objective in a college-level course is to guide the students toward a greater understanding of how to think critically and analytically about the subject. These particular syllabi provide the student with little guidance about the context of the course or the issues to be considered.”

These are valid observations by Carlos, and her own syllabi, judging from her Economics 4514-001 course, fall 2005, do explicate the context in which students might consider the assigned readings. But if Mitchell would have done well to supply additional context in his syllabi, Peter Boag, whose single peer observation of Mitchell’s teaching verged on condemnation, would also. Boag’s History 5106 syllabus, spring 2007, is if anything more spare than Mitchell’s in every area of concern that Carlos mentions to Gleeson. Similarly, Tom Zeiler, whose peer review of Mitchell is outspoken in raising issues of insufficient context provided by Mitchell’s syllabi, might consider applying some of that context to his own syllabi. His History 1065 syllabus, spring 2003, provides only the briefest of descriptions (e.g., “Jazz Age”) to frame the readings for students. It is debatable whether Zeiler’s deployment of context is much more useful than Mitchell’s listing of primary sources (Attachment 12).

Issues of due process pertain in this matter of the syllabus. If certain expectations are in place regarding an instructor’s syllabus, those expectations must be in writing, according to both University of Colorado policy and AAUP standards. There were no such written expectations of Phil Mitchell’s syllabus, either in the History Department or Sewall RAP when Phil Mitchell was terminated. Furthermore, it is standard practice for instructors to submit a copy of their syllabi at the beginning of each term. If an instructor’s syllabus is inadequate, it would be a fair employment practice to inform him of that fact at the beginning of the term instead of at the time that his contract is ending, especially when for seventeen years his syllabi have been deemed acceptable.

Sewall RAP's Course Objectives
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After asserting in her letter to Dean Gleeson that Mitchell should be terminated in part because he failed to provide adequate guidance to students through a useful syllabus, Carlos explicates a second concern that “has to do with the evaluation of students in his courses.” Carlos then makes several claims that, when measured against the verifiable record, are false. She begins by referring to her June 14, 2006, letter to the Sewall faculty, in which she outlines her objectives for the program: “These objectives were emerged from a series of conversations with the core faculty in the program and are based on what we consider to be vital for the continued academic success of the students in the program.” This claim is notable because Carlos never met with Mitchell. Of course one is entitled to generalize, and not every statement can be taken literally, but the assertion that she conducted a series of conversations with the core faculty in the program does imply that she met with those she considers to have a central role in the program. Prior to Carlos's assuming the directorship of Sewall, it is difficult to imagine anyone being more “core” to Sewall than Mitchell. After all, he was one of only five faculty rostered at Sewall; he had taught more classes and won more teaching and service awards than anyone in the history of the program. To more than a generation of students, Mitchell had been the face of the Sewall RAP. Carlos's exclusion of Mitchell from her conversations with “the core faculty” at Sewall implies that, before she had ever met him or observed his classes, she did not consider Mitchell to be central to the future of the program.

Carlos wrote to Gleeson,

At the center [of my objectives] stands a programmatic focus on analytical reading and writing. All faculty were asked both in this letter and at a subsequent faculty meeting to incorporate the writing textbook, Writing Analytically, in their courses and to ensure that there “be an extensive written component for assessment.” Dr. Mitchell has completely ignored my request on both of these issues. There is no mention of Writing Analytically anywhere on his syllabi and the assessment does not include extensive graded written work. Student evaluation is based on daily true/false quizzes and a final term paper. Although the syllabi mention that there might be short papers assigned from time to time, no point scheme is given for these papers nor is there any mention of how many and what format. In essence this means that the students receive no written feedback on written materials during the course of the semester. (Attachment 8)

In making the case to Gleeson here that Mitchell has "completely ignored" program objectives, Carlos makes several demonstrably false claims. In the letter to the Sewall faculty of June 14, 2006, she does articulate the new focus on analytical reading and writing, but her representation to Gleeson that all faculty were asked in this letter "to incorporate the writing textbook, Writing Analytically, in their courses," is at variance with what the letter states. The only mention of this textbook in the June 14 letter occurs in the following three sentences: “We are also recommending that students purchase Writing Analytically by David Rosenwasser and Jill Stephens to keep as a reference guide for their college years. I have also ordered desk copies for any faculty who is interested. Please ask [program assistant] Martha Shernick for a copy.” Nowhere in this letter does
she require her faculty to incorporate this textbook in their courses, as she tells Gleeson she has as pretext for terminating Mitchell's employment. Memory, of course, is fallible. It is natural not to recall precisely whether months previously a text was required or recommended, but to employ one's error in the service of firing a long-time, much honored member of the faculty is shameful.

Furthermore, in the June 14 letter, Carlos wrote, "I am asking that there be an extensive written component for all assessment. I realize that not all classes are amenable to essay style exams; in such courses, short answer structures could be used." In other words, Carlos allowed the Sewall faculty considerable flexibility in how they might meet the objective of an analytical writing component. Nonetheless, in her letter to Gleeson she uses Mitchell's assignment of short papers and a final term paper as evidence that he has "completely ignored" her requirement of an extensive written component for assessment.

There are further inaccuracies in Carlos's claim to Gleeson that Mitchell had "completely ignored" her requests. She writes, "There is no mention of Writing Analytically anywhere on his syllabi and the assessment does not include extensive graded written work." She also claims that there is "no point scheme is given [for short papers] nor is there mention of how many and what format." Yet on his Western Civilization syllabus (fall 2006), Writing Analytically is clearly listed as a required text, as is the stipulation that there will be "two short papers (50 points each)" and a "final paper (100 points)" (Attachment 12).

It is notable that in Gleeson's letter to Carlos of February 27, 2007, wherein he concurs with Carlos' dissatisfaction over Mitchell's "syllabus construction, grading, lack of emphasis on student writing, lack of a narrative or analytical structure to lectures, and failure to bring professional expertise to the lecture experience through incorporation of ancillary readings or other materials," Gleeson lists a consideration that Carlos does not mention in her indictment of Mitchell: grading. Gleeson understandably assumes that "questions of academic rigor" might involve grading. Of course, grading is not the sole determinant of rigor; its reliability as a measurement is debatable. But Ann Carlos thinks enough of grading as a measure of classroom rigor that in her letter to the Sewall faculty of June 14, she writes, "I am asking that we organize our courses such as that we have a B- average. Rather than impose an average ex post, we each need to think about our grading policies ex ante so that our grading structures are in line with the intended outcome." Carlos's non-mention of Mitchell's grading standards is a glaring omission in that the data suggest that Mitchell's classes are not easy, relative to those of other Sewall instructors. Of those Sewall faculty for whom we were able to obtain data from Pickaprof.com, Mitchell ranks among the half who give the lowest grades (Attachment 14). Additionally, with regard to academic rigor, Mitchell has clearly complied with Carlos's attendance requirements, as his syllabus states, in boldface, "Six absences will result in failure in the class" (Attachment 12).

*Peer Reviews: A Curious Selection*
The most serious charge in Ann Carlos’s letter to Dean Gleeson concerns his peer reviews. After presenting a brief overview, then acknowledging the range of courses that Mitchell has taught for the Sewall RAP, and applauding Mitchell for his extensive efforts to provide “a great opportunity for students to relate to an instructor on a level separate from the classroom,” as well as his uniformly high student evaluations (“The students see him as an outstanding instructor and by this metric he most certainly is”), Carlos tells Gleeson that student FCQs are but one measure of assessment, and that “serious concern emerges from other measures of teaching.” She points out that “Five peer reviews are contained in his file. There are four reviews by senior members of the history department dated from October 2002 to October 2006. There is also a peer review by me. . . .” She goes on to state that “Recurring themes emerge from these reviews which raise questions of academic rigor concerning Dr. Mitchell’s courses.”

There is no question that five peer reviews were contained in the file that Ann Carlos prepared and submitted to Dean Gleeson, and that her summaries of these reviews (while she leans most heavily on her own) are accurate within the bounds of reasonable interpretation, though those by Anderson and Zeiler are considerably less negative than Carlos implies. A question emerges, however, as to why she included only five reviews, and why—on the assumption she was seeking a representative sampling of the nine reviews in Mitchell’s personnel file at Sewall—she chose these five. If Carlos had decided to include only peer reviews by full professors in the History Department, there is no indication that she advised Dean Gleeson that these peer reviews were chosen according to this criterion.

It is also curious that Carlos did not include the review of William Wei, which—as do the reviews Carlos chose not to select by Ferrini, Lewis, and Viehmann—tells a vastly different story of Mitchell’s teaching. Wei, a full professor of History, had reported on Mitchell’s teaching numerous times over the years. (Almost three weeks after Gleeson had agreed to terminate Mitchell, Carlos, responding to Mitchell’s question as to why Wei’s reviews were not included in the file, tells Mitchell that the personnel files were in disarray due to “staffing changes” but that she has now found the Wei reviews and has sent them over to the Dean’s office) (Attachment 9).

It is standard academic practice to include only peer reviews taken during the most recent completed contract period (in Mitchell’s case the 2005-06 academic year). Yet Carlos chose not to include the overwhelmingly positive reviews by Ferrini, Lewis, and Viehmann, taken before the contract period, but did include respectful but mixed reviews by Anderson and Zeiler which also occurred before 2005-06. The answer as to why appears to be in what Carlos tells Gleeson: “I am very concerned with what would appear to be a pattern of behavior. Dr. Mitchell appears to have shown complete disregard for the issues raised in prior peer reviews, all of which were conducted by full professors in the Department of History noted for their own scholarship and teaching. My evaluation of the two classes that I visited in January 2007 raises the same issues first raised in October 2002.”
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Carlos does demonstrate a pattern of behavior, but it is her own behavior that is in question. If her inclusion of peer evaluations had been more comprehensive, and her descriptions of reviews by Anderson and Zeiler more reflective of their admiration for Mitchell’s abilities, it would be evident that this “history of negative peer reviews” was not established until after Mitchell had publicly protested his termination in 2005.

If the process of termination is to be legitimate, the Dean, who makes the final determination (pending approval of the Regents) based upon both the director’s recommendation and the reappointment file submitted to him, must have assurance that the file contains all relevant documents, and not only those that support the director’s recommendation.

One cannot presume what conclusions Gleeson might have reached about Mitchell’s pedagogy if presented with the full range of peer reviews, but it is reasonable to conclude that the file Carlos prepared for Gleeson was deceptive—unless by coincidence the evaluations by Ferrini, Viehmann, Lewis, and Wei were all misplaced during the staffing changes, while those by Anderson, Zeiler, Boag, Kenny, and Carlos were not.

Peer Reviews: Mitchell’s Pedagogy

The third and “most serious theme that emerges from all the peer evaluations,” Carlos writes to Gleeson, “concerns the lectures themselves.” Carlos focuses on Mitchell’s pedagogy of teaching from the quiz and then using the answers “to elaborate on the facts of the statements as presented by the author of the particular textbook.” Carlos writes, “This is very problematic. Although the students certainly ‘learn’ facts about the subject matter being discussed, the material is completely disjointed. There is no narrative framework, no overarching context, nor any analytical structure. History at the college level is not a disjointed set of facts.” Carlos reiterates that these concerns “are also present in the peer reviews conducted over the past four years by senior members of the Department of History.” Here, as elsewhere in her letter to Gleeson recommending Mitchell’s termination from Sewall, her representations about the peer reviews she has included with the file, though over-generalized and misleading in terms of Anderson and Zeiler, do not entirely distort their assessments.

It may be that Mitchell is as incompetent as three of these five included peer reviews describe him to be in provoking analytical thought. It may be that students, not knowing any better and influenced by Mitchell’s efforts to “connect,” consistently rate themselves as satisfied by a course that presents them with a vast series of interesting (if disjointed) facts but that offers little else in the way of intellectual fortification. It may be as well that Mitchell is less than the “master at work” that Ferrini, Lewis, and Wei consider him to be, though his accumulation of teaching awards—a fact that Carlos did not see fit to mention to Gleeson as she recommended non-reappointment—does tend to tilt the ledger toward those who champion Mitchell.
In that light, while the probity of the five peer reviews is difficult to assess, conclusive patterns emerge. Neither Boag, Kenney, nor Carlos allow for the possibility that Mitchell’s Socratic pedagogy might inspire critical reflection; Kenney and Carlos in particular demonstrate at great length why Mitchell’s efforts to broaden discussion are invariably “dead—didactically speaking—on arrival,” and then provide examples of superior alternatives that, in our view, would be preposterous in a freshman level class (Carlos: “What is China? Is it one great homogeneous plain?” “Who are Europeans?” “Does the author mean all Europeans or just some?”). Four of the five criticize the structure of Mitchell’s syllabi and not a single one—including Carlos, who is not only merciless in her evisceration, but who leans upon Sharon Rubin for authoritative substantiation—so much as balance their criticism with the recognition of Rubin’s fundamental insight that the purpose of an effective syllabus is to help create the sort of environment that Mitchell, according to the reports of each, creates. Kenney implies that Mitchell is anti-Semitic, Carlos suggests that he is sexist, both on the scarcest evidence, and all but Carlos are members of a department that has investigated Mitchell for evidence of homophobia during Boag's tenure as chair. These reviews certainly do not read like disinterested evaluations; they read as if they were written to get someone fired.

Another perspective on the quality of Mitchell’s teaching may be voiced by students who, without the benefit of Kenney’s or Boag’s disciplinary and pedagogical expertise, or Carlos’s experience teaching the history of economics, might find Mitchell’s Socratic probing more stimulating and less confusing than Anderson, Zeiler, Boag, Kenny and Carlos find it. “For his class alone I have done immeasurably more reading and critical thinking than every other class I have taken combined,” writes one student. Another contends,

He engages his students by questioning history and popular thought. Professor Mitchell has a deep concern for his students and tends to play devil’s advocate in order to encourage them to think critically. History is a subject of critical analysis. If we learn from the past by not only the documents that record it, but also with careful analysis of how it pertains to the now and the future, humanity as a whole improves. (Attachment 11)

One further perspective may be voiced by parents. According to Mitchell, the same session that Boag attended and found to be pedagogically unsound from multiple viewpoints, was attended by Dennis Lied, who is active with the CU Parents Association, and whose son was a student in that section. At the end of the session that Boag considered to be cause for considerable concern, Lied told Mitchell, “This class makes me wish I could go to college again.”

Carlos’s misrepresentations to Gleeson in her letter of February 25, 2007, are not negligible errors; they comprise her central support that Mitchell be fired: that his syllabi are not up to university standards (not true), that he has “completely ignored” the analytical writing requirement (not true), and that his dossier reveals a “history of
negative peer reviews” (true, but the contents she included in the dossier were cherry picked).

**Budgetary Reasons**

Ann Carlos recommended Phil Mitchell’s non-renewal not only on the basis of his syllabus, pedagogy, and peer reviews, but also because she could no longer afford him. One reason was that the History Department was not paying their fair share of his salary. The other was that he was due a raise, which Sewall could not afford. These reasons are unconvincing. If the History Department was not paying its fair share of Mitchell’s salary, the solution would be to negotiate with them, not to fire Mitchell. If the History Department were intractable in negotiations, an appeal could be made to the Dean for financial support. Furthermore, according to Mitchell, he offered to teach the courses at a reduced salary, but Carlos did not accept his offer. Secondly, as a standard practice, when there is no money in the budget for raises, faculty simply do not get raises; they do not get fired.

- **A dual employment structure exists at the University of Colorado, wherein most of the faculty can be fired at any time for any reason, or for no reason, thus allowing the administration and sometimes tenured faculty to suppress the academic freedom of the majority. Phil Mitchell’s termination is a prime example of this dual employment structure.**

**A Dual Employment Structure for CU Faculty That Debilitates Academic Freedom and Due Process**

There is a two-tiered employment structure for faculty at the University of Colorado: faculty who are tenured or on a tenure-track, and who therefore enjoy (or who may one day enjoy) academic freedom protected by meaningful due process, and the majority (more than two-thirds) of the faculty, who are not on a tenure track, who serve at-will, who can be fired at any time for any reason or for no reason at all, and who must continually reapply for their own jobs. These faculty members are often referred to as “contingent faculty,” even though their employment at CU may be full-time, for twenty or more years. The effect of this dual track employment system for faculty at CU has fostered an attitude among many administrators and tenured faculty that contingent faculty are merely employees and that the University can ignore their academic freedom and right to due process. Because of their precarious employment circumstance, there is an overwhelming incentive for these contingent faculty to keep quiet and not challenge prevailing conventions and ideologies, even if they perceive such challenges as being in the interest of society.

One example of how due process is denied to contingent faculty is the highly questionable termination of another CU-Boulder instructor, Adrienne Anderson. According to the September 20, 2006, issue of the *Colorado Daily*, CU’s Faculty Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) unanimously agreed that the CU
administration violated former instructor Adrienne Anderson's right to a "fair and unbiased appeal" over the non-renewal of her contract. The Daily reports that then-interim Chancellor Phil DiStefano rejected the P&T finding, in good part because, DiStefano said, he wanted to defend the authority "of the departments on this campus to make decisions about instructors." In other words, while instructors have the right to appeal their terminations, the right of departments to terminate instructors without being second-guessed by an appeal process is a greater right. From an AAUP perspective, it could be said that this institutional attitude toward due process for contingent faculty at CU defines the concept of meaninglessness.

Phil Mitchell did not appeal his termination with Privilege and Tenure, as he could, and probably should, have done. He says he did not know that such an option existed. Non-notification of appeal options is itself a violation of University and AAUP guidelines. However, Mitchell did contest his termination in his own way, by appealing directly to the administrators who concurred with Ann Carlos. He met with Arts and Sciences Dean Todd Gleeson on April 30, 2007. According to Mitchell, he told Gleeson that, considering he had served the University honorably for over twenty years, he was angered at his treatment by the University. He also told Gleeson that his termination was "immoral, unethical, and illegal"; Gleeson responded by saying, "I can assure you it wasn't illegal."

On May 21, 2007, Mitchell met with Chancellor Bud Peterson. According to Mitchell, Peterson angrily told him, "What you are doing [complaining to the media] is extremely detrimental to the University." According to Mitchell, Peterson also told him that he was not being terminated, but rather his contract at Sewall is not being renewed, and that there is a great distinction between the two that Mitchell does not understand.

Mitchell's efforts to obtain another teaching assignment at CU-Boulder were also thwarted. On August 8, 2007, Dean Todd Gleeson wrote to Christian Kopff, denying his request for "a reconsideration of the College's decision not to approve Phil Mitchell as an instructor of a College/CWC [Center for Western Civilization] course that the Chancellor's Leadership RAP would like to offer this coming term":

> In consultation with and concurrence of the Provost and Chancellor, I am sustaining my earlier decision not to authorize Phil Mitchell as a College instructor. This decision follows, as you may know, from a review of Dr. Mitchell's overall performance as a faculty member and a recommendation from his rostering unit (Sewall RAP) that he not be reappointed. My rationale is that the decision not to reappoint him has as much to do with his failure to take directions from his supervisor as does the quality of his instruction." (Attachment 13)

This indication on the part of the Dean that non-tenured faculty are essentially employees of their directors is troubling from numerous AAUP viewpoints. Administrators have an ethical and professional obligation to collaborate with their faculties, not to give orders
that the faculty must obey or be terminated. Dean Gleeson’s comment is further indicative of a culture in which the valuations of “supervisors” are sacrosanct and go undisputed by higher level administrators so as not to embarrass directors and chairs before their faculties. The conspicuously negative peer evaluations by the History Department and Ann Carlos, drastic departures from previous evaluations, ought to have raised a red flag: “potential academic hit job”; however, Dean Gleeson apparently did not hesitate to fire Phil Mitchell. Carlos’s letter to Gleeson was dated February 25, 2007. On February 27, Gleeson wrote back to concur with her judgment and to thank Ann Carlos for her commitment to academic rigor. The virtual contemporaneousness of recommendation and concurrence is disquieting.

It is notable that of all critics of Mitchell, only Fred Anderson voiced the possibility that in faulting Mitchell’s pedagogy he might be “reaching into questions of academic freedom.” We doubt that Carlos, Kenney, Boag, Zeiler or Gleeson are unappreciative of academic freedom, unaware of the central role academic freedom plays in the survival of democracy, or that they otherwise consider it an outmoded abstraction. It is certainly difficult to imagine that Kenney, for example, as a student of Eastern European history, or Boag, as a scholar in the field of gay and lesbian studies, is indifferent to the primacy of academic freedom.

There is, however, another consequence to the two-tiered system at the University of Colorado: when one tier of the faculty is treated as second-class by the administration, they will inevitably be perceived as second-class by some in the other tier. Thus, at the University of Colorado, many tenured faculty consider the majority of the faculty to be not-quite-colleagues. They consider them to be “backfill,” as Nicholas Flores of Economics referred to non-tenure track faculty during a meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly, May 3, 2007.9 As Peter Boag told the Silver & Gold Record in 2005, there is a “pool of instructors that the unit draws on when they need teaching assistance.”10 If an instructor is merely one of a pool whose function is to provide assistance, if the instructor is merely backfill, it is difficult to credit the instructor with having the identical rights to academic freedom as, say, Peter Boag has. Evidence of this damaging attitude is reflected in what is in Phil Mitchell’s file and in what is missing from his file. It does not appear to have occurred to Carlos, Boag, or Kenney that Mitchell, who has taught more classes at the University level than all of them combined, might have some idea of what he is doing in the classroom. It is difficult to imagine their voicing similar criticisms of each other’s teaching.

Carlos, Boag, and Kenny may be unaware that Mitchell, though untenured, has the same rights to academic freedom that they enjoy as tenured faculty; his function in a university classroom is not merely to serve as their employee.

Issues of Academic Freedom

Any conclusions concerning Phil Mitchell’s charges that the University of Colorado violated his rights of academic freedom must stem from a consideration of two questions:
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1) Was he fired in 2005, as he claims? 2) If so, was his termination the result of hostility toward his political and religious views?

The answers to these two questions furnish context for considering the third question germane to Mitchell's charges: Was his 2007 firing an act of retaliation by the History Department and the University against Mitchell for publicly speaking out against his 2005 firing?

Was Mitchell Fired in 2005?

It is difficult to imagine that, as the director of Sewall RAP, William Wei would tell Mitchell that he was to be fired “after one more year,” and repeat that claim to David Harasanyi of the Denver Post as well as tell the Colorado Daily that Dean Gleeson told him that Mitchell was being terminated if Wei did not believe that this was the case. Similarly, it is difficult to imagine that Mitchell would go to the trouble of publicly protesting his firing if he did not believe that he was being fired.

On the other hand, the response by the University in reaction to the negative publicity appears much less sincerely held. The original explanation changed; then the revised explanation shifted after portions were proven untrue. Finally, the actions by the University subsequent to 2005—Ann Carlos's determination to fire Mitchell, as documented herein; the suddenly numerous and unyielding peer reviews; the investigation by the Department into Mitchell's alleged homophobia—are 1) too unusual to consider as plausible variation of published reappointment procedure, and 2) vastly more consistent with the view that the University wanted Phil Mitchell fired than with any other narrative.

We conclude that Mitchell was fired in 2005, as he claims.

Why Was Mitchell Fired in 2005?

None of the published reasons for Mitchell's 2007 termination existed in 2005, as evidenced by his personnel file. There was no meaningful history of negative peer reviews, no criticism of Mitchell's syllabi, no complaints of failure to adhere to Sewall or History Department guidelines. While Anderson's 2002 peer review did express concern over lack of narrative structure to Mitchell's presentations and noted that his syllabus indicated rather more of an emphasis on the modern era than Anderson might prefer, these observations were highly qualified, accompanied by considerable praise for Mitchell's classroom abilities, and occurred in juxtaposition with other peer reviews that described Mitchell as “gifted” (Lewis) in creating narrative context to vitalize the presentation of data. Beyond Anderson, there is only Mitchell's history of superlative student evaluations, his numerous awards in recognition of outstanding teaching and service, and his glowing peer reviews. His personnel file does not contain any corroboration whatsoever for the complaints that Mitchell was not teaching up to History Department standards and was preaching to students.
As a non-tenure track instructor, Mitchell—like the majority of the faculty at CU—is employed at-will. What this means, at least as interpreted by the University and some courts, is that he can be fired at any time for any reason, or for no reason at all. In terms of state and federal statutes, no explanation is required. From a public relations standpoint, however, in a circumstance where an instructor at a state institution in a politically and religiously conservative-leaning state publicly protests that he has been fired for hostility to his conservative political and religious beliefs, explanations are necessary. Typically, if an instructor is fired for any reason, or for no reason, the instructor, recognizing the long odds against a successful legal challenge, will go away quietly, humiliated and battered but too discouraged to respond. In Mitchell's case, the haphazard explanations by the University certainly suggest that their reasons were both unjustified and rationalized. They seem to have been caught off-guard by Mitchell's public protest as well as the necessity of providing an explanation beyond that they are legally entitled to terminate an at-will employee whenever they feel like it.

Gleeson's original explanation—that Mitchell was not teaching up to standards and was preaching to students—would have been impossible to support publicly because no record existed of Mitchell's failure to meet standards and the single complaint against Mitchell for proselytizing had been quickly dismissed and was refuted by a history of student evaluations addressing respect for diversity. We surmise that the best the University could do, under the circumstances, was back off: Mitchell was not being fired after all; it was just a misunderstanding.

Assuming Gleeson's original explanation to be the most candid of the several offered, it is necessary to examine this version. First, was Mitchell teaching up to History Department standards? It is possible, of course, that in 2005 Mitchell's teaching was not meeting standards, though it is unclear how the History Department would know. Anderson's equivocal peer review did not mention standards; all other reviews are glowing. Furthermore, the Department has never used outcomes assessment procedures—controlled mechanisms for assessing whether students from Mitchell's courses fare better (or worse) in subsequent history classes than other students.

Second, was Mitchell preaching to students? While the charge cannot be plausibly supported, doubtless—considering the charged atmosphere of a good university classroom—Mitchell might be perceived by some students as trying to persuade them of the validity of his opinions. All teachers occasionally present opinions in class in addition to facts, and, if they are to have careers of any duration, learn to let students know which is which. Yet, at least at the university level, teachers must also assume that in some instances students can draw distinctions between fact and opinion on their own, even when the opinion is voiced by a teacher. This dynamic is further complicated by the circumstance that in smaller classes, such as those taught by Mitchell, during the give-and-take between students and teacher, the teacher may play "devil's advocate"—as one student describes Mitchell's pedagogy—and propose views that are designed to challenge the opinions of students, perhaps even dislodge students from their intellectual comfort.
zones—in effect, to teach critical thinking (Attachment 11). It is also reasonable to assume that, just as many teachers in politically-laden disciplines such as history might betray, for example, a Marxist-feminist perspective in their presentation of seemingly objective materials, Mitchell's politically conservative viewpoint no doubt influences the historical "truths" that he presents to students. But there is no evidence in his file that he was attempting to convert students to Christianity or to political conservatism, or forcing his opinions on them. Nor is it plausible that Mitchell would receive the highest student evaluations year after year if he were preaching to students.

Why was he fired in 2005? We surmise that the History Department refused to sign off on Mitchell's classes because the Department assumed his classes were not up to standards, because they assumed he was preaching to students, because his worldview made them uncomfortable, and because, as Mitchell was an instructor and thus employed at-will, no proof was required to substantiate their assumptions; they could get rid of him if they wanted, even when their reasons stemmed from antipathy toward his opinions.

Why did the University accede to the History Department's judgment before backing off in the face of public scrutiny? Based on the articulated practice of the CU administration, we surmise that the University considered the authority of the History Department chair to terminate an instructor without being subject to administrative second-guessing to be sacrosanct. Correspondingly, because Mitchell was "just" an instructor, the University disregarded his academic freedom.

Was the 2007 Firing an Act of Retaliation against Mitchell for His 2005 Public Protest?

The 2007 case differs in numerous ways from 2005. To begin with, in 2005 the Sewall RAP, under William Wei, enthusiastically recommended Mitchell for a three-year reappointment. The reappointment recommendation was denied by the administration because, according to Wei and, originally, Dean Gleeson, the History Department refused to sign off on Mitchell's courses. In 2007, it was the Sewall RAP, under Ann Carlos's direction, that recommended Mitchell be terminated. Furthermore, no mention is made in 2007 of Mitchell's preaching to students. In 2007, unlike the vague assumptions at work in 2005 that were voiced by Gleeson, the record is clear and substantiated: Mitchell's history of negative peer reviews, his inadequate syllabi, his "complete refusal" to meet course guidelines. There is nothing in the file to suggest that anyone had any problem whatsoever with either Mitchell's political or his religious beliefs, other than Carlos's brief suggestion that Mitchell may be sexist and Kenney's briefer implication that Mitchell may be anti-Semitic. Certainly, if it ever crossed the mind of anyone in the History Department that Mitchell is or ever has been homophobic, no mention is made in the file. When in 2005 the University was unprepared to justify Mitchell's termination without dissembling, in 2007, the University constructed a "pattern of behavior" going back to 2002. The 2007 firing is also justified, however flimsily, by budgetary reasons.

As we have demonstrated, some in the History Department were determined to get rid of Mitchell in 2007. But was the termination retaliation for embarrassing them in 2005, as
Mitchell claims, or instead an inconvenient finding, now substantiated, that Mitchell is simply not up to their teaching level? As we have also suggested in this report, it is too unlikely that the vehemence of the peer reviews by Boag and Kenney might be inspired by unease over Mitchell's Socratic pedagogy as a viable method of provoking critical inquiry, as well as alarm over insufficiently detailed syllabi. It is also unlikely that the four peer reviews since 2005 would essentially be facsimiles of each other—reflecting the same talking points—if they were independently constructed and not products of a previously arrived-at consensus. As the Director of the Center for Western Civilization, Christian Kopff says in a letter to Dean Gleeson, urging Gleeson to reconsider his decision to fire Mitchell, “The negative evaluations in Phil’s dossier consist of versions of what appears to be the same letter. . . .” Here, as elsewhere, the plausible explanation is Mitchell's: he embarrassed them by speaking out, so they fired him.

- Dr. Mitchell’s termination violates numerous AAUP Standards of due process, shared governance, and academic freedom.

From “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure”

Academic Tenure
After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

1. The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.

2. Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person’s total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.

3. During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.
Phil Mitchell was never given the opportunity to apply for tenure. He taught at-will for twenty-three years. Even if his entire twenty-three-year employment was considered "probationary," his academic freedoms were violated during that time, those academic freedoms being (1) to teach his classes as he saw fit, within the parameters of standards and requirements published and disseminated by the academic unit for whom he taught; (2) to express opinions at faculty meetings, even unpopular ones; (3) to criticize the administration to the media; (4) to have access to due process while being considered for reappointment. Due process—a fair and transparent system for appealing decisions—is crucial to the protection of academic freedom, even for an at-will employee. While CU may have a legal right to dismiss an at-will employee without due process, academic freedom is diminished when CU exercises that legal right.

From “1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings”

Procedural Recommendations
1. Preliminary Proceedings Concerning the Fitness of a Faculty Member. When reasons arise to question the fitness of a college or university faculty member who has tenure or whose term appointment has not expired, the appropriate administrative officers should ordinarily discuss the matter with the faculty member in personal conference. The matter may be terminated by mutual consent at this point; but if an adjustment does not result, a standing or ad hoc committee elected by the faculty and charged with the function of rendering confidential advice in such situations should informally inquire into the situation, to effect an adjustment, if possible, and, if none is effected, to determine whether in its view formal proceedings to consider the faculty member’s dismissal should be instituted. If the committee recommends that such proceedings should be begun, or if the president of the institution, even after considering a recommendation of the committee favorable to the faculty member, expresses the conviction that a proceeding should be undertaken, action should be commenced under the procedures that follow. Except where there is disagreement, a statement with reasonable particularity of the grounds proposed for the dismissal should then be jointly formulated by the president and the faculty committee; if there is disagreement, the president or the president’s representative should formulate the statement.

2. Commencement of Formal Proceedings. The formal proceedings should be commenced by a communication addressed to the faculty member by the president of the institution, informing the faculty member of the statement formulated, and also informing the faculty member that, at the faculty member’s request, a hearing will be conducted by a faculty committee at a specified time and place to determine whether he or she should be removed from the faculty position on the grounds stated. In setting the date of the hearing, sufficient time should be allowed the faculty member to prepare a defense. The faculty member should be informed, in detail or by reference to published regulations, of the procedural rights that will be accorded. The
faculty member should state in reply whether he or she wishes a hearing, and, if so, should answer in writing, not less than one week before the date set for the hearing, the statements in the president’s letter.

- On the surface it would seem that Procedural Recommendation #1 in the 1958 Statement would not apply to Mitchell, since his term had expired. However, in its report on Nicholls State University of Louisiana, published in the November-December 2008 issue of Academe, the AAUP states, “The Association accordingly asserts that faculty members, upon continuance of full-time service beyond the maximum probationary period, are entitled under the 1940 Statement to the protections of academic due process that accrue with tenure.”

- There is no indication that Mitchell was informed, verbally or in writing, that he was required to change his pedagogy, in accordance with recommendations made by his peers who were less experienced classroom teachers than he, or he would be terminated. The appropriate administrative officer, in this case, the director of the Sewall RAP and the chair of the History Department, did not discuss the matter with him in a personal conference. No standing or ad hoc committee elected by the faculty inquired into the situation. There was no hearing; no opportunity to prepare a defense.

From “Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom & Tenure”

Financial Exigency

Termination of an appointment with continuous tenure, or of a probationary or special appointment before the end of the specified term, may occur under extraordinary circumstances because of a demonstrably bona fide financial exigency, i.e., an imminent financial crisis that threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and that cannot be alleviated by less drastic means.

- Again, it would seem that the requirements of financial exigency do not apply to Phil Mitchell, since he did not have tenure and since his appointment was not terminated before the end of his specified term. However, we refer again to the above-referenced report on Nicholls State University of Louisiana: “The Association accordingly asserts that faculty members, upon continuance of full-time service beyond the maximum probationary period, are entitled under the 1940 Statement to the protections of academic due process that accrue with tenure.”

- The financial crisis of Sewall RAP was not demonstrably bona fide to warrant the termination of a long-serving member of the faculty.
[Note: Each institution in adopting regulations on financial exigency will need to decide how to share and allocate the hard judgments and decisions that are necessary in such a crisis.]

As a first step, there should be a faculty body that participates in the decision that a condition of financial exigency exists or is imminent, and that all feasible alternatives to termination of appointments have been pursued.

- No body of the faculty of Sewall RAP participated in the decision to terminate Phil Mitchell's employment on financial grounds. The financial justification was given by the administrator of the program alone.

- Feasible alternatives to termination of Phil Mitchell's employment were not pursued.

From "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities"

The Academic Institution: The Faculty

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

- Neither Sewall RAP nor the History Department had published teaching standards that were developed by the faculty. The director of Sewall RAP did issue a letter that communicated her requirements, but they were never formally approved by the Sewall faculty. Discussion with "core faculty," as Ann Carlos claims she conducted at Sewell, does not constitute formal faculty approval.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of
tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

- According to CU spokesperson Pauline Hale and Dean Todd Gleeson, CU’s administration allowed the new Sewall RAP director to decide curricular and personnel issues unilaterally. In fact, according to Gleeson, she was hired for that purpose.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

- According to Ann Carlos’s letter to Todd Gleeson recommending Phil Mitchell’s termination, one of the reasons was that Sewall RAP could not afford to give Mitchell a raise. The faculty of Sewall RAP never participated in this decision or in any determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

From “College and University Academic and Professional Appointments”

The terms and conditions of each appointment should be stated in writing, and a copy of the appointment document and any subsequent revisions should be provided to the appointee.

- Mitchell was terminated in part because of his pedagogy and syllabus. There were no terms or conditions with regard to these issues provided to him at the time of his appointment.

Term appointments should include reasonable notice of nonrenewal; after a period of probation professional appointees should have an opportunity to obtain appropriate security of employment.

- Mitchell had no opportunity to obtain appropriate security of employment after a period of probation.

Professionals should have access to a fair and reasonable grievance procedure and opportunities for review of allegedly improper discipline, nonrenewal, or termination. . . .
Mitchell was not advised of a formal grievance process, nor, given CU’s history of disregarding the findings of grievance committees in favor of instructors, can existing processes be characterized as fair and reasonable.

Professionals should be afforded the necessary sphere of autonomous decision making within which they can exercise their best professional judgment; those with significant academic responsibilities should have academic freedom on the discharge of those responsibilities and in their civic lives. Of course, colleges and universities should recognize the free-expression rights of all of their employees.

Mitchell was terminated for exercising his best professional judgment in his classroom. Furthermore, his rights to free expression were not recognized.

From “On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom”

In the case of issues of public interest generally, the faculty member must be free to exercise the rights accorded to all citizens.

Protecting academic freedom on campus requires ensuring that a particular instance of faculty speech will be subject to discipline only where that speech violates some central principle of academic morality, as, for example, where it is found to be fraudulent (academic freedom does not protect plagiarism and deceit). Protecting academic freedom also requires ensuring that faculty status turns on a faculty member’s views only where the holding of those views clearly supports a judgment of competence or incompetence.

Mitchell’s right to free expression was not recognized when he was berated as a racist for offering an unpopular opinion about affirmative action and when he criticized CU to the media.

From “Statement on Teaching Evaluation”

Expectations, Criteria, and Procedures. At the college or department level the expectations as to teaching, the weighting of teaching in relation to other expectations, and the criteria and procedures by which the fulfillment of these expectations is to be judged should be put in writing and periodically reviewed by all members of the college or department. This policy statement should specify the information that is to be gathered for all faculty members, the basic procedures to be followed in gathering it, and the time schedule for various aspects of the review process. Such information should include first-hand data from various sources, including students, and should emphasize the primacy of faculty colleague judgment of teaching effectiveness at the first level of review and recommendation.
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- Again, there were no written criteria in place with regard to Mitchell’s pedagogy or his syllabus, two of the stated reasons for his termination.

- There were no policies with regard to the basic procedures for gathering information for Mitchell’s reappointment file. While standard practice is one yearly observation, Mitchell was observed seven times in a three-semester period. Furthermore, materials selected for his reappointment dossier included negative evaluations that occurred outside the evaluation period and omitted positive ones that occurred within the evaluation period.

Assessing the Effectiveness of Instruction

Student learning. Evaluation of teaching usually refers to efforts made to assess the effectiveness of instruction. The most valid measure is probably the most difficult to obtain, that is the assessment of a teacher’s effectiveness on the basis of the learning of his or her students. On the one hand, a student’s learning is importantly influenced by much more than an individual teacher’s efforts. On the other, measures of before-and after learning are difficult to find, control, or compare. From a practical point of view, the difficulties of evaluating college teaching on the basis of changes in student performance limit the use of such a measure. The difficulties, however, should not rule out all efforts to seek reliable evidence of this kind.

- The History Department had never made any attempt to assess the effectiveness of Mitchell’s teaching or to measure students’ learning in comparison to the students of other instructors.
CONCLUSION

At least as represented by faculty in the humanities, Phil Mitchell is unusual from the standpoint of his religious and political convictions, as well as his access to national media. Nonetheless, his case personifies the vulnerability of all faculty who teach without the protections of tenure and due process. As a contingent member of the faculty, Mitchell was fortunate, at least on paper; he worked for a university where, according to published policy (but not state law) his academic freedom protections during the time of his contract were equivalent to those of his tenured colleagues. In fact, many of the University’s violations of AAUP standards were also violations of published University policy.

When academic freedom is protected by policy rather than by law, it is essential that policy be followed scrupulously by administrators, both in letter and in spirit. In the culture of academia today, such adherence is increasingly unlikely. Institutional imperatives are often in competition. Participation in university governance, due process, and academic freedom for all faculty is important, but so is efficiency and flexibility. Priorities have to be established. In such an environment, when administrators are legally free to dispense with certain imperatives in favor of other, more convenient, imperatives, abuses of academic freedom are inevitable. But the ramifications of choosing their own convenience over academic freedom for their faculty are calamitous to a free society. At the University of Colorado, administrators disregarded Phil Mitchell’s academic freedom and access to due process because they could.

Abuses of academic freedom are even more likely when administrators are permitted to draw distinctions between faculty being fired and faculty simply not being re-hired at the completion of their contract, particularly in circumstances when their employment would continue if these faculty were adjudged to pass muster by their “supervisors.” Many faculty, unprotected by tenure and due process, choose to abdicate their responsibilities to their profession and to society by not voicing their opinions for fear of risking offense to their supervisors. When the considerable majority of faculty at our colleges and universities learn to be risk-averse as their best strategy for job security, the damage to a free society is obvious. Phil Mitchell—perhaps feeling that he was protected by his long service to the University, record of extraordinary student evaluations, history of near-fawning peer evaluations, numerous teaching awards, and the published policies of the university—was terminated for behaving as if his academic freedom existed not only on paper, but in practice.

If Ann Carlos and the History Department at CU had merely said, “We recommend Mitchell not be re-hired because we don’t like his opinions,” it is doubtful that Dean Gleeson would have concurred. What they did instead was contrive a case against him, as documented in this report. Anyone who values the free exchange of ideas should be disturbed.
ATTACHMENT 1

PHIL MITCHELL'S TEACHING AWARDS

- The Marinus Smith Teacher Recognition Award presented by the Parents Association, University of Colorado, Boulder. Professors are nominated for making an outstanding contribution to the life of students at the University. 2006.

- Residence Life Academic Teaching Award, Department of Housing and the Committee on Learning and Academic Support Services, University of Colorado, Boulder. Spring 2006.

- Residence Life Academic Teaching Award, Department of Housing and the Committee on Learning and Academic Support Services, University of Colorado, Boulder. Spring 2003.

- Residence Life Academic Teaching Award, Department of Housing and the Committee on Learning and Academic Support Services, University of Colorado, Boulder. Fall 2002.

- Residence Life Academic Teaching Award, Department of Housing and the Committee on Learning and Academic Support Services, University of Colorado, Boulder. Spring 2002.


- Excellence in Teaching Award, Department of Housing, University of Colorado, Boulder. 2001

- Teaching Recognition Award, Student Organization for Alumni Relations, University of Colorado, Boulder. 1998.

ATTACHMENT 2

FACULTY COURSE QUESTIONNAIRES

Phil Mitchell's claim that his FCQs are superior to those of any member of the History faculty is substantiated by the following comparison. Not every member of the History faculty is included in the comparison, but the highest and the lowest faculty FCQs in the History Department and Sewall RAP are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>#ENR</th>
<th>#RET</th>
<th>CRSE INST FAIR ACES WORK DIVS ISSU</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-714</td>
<td>Fall03</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A+ A+ A A+ 5.3 A+ B+</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2746-300</td>
<td>Fall03</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ 4.9 A A</td>
<td>CHRISTIANITY/AMER HIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1020-710</td>
<td>Spr06</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A- A A B+ 5.3 A- B+ W CIV 2-16C</td>
<td>TO PRESENT GT-HI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-300</td>
<td>Spr06</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>A- A A A- 5.1 A+ A+</td>
<td>HIST OF US SINCE 1865 GT-HI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-730</td>
<td>Spr06</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>A A A+ A+ 4.9 A+ A+</td>
<td>HIST OF US SINCE 1865 GT-HI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2180-710</td>
<td>Spr06</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A- A A A+ A+ 5.1 A+ A+</td>
<td>HIST OF CHRISTIANITY 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1010-710</td>
<td>Fall05</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ 5.1 A+ A+</td>
<td>W CIV 1-ANTIQUITY 16C GT-HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1010-750</td>
<td>Fall05</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A+ A A+ A+ 5.1 A+ A+</td>
<td>W CIV 1-ANTIQUITY 16C GT-HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1010-790</td>
<td>Fall05</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ A+ 5.1 A+ A+</td>
<td>W CIV 1-ANTIQUITY 16C GT-HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-200</td>
<td>Fall05</td>
<td>MITCHELL, PHIL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A- A A B+ 5.5 A A</td>
<td>HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-HI1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitchell's FCQs for the period fall 1988-spring 2005 are attached.

---

FCQ'S OF HISTORY FACULTY FOR COMPARISON:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>#ENR</th>
<th>#RET</th>
<th>CRSE INST FAIR ACES WORK DIVS ISSU</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIST-6556-801</td>
<td>Spr06</td>
<td>BOAG, PETER</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B+ B A 5.8 A+ A+ U.S. DEPRESSION &amp; WWII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4636-001</td>
<td>Fall05</td>
<td>BOAG, PETER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>A- A A- A 5.8 A+ A+ LESBIAN AND GAY HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-5106-801</td>
<td>Spr05</td>
<td>BOAG, PETER</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>B+ B+ B+ 5.6 A+ A+ COLLOQ-US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4636-001</td>
<td>Fall04</td>
<td>BOAG, PETER</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>A- A- A- A A 5.9 A A LESBIAN AND GAY HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4227-001</td>
<td>Spr04</td>
<td>BOAG, PETER</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>B B A B+ 6.8 A+ A AMERICAN WEST-TWENTIETH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-5106-801</td>
<td>Spr04</td>
<td>BOAG, PETER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B B B B+ 6.1 A A COLLOQ-US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-001</td>
<td>Fall03</td>
<td>BOAG, PETER</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>B B B 4.8 A A HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2227-001</td>
<td>Fall03</td>
<td>BOAG, PETER</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>B B B 5.8 A A HIST OF AMER SOUTHWEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-7257-801</td>
<td>Fall03</td>
<td>BOAG, PETER</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B+ A A- A- 5.0 A+ A- SEM-HIST AMER FRONTIER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4233-001</td>
<td>Spr06</td>
<td>HANNA, MARTHA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>B+ A A A+ 5.7 A A HIST/FRANCE SINCE 1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-7052-801</td>
<td>Spr06</td>
<td>HANNA, MARTHA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ A+ 5.1 A A SEM-MOD EUROPE HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4020-100</td>
<td>Fall05</td>
<td>HANNA, MARTHA</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B+ B+ B+ 5.6 A+ A+ TPC-COMPARATIV REVOLUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4020-102</td>
<td>Fall05</td>
<td>HANNA, MARTHA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>B B+ A- A 5.2 A A REC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-5012-801</td>
<td>Fall05</td>
<td>HANNA, MARTHA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ 5.7 A+ A+ GRAD COLLOQ IN EUR HIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1020-100</td>
<td>Spr05</td>
<td>HANNA, MARTHA</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>B+ A A A 5.2 A A W CIV 2-16C TO PRESENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-6012-801</td>
<td>Spr05</td>
<td>HANNA, MARTHA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ 5.1 A+ A+ RDGS-MODERN EURO HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4623-100</td>
<td>Sum05</td>
<td>KENNEY, PADRAIC</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B+ A A A 6.5 A+ A HIST/E. EUROPE SINCE 1914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4442-001</td>
<td>Spr05</td>
<td>KENNEY, PADRAIC</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B B A 6.4 A B+ EUROPE SINCE 1945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-3010-801</td>
<td>Fall04</td>
<td>KENNEY, PADRAIC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A A B+ B+ 6.9 A+ A+ COMMUNIST SOCIETIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-6012-802</td>
<td>Fall04</td>
<td>KENNEY, PADRAIC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>A A B+ A 6.9 A+ A RDGS-MODERN EURO HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4442-100</td>
<td>Sum04</td>
<td>KENNEY, PADRAIC</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>B B+ C B 7.1 A B+ EUROPE SINCE 1945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4623-001</td>
<td>Spr04</td>
<td>KENNEY, PADRAIC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>A A B+ 6.9 A+ A HIST/E. EUROPE SINCE 1914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-5012-802</td>
<td>Spr04</td>
<td>KENNEY, PADRAIC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B B A A+ 5.4 A A GRAD COLLOQ IN EUR HIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2100-002</td>
<td>Fall03</td>
<td>KENNEY, PADRAIC</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>B B B A 6.1 A A- REVOLUTION IN HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AAUP Colorado State Conference

Statement on the Termination of Phil Mitchell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Term Instructor</th>
<th>#ENR</th>
<th>#RET</th>
<th>CRSE INST FAIR ACES WORK DIVS ISSU</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-001 Fall 04 LIMERICK, PATRICIA</td>
<td>36 33</td>
<td>B+ A- B+ A 6.3 A+ A</td>
<td>THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-001 Fall 03 LIMERICK, PATRICIA</td>
<td>38 38</td>
<td>B B B B+ 6.3 A A</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-3317-801 Spr 06 LIMERICK, PATRICIA</td>
<td>19 19</td>
<td>A A A A+ 5.5 A+ A</td>
<td>SEMERICAN-WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-6317-802 Spr 05 LIMERICK, PATRICIA</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>A+ A+ B+ 5.0 A A+ READINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1010-002 Spr 06 GERBER, MATTHEW</td>
<td>94 58</td>
<td>C C+ B B 6.2 A A- W CIV 1-AANTIQUITY TO 16C GT-HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4212-001 Spr 06 GERBER, MATTHEW</td>
<td>44 24</td>
<td>B+ B+ A- B+ 5.4 A+ A</td>
<td>EARLY MOD EUR:1500-1789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-5014-802 Spr 04 GERBER, MATTHEW</td>
<td>60 51</td>
<td>C+ B- B+ B+ 6.3 A A- W CIV 1-AANTIQUITY TO 16C GT-HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1010-002 Spr 06 LESTER, ANNE</td>
<td>89 42</td>
<td>C+ B B- A 6.9 A+ A</td>
<td>W CIV 1-AANTIQUITY TO 16C GT-HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-3311-801 Spr 06 LESTER, ANNE</td>
<td>17 17</td>
<td>A A A A+ 6.8 A+ A</td>
<td>MEDIEVAL HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2543-001 Fall 05 LESTER, ANNE</td>
<td>51 31</td>
<td>C+ B A A 6.6 A+ A</td>
<td>MEDIEVAL SOCIETIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4251-001 Fall 05 LESTER, ANNE</td>
<td>40 19</td>
<td>B B+ B- A+ 6.4 A A</td>
<td>EUROPE IN HIGH MIDL AGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2437-001 Sum 06 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>37 23</td>
<td>C+ C+ C B- 4.8 B+ A</td>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4253-200 Sum 06 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>20 7</td>
<td>D- D D D 4.4 B B</td>
<td>JACKSONIAN AMERICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2435-001 Spr 06 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>45 28</td>
<td>C C+ C B+ 5.6 B+ B</td>
<td>JACKSONIAN AMERICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4243-001 Sum 05 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>17 16</td>
<td>B B+ A- B+ 6.3 A A</td>
<td>AFRICAN HISTORY &amp; REFORM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2437-001 Sum 05 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>A A+ A+ A+ 4.7 A+</td>
<td>AFRICAN HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2437-001 Spr 05 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>31 20</td>
<td>B B+ B B+ 5.1 A+ A</td>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4016-001 Spr 05 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>33 16</td>
<td>C- C- D B 5.6 A A</td>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2437-001 Spr 05 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>39 28</td>
<td>B B C B 5.4 A+ A</td>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4253-001 Spr 05 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>46 15</td>
<td>C+ C C+ B 5.8 A A-</td>
<td>JACKSONIAN AMERICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4253-200 Sum 04 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>17 11</td>
<td>A- C A B- 5.6 A+ A+</td>
<td>SEMINAR/AFRICAN AM HIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2437-001 Fall 04 LOVE, ERIC</td>
<td>45 27</td>
<td>B B B B 5.5 A A</td>
<td>JACKSONIAN AMERICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-3328-801 Fall 04 WILLIS, JOHN</td>
<td>14 13</td>
<td>B B+ B+ 5.7 A+ A</td>
<td>SEMINAR/MIDDLE EAST HIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4368-001 Spr 06 WILLIS, JOHN</td>
<td>39 23</td>
<td>B B+ B A- 6.1 A+ A</td>
<td>HIST SOC MODERN ARABIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-3308-001 Fall 05 WILLIS, JOHN</td>
<td>103 52</td>
<td>C+ B- B B+ 5.6 A+ A</td>
<td>INTRO MIDDLE EAST HIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4328-001 Fall 05 WILLIS, JOHN</td>
<td>42 23</td>
<td>B- B- B+ A- 5.3 A B</td>
<td>MODERN MIDDLE EAST 1600 TO THE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FCQ'S OF SEWALL FACULTY FOR COMPARISON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Term Instructor</th>
<th>#ENR</th>
<th>#RET</th>
<th>CRSE INST FAIR ACES WORK DIVS ISSU</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECON-4339-801 Spr 06 CARLOS, ANN</td>
<td>12 9</td>
<td>A A A+ A+ 6.7 A+ A</td>
<td>ECONOMICS HONORS SEM 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON-4514-001 Spr 06 CARLOS, ANN</td>
<td>47 34</td>
<td>B B+ B+ A- 5.4 A A</td>
<td>ECONOMIC HISTORY-EUROPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON-4876-001 Spr 06 CARLOS, ANN</td>
<td>8 5</td>
<td>C+ B+ B+ B+ 6.4 A+ B</td>
<td>HISTORY ECON DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON-4514-001 Fall 05 CARLOS, ANN</td>
<td>45 29</td>
<td>B A- B A- 5.3 A A</td>
<td>ECONOMIC HISTORY-EUROPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON-4254-001 Fall 05 CARLOS, ANN</td>
<td>43 28</td>
<td>B B+ B A- 5.0 A A</td>
<td>ECONOMIC HISTORY OF U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON-4339-801 Spr 05 CARLOS, ANN</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td>A A+ A A+ 6.4 A+ A</td>
<td>ECONOMICS HONORS SEM 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON-4514-001 Spr 05 CARLOS, ANN</td>
<td>38 27</td>
<td>B B B A- 5.2 A A</td>
<td>ECONOMIC HISTORY-EUROPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON-4514-001 Fall 04 CARLOS, ANN</td>
<td>47 25</td>
<td>B A A A 5.1 A+ A</td>
<td>ECONOMIC HISTORY-EUROPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON-4254-001 Fall 04 CARLOS, ANN</td>
<td>45 26</td>
<td>B A A 4.9 A A+ A</td>
<td>ECONOMIC HISTORY OF U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AAUP Colorado State Conference

**Statement on the Termination of Phil Mitchell**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>#ENR</th>
<th>#RET</th>
<th>CRSE</th>
<th>INST</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>ACES</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>DIVS</th>
<th>ISSU</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-712 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>13 12 C- C B A- 6.8 A A</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-713 Fall05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>18 17 C+ B B+ A 5.9 A+ A</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-714 Fall05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>18 16 B B A- A- 5.8 A+ A</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>#ENR</th>
<th>#RET</th>
<th>CRSE</th>
<th>INST</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>ACES</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>DIVS</th>
<th>ISSU</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-714 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>9 9 B B B A 6.0 B+ B+</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-713 Fall04 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>18 18 B- B B+ A 6.2 A+ A-</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-714 Fall04 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>18 16 B A A- A 5.6 A+ A</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-710 Spr04 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>6 6 B B- A 7.0 A+ A+</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-711 Spr04 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>15 13 B B A A+ 5.2 A+ A+</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-710 Fall03 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>18 16 B A B+ 5.9 A+ A</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-711 Fall03 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>19 17 C B- B A+ 6.2 A+ B+</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMW-2001-712 Fall03 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>17 14 B+ A A 5.5 A+ A</td>
<td>THE AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2217-001 Spr06 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>47 37 B B B B+ 5.4 A A-</td>
<td>HISTORY OF COLORADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2262-710 Spr06 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>19 19 C+ C+ B+ A 5.5 A+ A</td>
<td>GENDER AND CULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2217-001 Fall05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>50 33 B+ B+ B B 6.1 A A</td>
<td>HISTORY OF COLORADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2262-710 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>19 16 C C+ C+ A 5.6 A A</td>
<td>GENDER AND CULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2262-710 Spr04 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>18 17 B B+ A+ A+ 5.2 A+ A+</td>
<td>GENDER AND CULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-710 Spr06 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>175 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>EXPLORING THE NEW WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-710 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>15 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>CONVERSATIONS ON AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-711 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>18 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>CONVERSATIONS ON AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-712 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>13 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>CONVERSATIONS ON AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-713 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>6 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>CONVERSATIONS ON AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-714 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>9 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>CONVERSATIONS ON AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-715 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>17 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>CONVERSATIONS ON AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-716 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>16 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>CONVERSATIONS ON AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-717 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>15 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>CONVERSATIONS ON AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWL-2020-718 Spr05 AIKEN, ELLEN</td>
<td>14 Forms requested but not returned</td>
<td>CONVERSATIONS ON AMERICAN WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-038 Fall04 DOERSCH, C</td>
<td>17 17 B B B A- 6.6 A A- 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-088 Fall04 DOERSCH, C</td>
<td>18 13 B- B+ B+ B+ 6.0 A+ A- 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-106 Fall04 DOERSCH, C</td>
<td>12 9 A A B B 5.1 A+ A 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-3020-200 Sum06 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>15 10 B+ A+ B A 5.2 A+ A+ QUEER RHETORICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-711 Spr06 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>16 15 B B B A 6.8 A A 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-712 Spr06 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>16 16 A+ A+ A+ A A 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-3020-030 Spr06 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>18 14 C C B- 4.9 B B QUEER RHETORICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-036 Fall05 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>18 12 B B B B 6.0 B+ B+ 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-710 Fall05 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>17 13 D+ D+ C+ B B 6.5 C+ C+ 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-711 Fall05 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>18 14 B- B B- 6.5 A+ A A 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-712 Fall05 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>16 12 B B- B+ 7.5 B+ B+ 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-3020-203 Sum05 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>15 12 A A B+ A 5.7 A+ A+ SPIRITUALLITY: LIT/ART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-003 Spr05 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>17 15 B B B A- 7.1 A 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-006 Spr05 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>17 12 B C B- 7.5 A 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG-1150-030 Spr05 DOERSCH, CHARLES</td>
<td>17 14 C B C+ A- 7.9 A A 1ST YR WRITING/RHETORIC GT-CO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-100 Sum06 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>29 13 C B B- B+ 7.0 A+ A- HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-HI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-710 Spr06 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>18 16 B A A 5.3 A+ A+ HIST OF US SINCE 1865 GT-HI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2126-710 Spr06 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>20 14 B A- B+ B+ 6.1 A+ A MODERN U.S. POL/DIPLOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2316-001 Spr06 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>52 21 C+ B A- B+ 5.0 A+ A AMERICAN POPULAR CULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2326-001 Spr06 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>60 40 B B+ B A- 5.1 A+ A+ ISSUES IN AMER THOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2326-300 Spr06 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>19 16 B+ A A A A 5.6 A+ A+ ISSUES IN AMER THOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-030 Fall05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>122 50 C+ B B 6.0 A A HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-HI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>#ENR #RET CRSE INST FAIR ACES WORK DIVS ISSU TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-004 Fall 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>46 29</td>
<td>B B B A- 5.3 A A HIST OF US SINCE 1865 GT-H11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-710 Fall 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>18 15</td>
<td>B A+ A A 5.3 A+ A HIST OF US SINCE 1865 GT-H11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2326-002 Fall 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>59 39</td>
<td>B+ B+ A- A- 5.2 A+ A ISSUES IN AMER THOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2100-300 Spring 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>8 8</td>
<td>A- A A A+ 5.3 A+ A+ REVELATION IN HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-710 Spring 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>17 13</td>
<td>B B A A 5.5 A A HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-711 Spring 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>14 11</td>
<td>B A- A A 5.6 A+ A+ HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course # Term Instructor #ENR #RET CRSE INST FAIR ACES WORK DIVS ISSU TITLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>#ENR #RET CRSE INST FAIR ACES WORK DIVS ISSU TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2126-001 Spring 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>59 32</td>
<td>B B A- B 5.3 A+ A MODERN U.S. POL/DIPLOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2227-001 Spring 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>50 31</td>
<td>C+ C+ B B- 6.0 A A HIST OF AMER SOUTHWEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2326-003 Spring 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>74 55</td>
<td>B B B+ B+ 5.1 A A ISSUES IN AMER THOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2326-300 Spring 05 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>19 12</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ 5.3 A+ A+ ISSUES IN AMER THOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-300 Fall 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>30 24</td>
<td>B+ A B 5.4 A+ A HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-710 Fall 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>17 17</td>
<td>B A B A 5.4 A+ A HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2126-001 Fall 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>94 72</td>
<td>C+ B+ B- B+ 5.6 A A MODERN U.S. POL/DIPLOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2126-300 Fall 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>28 19</td>
<td>A A A 5.3 A+ A+ MODERN U.S. POL/DIPLOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2227-001 Fall 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>49 32</td>
<td>C C B+ C+ 5.0 A+ A- HIST OF AMER SOUTHWEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2326-002 Fall 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>73 57</td>
<td>B+ B+ A- A- 5.1 A+ A ISSUES IN AMER THOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-100 Summer 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>48 31</td>
<td>B B B B 6.0 A A HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2316-100 Summer 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>9 7</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ A+ 5.0 A+ A+ AMERICAN POPULAR CULTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-300 Spring 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>31 22</td>
<td>B+ A B 5.4 A+ A HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-710 Spring 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Forms requested but not returned HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-711 Spring 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>19 14</td>
<td>A- A A A 5.1 A+ A HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2326-300 Spring 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>36 26</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ A+ 4.9 A+ A+ ISSUES IN AMER THOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2746-001 Spring 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>53 41</td>
<td>B+ A A 5.6 A+ A CHRISTIANITY/AMER HIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-4225-001 Spring 04 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>57 43</td>
<td>C+ B- A A 5.5 A+ A JACKSONIAN AMERICA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-100 Fall 03 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>24 20</td>
<td>A A A+ 5.7 A+ A HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-200 Fall 03 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Forms requested but not returned HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-710 Fall 03 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>19 19</td>
<td>B A A+ A+ 5.3 A+ A HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1025-711 Fall 03 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>18 17</td>
<td>B B A A 5.1 A+ A HIST OF US SINCE 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2126-002 Spring 03 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>110 75</td>
<td>B B+ A A 5.1 A+ A MODERN U.S. POL/DIPLOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2316-002 Spring 03 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>76 58</td>
<td>B- B A- A 5.2 A+ A AMERICAN POPULAR CULTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2326-001 Spring 03 FUNK, MERLE</td>
<td>71 48</td>
<td>A- A A A 5.3 A A ISSUES IN AMER THOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>#ENR #RET CRSE INST FAIR ACES WORK DIVS ISSU TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-710 Spring 06 HELM, RUTH</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td>A- A B+ A+ 5.0 A+ A HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2215-710 Spring 06 HELM, RUTH</td>
<td>15 13</td>
<td>A+ A+ A+ 4.9 A+ A THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-710 Fall 05 HELM, RUTH</td>
<td>15 14</td>
<td>B+ A- A 4.9 A+ A HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2215-710 Fall 05 HELM, RUTH</td>
<td>15 11</td>
<td>A+ A+ A 4.9 A+ A THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-710 Spring 05 HELM, RUTH</td>
<td>17 15</td>
<td>B+ B A+ 4.9 A+ A HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2215-710 Spring 05 HELM, RUTH</td>
<td>15 10</td>
<td>B+ A A A+ 4.9 A+ A THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-710 Fall 04 HELM, RUTH</td>
<td>15 15</td>
<td>A A+ B+ A+ 4.9 A+ A THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-2215-710 Fall 04 HELM, RUTH</td>
<td>12 10</td>
<td>B+ A A A+ 4.7 A+ A HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-1015-710 Fall 03 HELM, RUTH</td>
<td>18 17</td>
<td>A- A A A 4.9 A+ A+ HIST OF US TO 1865 GT-H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AAUP Colorado State Conference
Statement on the Termination of Phil Mitchell

ATTACHMENT 3

MITCHELL'S PEER EVALUATIONS
March 15, 1999

To whom it may concern:

I was asked by Professor William Wei, Director of the Sewall Academic Program at the University of Colorado to observe Professor Phil Mitchell in one of his courses and write an evaluation. I attended a class of Professor Mitchell’s in mid-March at Sewall Hall. I have also seen Professor Mitchell at work on several other occasions as I have had him guest lecture in my courses on multiple occasions and have visited his classes at other times.

The class I attended recently was an American Studies survey course. The day’s subject was a review of World War I; in specific a look at various individual battles, their costs and effects on the war itself. The setting was a seminar styled 20 person course in Sewall Hall.

Professor Mitchell possesses an encyclopedic and on demand knowledge of his field. He is remarkable insofar as he can recall not only the general themes of his subject matter but seemingly the most minute details. It allows for him to present information in what appears to the listener as a fully extemporaneous discourse, in narrative form. He has the historian’s gift for presenting data in a form, like a story, which is coherent, pointed, readily understood and compelling. It is easy to listen to Professor Mitchell and become absorbed in his presentations.

Within the Sewall Hall program, there is a great emphasis on class discussion as opposed to lecture. The classes are small and each student can he known individually to both teacher and group. Such settings are seemingly ideal for the teacher, but they presuppose an already existing intellectual curiosity on the part of the students and the ability to engage in debate, question and answer, etc. The professor does not lecture as such and depends on stimulating the class participants and letting them get involved in the learning process very actively.

Professor Mitchell’s classes are the finest example of this process I’ve witnessed at Sewall Hall. He engages the students in a friendly, humorous and relaxed way. He doesn’t present an authoritative manner that intimidates but allows the students to approach him with a relaxed feeling and a sense that he will not mock their person or ideas even if he is refuting them intellectually. His students genuinely love his teaching style and absorb his classes fully. His classes are lively and manage to wake up the students who might otherwise just be silent and only active in the role of note-taking.

Professor Mitchell is a master teacher. His love of his craft is obvious. So are his skills. I think the students relish the opportunity to study with him. He is the sort of teacher who sticks with a person long after his or her school days are past. Each of us has had a teacher or two like Professor Mitchell. They make the education process come alive and provide meaning to what has, lamentably, been reduced to a credential gathering process for many.

Sincerely yours,

Gary Owen Ferrini
I observed Professor Phil Michells Humanities class on 1/30/02. Professor Mitchell follows a predictable routine in his classes that provides a strong incentive for students to keep up with the reading and attend class, thereby assuring students familiarity with course material. Yet within this structure, there is considerable freedom for discussion and informal exchanges. Thus Professor Mitchell combines an emphasis on core knowledge with easy-going repartee, which facilitates building rapport with students. Professor Mitchells ability to reach out to students furthers the communities we seek to build in Residential Academic Programs and promotes positive relationships between faculty and students that encourage students to remain at the University. It is also one of his greatest strengths as a teacher. Mitchell also continually seeks to improve his classes and his teaching by identifying new materials and seeking input from colleagues; yet this is no sign of inadequacies. Rather, his efforts to keep his courses fresh and to find the right balance between nurturing and challenging his students is a sign of his strong commitment to being the best possible teacher he can be. Phil Mitchell is clearly an asset to CU.

Martha L. Viehmann
HISTORY 1015-060, FALL TERM 2003
PEER EVALUATION--DR. PHILIP MITCHELL

Fred Anderson

I visited Dr. Phil Mitchell’s lecture class, History 1015, on 3 December 2002. The class had approximately 100 students in attendance, and ran for 50 minutes.

I arrived at 8:03 a.m., and found that Dr. Mitchell had written three terms on the blackboard: Urbanization, Industrialization, and Immigration. He was taking questions from the students on the previous days’ classes as I walked in; soon he began asking others, as a means of framing the topic for the day, Immigration. His style was informal and relaxed. Working without notes, he talked as he strolled from side to side across the front of the lecture hall, and even down the center aisle (indeed, on at least two occasions during the class he carried on as he walked all the way to the back of the room, where he continued to speak). After about five minutes of asking questions that were evidently intended to make the students engage the topic of the day (e.g., “How many of you are from towns of less than 2,000 people?” and “How many of you were born outside the United States?”), he told the students to take out a sheet of paper and then administered a quiz to them on their reading assignment, Book I of Willa Cather’s novel, My Ántonia. There were about ten questions in the quiz. I was able to take down the following ones: Who is the novel’s protagonist? Where was Ántonia born? To what state is her family moving? In what kind of dwelling does the Shimerda family live? Why had the two Russian characters left their homeland? Ántonia’s opinion of Jim changed when Jim killed what? What caused a change of plans in Jim’s first Christmas? What special gift did Jim receive at his first Christmas? True or false: Jim’s grandfather was an incurable bigot. True or false: Mr. Shimerda was so unhappy about his new life that he killed himself.

The administration of the quiz took five or six minutes, including the time spent in reading the questions a second time for the benefit of students who missed them on first reading. Dr. Mitchell delayed momentarily to allow a student who arrived late to take the quiz on the second reading. When another latecomer arrived at the end of second reading, Mitchell asked him to put his name on a blank sheet of paper and turn it in; at this point it became clear to me that the quiz was also a means of taking attendance. (Subsequent examination of the syllabus, which I have attached, revealed that Dr. Mitchell administers quizzes at every class period. It was clear from the reactions of the students to his questions and instructions that they were fully accustomed to this approach.) Upon completion of the quiz, Dr. Mitchell instructed the students to exchange papers.

For approximately the next fifteen minutes, Dr. Mitchell asked general questions related to the day’s reading assignment. His manner was consistently friendly, informal, and humorous; he called on students who volunteered answers by name, and his bantering exchanges with the class members revealed that despite the large size of the group he not only knew all their names, but a surprising amount of personal information about most of them. In this part of the class, his
questions were general, and built one on another according to a more or less Socratic strategy. He first asked, for example, what would appeal to students about life on the Kansas or Nebraska frontier in the period described in the novel. Several offered that it would not have been crowded, and that people who lived there had a great deal of contact with nature. What wouldn’t appeal to you about those conditions? he asked. Several more answers followed: the lack of technology, the hard work, the dirt, the omnipresence of insects and vermin, the loneliness and detachment from society for extended periods; etc. Who is the protagonist of the book? Antónia, someone replied. Is she the protagonist or the heroine? Mitchell asked; and is there a difference? If she’s the heroine, he continued, who is the villain of the story? When someone replied “Nebraska,” there was of course a great deal of laughter, and Dr. Mitchell took the opportunity to comment on CU’s recent loss to the University of Nebraska at football; but what, he asked, apart from its football team, was wrong with Nebraska in the 1880s? This led to a discussion of the adverse conditions that faced the pioneer farmers, including harsh weather, the lack of health care to counter the devastations of disease and the perils of childbirth, etc.

The constant querying of students continued now in the context of grading the quizzes, which took the remainder of the class period, about twenty minutes. When students came up with the right answer, he would congratulate them on being right, and then either ask a related question to elicit more information, or would offer further remarks, imparting a variety of related facts in doing so. Thus, for example, after a student rightly identified the house in which the Shimerda family lived as a dugout, he commented extensively on living conditions in such dwellings: the perennial presence of vermin and snakes; how dugouts were constructed; how they leaked in wet weather; their small size; their poor ventilation; their darkness; how cattle were apt to fall through the roofs if they grazed on top of them. With each question and its answer, Dr. Mitchell added more factual information (on the average size of prairie rattlesnakes, on the average numbers of inhabitants per room in nineteenth-century houses [three] versus the average number of rooms per person in twentieth-first century houses [also three], on the differences in people’s responses to blizzards in nineteenth- versus twentieth-century America, on the psychological disorders that beset many European immigrants as a consequence of being uprooted from familiar social and cultural surroundings and being forced to survive in unfamiliar circumstances, and so forth). The students seemed engaged throughout, and generally volunteered answers without waiting to be called upon. As the hour ended, Dr. Mitchell asked for the students to pass in their quizzes, and offered to remain after class to answer questions on the examination. Class ended promptly at 8:50.

There is no question that Dr. Phil Mitchell, the recipient of a SOAR award and perhaps of others as well, is an accomplished instructor who makes strong connections with his students; the students in turn respond strongly to him as a teacher. Similarly, it was quite clear that he imparted substantial amounts of information by means of Socratic questioning and commentary, a technique he seems to relish. On the basis of a single class visit and a close reading of his syllabus, I do not know if this is the sole, or predominant, technique that he employs in teaching History 1015. If it is, I would have two concerns.
First, narration was essentially absent from the class that I witnessed. Insofar as history is usually communicated to students in History 1015 (and other, comparable, survey courses) not as disconnected facts but as a complex and multidimensional story, what happened in this class did not resemble what goes on in a typical survey. This absence of narration may or may not be a concern to the Department. Personally speaking, I found it disorienting, perhaps because it was so entirely unexpected. I doubt that freshmen and sophomores are so familiar with the basic American story before 1865 that teachers of the survey can usually dispense with narration altogether. It is possible, of course, that the students can acquire enough of a narrative from the textbook to make the absence of conventional lecturing non-problematic. If so, however, the textbook must carry considerable responsibility for offering continuity and analysis, and I am not necessarily persuaded that the English historian Paul Johnson’s work, which has been construed in some quarters as a Tory polemic, is fully adequate to the task. Clearly we are reaching into questions of academic freedom here, and I do not presume to prejudge Dr. Mitchell’s choice of textbook any more than I would criticize his pedagogy on the basis of a single class visit. These may, however, be issues that the Department wishes to consider further in connection with the survey course generally.

Second, there seems to me to be a considerable skewing toward the modern era in the course as described in the syllabus. Three weeks of the semester’s instruction deal with the entire colonial period, the Revolution, and the establishment of the American republic—approximately 200 years—while the remaining twelve weeks deal with just three-quarters of a century. (Indeed, the last two weeks of the course seem to concern a period, the 1880s, that is usually considered as falling outside the chronological limits of History 1015, and appears more often as part of History 1025.) All four of the supplemental readings deal with nineteenth-century topics; two of these are novels. Once again, there are issues of academic freedom at stake here, and I do not mean to suggest that Dr. Mitchell, a highly experienced teacher, should be required to reorient his instruction to conform to my own preferences. As I said above, however, the Department may wish to consider such issues further in the event it undertakes discussions of the functions and scope of the U.S. history survey course.

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Anderson
Professor of History
Sewall Faculty Review of Professor Phil Mitchell’s Teaching

I visited Sewall Instructor Phil Mitchell’s Western Civilization II class on Friday, January 21, in the Bigelow classroom in Sewall Hall. Professor Mitchell was discussing chapter 15 of Glenn Blackburn’s Western Civilization: A Concise History, vol. II. This material covered the early Industrial Revolution in Europe. Professor Mitchell did a great job of integrating major points in the Blackburn reading with central issues in Western Civilization and skillfully connected some of these issues with current dilemmas facing our globalizing world, such as sweat shops in Cambodia and the poverty of Asian and African peoples.

Professor Mitchell has an unusual teaching style that seems to work very well for him and his students. Mitchell first assigns a series of daily readings and then quizzes his students on the material in each class. Because the students are expecting daily quizzes, they are forced to keep up with the daily readings. By making these daily quizzes a large part of their course grade, this encourages students to carefully read the assignments and prepare for each class quiz. The key to success with such a teaching strategy is to make sure that the quiz questions cover the central points and issues in the assigned readings. Mitchell’s quizzes are designed to help students integrate the central themes and points in the daily reading and over the entire course.

Professor Mitchell organized the class I visited around central issues in the early Industrial Revolution in Europe. He asked questions about the standard of living of 18th and 19th century Europeans, about what fuel powered the Industrial Revolution, and about the impact of these new industrial factories on the lives of English workers and citizens. After spending a third of the class having students take the quiz, Mitchell then asked students to exchange papers and grade each other quizzes. It is here where Mitchell’s pedagogical strategy really works. He discusses the answer to each quiz question with the students, asking some students what they thought the answer was and to explain their reasoning. It is through this open discussion of the quiz questions that Professor Mitchell helps the students develop an understanding of the larger issues in the reading and to integrate this material into the larger themes and issues of the course. He doesn’t just answer the question, he explains the larger logic and reasoning behind the answer. Because Mitchell has practiced and developed this teaching style for a number of years, he is very skilled at covering a lot of material and integrating that material with the larger issues of the course.

This teaching strategy wouldn’t work for all Sewall instructors, however.
Professor pulls this off by developing a great rapport with his students. He knows all the students' names, a little about their background, and asks about students who aren't in class. Mitchell is able to build on this rapport with his Sewall students by inviting them to join him for lunch in the Sewall dining hall. Students will often continue to ask him questions about the class material during lunch, which demonstrates the level of interest and curiosity that Professor Mitchell was able to create in his students. His students recognize that Mitchell has a genuine interest in their learning and in their success in Sewall. The key to Mitchell's success with this teaching strategy is his careful attention to developing rapport and a close working relationship with his students. Not all Sewall faculty have the people skills, the emotional warmth, and a genuine concern for each of their Sewall students like Professor Mitchell does. It is very obvious from visiting his class why Mitchell is so popular with Sewall students. He is a skilled teacher, a caring mentor, and a concerned adult, who cares and worries about each of his students.

Although Professor Mitchell's teaching style is different from many other Sewall faculty, he provides his students with an excellent classroom experience. His concern for his students, his enthusiasm for the course material, and his love for teaching college all shine through in his teaching. I was very impressed with Mitchell’s teaching and the rapport and camaraderie he had with his students. It is an honor to work with such a fine college instructor.

Sincerely,

Chris H. Lewis, Ph.D., Senior Instructor
Sewall Academic Program
CU-Boulder
To: Peter Boag, Chair  
From: Tom Zeiler  
Re: Evaluation of Phil Mitchell  

October 7, 2005  

Class  

On Friday, September 16, 2005, I visited Phil Mitchell’s course, History 1015: United States to 1865. It was held in Farrand Hall 230 at 2:00 p.m.  

There were about twenty students in the classroom, and Phil had them sit in a circle to facilitate discussion. Actually, the day was taken up with a quiz for the entire period, both taking it and grading it. But, it was also instructive to see Phil in action even if this meant going over an exam. Most outstanding was the atmosphere of the room; it was buzzing. Students and Phil talked back and forth, sometimes parrying with each other, all the time very comfortable. There was an energy in the room that was driven by Phil’s amiable personality and obviously deep commitment to his students. These students, by the way, are familiar with each other as part of the Farrand RAPS, and that made the atmosphere conducive to learning. Phil has an easy-going, friendly nature and style, and his students really like him. He kidded with late-comers, he mockingly scowled at those voicing strong opinions. All in all, the class was fun and I think the students walked out satisfied, even though the learning came through a quiz.  

The day’s topic concerned the American Revolutionary War. The students had read the Stokesbury short history of the conflict and Phil tested them on a variety of broad and specific topics. In the grading portion, he actually stopped to broaden out discussion on a topic. For example, he compared the war deaths in the Revolution to those of other American wars. All in all, the students learned some important tidbits of history as well as some larger trends. Because of this rather haphazard presentation of material (though it is coupled with his energetic style), it was harder to see if he had a set theme in mind for the course or even for the class that day. Still, although at first I thought the trivia surrounding each quiz question was distracting, and the content of the quizzes involved very traditional issues such as Valley Forge and the like, I then realized that the rapid-fire approach kept kids on their toes, happy, and interested. I would suggest that Phil include some newer material on, say, social history, and also limit the time of the quiz. Regarding the latter, it might be better not to devote an entire class period to a quiz.  

Syllabus  

This is a weak point of the course. According to the guidelines for the syllabus for History 1015, and considering the syllabi of other faculty, Phil’s syllabus is not meeting
the requirements. The description says very little about the content of the course. There is a sentence about the time-frame to be covered but after that, Phil presents his three objectives, and they are very broad and, really, should not be mentioned in a syllabus except as a general, final statement. Claiming that the course will "discuss some of the great issues and controversies in American culture," or that he wants the students to "appreciate the richness of American history" should go without saying. The reading load seems standard – a textbook and three other readings, although they are also pretty unimaginative. Coupling a book on the Revolution with Ambrose's on Lewis and Clark seems pretty limiting, especially regarding a course that covers so much terrain and ends with the Civil War. In addition, the assignments oftentimes just refer to the readings. For example, for the 7 days extending from Sept. 12-21, the assignment is merely *A Short History of the American Revolution*, with page numbers. There is no indication of what part of the Revolution will be discussed. The same happens with the Ambrose book. On top of this, should a survey course of US history from its beginnings to 1865 spend 7 days on the Lewis and Clark mission? I don't think so, but that is how it appears on the syllabus. Some colossal topics (the causes of the Civil War: 1 day) get brief treatment, while others, such as the "emergence of the Western myth" (whatever that is) get 4 days. Phil seems to be teaching to his interests rather than to the needs of the students. Furthermore, under the section of evaluation, there is a quiz "almost every day." If my visit is any indication, that quiz takes up much if not all of the class period. Perhaps Phil should think about not having a quiz every day but, say, once a week. Anything more seems like high school.

So, overall, Phil Mitchell is a great classroom teacher, as an instructor goes, but his course, and his approach to the material, requires some major modification.
Evaluation of Dr. Philip Mitchell's "Western Civilization II" Class
Sewall Academic Program

On February 23, 2006, I observed Dr. Philip Mitchell's "Western Civilization II" (History 1010) class. It was a treat to be there to watch a master teacher at work. From the beginning of class until the end, Mitchell was able to hold the attention of his students while discussing the economic history of the West or what he humorously referred to as his "Why we got rich" lesson. While economics may be the so-called dismal science, in his hands it was an engaging subject that explained the material development of Western civilization and how it reached its current level of affluence.

Mitchell is able to do this for several reasons: first and foremost, it is because he has established a rapport with everyone of his students who obviously like as well as respect him; second, it is because he made the historical material relevant to the students' current life (what I would call a "presentist" approach); third, it is because like all good history teacher, he knows how to tell a good story; and, finally, it is because the students realized that they would probably hear the questions again in a short-answer test. The latter is simply using material incentives (what we call grades) to get the students not only to listen carefully, but also to take copious notes.

Enhancing the discussion was Mitchell's ability to draw on other historians such as Paul Johnson when talking about the development of transportation and Fernand Braudel when talking about the emergence of the factory system to support his comments about Western economic history. Mitchell clearly has a good command of the literature and is able to communicate its relevance without appearing to be a showoff.

In many ways, it was a Socratic approach to teaching, with Mitchell posing interesting questions that could be answered by the students if they had read the section on the traditional economy of industrial Europe or simply thought about it. It should be noted that it was not merely an exercise in remembering historical facts. On more than one occasion, Mitchell would challenge the text's assertion (which the students could verify since most of them appear to have the book with them) as he did when he questioned its explanation of per capita income growth. In effect, through personal example he illustrated how to engage in historical reasoning, achieving in his own fashion the educational goal of critical thinking and encouraging analytical thought. Not incidentally, this goal is much talked about on campus but according to colleagues difficult if not impossible to achieve in class, certainly for first-year students. It would behoove them to watch Mitchell in action.

In summary, I observed a fine class on a significant aspect of European history taught by an exceptional teacher.

Submitted by William Wei
February 24, 2006
As part of the History Department’s on-going review of history courses offered by lecturers and instructors both within the Department of History and in other units on campus, I visited Dr. Phil Mitchell’s HIST 1020 course, Western Civilization II, on March 10, 2006. The class is offered through the Sewall Residential Academic Program (RAP) and took place in a small room called Bigelow in Sewall Hall. There were perhaps 15 students and the seating available was filled. The class took place from 10:00-10:50 AM.

Being a RAP course, I expected the atmosphere to be somewhat casual, and it was. Dr. Mitchell utilized a style of familiarity with his students. He also had an informal approach to teaching, engaging in jokes, quips, and witty repartee with his pupils throughout the period. I understand that RAPs often provide something of a middle-ground between the more rigorous atmosphere one generally associates with a university education and the high-school, homey situation that first-year students have recently come from. While there is much to be commended in this approach to teaching, there are some drawbacks as well, or at least in this particular case. For example, some ten minutes of the fifty-minute period passed before the students were finally situated—after the hour, one student ran out to rustle another out of bed; a number of students appeared in their pajamas and slippers, something that received comment; and various good-humored remarks were made as students showed up and decided on seating; several students who sat by me came to class with no notepads and needed to borrow from neighbors before being ready for class. The generally casual atmosphere also encouraged students to engage in small talk among, and other communications between themselves through the period. Examples include two students who sat on either side of me at a long table and who passed open notes back and forth to each other about who recently slept with whom (open notes in front of me, even after Dr. Mitchell had introduced me to the class as the chair of the History Department). I certainly understand why some students find Dr. Mitchell’s classes appealing, as the feeling in the class was certainly one of fun, good humor, and general sociability. While a sense of community among students is desirable for enhancing learning, it can also go beyond the bounds, making class more a pleasurable sidelight to what should be a more demanding college experience.

Instructors have been informed that Western Civ II is a course that covers the period from roughly 1520 (beginning of the Protestant Reformation) to the present. It appears on Dr. Mitchell’s syllabus that he does indeed begin roughly with the Reformation. I visited this class at the end of week 8 of a 15 week term. At this point, Dr. Mitchell was up to World War I, the subject considered in class today. This was about three weeks ahead of what the syllabus had actually outlined for the day. Rather than March 10th, the syllabus explains that this is a topic to be covered on April 3rd. I assume that something happened to lead Dr. Mitchell to jump ahead in the syllabus and that he issued a new syllabus with updates for readings and so on to students, though if he had, he provided me with the original and not the amended syllabus. Dr. Mitchell began with a brief review of the causes of World War I and spent much the period presenting a number of facts about World War I, both in review and also in an informal quiz that occupied about 20 minutes of the day. I see on the syllabus that daily quizzes count for 200 points, but I am unsure how these are actually graded as students today didn’t turn in papers and people were
permitted to speak out the answers (whether correct or not) that occurred to them. While the facts presented and quizzed were indeed interesting (sizes of battles, number of people killed, the use of gas and the submarine in war) Dr. Mitchell should include a central point or thesis to structure his classes. What is the point of the class? What is it that students really should know? I also wonder about the usefulness of such quizzes, based on true and false questions about facts (see below), and which students are not fully engaged. That such quizzes are a daily affair compounds my concern about the pedagogical soundness of this course.

Dr. Mitchell often talked about World War II as he was presenting on World War I. It is likely that freshmen in college, somewhat less knowledgeable about European and world history, might become easily confused, not being able to differentiate between the wars when presented with remarks about D-Day and Stalingrad in the same breath as the von Schlieffen Plan and the Somme. Even I, with a considerable knowledge of and experience in teaching both World Wars I and II, found myself catching up to Dr. Mitchell when he jumped back and forth between the wars. Dr. Mitchell’s use of counterfactual material was also quite interesting (e.g., what if the von Schlieffen Plan had worked?), but I again wonder if this might be a bit too much for students who likely don’t yet have a full-grasp of what actually “did happen.”

I would encourage Dr. Mitchell to do several things to improve the quality and usefulness of his presentations and classes. First, it is always important to provide some specific point to a class period so that students know what to hang information on. Second, while the History Department recognizes the importance of factual information, it is particularly dedicated to getting students to think more about historical processes and develop skills of conceptualizing historically. Occasional rather than daily quizzes might be a better use of time. Third, I would encourage Dr. Mitchell to think carefully about the perhaps overly casual atmosphere of this college-level course.

Dr. Mitchell should also consider the following about his syllabus. Although Dr. Mitchell did not include this, the university does require us to include information on the syllabus about office hours, disability, decorum, the honor code, sexual harassment, and religious observance (save in the case of office hours, the university has established template statements for each of these). I think the syllabus could also delineate better the breakdown of grades — how many points is an A versus an A-, for example.
I visited Dr. Mitchell’s section of HIST 1010 in Sewall Hall on Monday, September 11, at 11AM. This visit is part of the Department of History’s annual review of all instructors and lecturers teaching history in the department or elsewhere on campus. This review included the class visit and a review of the syllabus.

The syllabus for HIST 1010 does lay out general expectations for students, and offers a calendar of readings. It does not list topics to be discussed each week or each session. This would hamper students in understanding the direction of the course, possibly limiting their horizon to the next reading assignment only. Adding topics to the calendar would be a good idea. The grading system, out of 700 points, is clear enough. While the syllabus mentions daily quizzes, there was no quiz during the class I attended.

As is usual for Sewall Hall, the entire class was present. The first few minutes made it quite clear that all the students feel familiar and comfortable with Dr. Mitchell, and that he, in turn, already knows them well. That he closed the class by inviting the students to join him for lunch in the adjacent cafeteria – and that a number of them accepted the offer – is strong indication of the rapport he has built with students after just two weeks of class.

The topic for the day was Jewish History in the last two millennia BC. This corresponded roughly to the topic’s place on the syllabus. The material discussed appeared to provide a good example of Dr. Mitchell’s desire, as stated in the class syllabus, to show how “the civilization of the present is innately connected to the past.” Frequent references to present conflicts and contemporary culture helped to make this point.

The structure of the class was roughly as follows: the first 10-15 minutes were devoted to some general reflections – for example, Dr. Mitchell asked students if they remembered where they were five years ago on 9/11/01 – and a broad overview of the role of Israel and the Jews in world history. This included a brief discussion of last week’s reading, a counterfactual essay by William McNeal on Jerusalem’s averting of disaster in 700 BC. Following this, the rest of class consisted of a lecture on Jewish History from 2000BC to 70AD; Dr. Mitchell, working mostly at the blackboard, gave a periodization of that history and discussed key moments in that history, relating them all the while to students’ reading of primary sources (including the Torah).

The hour I spent watching Dr. Mitchell teach his students was very pleasant. It was also disappointing. He offered rather less than should be expected at the University of Colorado – or, generally, of college-level teaching. At the same time, his choice of teaching style and method is entirely understandable, and logical, and deserves careful consideration.

The dilemma is this: on the one hand, Dr. Mitchell presented a fair amount of historical material that was not at all uninteresting. On the other, his presentation was almost entirely unreflective. History, in his presentation (and, to judge from students’ responses during lecture, in the minds of his listeners), is simply a collection of interesting facts that may also remind us of the present in various ways. There were numerous opportunities to raise questions about historical or historiographical processes in this lecture; they were generally missed. Therefore, the course did not, in my opinion, meet the expectations outlined in the University’s Core area of Historical Context: “to investigate both the processes and the meanings of change.” There was little of either process or meaning in this class.
Let me take one example that I believe highlights the problem. Discussing the Age of the Patriarchs, Dr. Mitchell mentioned that there is a traditional belief that Arabs descend from Ishmael, one of Abraham’s sons. He commented: “you can’t do the genealogy really tight to prove it.” The moment was right to note how notions of genealogy and connection to a distant past can be a part of national or racial mythmaking; or to observe how Abraham’s rejection of Ishmael becomes a metaphor for Arab self-understanding in today’s world. Instead, the story becomes simply one of (unproven and unprovable) genetic continuity. Such a misunderstanding of history will not help students grasp fundamental ideas of the discipline, whether or not they later become majors in History.

A recurring theme throughout the class was movie representations of the Old Testament. Students participated eagerly in these discussions. Surely every historian, seeking to make the past more relevant, willingly summons such cultural references in lecture. Here, though, the movie references simply underscored a notion of history as a dead repository of static moments, facts to be recalled in idle conversation. “Who plays the Pharaoh in The Ten Commandments?” asked Dr. Mitchell. The Masada, Alexander, Joseph and the Technicolor Dreamcoat, Indiana Jones and the raiders of the Lost Ark, etc. – all made brief appearances. None of them opened up any significant historical issues (as any could have); every student comment (such as a lively debate over why Harrison Ford survived the opening of the Ark) had its place, and none were used to deepen their historical understanding. This is History as trivia, and it does the students of the University of Colorado a disservice.

A final example was particularly disappointing. Introducing the day’s topic, Dr. Mitchell asked students to guess what percentage of the world’s population is Jewish. Guesses (which were probably a result of innumeracy rather than anything else) ranged from 2 to 20 percent. Revealing that the actual proportion is more like 0.25%, Dr. Mitchell asked “Do they exercise influence out of proportion to their numbers?” Let me be clear: this is not a bad question. It is not a priori antisemitic, and none of the context implied such a reading of it. What was disturbing was rather that, like every previous or subsequent question, it was dead – didactically speaking – on arrival. Several students answered “yes”, and there the matter lay. This was a moment to consider the history of migration; or why some religions, nations, and cultures prove more resilient than others; or how diverse understandings (and misunderstandings) of history and of cultural tradition lead to positive or negative values being assigned to nations; or how demography can be misinterpreted in the service of ideology. Instead, students simply registered their amazement at the numbers (some, perhaps, thinking that influential Jews might be something to be concerned about) and were allowed to move on. Once again, history is merely an assortment of curious facts.

The experience of visiting Dr. Mitchell’s class was quite thought-provoking. Is there a place, I wondered, for simply laying out historical moments in their contemporary cultural context? Is the fact that Dr. Mitchell’s classes are unquestionably enjoyable count for more than the fact that this class meeting, at least, was simply not up to the mark in terms of conveying to students an understanding of history? In the end, I felt that I had sat in on a class of high-school history. I hesitate to make this statement, because I do not mean to make assumptions about what actually occurs in high school nor about what should be taught there. Nevertheless, inasmuch as one might want in high school merely to awaken students’ curiosity in the past, at the University of Colorado we should expect much more of our students and of our instructors as well.
January 30, 2007

Report on class visits by Professor Ann Carlos: Dr. Philip Mitchell

During the week of January 22, I visited each of the two classes that Dr. Philip Mitchell is teaching this semester for the Sewall Residential Academic Program: HIST 1020 - Western Civilization 2: 16th Century to the Present and HIST 2180 - History of Christianity 2: From the Reformation. I will discuss each of these courses in turn. Both classes took place in the Bigelow classroom in Sewall. This is a smallish, square seminar style room. There were eighteen to twenty students present which is at the outside edge of the capacity of the room. Dr. Mitchell sat in the middle of an arm facing the door.

HIST 1020 - Western Civilization 2: 16th Century to the Present

As the students came into the room, Dr. Mitchell chatted and quipped familiarly with them. Clearly Dr. Mitchell has a very good rapport with the students. With everyone seated, Dr. Mitchell announced there was a quiz on the chapter for the day. He then read out eleven statements to which the students had to note on a named sheet of paper if the statements were, according to the author, true or false. The following are a selection of the questions as I noted them down:

1. During the four centuries [discussed] in this chapter, according to the author western civilization became more powerful than any other.
2. Name two of the three important inventions that occurred in China.
3. Greatest enemy of Chinese scientific innovation was the government.
5. Europeans were more aggressive than others.
6. African development was hindered by disease.

The students were then told to switch their sheets three to the right. Dr. Mitchell proceeded to answer the statements (according to the author) and the students had to note if the answer on the paper in front of them was correct or not. The sheets were collected by Dr. Mitchell at the end of class.

Dr. Mitchell stated that the day’s big issue came with question 1. The chapter apparently gives a list of reasons. Dr. Mitchell went through the list: there was not one ruling government and that Blackburn (the author) noted that Europe had a higher degree of freedom. The role of geographic location in terms of proximity to oceans and closeness to trade routes leading around the world. Dr. Mitchell then mentioned geography probably does matter. Europe was moving into the age of discovery and Iberia’s location was probably important. Its position allowed Spanish and Portuguese ships to evade the Muslim monopoly by sailing around Africa.

The next factor in the list was climate. European climate is stable. Dr. Mitchell noted that there were no major civilizations in the more northerly climes, at the equator, nor in the South Pacific. So to be a major civilization, one needed to be near the 40th line of latitude with no environmental
catastrophes. Again Dr. Mitchell did state that the climate argument is probably weak but went on to say that one probably does not have to work too hard in the South Pacific. Blackburn’s next argument is overpopulation. There was some commentary from a student on China’s overpopulation. Dr. Mitchell said that a growing population was also a signal of prosperity, noting that at the same time, the west had the opportunity to send people to the New World. He asked the students what the population of the New World in 1492 might have been? He reported that the population north of the Rio Grande was probably about 5 million and down to 1 million by the time of the Pilgrims due to devastating disease. So with no cities, the country would look empty to those arriving from Europe. [Actually, the current best accepted estimates are from six to twelve million.]

Then Dr. Mitchell turned to Blackburn’s assertion that Europeans were more aggressive, which he said begged the question why. One reason given by Dr. Mitchell was that Europeans had a disinterested curiosity which would explain why they set sail. With no further discussion, he turned to the role of a Judeo-Christian world view, technology and the Chinese inventions question - printing press, gunpowder and compass - with some discussion of the Gutenberg press and the importance of the compass. Dr. Mitchell then asked why other cultures did not develop these characteristics. One student mentioned the caste system in India to which Dr. Mitchell added the implications for mobility. He then asked the class whether diversity helped America. In an aside, Dr. Mitchell asked if anyone from India had succeeded in Silicon Valley and whether any were on the letterhead. This was followed by the statement that Dolby was from India. Another student then pointed out that the Muslim empire was not willing to import Chinese technology. The class continued through the thirteen questions. Dr. Mitchell told them that he would see them on Friday.

**Analysis**
I was disturbed by this class. Firstly there was no outline of the class laid out for the students either on the board, on an overhead, or even verbally. Dr. Mitchell made no mention of what had been covered in the previous class nor how today’s class followed from that previous class. Thus a student who had missed the previous class, due to illness, would have no way of knowing how the material was connected. I certainly did not know what the class was about. From the syllabus, the students were reading sequential chapters in a text by Blackburn. I had not read the chapter in Blackburn in advance of the class. But clearly this was a chapter that gave a list of reasons for why Europe rather than China, India, or the Muslim empire rose to dominance by the end of the eighteenth century. To the extent that there was an objective for this class, it was the implied one of understanding the textbook chapter and Dr. Mitchell’s statement some time after the beginning of class concerning the rise of the West. The class was structured around the true/false statements according to the author of the text. The syllabus states that there will be daily quizzes, thus this would appear to be the structure used for most classes. In a university classroom, we have to assume that the students have the ability to read the text and know what the author is saying. The role of the instructor must be to move the students beyond the merely descriptive and to help develop a critical understanding of the analytical nature of historical inquiry.

When answering the true false statements Dr. Mitchell did note that the big issue comes with Question 1 - during the four centuries described in the chapter western civilization became more powerful. But as I laid out above, the evaluation of why was a list of reasons from geography, to
religion, to aggressiveness, to freedom, to population, to technology. At no time were the students given much sense for the relative importance of any one of these. Indeed, the students were never even asked if the list might be incomplete. There were a number of other places where Dr. Mitchell could have shaped the discussion to focus on the analytical nature of the historical inquiry. For instance, one of the statements that Dr. Mitchell read to the class was that Europeans were more aggressive than others, which I found to be an odd statement in itself. Although Dr. Mitchell did say that this begs the question, it was never made clear what begs what question? I was confused. Dr. Mitchell could have asked the class what exactly the author meant by this statement? What does ‘aggressive’ mean? How is it being measured? Who are the comparison group? How reliable are the data used by the author? What are the sources for such a statement? Indeed, one could ask who are ‘Europeans’? Does the author mean all Europeans or just some? None of these questions were posed to the students nor raised by the students. What they were told was that Europeans were more aggressive. Another issue that arises here is why did Dr. Mitchell choose this particular statement? Is this view of Europeans in some way more privileged than others for Blackburn? Does this view drive the author’s particular narrative? The problem is that at no time was there explanation by Dr. Mitchell as to why he chose the statements he did; neither did he explain how they help the students understand how the author sees the world or how it might relate to what they were going to see in future chapters.

I also found there to be a curious lack of reference to other materials. There are possibly more bookshelves in the Norlin on this topic relative than many others. Yet, Dr. Mitchell made no mention of alternative interpretations. Recent work by Kenneth Pomeranz titled *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy* argues that a divergence of China and Europe did not happen until the nineteenth century. Parenthetically, Professor Pomeranz was an invited College by the History Department about three years ago. Pomeranz argues that China was not facing a Malthusian population crisis which runs completely against the Blackburn argument that China was overpopulated. In this case again, Dr. Mitchell could have deconstructed what we mean by overpopulation. He did briefly say that rising population is a sign of prosperity and that Blackburn probably overemphasizes the issue of population, but again there is no analysis or context. When is a country overpopulated? How are population and invention related? Is necessity the mother of invention or do too many people lead inexorably to starvation? Again here there is a huge literature, but the students do not know this. There was no mention of Malthus or Ester Boserup. What they learned was that China was overpopulated. Even here, one could have asked the students what is China? Is it one great homogeneous plain? I found myself very concerned at the lack of a critical approach to the topic. I quite accept that one cannot cover everything in one class, but one should be demonstrating to the students how to approach a question or idea or statement in an analytical manner.

**HIST 2180 - History of Christianity 2: From the Reformation**

The organization of this class is similar to that used in the HIST 1020. As the student came into the room, again Dr. Mitchell chatted and quipped familiarly with them on subjects ranging from disbelief about their public school background (he used the term lying), football, sports teams and at one point told two of the female students that they could now ‘change their hair’.
Again when everyone was seated, Dr. Mitchell announced that there was a quiz on the chapter for the class. From the syllabus, this was chapter 1 of *The Next Christendom* by Philip Jenkins which explores the future of Christianity in the 21st millennium. Dr. Mitchell again read out a series of statements to which the students had to state whether they were true or false. Two other questions required students to fill in a blank. The questions were statements drawn from the text and Dr. Mitchell stressed repeatedly that he was asking whether the statements were true false according to the Jenkins. As he read out the thirteen statements, Dr. Mitchell walked around one half of the room behind the students. He told them to guess if they did not know the answer giving the students a fifty percent chance of getting the correct answer. When finished, Dr. Mitchell again had the students pass the sheets three students to one side and then he proceeded to go through the statements. At no time was the objective of the class made clear to the students. There was no outline of what would be covered nor any discussion of how this class fitted with the previous class and at the end, no tie to future material.

Much of the class discussion focused on one of the statements. Dr. Mitchell had asked what, according to the text, was the most successful social movement of the century? The answer was the Pentecostal movement which one student mispronounced as ‘Pentacoastal’ and faced some ribbing from Dr. Mitchell. Dr. Mitchell then gave the students a short history of the movement from its origins in Topeka, Kansas in 1900 to Jenkins’ estimate of 1 billion members by 2050. As Dr. Mitchell explained to the class, the emphasis in this movement is on physical healing, speaking in tongues, and the second work of Grace or baptism by the Holy Spirit. He noted that there are currently about 350 million Pentacostals world wide while only about 12 million Mormons. Here one student made a comment about Mormon family size which Dr. Mitchell might not have heard but did not respond to. Another student asked if they were different from Protestants and was told no and that the best known groups would be the Assemblies of God. Dr. Mitchell then went on to describe the movement as clearly multi-racial with a heavy emphasis on emotion. Services would have music, bands and dancing. Dr. Mitchell also stated that the movement reached the lowest common denominator in society - sex addicts, pedophiles, and the lower classes which might explain its fast growth. A student asked how they overlapped with Baptists. Dr. Mitchell stated that Baptists were not Pentacostal but in his view there was not much difference between the two although Southern Baptists have no healing. There was no discussion of evangelical Protestantism which I will expand on below.

Dr. Mitchell then turned his attention back to the remainder of the quiz questions. Here most of the questions focused on the growth areas for Christianity in the next century. These would occur in the South rather than in Europe or North America. Using statistics read from an article, the name and title of which was not noted on the board or anywhere I could ascertain, Dr. Mitchell said that 80% of Christians were [would be] in the third world and they were brown, poor and did not speak English as a first language. Using the same statistics, he gave the relative sizes of the world religions with the noted exception of Judaism. Rather he asked the class how many Jews they thought there probably were. And then just dropped the subject. The class then spent some time on the conservative nature of third world Christianity which will clearly have an impact both in their own countries and in those countries to which they migrate. These are biblically literate groups which so will have an impact on theology. Here Dr. Mitchell mentioned that the material in the Book of Revelations would be everyday material for 3rd world Christians. The class ended with no summary
nor any comment on material for the next class.

Again in this class, I found there to be little critical thinking or analysis. For most of the class period, the focus was on the Pentecostal movement, however, the students came away with a perception of the movement as emotional and comprised of 'the lowest common denominator' of society. I find this characterization very problematic. There was little discussion of the theological positioning of this movement. Dr. Mitchell could easily have used the movement to provide the students with an overview of the various Christian groups from Catholics through Protestants through the evangelical movements. As this is a course on the history of Christianity from the reformation, such an overview would be useful to the student who asked if Catholics were Christians. The students were told that the Movement started in 1900 in Topeka, Kansas. Now this is a fact. But in history classes, we can expect that students will learn more than mere facts. At no time did Dr. Mitchell explain why it was that the movement started at the turn of the century. Was it due to various crises of confidence occurring as a result of the beginning of a new century? What made people so open to this movement? Why did it start in Kansas? What made Kansas different? Why did it spread so quickly to Houston, Texas? What were the particular social aspects that encouraged African Americans to participate? Indeed, given this is a survey course on the History of Christianity, I would have expected to hear some discussion of why he was discussing a twentieth and twenty-first century movement in the second week of term. Did this movement highlight certain aspects of Christianity that the students would be developing in the coming weeks. There was no analysis or critical commentary of the type that one would expect to see developed in history classes.

It was very clear in both of the classes that I observed that Dr. Mitchell gets on very well with his students. He is a charismatic person who connects with the students. Indeed, he works very hard to find points of contact with each student which is to be commended. At the same time, I found, for my taste, some of the remarks made to be overly familiar. I understand the comment made to two female students that they could now 'change your hair' to mean that he recognized their faces. Yet it could be construed as a very gendered comment. I am also concerned about the process of allowing fellow students to correct quiz papers. No student should be able to see the graded work of another students. This may breach privacy rules in spirit if not in law and I have already talked to Dr. Mitchell on this matter. However, my biggest concern is the total lack of an analytical process in these two classes. Third level institutions are teaching students how to think and how to question. There were many marvelous teaching points in both of these classes which were completely missed.
ATTACHMENT 4

MITCHELL'S MERIT EVALUATIONS
Faculty Name: Mitchell, Philip  
Department: Sewall RAP  
Rank: Senior Instructor

College/School: Arts and Sciences

**Faculty Rating:**
Rate and provide brief narrative statements which describe this faculty member’s performance at the rank currently held:

**A. Teaching** 80 %

Professor Mitchell is one of our most popular teachers.

**B. Research and Creative Work** 0 %

N/A

**C. Service to the University, Profession, and Community** 20 %

Professor Mitchell is the Sewall RAP Diversity Officer. He is the recipient of a Certificate of Appreciation for my dedication and commitment to the success of students of color at the University of Colorado at Boulder from the McNell Academic Program awarded and an award from the Committee on Learning and Academic Support Services granted to him for having a significant impact of the success of residence hall students at CU Boulder.

**D. Overall Evaluation** (Tenured faculty who have received two “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” ratings or any combination of the two within the previous five years will undergo Extensive Post-tenure Review)

- [ ] Far Exceeds Expectations
- [x] Exceeds Normal Expectations
- [ ] Meets Normal Expectations
- [ ] Below Expectations
- [ ] Unsatisfactory

I have read this performance rating:

Faculty Member’s Signature: _______________  Date: 5/3/02

Chair’s Signature: _______________  Date: ______/____/____

Dean’s Signature: _______________  Date: ______/____/____

Provost Signature: _______________  Date: ______/____/____
Faculty Performance Rating for AY2002-2003  
(AY03-04 Stipend Adjustment Recorded on Separate Document)  
(Accessible Under Open Records Act)

Employee ID: 115662  Position Number: 150284  Date: 5/2/03

Faculty Name: Mitchell, Philip  Department: Sewall RAP  Rank: Senior Instructor

College/School: Arts & Sciences

Faculty Rating:
Rate and provide brief narrative statements which describe this faculty member's performance at the rank currently held:

A. Teaching __80__%

University Housing Citation for outstanding performance as an instructor in the RAPs

B. Research and Creative Work __0__%

C. Service to the University, Profession, and Community __20__%

Received an award for work with students of color

D. Overall Evaluation  (Tenured faculty who have received two “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” ratings or any combination of the two within the previous five years will undergo Extensive Post-tenure Review)

☐ Far Exceeds Expectations  
X Exceeds Normal Expectations  
☐ Meets Normal Expectations  
☐ Below Expectations  
☐ Unsatisfactory

I have read this performance rating:

Faculty Member’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: 5/22/03

Chair’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: 5/4/03

Dean’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: 

Provost Signature: ___________________________ Date: 
Faculty Performance Rating for Jan 2003 – Dec 2003
(AY04-05 Stipend Adjustment Recorded on Separate Document)
(Accessible Under Open Records Act)

Employee ID: 115662  Position Number: 150284  Date: 4/30/04

Faculty Name: Mitchell, Philip  Department: Sewall RAP  Rank: Senior Instructor

College/School: Arts & Sciences

Faculty Rating:
Rate and provide brief narrative statements which describe this faculty member's performance at the rank currently held:

A. Teaching ___80___%

Mitchell remains one of our most popular teachers.

B. Research and Creative Work ___0___%

In terms of research, Mitchell fulfills the requirements of his contract.

C. Service to the University, Profession, and Community ___20___%

As the Program’s diversity officer, Mitchell has served as a mentor to the students of color in the Program. He is a fixture in the dining hall where he interacts with students on a daily basis.

D. Overall Evaluation (Tenured faculty who have received two “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” ratings or any combination of the two within the previous five years will undergo Extensive Post-tenure Review)

- Far Exceeds Expectations
- Exceeds Normal Expectations
- X Meets Normal Expectations
- Below Expectations
- Unsatisfactory

I have read this performance rating:

Faculty Member's Signature: ________________________ Date: 5-3-04

Chair’s Signature: ________________________ Date: 5/3/04

Dean’s Signature: ________________________ Date:

Provost Signature: ________________________ Date:
Faculty Performance Rating for Jan 2004 – Dec 2004
(AY05-06 Stipend Adjustment Recorded on Separate Document)
(Accessible Under Open Records Act)

Employee ID: 115662 Position Number: 150284 Date: 04/15/05
Faculty Name: Mitchell, P. Department: Sewall RAP Rank: Senior Instructor
College/School: Arts and Sciences

Faculty Rating:
Rate and provide brief narrative statements which describe this faculty member's performance at the rank currently held:

A. Teaching 80 %

Mitchell remains one of our most popular teachers.

B. Research and Creative Work 0 %

Mitchell meets his obligations in this category.

C. Service to the University, Profession, and Community 20 %

Mitchell is to be commended for his work as the Sewall RAP's diversity officer.

D. Overall Evaluation (Tenured faculty who have received two "Below Expectations" or "Unsatisfactory" ratings or any combination of the two within the previous five years will undergo Extensive Post-tenure Review)

- [ ] Far Exceeds Expectations
- [ ] Exceeds Normal Expectations
- [X] Meets Normal Expectations
- [ ] Below Expectations
- [ ] Unsatisfactory

I have read this performance rating:

Faculty Member's Signature: [Signature] Date: 4/18/05

Chair's Signature: [Signature] Date: 4/16/05

Dean's Signature: Date:

Provost Signature: Date:
Faculty Performance Rating for Jan 2005 – Dec 2005  
(AY06-07 Stipend Adjustment Recorded on Separate Document)  
(Accessible Under Open Records Act)

Employee ID: 115662  Position Number: 150284  Date: 5/5/06

Faculty Name: Phil Mitchell  Department: Sewall RAP  Rank: Senior Instructor

College/School: Arts and Sciences

Faculty Rating:
Rate and provide brief narrative statements which describe this faculty member's performance at the rank currently held:

A. Teaching  75%

Dr. Mitchell is clearly the most popular teacher in the Sewall RAP. Everyone who has ever visited his class comes away impressed with the learning that goes on, the interaction between teacher and student, and the humanity of the lessons taught.

B. Research and Creative Work ____%

C. Service to the University, Profession, and Community  25%

Dr. Mitchell can always be counted on to serve the Program, which he is devoted to. As the Sewall RAP Diversity Officer, he has established a fine rapport with our students of color.

D. Overall Evaluation  (Tenured faculty who have received two “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” ratings or any combination of the two within the previous five years will undergo Extensive Post-tenure Review)

☐ Far Exceeds Expectations
X ☐ Exceeds Normal Expectations
☐ Meets Normal Expectations
☐ Below Expectations
☐ Unsatisfactory

I have read this performance rating:

Faculty Member’s Signature:  

Date: 5/5/06

Chair’s Signature:  

Date: 5/3/06

Dean’s Signature:  

Date: 

Provost Signature:  

Date:
Employee ID: 115662  Position Number: 150284  Date: 3/27/07

Faculty Name: Phil Mitchell  Department: Sewall RAP  Rank: Senior Instructor

Rate and provide brief narrative statements which describe this faculty member's performance at the rank currently held:

A. Teaching  75%

Dr. Mitchell teaches three courses a year for the Sewall Residential Academic Program: HIST 1010, Western Civilization I; HIST 1020, Western Civilization II; HIST 2180, History of Christianity. Dr. Mitchell also teaches for other units on Campus. Concerns were expressed in peer reviews of these courses. In addition, Dr. Mitchell failed to follow Sewall guidelines regarding the teaching of analytical writing.

B. Research and Creative Work  ____ %

C. Service to the University, Profession, and Community  25%

Dr. Mitchell was the Sewall Diversity Officer. Dr. Mitchell did not meet deadlines set by the diversity office. Required many reminders.

D. Overall Evaluation (Tenured faculty who have received two “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” ratings or any combination of the two within the previous five years will undergo Extensive Post-tenure Review)

- [ ] Far Exceeds Expectations
- [ ] Exceeds Normal Expectations
- [ ] Meets Normal Expectations
- [X] Below Expectations
- [ ] Unsatisfactory

I have read this performance rating:
Chair's
Signature __________________________ Date: __________________

Dean's
Signature __________________________ Date: __________________

Provost
Signature __________________________ Date: __________________
April 17, 2007

Attached is my merit evaluation for calendar year 2006.

Could you please read over it.

If your are comfortable with this evaluation, please just sign and give it back to me before the end of the week. Wednesday, April 25.

If you want to talk to me about it, please drop by my office any morning this week or let me know when would be a convenient time for you this week.

I have to submit these evaluation forms to the Dean's office next week.

Thanks so much for all you work on behalf of the program.

NO FRPA.
Memorandum

To: Dean Todd Gleeson, College of Arts and Sciences

From: Professor Ann Carlos, Director, Sewall RAP

Date: April 20, 2007

Re: Merit Evaluation Form, Dr. Philip Mitchell

Dr. Mitchell did not submit a FRPA.

Dr. Mitchell did not sign this merit review nor did he discuss it with me. Dr. Mitchell put it in the garbage can in the mail room.

[Signature]

Ann Carlos
ATTACHMENT 5

ANN CARLOS'S LETTER TO THE SEWALL RAP FACULTY
JUNE 14, 2006
Dear Colleagues,

I would like to take this opportunity to tell you how pleased I am to be involved in the Sewall RAP and to thank William Wei for his outstanding stewardship of the program. Sewall has a long tradition of excellence and, in fact, this is the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the program. Such a long tradition of excellence in freshman education brings with it responsibilities to maintain and expand on the quality of the program. It seems to me that we are in a very auspicious position. We have a great base and, in conjunction with the Dean’s Colorado Challenge, are excellently poised to take the program forward.

Over the past two months, I have been meeting with the Core Instructors to discuss the nature of the academic program and more importantly the nature of the academic community that is Sewall. An academic community is more than a set of classes in a particular location. An academic community is one in which groups of people come together with a common purpose to communicate, interact and learn. As members of that community we have a responsibility to hold ourselves and our students to the highest possible standards. As a result of these conversations, we have formulated criteria that will help us meet such a goal. These requirements will bring uniformity across all the courses and a greater sense of identity for those students who are so very fortunate to be in the Sewall RAP.

We must be very cognizant of the privileged position of our first-year students. They have this amazing academic community to support them and help them navigate their first year at the University. We sometimes forget that, for the majority of these students, it is their first time in a University classroom. They are, as yet, unaware what that means and the expectations that will be placed upon them. Thus, I feel that uniform policies regarding the structure of our classes will help ease the transition for them and for us. The small class size that we provide at Sewall is extraordinary for a University of our size. We should take pride in our ability to be able to offer such classes. But our ability to provide small classes brings with it a responsibility to demand the highest of academic standards from our students. To do otherwise is to privilege those students further. I realize that most of what I am about to suggest is exactly what all of us are already doing. But this is an opportunity to formalize our individual actions and to speak in a common voice.

In line with the Dean’s Challenge, I am asking that there be an extensive written component for all assessment. I realize that not all classes are amenable to essay style exams; in such courses, short answer structures could be used. In addition, the very small size of the classes makes it imperative that students attend and participate. The proximity of Sewall classrooms to the residence hall makes it very easy for students to get to class and to get to class on time. I realize that a majority of students do attend class regularly, but to aid the few that don’t, I would like to see the following common attendance policy. Students who miss six class hours fail the course. Six class hours is two weeks of classes for both a MWF and TR schedule.
There will be a few students who will be unable to attend class for more than two weeks due to very extreme circumstances. We can discuss these students on a case by case basis. My intent here is not to punish but rather to help focus the minds of the students on the academic nature of the Program. In the event that a student fails to attend class, I would be grateful if you could bring that to my attention, so that I can coordinate with the housing director to discover the nature of the problem.

We all wish to ensure that our students do the very best that they can do. At the same time, there is a tendency in very small classes for the grade distributions to drift up. While such a drift helps an individual student in the short run, it is not beneficial in the longer run for the body of students. Again motivated by the Colorado Challenge, I am asking that there be a uniformity of grading standards over all our courses. Each of us has had the class that was just outstanding. We have also had the class that was the reverse. But in the main, there is a distribution of abilities across our students; some are great, some less so. I am asking that we organize our courses such that we have a B- average. Rather than impose an average *ex post*, we each need to think about our grading policies *ex ante* so that our grading structures are in line with the intended outcome.

The ability to think and write analytically is a skill that many incoming freshmen lack. They do not have the background. Understanding the difference between description and argument is essential for all of our disciplines. The Core faculty and those teaching in the United States context plan to use the first ten days of the term on a common reading which will be sent to Sewall students prior to the beginning of the semester focusing on methodology and argument. All faculty might want to consider using the first few days of the semester to discuss the nature of methodology and analysis in your particular disciplines. We are also recommending that students purchase *Writing Analytically* by David Rosenwasser and Jill Stephens to keep as a reference guide for their college years. I have also ordered desk copies for any faculty who is interested. Please ask Martha Shernick for a copy.

I look forward to meeting each of you and working with you during this upcoming academic year. Thank you in advance for all your support to the Sewall RAP both in the past and in the future.

Yours

Ann Carlos

Ann M. Carlos
Professor of Economics
Director, Sewall RAP
ATTACHMENT 6

SEWALL RAP DIVERSITY REPORT:
EMAIL EXCHANGE
-----Original Message-----
From: Ann M. Carlos [mailto:Ann.Carlos@colorado.edu]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2006 3:42 PM
To: Philip.Mitchell@colorado.edu
Cc: 'Sewall Residential Academic Program'
Subject: Diversity Plan

Dear Phil,

I have looked at the material you gave me and am concerned. The Campus diversity plan for Sewall is merely what is currently listed on the diversity office web site. It was posted in 2004. As Diversity officer, it is your job to ensure that the plan is updated annually, along with outcomes and assessments of each goal as has been undertaken by Sewall in academic year 2005/05. Giving me a printout of what is on line is not acceptable.

It also is very clear that you did not even bother to proofread and change the Program Overview. I do not accept such carelessness from my students and I certainly do not expect it from faculty members.

Please provide me with material that is both updated and corrected.

Ann

Ann M. Carlos
Professor, Director, Sewall RAP
Department of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80304
Ann M. Carlos
Professor
Department of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80304

----- Forwarded message from Phil Mitchell <mitchelp@spot.colorado.edu> -----
Date: Wed, 27 Sep 2006 18:16:24 -0600
From: Phil Mitchell <mitchelp@spot.colorado.edu>
Reply-To: Phil Mitchell <mitchelp@spot.colorado.edu>
Subject: RE: Diversity Plan
To: "Ann M. Carlos" <Ann.Carlos@colorado.edu>

I understand. I will continue as Diversity Officer.

-----Original Message-----
From: Ann M. Carlos [mailto:Ann.Carlos@colorado.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, September 27, 2006 2:49 PM
To: Philip.Mitchell@colorado.edu
Cc: Martha Shernick; Ruth Helm
Subject: Diversity Plan

Dear Phil,

Good to talk to you the other day. First, I just want to confirm what we had agreed upon. As the Diversity Officer for Sewall for the academic year 2005/06, you will provide me with a report for that year and how you will amend the Sewall on-line plan. I can expect this by October 13.

I realize that you told me that you did not want to be diversity officer for the current academic year. As I said, you do have to provide service to the Program as part of your contractual agreement. I have discussed the matter with Professor Helm and we cannot come up with a different service assignment at this point. There are no other faculty who can take over this position. Thus, while I realize that it is not what you want, you will have to be the Diversity Officer for the current year. We can discuss plans for this year, once the report and update for last year is in.

I know that you have lunch in the Sewall Dining Room. I appreciate that this is a benefit to the students, but I do not see it as a specialized service role. Indeed, as you are aware, this year, there will be a rotation of faculty through the dining room at lunch time as we get the lunch voucher program up and running.

Looking forward to the report.

Yours
Ann

Ann M. Carlos
Professor
Department of Economics
Dear Phil,

Thank you for revising the diversity plan. I received a call yesteday from Regent Hall asking who was our diversity officer and where was our update. I told the person that you had sent it to me for review and I had not been able to get to it yet.

I went over it this morning and would like you to make a few minor changes. Then you can submit it to Regent Hall.
Could you also copy myself and Martha in so that we have the updated copy?

Changes:

Section 1.B3  This needs to be changed to say that all students take their US context core at Sewall and that many of them elect to do this with courses on the American West.

Section 1. B5  You need to say that many of our students go on to do Study Abroad. None of our current students do the program as they are all first year students.

Section 2. A6  Did you meet with MEP in October? If so change the wording.

The rest is fine.

Thanks Ann
--
Ann M. Carlos
Professor
Department of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80304

Quoting Phil Mitchell <micaiahministries@comcast.net>:

> Ann,
> 
> Attached is the revised Diversity Plan.
> 
> Phil
> 
>
Phil,

I don't know who in Regent Hall is responsible. You will have to call and find out.

Thanks
Ann

--
Ann M. Carlos
Professor
Department of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80304

Quoting Phil Mitchell <micaiahministries@comcast.net>:

> Ann,
> I have attached the Diversity Plan with the revisions you
> recommended. Do I send it to Mary Ann Sergeant?
> Phil
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Ann M. Carlos [mailto:Ann.Carlos@colorado.edu]
> Sent: Wednesday, November 01, 2006 11:17 AM
> To: Phil Mitchell
> Cc: martha.shernick@colorado.edu
> Subject: Re: Diversity Plan Revision
> Dear Phil,
>
> Thank you for revising the diversity plan. I received a call yesterday
> from Regent Hall asking who was our diversity officer and where was
> our update. I told the person that you had sent it to me for review
> and I had not been able to get to it yet.
>
> I went over it this morning and would like you to make a few minor
> changes. Then you can submit it to Regent Hall.
> Could you also copy myself and Martha in so that we have the updated
> copy?
>
> Changes:
>
> Section 1.B3 This needs to be changed to say that all students take
> their US context core at Sewall and that many of them elect to do this
> with courses on the American West.

> Section 1. B5 You need to say that many of our students go on to do
> Study Abroad. None of our current students do the program as they are
> all first year students.

> Section 2. A6 Did you meet with MBP in October? If so change the
> wording.

> The rest is fine.
Thanks Ann
---
Ann M. Carlos
Professor
Department of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80304

Quoting Phil Mitchell <micaiahministries@comcast.net>:

> Ann,
> > Attached is the revised Diversity Plan.
> >
> Phil
> 
>
University of Colorado at Boulder

Office of Diversity and Equity
206 Regent Administrative Center
18 UCB
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0018
303-735-1332
Fax: 303-735-2425
www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity

November 17, 2006

Re: Sewall Residential Academic Program Diversity Plan Progress Report

Dear Phil:

I want to acknowledge the Sewall RAP’s commitment to diversity and efforts to develop a more welcoming climate. The Residential Academic Programs are an important component of infusing diversity in the education of our undergraduate freshmen. Continuous input from the RAPs about success of strategies to provide students with knowledge that will assist them in being prepared for their role in a global society will help us to develop and improve the best possible strategies. In future progress reports, please give more specifics about your strategies and their results.

It is clear that Sewall is very dedicated to creating an inclusive and supportive environment. Your efforts to encourage discussion of diversity issues in classes, faculty meetings and informal conversations are commendable. The diversity officer sounds like a great resource for your underrepresented students and your program. Sewall does a good job infusing diversity into the curriculum and involving families of students in Sewall activites. Your diversity plan mentioned working with RA’s to brainstorm new ways of fostering diversity – has this led to any new initiatives? We’re always interested to hear what is working and what is not.

Increasing diversity among undergraduate student enrollment is a goal for all units. Sewall has implemented some commendable recruitment strategies, including community outreach and partnerships with the MEP and MASP programs. Collaborating with these and other CU-LEAD Alliance programs may help you develop additional initiatives to assist in increasing the number of diverse students who choose to participate in Sewall. Also, the Admissions Office may have new ideas on recruiting strategies. We encourage you to continue pursuing your goal of being involved in summer bridge programs on campus. As you know, many students choose to be in a RAP so they will have a community and not feel alone. With this in mind, our diversity efforts should be focused on trying create a critical mass of diverse students in order to ensure that these students will not feel isolated.

Sewall shows great success in the recruitment and retention of faculty from diverse backgrounds. Your continued encouragement to provide your outstanding faculty with professional development opportunities as well as increasingly diverse classrooms will also undoubtedly help maintain excellent retention levels. It is important to remember that it is not only up to the diverse faculty members to educate on the campus diversity issues – it is up to all of us.

No matter how good the climate and environment are in unit, we can always improve. We are asking all units to really dig deep to identify the basic causes of dissent and climate issues for students, faculty and staff, and then to try to determine what types of initiatives might help to alleviate these very complex problem. Feedback systems include student focus groups, interviews or surveys. Information from students and from employees about how to improve the unit’s climate is important to obtain. Obtaining information from faculty/staff is more challenging as the employee who attempts to obtain the feedback must have the trust of the faculty and staff in order to be willing to share information about climate issues. For your reference, sample climate surveys are posted to www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/plans.html#four.

Mandatory diversity training has been approved for all employees, faculty and staff. We are asking all diversity committees to ensure that all employees in their units participate in at least one diversity training each year. At the
end of each academic year, we will ask for a report documenting each employee’s attendance. A campus-wide committee that is obtaining input from both faculty and staff is providing recommendations to the Chancellor and Provost for the most effective training program. Some units will choose to provide training specific to the needs of the units, while others may ask all faculty and staff to participate in a diversity training of their choice. Many training and education options are already available and can be found at [www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/training.html](http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/training.html). For additional opportunities throughout the year, stay posted to the News and Announcements section of [www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/news.html](http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/news.html) or on the Diversity News Channel of CUConnect, as well as our newsletter that comes out once each semester.

We also ask that all diversity committees provide us at the start of each academic year with the names, contact numbers and e-mail addresses of their diversity chair and their committee members. Committees should be representative of the unit, including a faculty member, staff member, an undergraduate student and a graduate student. Please email this information to Amanda.McKeef@Colorado.edu.

Thank you for your efforts towards diversity.

Sincerely,

Christine Yoshinaga-Itano, Ph.D.
Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Equity

Sent by:
MaryAnn Sergeant
Projects Manager and Program Coordinator
Office of Diversity and Equity and CU-LEAD Alliance
CB 18, (303) 492-0680
Boulder, CO 80309
[www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity](http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity)

To learn more about the CU-LEAD Alliance or how to support CU-LEAD scholars, please visit: [http/www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/lead.html](http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/lead.html)
ATTACHMENT 7

MITCHELL'S REAPPOINTMENT FILE:
EMAIL EXCHANGE
Dear Phil,

As we discussed in October, I do have budget problems that makes it difficult for me to re-roster you in the program. However, I would still like to do a full re-appointment file for all the currently rostered faculty. Such files provide a teaching and service review for current instructors which form the basis for future decisions, independent of budget.

If you do not want to continue with this process, please advise me as soon as possible.

Ann
--
Ann M. Carlos
Professor
Department of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80304

Quoting Sewall Residential Academic Program
<SRAP@colorado.edu>:

> Does this apply to me in any way?
>
> Phil

> The Dean's office has advised me that the re-appointment files must be submitted by Feb 15. I just wanted to check that the proper materials are in each of your files. If you have not done so, please submit a teaching and service statement; copies of current and previous syllabi; any letters that you might have received from current and prior students commenting on the courses, you or the program; any complete fqc forms with comments that you wish to (this is voluntary); and any other documentation that you think important and relevant.
>
> Thanks
> Ann
ATTACHMENT 8

ANN CARLOS'S LETTER TO DEAN GLEESON
AND DEAN GLEESON'S RESPONSE
Dear Dean Gleeson,

As the current director of the Sewall Residential Academic Program, this letter constitutes my evaluation and recommendation of non-renewal for Dr. Philip Mitchell. In summary, my decision is based on two considerations: first, issues of academic rigor based on multiple measures of teaching; and second, the financial position of the Sewall budget. It is with regret that I recommend that Dr. Mitchell’s contract with the Sewall Residential Academic Program not be renewed.

**Issues of Academic Rigor**

Dr. Mitchell has taught a range of history courses for the Sewall Residential Academic Program. These include but are not limited to HIST 1010 and 1020 - Western Civilization 1 and 2; HIST 1015 and 1025 - History of the US to 1865 and since 1865; HIST 2180 - History of Christianity from the 16th century. This is an impressive portfolio of courses. As an instructor, Dr. Mitchell is extremely charismatic and the students respond to him on an individual level. Dr. Mitchell works very hard to get to know his students. Indeed each semester he invites the students to have lunch with him in the Sewall dining hall after class. On occasion, he invites other members of the academy to lunch with him and the students. This is clearly a great opportunity for students to relate to an instructor on a level separate from the classroom. Dr. Mitchell is to be applauded for this. Student ratings of Dr. Mitchell’s classes are almost uniformly A. The students see him as an outstanding instructor and by this metric he most certainly is.

However, student FCQs are only one measure of teaching. Cause for serious concern emerges from the other measures of teaching. Five peer reviews are contained in his file. There are four reviews by senior members of the history department dated from October 2002 to October 2006. There is also a peer review by me of each of the two classes taught by Dr. Mitchell for the Sewall Program this current semester, Spring 2007. Each of these reviews notes, as I do above, the strong rapport between Dr. Mitchell and his students. However, as I elaborate in my peer review included in the file, I found the quips and jocularity to be, on occasion, somewhat too familiar.

The five peer reviews contained in this file are all detailed and lengthy. Recurring themes emerge from these reviews which raise questions of academic rigor concerning Dr. Mitchell’s courses. The first theme concerns the structure of the course syllabi and their inadequacy. The syllabus is the first point of contact between the instructor, the course and the students. As Sharon Rubin writes in *Professor, Students, and the Syllabus* (FTEP (Faculty Teaching Excellence
Program), Memo to Faculty) "students should be able to find out what they will know by the end of the course, and also what they will be able to do better afterwards than before" (p.1). Dr. Mitchell’s syllabi are extremely spare in this regard. Dr. Mitchell’s syllabi discuss the nature of the course in only the broadest terms. For example, the syllabus for HIST 2180 says that the course will 'consider a number of the great issues and controversies in the History of Christianity.' One might indeed expect that a course on the History of Christianity would cover the great issues, but one would also expect there to be some discussion of exactly what these issues are. This syllabus merely give a list of what chapter to read for what date. There is no guidance to the student as to why he or she is reading this chapter. What questions should she or he have in mind when reading? What might Dr. Mitchell be expecting the student to gain from this chapter? There is also a lack of readings ancillary to the textbooks. The objective in a college-level course is guide the students towards a greater understanding of how to think critically and analytically about the subject. These particular syllabi provide the student with little guidance about the context of the course or the issues to be considered.

A second concern has to do with the evaluation of students in his courses. Although this is mentioned in passing in the previous peer reviews, it is of major concern to me. In a letter to the Sewall faculty dated June 14, 2006, I laid out my objectives for the Sewall Residential Academic Program. These objectives were emerged from a series of conversations with the core faculty in the program and are based on what we consider to be vital for the continued academic success of the students in the program. At the center stands a programmatic focus on analytical reading and writing. All faculty were asked both in this letter and at a subsequent faculty meeting to incorporate the writing textbook, Writing Analytically, in their courses and to ensure that there "be an extensive written component for all assessment." Dr. Mitchell has completely ignored my request on both of these issues. There is no mention of Writing Analytically anywhere on his syllabi and the assessment does not include extensive graded written work. Student evaluation is based on daily true/false quizzes and a final term paper. Although the syllabi mention that there might be short papers assigned from time to time, no point scheme is given for these papers nor is there any mention of how many and what format. In essence this means that the students receive no feedback on written materials during the course of the semester. Not only do these assessments not meet the standards of evaluation that I set for the Sewall program and which are being met by all other faculty, but the overall vagueness of the syllabi is in stark contrast to College expectations for clarity in methods and conditions of assessment.

A third and the most serious theme that emerges from all of the peer evaluations concerns the lectures themselves. In both of the classes that I attended and evident from all but one of the other classes reviews, the class was structured around (a daily) true/false quiz. As I discuss in detail in my peer review(s), the classes began with Dr. Mitchell telling the students to take out a piece of paper. There was no discussion of prior material, nor of what issues would be discussed in these particular classes. Rather the students were presented with a series of statements and they had to note whether these were true or false according to the author of the chosen textbook chapter read. The procedure is described in detail in my peer review in this file. Having read the statements Dr. Mitchell then proceeded to have the students 'grade' the quiz. He used the answers to elaborate on the facts of the statements as presented by the author of the particular textbook. This is very problematic. Although the students certainly 'learn' facts about the subject matter being discussed,
the material is completely disjointed. There is no narrative framework, no overarching context, nor any analytical structure. History at the college level is not a disjointed set of facts. As is stated in the College’s explanation of the Historical Context, history is about learning “to analyze subjects in their context, that is, to investigate both the processes and the meanings of change.” (Catalog 2006-07, Historical Context, p.67). This was not happening in either of the two classes that I visited. These concerns are not due to disciplinary differences between my area of expertise and that of Dr. Mitchell. I teach economic history courses and graduate courses cross-listed with the History Department. My concerns regarding the nature of the lectures and the lack of narrative or analytical structure are also present in the peer reviews conducted over the past four years by senior members of the Department of History.

As the Director of the Sewall program, I am very concerned with what would appear to be a pattern of behavior. Dr. Mitchell appears to have shown a complete disregard for the issues raised in prior peer reviews, all of which were conducted by full professors in the Department of History noted for their own scholarship and teaching. My evaluation of the two classes that I visited in January 2007 raises the same issues first raised in October 2002. As mentioned above, the syllabi for Dr. Mitchell’s courses completely ignore my stated requests concerning the nature of pedagogy in the small liberal arts setting. Dr. Mitchell not only received my letter of June 14th but also attended a faculty meeting in August 2006 when I discussed my direction and requirements for the Program.

Financial Position

In order to understand the financial issues, I need to provide you with some background. I took over formally as the Director of the Sewall Academic Program in summer 2006 and in coming to grips with the budget situation, I found that there were two instructors rostered in the Sewall program who did not teach full time for the program. Dr. Mitchell is one of these instructors. Dr. Mitchell is currently teaching three courses a year for Sewall, yet receives 100% salary from the Sewall budget. The Sewall Program, in turn, is refunded at the standard honorarium rate for the three courses taught outside the program. In budget terms, this means that the Sewall Program is currently subsidizing his teaching of courses in the History Department at the rate of $2000 per course which is the difference between Phil’s pro-rated salary and the honorarium salary paid to an honorarium instructor in the History. In addition, as a rostered staff member in the Sewall program, Dr. Mitchell’s annual merit increase must be completely self-funded from the Sewall instructional budget. Unfortunately, the current budget situation at Sewall does not allow this situation to continue. Not only is the revenue stream for the Program flat at best while expenditures rise, but expenditures might be greater than revenues in this academic year. As the fiscally responsible agent for the Program, I cannot knowingly allow the program to run in deficit. In addition, I do not believe it justifiable to use instructional moneys paid by Sewall students as part of their housing to subsidize instruction in other College departments. As a result I can no longer roster Dr. Mitchell within the Sewall Residential Academic Program.

This is a difficult decision to make. As the incoming Director it took me some weeks to understand how the program operated both academically and fiscally. As soon as I realized that there was a budget issue pertaining to the rather unusual rostering structure of two instructors, I made appointments to discuss the matter with each of them. I met with Dr. Mitchell on October 18, 2006
and the other instructor on October 25, 2006. In the course of my meeting with each of them, I discussed the budgetary problem at Sewall and the implications of my financial situation for their contract renewal at the end of the academic year 2006/07. I told each instructor that it was highly unlikely that I would be able to renew his contract. Later having spoken with members of the budget office in Arts and Sciences, Dr. Mitchell dropped by my office to say that he understood the situation. In the course of that October 18th meeting with Dr. Mitchell, I also discussed the negative peer review by Professor Kenney for the Department of History. I told Dr. Mitchell at that time that I would be visiting his classes to conduct my own peer review.

Although I had met with Dr. Mitchell to appraise him of the budget situation at Sewall with respect to his unusual rostering, I included him in my review of all rostered Sewall faculty during the first three weeks of Spring semester, 2007. Dr. Mitchell wrote to ask if my request for information included him. I replied that such a review would “provide a teaching review … which would form the basis for future decisions, independent of budget.” Dr. Mitchell replied that “I would like to continue the process.” (25th January 2007) However, Dr. Mitchell failed to provide me a current *curriculum vitae*, a teaching and service statement nor any other supplementary teaching materials, all of which I received from all other faculty. He emailed a *curriculum vitae* on 12th February, 2007.

In summary, it is with regret that I am informing you that I will not be renewing Dr. Mitchell’s contract with the Sewall Program after the end of the current semester, Spring 2007. This semester is therefore a terminal semester for Dr. Mitchell.

Yours

[Signature]

Ann M. Carlos
Professor of Economics
Director, Sewall Residential Academic Program
February 27, 2007

Professor Ann Carlos, Director
Sewall Residential Academic Program
UCB 353
Boulder

Dear Ann,

I am in receipt of your February 25, 2007 letter to me in which you summarize your recommendation not to renew Dr. Phillip Mitchell as an instructor in Sewall at the end of his current appointment.

Your explanation focuses on concerns that insufficient attention has been paid to the academic rigor found in Dr. Mitchell’s courses. You describe dissatisfaction in the areas of syllabus construction, grading, lack of emphasis on student writing, lack of a narrative or analytical structure to lectures, and failure to bring professional expertise to the lecture experience through incorporation of ancillary reading or other materials. These same concerns appear in reviews of Dr. Mitchell’s teaching by other faculty members dating back to 2002, suggesting that Dr. Mitchell is firmly committed to his style of instruction, but that this style is in conflict with the expectations of Sewall, the History Department, and indeed the rest of the College. Our College’s attention to its instructional standards and goals as articulated in our Colorado Challenge initiative, and the interests of the Regents and the public in academic rigor more generally, have made actions to enhance our undergraduate instruction more important and timely. I appreciate your commitment to those goals within Sewall, even in this difficult case. Secondarily, you cite your responsibility to operate within your budget and that the budget is strained by continuation of this appointment.

I have read the reappointment dossier that you have prepared, including the class reviews written earlier by other senior faculty members. I concur with your judgment in this case and accept your recommendation. I ask that you notify Dr. Mitchell in writing immediately and attach a copy of your recommendation to me along with a copy of this letter.

Sincerely,

Todd Gleeson
Dean
Dr. Philip Mitchell  
Instructor, Sewall Residential Academic Program  
UCB 353  
Boulder  
CO, 80309  

March 12, 2007  

Dear Dr. Mitchell,  

I write to inform you formally that, with the concurrence of the Dean, Sewall Residential Academic Program will not be extending an offer of reappointment as Instructor to you following the expiration of your current contract. This decision follows a comprehensive review of your teaching relative to the expectations and goals of the Sewall Program and a consideration of the future budgetary limitations. A copy of my recommendation to the Dean, and his response, is attached.

Thank you for your service to the Sewall Program these past years and I wish you the best in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Ann M. Carlos  
Professor of Economics  
Director, Sewall Residential Academic Program
ATTACHMENT 9
MISSING PEER EVALUATION:
EMAIL EXCHANGE
Dear Phil,

After I spoke with you, Martha Shernick and I searched the files. Given the staffing issues in the office over the last two years, the files are not yet in proper order. We did find letters signed by William. I have read them and you are correct that William's review is extremely positive. I have put copies of these letters in your box and I have sent them over to the Dean's office. Unfortunately, William's reviews do not change my assessment relative to the weight of the other reviews in the file and, as I said yesterday, to your unwillingness to comply with the standards of analytical writing set for the program.

Yours
Ann

Ann M. Carlos
Professor
Department of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80304

---- Original message ----
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2007 21:01:40 -0600
>From: "Phil Mitchell" <micaiahministries@comcast.net>
>Subject: Missing Evaluations
>To: "'Ann M. Carlos'" <Ann.Carlos@colorado.edu>
>
>Dear Ann,
>
> I am still mystified as to what
> happened to William Wei's evaluations of my
> teaching. He has evaluated me numerous times over
> the years and those should have been in my
> personnel file. Do you have any idea what might
> have happened to them? I would feel better if you
> at least had a chance to review them.
>
>
>Phil Mitchell
ATTACHMENT 10

EMAIL FROM CAROL MIYAGASHIMA
Don,

I had managed to schedule one class for the fall at CU. I would teach for the Center for Western Civilization and teach their core class, The Western Tradition. Carol Miyagishima in the Chancellor's RAP loves to have me teach for them and was anxious to have me do so. I just received the following email from her. The vindictiveness has reached a new low. I appreciate your comments.

Phil

-----Original Message-----
From: Carol Ellen Miyagishima [mailto:Carol.Miyagishima@Colorado.EDU]
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2007 2:26 PM
To: Philip.Mitchell@Colorado.EDU
Subject: teaching in the fall

Hello Phil, I have some bad news to deliver. It appears that we are unable to extend a teaching contract to you. I regret being the bearer of this news especially to you. Phil you have been a great colleague and we appreciate the support you have given the Chancellor's RAP over the years. Best of wishes to you and your family. Carol
AAUP Colorado State Conference
Statement on the Termination of Phil Mitchell

ATTACHMENT 11
STUDENT LETTERS
Hi,

I was a student in Sr. Mitchell's Western Civilization class in Sewall last semester. I just wanted to say that he was by far my favorite teacher of last semester. He actually found a way to make the students read. He would give quizzes every time we met in class. These quizzes were not hard, but were just enough to see if the kids read. Every student read and participated. He made it fun as well. He would always crack jokes and start interesting discussions. He also tried to get to know all of his students. He would talk to us as much as he could. We would eat lunch together in the cafeteria everyday after class. I believe that Dr. Mitchell works very hard to be the best teacher that he can be. I think, and I also speak for at least my three other close friends that live next to me and with me, that Dr. Mitchell is a great teacher and we wish that we could have had him as a teacher this semester. I hope that my input will be sufficient.

Dominic Seymour
Room 275
Mr. Wei,

I can assure you that Dr. Mitchell is by far one of the best teachers I have ever had. He, of course, has his own opinions and believes (like any professor) that he stresses in the classroom, but he was always open to any argument the students had to give. He taught all other necessary views as well w/o trying to make his students see only his way. He was VERY available to his students as well. You could eat lunch with him any day of the school week right there in Sewall Hall. Mainly, I believe that Mitchell is a great teacher because it is obvious that he cares for his students and enjoys what he is doing. He takes time to get to know his kids and does what he can to help us out. My only complaint would be that sometimes he and some of the other students in my class would go off the subject for lengthy periods from time to time. Don't let that seem like a criticism though. Just because I personally don't enjoy debate and politics and well, talking much in general, doesn't mean that the other students shouldn't get an opportunity to express themselves in the classroom; I am just impatient. :) Anyway, I hope this will help in whatever exactly it is that you are doing.

~JENNIE~
This is a letter pertaining to Professor Philip Mitchell. I took his Western Civilization I class last semester, and I must say, I was thoroughly impressed with his class. Of all the excellent professors I had last semester, he was my favorite. His method of teaching class is very effective, which allows him to cover large amounts of material quickly and clearly. The expectations of his students are high, and most rise to the occasion. He is very accessible to all of his students (he eats lunch in the dorm cafeteria with students nearly every day after class). His method of quizzing students everyday is very effective at ensuring that his students actually read the required material the night before. As stated before, Prof. Mitchell is an excellent teacher and definitely worth of reappointment.

Sincerely,

Phillip McNeal
February 1, 2005

Dear Academic Department,

I was asked to write a letter on behalf of my experience in Professor Mitchell’s classes. During the fall of 2004 I had him for Western Civilization I and this current semester I have him for History of Christianity II, which are both Sewall classes. I have extremely enjoyed taking both of these classes with Professor Mitchell.

I believe that Professor Mitchell has a very unique style of teaching that engages the students, and makes them eager to come to class. His daily quizzes give the students encouragement to read the nightly texts he assigns. Also, the way the class is conducted is very welcoming to get the students participation. He spends the day going over the material from the previous nights homework, stressing what he believes was most important topic for the students to get out of that specific class.

Professor Mitchell is also very interested in getting to know his students. He is one of my only professors that spent time the first week of class to make sure he knew all of our names, where we are from, and what we like to do. He also makes it very easy for his students to get to know his personality and who he is as a teacher. After being in his classes for seven months, it is obvious that he is extremely passionate about what he teaches. He has a desire to pass on his passion of history to the students he teaches every semester. Another strong aspect of having him as a Sewall professor is that he eats lunch in the cafeteria three days a week with his students. This is all in attempts to get to know his students better.

Over all I have absolutely loved having Professor Mitchell. To me, he makes going to such a huge university seem much smaller simply because he wants to get to know you and he wants nothing more than for his students to succeed.

Thank You,

Emily Stone

Emily Stone @ emilystone.com
Austin Arensberg  
636 Arapahoe Unit 8  
Boulder, CO 80302  
(502) 445-7285  
austinarensberg@hotmail.com  

Renée Crétien  
Administrative Program Coordinator  
Sewall Academic Program  
University of Colorado at Boulder  
Sewall Hall, UCB 353  
Boulder, CO 80309  
Phone: 303.492.6004  
Fax: 303.492.3270  

February 1, 2005  

Dear Ms. Crétien,  

I have been asked by you to write a letter reflecting on my experience with Professor Mitchell in class and my opinion of him as a teacher. I am thankful for this opportunity. Two years ago in my sophomore year at CU I took Professor Mitchell’s Modern U.S. Diplomacy class. Since then we have developed a strong friendship and I have nothing but total admiration for the way he conducts his class and the support he has given me through my time at CU.

Let me first begin by explaining that I am a graduating Senior this semester in Environmental Studies and Political Science. I took Mitchell’s course in the fall of 2002 at the time when the debate on the upcoming Iraq War was still in its infancy. Instead of ignoring the most pressing issue of the time Mitchell chose to make it a central element of dialogue in the class. This was not easy as it touched upon many nerves. But I believe it was crucial to the learning experience of a course designed to teach us about U.S. foreign diplomacy. This technique of active engagement is a central feature in Mitchell’s courses and is in my personal opinion the only way a class can become successful for the many participants. Up to that point and not again since have I been in a class with more than 50 people (I believe that particular class seated around 75) where discussion was lively, engaging, not rude, and most importantly equally distributed across political ideologies. In addition it was not just a few students who would routinely say the same things, a student could sense an evolution of viewpoints as the class continued – that is to say that as students became interested in the class material it began to change how they viewed the events we would discuss. That does not mean that students changed their political viewpoints but a sense of academic dialogue began to formulate half way through the semester that facilitated healthy and productive discussion. This again is something I have never seen in any of my classes. All too often class discussion...
involving politics becomes a battle of partisan loud mouths rather than an opportunity to learn from different stances. This class was completely different.

Mitchell was engaging of students in a manner that was not intrusive, when a student had not spoken in a few classes he would pointedly ask them a question in front of the class, but rather than the student cowering in embarrassment they always felt that their view was heard and important both to Mitchell and the class. Not once did Mitchell deride someone for their views or create an environment that stifled them – in fact I believe he would feel that the class simply got more exciting with strong and adamant dissension. Mitchell also remembered every student’s name by the second week – quite a feat in a large class. This was especially important I believe to a sense of personal engagement certain that I felt and that made me want to go and get lunch with him at Sewall but also with other students who sensed that they really were Mitchell’s friend by the end of the semester. There were many times at the end of class when students would stay around to talk with Mitchell about the topics we covered and on more than one occasion I heard people near my seat say “This guy is great” as they smiled and left the class literally thinking about and talking with others about the discussion. One sensed that the real end of class was when the students broke paths with each other four or five minutes later and stopped turning over war in Iraq or the Truman Doctrine.

Mitchell has also written four separate letters of recommendation for me, each on time if not before the time they were due – this despite the fact that I often got them to him very late, in one instance merely one week before it was due. Despite this he was immediately receptive and asked of nothing in return.

Around halfway through the class I began to meet with Mitchell at Sewall for lunch. He was there everyday and he always met me with a smile and a handshake. To this day I stop by once or twice a semester to talk with him. As usual he sits at his table with ten or so students talking about various things. It was at these lunches that I really began to grow a friendship with Mitchell. Although we share starkly different political views I have been incredibly nurtured by his differing concepts and perceptions. At one luncheon two years ago I had the chance to meet a friend of his in his church who runs an orphanage in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. This past summer I got the chance to visit that orphanage while conducting research for a UROP grant in SE Asia. The experience was fantastic and without Mitchell’s guidance it would have been impossible. Recently I was able to have dinner with his family outside of school and it made me realize how lucky I was to have such a good relationship with a professor at such a large university as CU.

I hope that this note is sufficient for your purposes. I would gladly talk on the telephone if you would like that as well. My number is (502) 445-7285, please feel free to call or email austinarensberg@hotmail.com if there is anything you need.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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I am appalled at your effort to fire Professor Phil Mitchell. It seems very interesting to me that freedom of speech only applies to liberal speech. If you go through with this I hope your school gets the bad publicity it deserves and I will do everything in my power to let others know of your bias.

Bridget Skillman
May 2, 2007

To Whom It May Concern,

I have recently learned that Professor Phillip Mitchell, the best professor I have had the good fortune of knowing and learning from will not be given the opportunity to teach at the University of Colorado at Boulder next year. In this information I find great injustice and shame. The shame deservedly rests on those in the administration of UCB who are guilty of committing an egregious injustice upon the student body.

I am in many ways proud to be an honor student at the University of Colorado, but I am ashamed that the institution to which I have invested thousands of dollars and my undergraduate education has committed such a mistake. In my first semester at UCB I was greatly dismayed at the lack of care and adequate instruction that I was getting from my professors. Not one of my professors knew my name or seemed concerned enough to acknowledge me in or out of class. Disappointed in the education I was over-paying for but rarely receiving, I began to question whether or not UCB was the academy for me or anyone else sincerely wishing for a legitimate education.

That changed this year with my enrolling in Professor Mitchell’s honors class. In the few months that I have had the pleasure to take his class I believe I have learned more about history, myself, and the world around me than in the entire fall 2006 semester. For his class alone I have done immeasurably more reading and critical thinking than every other class I have taken combined. In my academic, professional, and athletic history, no single teacher, boss, coach, or professor has held me as accountable or inspired me to better myself as much as Professor Mitchell has. Amazingly, he has done all of this while actually instilling within me a belief that he does care about my academic and personal well-being. He has spent more of time corresponding with me via email and personal meetings than many of my other professors have spent time “teaching” me. It is because of the large investment of work and thought that I have put into his class that I would be more proud of earning a “B” from him than any “A” that I receive in another.

I personally do not agree with all of Professor Mitchell’s personal, professional, and political beliefs, but I have never once felt intimidated to express my beliefs or overtly take issue with his. I cannot make the same claim about some of my other professors and teaching assistants.

As a student and eventual alumnus of the University of Colorado at Boulder I am greatly disappointed in the administration. To prevent him from teaching at this university is not so great a relative disservice to Professor Mitchell as it is to the students, alumnus, boosters, and parents of UCB. I have no doubt that Professor Mitchell will find another job, any school would be lucky to attain his services. Whatever the motive for his firing, it is the students that will suffer from this action.

Sincerely,

Zak Franklin
Zachary.franklin@colorado.edu
303-378-7599
To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Tara Walker, I am sophomore at CU, and I had Professor Mitchell last year in US History Since 1865. Not only do I view Professor Mitchell as an excellent teacher and mentor, but I also have a great respect for his character.

I thoroughly enjoyed and benefited from my experience with Professor Mitchell. The structure of his classroom is what I deem to be a crucial exemplar for an optimal educational setting. Mr. Mitchell teaches by a Socratic method. He engages his students by questioning history and popular thought. Professor Mitchell has a deep concern for his students and he tends to play devils advocate in order to encourage them to think critically. History is a subject of critical analysis. If we learn from the past by not only the documents that record it, but also with careful analysis of how it pertains to the now and the future, humanity as a whole improves.

The quality that I most enjoy of Mr. Mitchell’s character is his respect for opposable opinions. He actually encourages this in the classroom. I often debated with Professor Mitchell in class and actually, we still meet for an occasional coffee to continue discussions. What I like most about the way Professor Mitchell teaches is how he, as objectively as possible, gives the information and allows us, the students, to interpret it. There is no right or wrong opinion when discussing history and current events in his class. It is all discussion among students with a little guidance and encouraged debate from Prof. Mitchell. Discussion based learning is how students retain information. I argue that information that we never apply is never retained.

Perhaps we are merely ignorant if we do not question our own beliefs and we limit our conversations to only those who are in mutual agreement with us. Perhaps we create ignorance by NOT critically thinking about history. If we do not act for humanity and justice in the world, history and well, ...

Living,

Has taught us nothing.

As far as the character and person Mr. Mitchell is, I could speak in his high esteem all day. As a student among thousands, and especially as a freshman last year, it is easy to be lost among the masses. Though I love the University of Colorado and am grateful for the education provided, the size does hinder a feeling of support and community sometimes.

Last January, I lost a close member of my family. I couldn’t show to class and was going through an intensely emotional experience. I am greatly thankful for the concern and offered support from Mr. Mitchell during this time. He made an effort to be accommodating not only as a teacher, but also offered support and checked up on my well being while I went through my grievance. The University of Colorado may have over 30,000 some odd undergraduates, but the quality of the instructors I have experienced here at CU more than compensates.

Professor Mitchell is not only an excellent teacher, but a humanitarian at heart. It is one thing to be taught, and quite another to learn. Professor Mitchell is a quality teacher and a huge asset to this University.

Sincerely,

Tara Walker

Tara.Walker@colorado.edu
ATTACHMENT 12

MITCHELL'S, ZEILER'S, AND BOAG'S SYLLABI
Welcome to Sewall and Western Civilization II! This semester we will study the development of Western culture from its beginning in the Middle East until the Protestant Reformation and the Age of Discovery in the sixteenth century. In this class I have two major objectives. First, we will consider the great issues and controversies in the history of Western culture. Second, I want to acquaint you with many of the major terms, trends, names and events of the Western heritage. It is hoped that through an examination of the principal political, social, religious, cultural and intellectual developments of this epoch, you will not only become acquainted with the roots of Western heritage, but you will also recognize that the civilization of the present is innately connected to the past. I am looking forward to this class and I hope you have a great semester.

TEXTS:

*Here I Stand*, by Roland Bainton

*What If?,* edited by Robert Cowley


*Writing Analytically*, by David Rosenwasser and Jill Stephens

A Spiral-bound Reader of Selected Articles

Primary Readings Selected from Internet Sources, *et al.*

August 28: Introduction
September 1: Why Study Western Civilization?
September 6: *The Torah*, Genesis 1-25
September 8: *What If?,* 1-14; “The Plague that Saved Jerusalem”
September 11: Blackburn, chapters 1-2; Ancient Near East; Primary Source: The Code of Hammurabi
September 13: Blackburn, 3; Primary Source: “The Epic of Gilgamesh”
September 15: *What If?,* 15-36; “The Persians Win at Salamis”
September 18: First Paper Due; Reader: Organized Greek Games
September 20: *What If?,* 37-56; “The Premature Death of Alexander the Great”
September 25: Blackburn, 5: Rome;
September 27: Reader: Women in Roman Society; Primary Source, *Luke*

October 2: Review for Midterm; Primary Source: Selections from *The Aeneid*
October 4: First Midterm Exam
October 6: Blackburn, 6, Byzantine and Islamic Civilizations; Primary Sources, *Justinian’s Code*
October 9: *What If?,* 71-92; “The Dark Ages Made Lighter”
October 11: Blackburn, 7, The Early Middle Ages
October 13: Reader: Augustine; Primary Source, Selections from *The Confessions*
October 16: Reader: Genghis Khan
October 18: *What If?,* 93-106, “The Death that Saved Europe
October 20: Reader: The Black Death
October 23: Reader: Feudal War in Practice
October 25: Primary Sources, *Dante’s Inferno*
October 27: Blackburn, 8, The High Middle Ages
October 30: Midterm Review; Primary Source: Selections from *Summa Theologica*

November 1: Second Midterm Exam
November 3: Blackburn, 9; Social Life During the Renaissance
November 6: Blackburn, 10; The Renaissance and the Age of Discovery
November 8: Reader: Attitudes and Motives on the Eve of the Age of Discovery
November 10: Primary Source; Machiavelli, *The Prince*
November 13: Reader: One Man Alone(Magellan), 223-228, 245-264
November 15: Reader: One Man Alone(Magellan), 264-286
November 17: Reader: The American Conquests; Primary Source, *The Diary of Bernal Diaz*
November 27: Reader: Religion and the Decline of Magic
November 29: Luther, Bainton 1-7; Primary Source, Luther's *95 Theses*

December 1: Blackburn, 11; The Reformation and Subsequent Conflicts
December 4: Final Paper Discussion
December 6: Bainton 8-14; Primary Source, Luther, *An Address to the German Nobility*
December 8: Bainton 15-18
December 11: Bainton, 19-22
December 13: Bainton, 23-29
December 15: Primary Source: Calvin’s *Institutes*

**EVALUATION:**

- the two midterms and a final exam (100 points each)
- two short papers (50 points each)
- final paper (100 points)
- daily quizzes (200 points)

Grading for this course is based on the grading system standardized for all colleges and schools in the university (see the CU-Boulder 2005-6 Course Catalogue, 16).

- According to this system, the grade of C is to be assigned to "competent" or "average" work. "Average" can be understood as merely reproducing on papers and examinations what the student has taken directly from lectures, readings, and supplementary materials, adding little or nothing to it. Answers given may be technically correct, but little more than that, hence "competence."
- The grade of B indicates "good" or "better than average" work. It shows that the student has demonstrated his/her ability to move well beyond repeating received information and toward clear and fully capable application of the skills cited above: comprehension, analysis and interpretation, clear and precise written and oral communication of historical narratives in exams and papers.
- The grade of A is held aside for work that is clearly superior or excellent. The student who gets this grade has advanced to a level where she or he challenges our conventional understanding of the past through research, critique, sound and imaginative readings of sources, followed by clear and evidence-based articulation of their ideas.

**Attendance:** Attendance is taken for each class period. Since regular quizzes are an important component in your grade absences will harm your performance. Classroom discussion and lectures will be the basis of a number of exam questions. If you miss a class you are responsible for getting missed notes from classmates. If you miss an exam you will not be allowed to make it up without good reasons for the absence as judged by the instructor. Missed quizzes cannot be made up. Six absences will result in failure in the class.

**Classroom Decorum:** Please turn off pagers and cell phones. Cell phones must be put away. Please: No Texting! Please be respectful to both instructor and students and speak graciously, especially to those with whom you disagree.
HISTORY 1025: U.S. History Since 1865
Muenzinger E050
MWF 1:00-1:50

Professor Tom Zeiler
Office hours: MW 2-3, Hellems 203
E-mail: thomas.zeiler@colorado.edu
Website: http://spot.colorado.edu/~zeilert/

Study Questions I
Study Questions II
Study Questions III
Study Questions IV

Where do you fit into history? Do individuals like you matter in this country, or do only the rich and powerful? Does voting matter? Does your generation matter? Do you believe in the American Dream? What is it? Can you explain the tragedy of 9/11? Has our nation gotten better over time, or worse? Are you a conservative or liberal? Those late-night dorm talks or family dinner-time conversations about America always seem to draw on history, but do you participate in them? Or do you shrink from discussion because you lack historical knowledge and interpretations?

This course surveys U.S. history since the Civil War to give you information and interpretations so that you can try to answer these questions. The course surveys that history, and it is hoped that all of you – whether you are History majors or not – will learn something about yourselves, the present, and the future by studying the past.

You will be asked to form your own judgments from lectures, discussions, and the readings by analyzing history as a praiser or as a critic. Forming and expressing your own opinion is critical to doing well in this class.

**PRAISER:** Believes that since 1865, Americans have enjoyed a progressively better life. Government has responded to problems, and though many still exist, we can solve them if we stay on the same course as the past. Reforms have brought benefits to Americans, even the down and out. Those who cannot make it in America, a nation of opportunity, can only blame themselves. Individuals matter. In foreign policy, the United States has been a defender of the oppressed abroad.

**CRITIC:** Believes that since 1865, many Americans have endured unnecessary hardship. Government -controlled by the rich and majority white males - has responded insufficiently to help all Americans. Problems still remain, some loom larger. Those struggling in the nation are victims of a power elite and a structure of poverty, prejudice, and discrimination. Institutions matter. America has been an aggressive imperial power that has caused problems overseas.

There are no prerequisites for this class.

**Please note the following:**

If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit to me a letter from Disability Services (DS) early in the semester so that your needs may be addressed. DS determines accommodations based on documented disabilities (303) 492-8671, Willard 322,

http://spot.colorado.edu/~zeilert/1025-2004.htm
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If you will have a conflict between religious observance dates and course examinations or assignments, please let your TA and me know at least two weeks in advance. We will make lecture notes available and also change exam dates.

CU has an Honor Code. See http://www.colorado.edu/academics/honorcode. It applies to all aspects of this course. In particular, do not copy another student's work. Plagiarism also will not be tolerated. This course adopts the following definition of plagiarism: to steal and use the ideas or writings of another as one's own; to take passages or ideas from another and use them as one's own. Any source you use for your written work must be cited, in full and in an accepted style (see the Chicago Manual of Style). **Violations will result in automatic failure of the course.**

**GRADING:** Your grade will be determined by four (4) exams and the recitation grade.

**LOCATION:** The FIRST EXAM will be in class; the next two will be in recitation; the Final Exam will be in class.

**ALL EXAMS ARE REQUIRED, AND MUST BE TAKEN ON THE DAY ASSIGNED.** They are worth 10% for the first one, 15% for the second, 20% for the third, and 25% for the Final Exam.

**Failure to hand in an exam will result in failure of the entire course.**

Exams will involve short-answer identifications and an essay. Each of the three midterm exams will cover material in the lectures and readings that precede it; the Final will have identifications drawn from the final quarter of the course but the essay will be COMPREHENSIVE, covering the entire course.

The Recitation grade, which includes participation, attendance, and written work in the recitation section, is worth 30%. **RECITATIONS ARE REQUIRED.**

**Attendance is required for recitations.** You are allowed to miss one recitation. After that, you will receive an F (a 0) for the entire recitation grade.

**READINGS** (readings cited in assignments by title, EXCEPT for Roark textbook)


Akira Iriye, *Pearl Harbor and the Coming of the Pacific War* (1999)


**LECTURES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

***Reading assignments are due on the day they are listed.***

Jan 12 Introduction.
Jan 14 Westward Ho. Roark, pp. 413-428.

http://spot.colorado.edu/~zeilert/1025-2004.htm

7/3/2007
Jan 16   RECITATION

Jan 19   **MLK Holiday**; no class
Jan 21   Race and Reconstruction. Roark, chp. 16.
Jan 23   RECITATION

Jan 26   Captains of Industry? Roark, pp. 443-453; start *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall*
Jan 28   Or Robber Barons? Roark, pp. 454-465; Read *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall*
Jan 30   RECITATION

Feb 2    Labor market. Roark, pp. 429-440; chp. 19; Read *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall.*
Feb 4    Huddled masses. Finish *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall*
Feb 6    RECITATION

Feb 11   **FIRST EXAM IN OUR LECTURE CLASSROOM.**
Feb 13   RECITATION

Feb 20   RECITATION

Feb 27   RECITATION

Mar 5    RECITATION

Mar 12   **SECOND EXAM in Recitation**

Mar 19   RECITATION

Mar 22-26 **SPRING BREAK**

Mar 29   Red Scare. Roark, pp. 688-690; *Dean Rusk*, chps. 3-6.
Mar 31   Vietnam. Roark, pp. 755-769; *Dean Rusk*, chps. 7-10, Conclusion.
Apr 2    RECITATION

Apr 7    Civil rights. Roark, pp. 716-719.
Apr 9    RECITATION

Apr 12   Black power. Roark, pp. 723-727; 731-743.
Apr 16   **THIRD EXAM in Recitation.**

http://spot.colorado.edu/~zeilert/1025-2004.htm
Apr 23  RECITATION
Apr 30  America in a global age. Roark, pp. 809, 823-830.
Apr 30  RECITATION

May 5 (Wednesday)  **FINAL EXAM** IN OUR LECTURE CLASSROOM
                   1:30-4:00 P.M.
HISTORY 5106: Colloquium in United States History since 1865
Spring 2007
Professor Peter Boag
Office: Hellem 203
Hours:
email: boag@colorado.edu

PROFESSOR'S INFORMATION: Office is Hellem 203. The best way to contact me is during my office hours in
if not possible, during office hours by telephone. I do not always get e-mail and respond to it in a timely fashion and i
awhile to respond to messages left on voice mail. If there is an emergency, however, do leave a voice mail if I am not
hours are TBA and by appointment.

COURSE DESCRIPTION: Regardless of the historical subfield of your particular interest, as graduate students of
history, it is imperative that you familiarize yourself with the historiography of this broader field. You will be evaluat
your comprehensive examinations, you will find it essential in writing your theses and dissertations, and, should you p
traditional academic career, you will no doubt teach the modern American history survey. This graduate-level course, is designed to introduce you to the sweeping contours of the historiography of modern America (since 1865) while als examining some of the major events that have shaped the United States since the latter part of the nineteenth century.

ASSIGNMENTS: Attendance and participation in weekly discussions are requisite for successful completion of the
Writing assignments are two (2) historiography papers (roughly 15 pages each, due at roughly the mid-term and the e
semester), and short papers for most weeks (topics vary and will be announced in class). Papers should be typed, dou
paginated, and use standard margins and fonts. Where appropriate, endnote or footnote citations should be used.

(1) Historiography paper number 1: due at the beginning of class on March 14.
(2) Historiography paper number 2: due in my departmental mailbox on May 4 by 3:00 pm.
(3) Short papers: will be assigned periodically through the semester and will vary in nature. They will be based on the
topic of the book considered that particular week (may include additional article-length reading or consideration o
reviews) and will be due during class for which they are assigned.

GRADING: Grading will be based on your participation in weekly discussions and on your papers. The breakdown i
follows:
Participation: 28%
Historiography Paper no. 1: 28%
Critical Thought Paper no. 2: 28%
Short papers: 16%

WEEKLY SCHEDULE*:
1. January 17: Eric Foner, A Short History of Reconstruction
2. January 24: Kirsten Hogansen, Fighting for American Manhood
3. January 31: Kathy Peiss, Cheap Amusements
4. February 7: Shelton Stromquist, Reinventing the People
5. February 14: George Chauncey, Gay New York
6. February 21: Jennifer D. Keene, Doughboys, the Great War, and the Remaking of America
7. February 28: Donald Worster, Dust Bowl
8. March 7: David Kennedy, The American People in the Great Depression
9. March 14: no readings – first historiography paper due
10. March 21: Roger Lotchin, The Bad City in the Good War
March 28: Spring Break
11. April 4: Valerie Matsumoto, Farming the Home Place
12. April 11: Elaine Tyler May, Homeward Bound
12. April 18: Beth Bailey, Sex in the Heartland
13. April 25: Clayborne Carson, In Struggle
14. May 2: Rick Perlstein, Before the Storm
May 4: second historiography paper due

*Course books assigned are available for purchase at the University of Colorado at Boulder Bookstore located in the I

PARTICIPATION/ILLNESS/EMERGENCIES: Attendance and participation are a necessary part of this course. 1

http://www.colorado.edu/history/boag/HIST%205106.html
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are necessary in order for the class to work. Therefore, attendance and participation constitute a significant portion of grade. If you are ill or have an emergency that interferes with class, you must leave a message (in advance if possible) that papers and assignments are not accepted, unless there is an emergency or an illness. In either case, you must have written evidence documenting the emergency and, in the case of an illness, from a physician.

**DEADLINES FOR REGISTERING, DROPPING, ETC.:** There are many deadlines throughout the early part of the quarter regarding your relationship to this course, including, but not limited to, adding and dropping. It is your responsibility to familiarize yourself with these. Check the Registration Handbook!

**DISABILITY STATEMENT:** If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit to me a letter from Disability Services (DS) early in the semester so that your needs may be addressed. DS determines accommodations for documented disabilities (303-492-8671, Willard 322; http://www.colorado.edu/disabilityservices/index.html).

**RELIgIOUS OBSERVANCE:** Every effort shall be made to reasonably and fairly deal with students who, because of religious obligations, have conflicts with scheduled exams, assignments or required attendance. Students must notify the instructor of anticipated conflicts within the first couple weeks of the semester so that there is adequate time to make necessary arrangements.

**CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR:** CU-Boulder’s Classroom Behavior Policy may be reviewed by clicking here. Student and faculty each take responsibility for maintaining an appropriate learning environment. Students who fail to adhere to the behavioral standards may be subject to discipline. Professional courtesy and sensitivity are especially important when individuals and topics dealing with differences of race, culture, religion, politics, sexual orientation, gender variance, and nationalities.

**HONOR CODE:** CU-Boulder has an established honor code which students will be held to. According to the CU-Boulder Honor Code, "An honor code establishes a fundamental social contract within which the university community agrees to live. This contract relies on the conviction that the personal and academic integrity of each individual member strengthens the community as a whole and improves the quality of life for the entire academic community. The presence of an honor code is vital to the Building Community Campaign, which is striving to develop a welcoming and supportive climate in which all people are respected and free to express differing ideals and opinions. A sense of mutual trust is critical to achieving such a community. The honor system works by receiving the support and participation of all members of the university community. Each member of the university community pledges to personally uphold the values of the honor code, though hearings are held for alleged student violations only in respect to non-academic sanctions." You should familiarize yourself with the CU-Boulder Honor Code at: http://www.colorado.edu/policies/honor.html

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT:** The University of Colorado Policy on Sexual Harassment states that sexual harassment is unwelcome sexual attention. It can involve intimidation, threats, coercion, or promises or create an environment that is offensive. Harassment may occur between members of the same or opposite gender and between any combination of persons in the campus community: students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Harassment can occur anywhere on campus, including classroom, the workplace, or a residence hall. The Office of Discrimination and Harassment may be contacted at 303-492-5555. For more information on sexual harassment at CU-Boulder, click here.

http://www.colorado.edu/history/boag/HIST%205106.html
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CHRISTIAN KOPFF'S LETTER TO DEAN GLEESON
AND DEAN GLEESON'S RESPONSE
July 30, 2007

Dean Todd Gleeson
College of Arts & Sciences
University of Colorado
Boulder CO 80309

Dear Dean Gleeson,

In spring 2007 the A&S Curriculum Committee approved the introductory course for the Center for Western Civilization, “Western Traditions.” Carol Ellen Miyagishima, director of the Williams Village RAP asked Senior Instructor Phil Mitchell, who had helped develop the course, to teach two sections there. On July 11 Carol e-mailed Phil Mitchell to say that he had been denied permission to teach these two sections. I am writing to ask you to rescind this decision for at least one year.

1. Plans are far advanced for teaching this course, which strengthens the liberal arts teaching at Williams Village and could allow the Certificate in the Foundations of Western Civilization to move forward more rapidly, should it be approved this Fall.

2. Teaching evaluations of faculty are supposed to be based on at least three factors, one of which may be FCQs. (1) Phil Mitchell’s FCQs have been among the best in the College of Arts and Sciences for over a decade. (2) He is the winner of a SOAR award, the most prestigious teaching award for undergraduate education. (You and I probably agree on this.) (3) He has received very favorable evaluations from Professor William Wei, who is known as an excellent teacher, scholar and administrator (of the Sewall Hall RAP). The negative evaluations in Phil’s dossier consist of versions of what appears to be the same letter, signed by faculty who are less distinguished teachers and administrators.

3. Phil Mitchell’s teaching skills are admired by undergraduates and requested by the directors of the Williams Village RAP and the Center for Western Civilization.

I hope these considerations will help you to decide to allow Phil Mitchell to teach for CWC and Williams Village this school year, 2007-2008.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

E. Christian Kopff, Director
Center for Western Civilization
Campus Box 184
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309-0184
(303) 492-8401 (Office)
(303) 492-3851 (FAX)
E.Kopff@Colorado.edu
University of Colorado at Boulder

Todd T. Gleeson, Dean

College of Arts and Sciences
Old Main 1-43
275 UCB
University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0275
(303) 492-7294, Fax: (303) 492-4944, email: gleeson@colorado.edu

8 August 2007

Christian Kopff, Director
Center for Western Civilization
UCB 184

Dear Chris,

I am in receipt of your July 30 letter to me asking for reconsideration of the College's decision not to approve Phil Mitchell as an instructor of a College/CWC course that the Chancellor's Leadership RAP would like to offer this coming term.

In consultation with and concurrence of the Provost and Chancellor, I am sustaining my earlier decision not to authorize Phil Mitchell as a College instructor. This decision follows, as you may know, from a review of Dr. Mitchell's overall performance as a faculty member and a recommendation from his rostering unit (Sewall RAP) that he not be reappointed. My rationale is that the decision not to reappoint him has as much to do with his failure to take directions from his supervisor as does the quality of his instruction.

This decision does not reflect on the merits of the "Western Traditions" course, which promises to be an excellent course. I hope that the Chancellor's Leadership RAP can find an alternative instructor who will bring this course to our students.

Respectfully,

Todd T. Gleeson
Dean

Cc: G. P. "Bud" Peterson, Chancellor
    Phil DiStefano, Provost
    Ann Carlos, Professor and Director, Sewall RAP
**ATTACHMENT 14**

**PICK-A-PROF DATA**  
A COMPARISON OF GRADES GIVEN BY SEWALL FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Number and Type of Classes</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Average GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Aiken</td>
<td>10 HIST</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Brigham</td>
<td>31 PWR</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy DiDomenico</td>
<td>2 MCDB, 12 EBIO</td>
<td>227, 571</td>
<td>2.97, 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Doersch</td>
<td>16 PWR</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Ferrell</td>
<td>12 PWR, 6 SPAN</td>
<td>191, 80</td>
<td>3.19, 2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Fredericki</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merle Funk</td>
<td>47 HIST, 2 RUSS, 6 AMST</td>
<td>1,791, 39, 110</td>
<td>2.97, 3.46, 3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Helm</td>
<td>21 HIST, 10 AMST</td>
<td>799, 182</td>
<td>3.19, 3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Kratzke</td>
<td>29 PWR</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Lewis</td>
<td>17 HIST</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth Lynch</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Mindock</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Mitchell</td>
<td>60 HIST</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Moore</td>
<td>31 ENG, 8 ARSC</td>
<td>640, 1</td>
<td>3.21, 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Ramirez</td>
<td>8 PWR, 3 ENG</td>
<td>109, 84</td>
<td>3.22, 2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Smith</td>
<td>34 HIST</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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