

American Association of University Professors  
University of Colorado at Boulder Chapter  
Colorado Conference of the AAUP

**Report on CU's Treatment of the Philosophy Department**

April 17, 2014

The University of Colorado (CU) chapter and the Colorado Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) condemn several recent attacks upon the academic freedom, shared governance, and due process rights of faculty by CU-Boulder Arts and Sciences Dean Steven Leigh and Provost Russell Moore. Dean Leigh and Provost Moore threatened to dissolve the Philosophy Department—a threat that silenced faculty criticism on an issue of institutional importance and which neither Dean Leigh nor Provost Moore have authority to carry out in either the policies of the University or the standards of the profession. Leigh and Moore then ordered sanctions against the department in the absence of accepted procedural norms. They publicly released a report that the Philosophy Department had been assured would be confidential and by doing so have damaged the reputations of numerous individual members of the Philosophy Department. Finally, they have enforced an atmosphere of intolerance for faculty speech that they find distasteful or with which they disagree.

*Background*

Concerns involving the Philosophy Department stemmed from complaints made to the Office of Discrimination and Harassment (ODH)—at least fifteen since 2007, according to information that the University released to the public.<sup>i</sup> Because ODH policies are designed to protect complainants, the disposition of these complaints is confidential and there is no way to know whether they involve fifteen faculty members or one, whether they were resolved formally or informally, or whether they resulted in the severe sanctioning of faculty or were dismissed. In response to these ambiguities, as well as to faculty suspicions of overzealousness by ODH investigators, in December 2013 the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) assigned a special committee to report on the processes of the ODH.

Provost Moore and Dean Leigh, construing a pattern of harassment from the fifteen ODH complaints, met with the Philosophy Department in spring 2013 to demand that the department take immediate concrete steps to reform or “all options were on the table.”<sup>ii</sup> Claims that the department had instituted measures to combat sexual harassment—creating a standing climate committee, establishing a code of conduct, staging consciousness-raising events—or that, given the secretive nature of the ODH process, there was no way for the faculty to know whether a serious departmental problem existed were regarded as inconsequential by Provost Moore and Dean Leigh, according to some who were present.<sup>iii</sup> Two days later, the Department's climate committee contacted the newly formed Site Visit Program of the American Philosophical Association's Committee on the Status of Women to request a visit.

## *Site Visit Report*

After sending faculty and graduate students a confidential survey, the three-person Site Visit Team (SVT) spent a day and a half in Boulder. The published purpose of the visit was to analyze conditions within the department, through interviews with all stakeholders, as the basis for suggestions to improve the climate for women.<sup>iv</sup> The SVT spoke with groups of faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, and staff. They also conferred with Provost Moore, Associate Dean Mary Kraus, and Katherine Erwin, the head of the ODH, who provided the SVT with access to confidential ODH complaint files.<sup>v</sup> On November 18, the SVT sent copies of their report to Chair Forbes, Dean Leigh, and Provost Moore.

On November 20, Chair Forbes sent an email to the Philosophy Department faculty advising them that he had distributed hard copies of the SVT report in their department mailboxes. Forbes cautioned the Philosophy faculty not to discuss the report with anyone outside the Department:

Be aware that if this report leaks beyond the department and becomes a local, or worse national, scandal, the continued existence of this department is improbable. . . . If I see discussion of the report developing on any department listserv, I'll shut the listserv down. If I see any email of the kind the report complains about, I will have the author's colorado.edu account deleted. Finally, I think some of us will have a critical response to some parts of the report. It would be unwise to convey such responses to the Deans or other administration officials. . . . In some parts of the administration this report has made the idea of dissolving the department appealing. . . .<sup>vi</sup>

On December 2, Moore and Leigh met with the Philosophy Department to discuss the administration's response to the SVT report. They warned the Philosophy faculty not to mention the report if asked about developments within the Department.<sup>vii</sup> Moore and Leigh raised the specter of Jerry Sandusky: this was a "post-Sandusky" era when universities were subject to multi-million dollar lawsuits (and administrators to criminal investigation) if they were found not to have acted forcefully in the face of complaints involving sexual misconduct. They again conveyed that the Department would face severe reprisals if faculty failed to take responsibility by challenging the report's conclusions.<sup>viii</sup>

Despite admonitions that no one in the Philosophy Department was to discuss the report with anyone outside the Department, on January 31, 2014, Leigh and Moore released the SVT report to the public.

The Philosophy Department faculty believed that Provost Moore and Dean Leigh had the authority to dissolve their program. Michael Tooley, a College Professor of Distinction at CU who has served as president of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association, and who is an outspoken critic of the SVT report, has written at length about the silence of the Philosophy Department in response to these threats. According to

Tooley, the Department was not given the opportunity by the administration to respond to the report prior to sanctions—a fundamental violation of core AAUP principles. The internal pressures to remain silent were overwhelming. Any response would be seen as an admission of individual and collective guilt, evidence that the department was unwilling and incapable of addressing its hostile climate toward women, proof of the report’s accuracy, and justification for even more severe penalties.<sup>ix</sup>

Based on the report, the University administration ordered that graduate admissions be suspended for the coming year or longer, until procedures are in place to ensure a welcoming learning environment. This action, generated by the administration and not by the faculty, violates AAUP principles. They announced that Graeme Forbes would be replaced as Philosophy chair by an external chair who would enforce the cultural change, as had been recommended by the SVT and endorsed by the Philosophy faculty in the wake of the report. The administration also commanded that all members of the department undergo rigorous training in detecting and reporting sexual harassment, with all relevant discussions being facilitated by experts.

#### *Professional Obligations of the Faculty and of the Administration*

The determination of Dean Leigh and Provost Moore to stamp out sexual harassment in the Philosophy Department is admirable, and if faculty members have tolerated sexual harassers, their actions should be severely penalized. However, it is the obligation of administrators and faculty alike to live up to the standards of the profession, as articulated by the AAUP. The AAUP’s statement “Due Process in Sexual Harassment Complaints” notes that while administrators may be strongly motivated to bypass policy and procedure in order to punish faculty suspected of harassment, such actions are not permissible:

*These instances of avoiding or shortcutting recognized safeguards of academic due process in treating complaints of sexual harassment may be motivated partly by fear of negative publicity or of litigation if prompt and decisive action does not appear to be taken, or they may be motivated by a well-meaning desire to cure a wrong. Nonetheless, sexual harassment . . . is not somehow so different from other kinds of sanctionable misconduct as to permit the institution to render judgment and to penalize without having afforded due process. In dealing with cases in which sexual harassment is alleged, as in dealing with all other cases in which a faculty member’s fitness is under question, the protections of academic due process are necessary for the individual, for the institution, and for the principles of academic freedom and tenure.*

According to numerous AAUP statements, most notably “On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom,” and the “Statement on Professional Ethics,” it is the right and the ethical responsibility of faculty to speak out on issues of institutional importance, or else a university cannot fulfill its obligation to provide a public good. For the same purpose of advancing a public good, it is a central obligation of administrators to be vigilant in protecting these rights.

Furthermore, administrators do not possess the authority unilaterally to discontinue or suspend programs. According to the AAUP's "Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure," when program discontinuance does not involve financial exigency:

*The decision to discontinue formally a program or department of instruction will be based essentially on educational considerations, as determined primarily by the faculty as a whole or an appropriate committee thereof.*

#### *Confidentiality and the Release of the Report*

Both the information on the SVT website and the information sent by the SVT to Chair Forbes state that the report would be confidential, seen by only the Department for the internal purpose of improving the climate for women within the Department. According to the SVT web site: "The team members will keep the content of their findings and of this report confidential. . . . Further, the Site Visit Team will not communicate the details of what is learned about the Department as part of the Site Visit process to people outside of the Department. The final report will be directly provided only to the Department." It does provide for an exception to this assurance of confidentiality: that the report will be sent to the dean, at the dean's request, if the dean was the party who invited the SVT. Under no conditions would the report be sent to an "institutional administrator" such as Provost Moore.<sup>x</sup>

Two days before the SVT arrived, Chair Forbes wrote to the faculty, emphasizing the confidential nature of the meetings with the SVT: "You are strongly encouraged to attend and have your voice heard. However, what is said by anyone else at your meeting should be regarded as completely confidential, and not repeated to, or discussed with, anyone who wasn't at the meeting."<sup>xi</sup>

Two issues involving confidentiality call into question the integrity of Dean Leigh and Provost Moore's treatment of the Philosophy Department. The first issue is the administration's actions in providing the SVT access to confidential files; the second is their damaging public release of the SVT report. A third issue is the SVT's providing copies of the report to Dean Leigh and Provost Moore.

In published accounts of why the CU administration provided the SVT with access to the confidential files, University spokespeople have focused on the role of the SVT as consultants to the University administration who, in performing an administrative function, needed access to relevant materials in order to ensure a comprehensive understanding: "In their roles as consultants for the university, the site visit investigators had access to . . . relevant documents that helped them assess the climate of the philosophy department."<sup>xii</sup>

If the SVT had been invited by the dean, it is at least arguable that the SVT warranted access to the ODH files. However, the University's assertion that the SVT had a legitimate role as "consultants for the university" appears to lack any basis in fact.

Michael Tooley provides extensive documentation on his website of his efforts to persuade the members of the SVT to provide any evidence that Moore and Leigh had invited the site team. Citing confidentiality, members of the SVT refused Tooley's request. To skirt the confidentiality issue, Tooley asked the SVT members to send to former chair Graeme Forbes documentation that he had signed or been copied on, that suggested that any party other than the Philosophy Department had issued the invitation. Again, citing the ethics of confidentiality, the SVT members refused to send to Forbes copies of any documents he had signed or been copied on. Eventually Tooley, through the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA), sought all emails between the SVT and Moore or Leigh during the period that an invitation would have been conceivable. At the very least the SVT would have sent their hosts the same information that they had sent to the Philosophy Department, via email, in which they describe the conditions of their visit. Professor Tooley's CORA search yielded no such emails.<sup>xiii</sup>

A related confidentiality issue revolves around the SVT's sending copies of their report to Dean Leigh and Provost Moore. The SVT has justified this action on the grounds that 1) Dean Leigh and Provost Moore were their hosts, 2) they told the department during their visit that they would send the report to Leigh and Moore, and 3) because Colorado is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), they would have to release the report to Leigh and Moore if Leigh and Moore were to file an FOI request.<sup>xiv</sup>

However, as previously shown in this report, there are no emails that verify a joint invitation, and, according to the guidelines sent to the Philosophy Department, in no event was it permissible for the SVT to send the report to Provost Moore. Furthermore, that the SVT advised the department during the site visit that they would send the report to the administration is disputed by some philosophy faculty who attended those meetings.<sup>xv</sup> Regardless, the ethics of assuring the department (through the guidelines) that the administration would not have access to the findings as a precondition of the visit, and then to change that condition during the visit, are dubious. The third justification—that the SVT would have to send the report to Moore and Leigh if they filed an FOI request, so the SVT went ahead and sent it—is, in the absence of an FOI request, spurious.

#### *The Forced Resignation of the BFA Representative*

On February 3, 2014, four days after Dean Leigh and Provost Moore released the SVT report, the executive committee of the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) held their weekly meeting. When the controversy with the Philosophy Department was raised, Brad Monton, an associate professor of philosophy who was also a member of the BFA executive committee, communicated his frustrations with the ODH process, as well as his opinion that the SVT report overstated the degree of sexual harassment in the Philosophy Department. In the original published minutes of the meeting, Professor Monton's remarks were recorded as follows:

Is it possible that ODH secrecy led to this going on for years in Philosophy?

Insight into what happened within the department of Philosophy:

- Approximately two years ago, Philosophy determined that they needed to change the culture in their department
  - They went to the Administration to request a site visit (American Philosophical Association [APA])
    - Administration agreed to pay half of the cost
- The Philosophy department understood that they were in charge of the process of the survey
- Found out later that the APA thought they were hired by the department, the Dean Steve Leigh, and Provost, Russ Moore, so they gave the report to all parties
- Philosophy found out on Friday, January 31, 2014, that the report was coming out publically
  - A few days before this, faculty in the department received the report from the chair who stated that they were not to share it outside of the department and could only discuss it with faculty within the department
- Administration knew the report was coming out on January 31st but did not give the Philosophy department any warning
  - Administration created a media campaign ahead of time
  - Administration released the report to the Daily Camera on Thursday, January 30th, without informing the Philosophy department that they were doing so
    - Steve Leigh maintains that it was released because of a Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) request
      - CU-Boulder Communications said that there was not a CORA request
- Paul Chinowsky, BFA Chair, found out about the situation on Thursday, January 30th
  - There might have been a legal implication for the campus if a complaint was filed and CU-Boulder did not release the information.<sup>xvi</sup>

Subsequently, the minutes of the February 3 meeting were revised. The above summary was deleted, replaced with: “Insight was given into what happened within the department of Philosophy by Brad Monton. [Those comments were retracted from these minutes.]”<sup>xvii</sup>

On Friday, February 7, Monton received an email from BFA chair Paul Chinowsky, asking that Monton not attend the next meeting of the executive committee, February 10. Over the weekend, Monton received another email from Chinowsky. Chinowsky requested that on February 10 Monton meet with Chinowsky and Andrew Cowell, a linguistics professor who had become the Philosophy chair eleven days before. (Among the SVT recommendations was that someone from outside the Philosophy Department replace Graeme Forbes: “Under the current configuration, it is very difficult for an internal chair to make the required changes, or to hold people accountable.”)<sup>xviii</sup> As Monton was leaving his office for the February 10 meeting, Cowell informed him of a

change of plans: instead of meeting with Chinowsky, they would meet with Dean Steven Leigh.

According to Monton, at this meeting, which was also attended by Associate Dean Mary Kraus, Leigh and Cowell pressured him into retracting the opinions that he had presented to the BFA executive committee, and into resigning from his position on the BFA. In a comment that is not recorded in the original BFA minutes, Monton had told the executive committee that he had never been the subject of an ODH complaint. But Leigh and Cowell had looked at his personnel file and discovered that there was an ODH complaint (of which Monton claims he was unaware). They threatened to release his ODH file to the public if he didn't retract his criticisms and resign.<sup>xix</sup> Cowell also brought up another issue: there had been complaints against Monton several months before over a Facebook posting that, Cowell argued, violated Philosophy Department confidentiality. At the end of the meeting Cowell sanctioned Monton for unprofessional conduct.

Monton's official letter of sanction from Cowell, dated February 12, states that both he (as Philosophy Chair) and Dean Leigh had access to Monton's personnel files. They had determined that Monton's February 3 "public comments" were a "deliberate" attempt to deceive the BFA executive committee about the circumstance in the Philosophy Department. Numerous comments he had made were "false in their contents or implications. These comments were a serious breach of [Monton's] responsibilities to the BFA specifically, and to the department and the campus more generally, and have contributed to greatly diminishing trust between the faculty and the administration. . . ." Cowell then reiterated Monton's punishment: he would be banned from departmental service participation and denied all service credit in his annual merit review. Cowell also wrote to Monton that he would "reserve the right to impose additional sanctions pending further investigation of the actions in question."

According to the AAUP statement "On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom,"

*[T]he protection of academic freedom in issues of institutional governance is a pre-requisite for the practice of governance unhampered by fear of retribution. . . . [G]rounds for thinking an institutional policy desirable or undesirable must be heard and assessed if the community is to have confidence that its policies are appropriate.*

As discussed previously in this report, one of the central tenets of academic freedom is the right of faculty to speak out on matters of institutional policy. Without that right faculty, either individually, or collectively in the form of representative entities such as the BFA, cannot enforce the system of checks and balances that is essential for the institution to fulfill its obligation to provide a public good.

But academic freedom is not an unfettered right. One is not free to plagiarize or deceive or commit other acts that defy academic morality. But who is to decide? Academic history has shown that administrators, whose initiatives may be slowed or halted by

faculty speech, might be quick to regard views that differ from their own as not merely inconvenient, but deceptive. In other instances, administrators may not be competent to evaluate opinions that fall within domains of faculty expertise. That is why, according to the standards articulated by the AAUP, it is the responsibility of the faculty to determine whether an instance of faculty speech exceeds the bounds of academic freedom. Furthermore, as a protection for speech that others might find to be disagreeable, that standard is explicit:

*[P]rotecting academic freedom on campus requires ensuring that a particular instance of faculty speech 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. . . . Protecting faculty status turns on a faculty member's views only when the holding of those views clearly supports a judgment of competence or incompetence."*

The letter of sanction makes no reference to the recommendation of a faculty committee. As Cowell states, "We [Dean Leigh and I] both believe that your comments to the BFA were a deliberate attempt on your part to misrepresent your own role in the recent problems in the Philosophy Department . . . ."

Dean Leigh and Chair Cowell are free to believe that Monton's comments about the ODH, the actions of the administration, and sexual harassment in the Philosophy Department were false, and that these comments "contributed to greatly diminishing trust between the faculty and the administration." But they are not free to discipline Professor Monton for these comments unless a faculty hearing committee finds that his speech clearly supports a judgment of incompetence or fraudulence.

Monton claims that he thought he was telling the truth. In fact, all of Monton's remarks, as originally recorded in the minutes of the February 3 meeting, have been subsequently validated in newspaper accounts or in interviews with members of the Philosophy Department—including some who hold radically differing perspectives on the accuracy of the SVT report.

#### *Suspension and Banishment of a Faculty Member*

On the morning of March 4, 2014, two campus police officers awaited philosophy associate professor Dan Kaufman outside his classroom. Kaufman was then escorted by Philosophy Chair Andrew Cowell to Dean Leigh's office, where four more campus police awaited him. Provost Moore notified Kaufman that he was suspended indefinitely upon threat of arrest if he returned to campus. In front of colleagues and students, Kaufman was then escorted off campus by the police officers. Philosophy faculty were ordered by Cowell to call 911 immediately if they saw Kaufman on campus.<sup>xx</sup>

Kaufman was not a suspected sexual harasser, but he had notified Cowell of an accommodation that he had been granted by CU under the Americans with Disabilities Act. According to Kaufman, during a follow-up discussion, Cowell brought up the

question of suicide, and Kaufman made a “philosopher’s joke” that alluded to a standard philosophy textbook conundrum: He wouldn’t kill himself; he was sure Cowell wouldn’t kill him, and he wouldn’t kill Cowell, unless Cowell were truly evil, like Adolf Hitler.<sup>xxi</sup>

According to Provost Moore, in a letter that he presented to Kaufman advising him of his suspension while flanked by two police officers in Dean Leigh’s office, with another two police officers standing in the hallway, “Dr. Cowell informed us that he initially considered these words to be simply a poor attempt at a joke, not a direct threat. The Campus, however, finds these remarks profoundly troubling and completely unacceptable, even as a joke.”<sup>xxii</sup>

Moore’s letter also alludes to complaints about Kaufman’s behavior from several years before (including an outburst at a Denver restaurant). Based on these incidents and allegations, Moore has deemed Kaufman’s conduct “detrimental to the well-being of the university and incompatible to the function of the university as an educational institution.” Regardless, the suspension of a faculty member is considered by the AAUP as punishment second only to dismissal, and, barring extraordinary circumstances, can be enacted only after there has been the opportunity for a defense against charges before a faculty hearing committee. Kaufman claims the first he heard he was under suspicion was that morning.

The 2008 AAUP Report “The Use and Abuse of Faculty Suspensions” characterizes a faculty member’s banishment from campus, particularly in such a fashion, as pernicious:

*The use of uniformed police or security officers to escort faculty members off campus . . . strikes us as an insulting and grossly disproportionate response to a situation served better by discretion than by drama [and] . . . suggests an intention to add insult to injury. When the effect of suspension is not only to remove the faculty member from teaching duties but also to deny him or her access to the material needed to prove that the charges are groundless and wrongful, such a practice is doubly intolerable. . . . But unless the threat of immediate harm is so exigent as to require the faculty member not only to be suspended but also to be absent from campus—and we think the standard in that case should be of high magnitude indeed—or unless there is demonstrable evidence that the faculty member’s office itself contains material or information that poses a high risk to campus security, we see no grounds to support banishment as a sanction superimposed on the suspension itself.*

The letter to Kaufman advising him of his suspension and banishment from campus was dated February 28—four days earlier, more than enough time to notify him through other means. As with other actions ordered by Leigh and Moore described in this report, the police apprehension of Professor Kaufman created maximum humiliation.

*Conclusion*

By all accounts, there has been sexual harassment in CU's Philosophy Department, though there is disagreement about how widespread. By some accounts, there continues to be not only sexual harassment but also a climate of hostility toward women. The SVT report, produced under strict constraints so as not to reveal the identities of victims or perpetrators, necessarily generalizes about faculty behavior without substantiation through fact or anecdote. The result, however, is the depiction of the entire Philosophy Department faculty as not only incompetent, but also complicit in sexual harassment through, at best, indifference to the human consequences. The SVT report was intended for an internal audience but was released to the public, and the public release has damaged the reputation of every male faculty member in the department and increases the difficulty for current graduate students to find employment in the field. In the aftermath of the report, at least two Philosophy Department faculty have been sanctioned in disregard or ignorance of AAUP policies and principles.

Had the SVT report been kept confidential per the assurances of the SVT, it may have provoked anger but eventually given way to self-assessment, which can lead to change. The tactics of Dean Leigh and Provost Moore may lead to the end of sexual harassment in the Philosophy Department, but at the cost of faculty trust in the ODH, of Dean Leigh's and Provost Moore's personal integrity, and possibly of the SVT program as a viable mechanism for improving the climate for women in philosophy. Leigh and Moore's tactics perpetuate a climate of fear and disregard for the academic freedom and due process protections of faculty at the University of Colorado.

### *Recommendations*

1. The CU Chapter and the Colorado Conference of the AAUP recommend that the CU-Boulder administration rescind the following disciplinary actions for which the administration has usurped faculty responsibility.
  - A. The disciplinary sanctioning of Brad Monton
  - B. The suspension and banishment from campus of Dan Kaufman
2. The CU Chapter and the Colorado Conference of the AAUP recommends that the CU-Boulder administration rescind the suspension of graduate school admissions in the Philosophy Department and allow the Philosophy Department to employ established procedures, in keeping with AAUP guidelines, for deciding what, if any, action to take in regard to the issue.

Finally, we are troubled at the circumstance under which Graeme Forbes was removed as chair and replaced by someone from outside the Philosophy Department. While that decision was not made by the administration in the absence of faculty participation, that participation, in the wake of the SVT recommendation and warnings about the continued existence of the program, cannot be regarded as meaningful. We recommend that the Philosophy Department revisit the issue.

---

## Endnotes

<sup>i</sup> “Report on Site Visit Conducted by the American Philosophical Association (APA) Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) Site Visit Program at University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Philosophy, on September 25-28, 2013,” <http://www.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/attached-files/APA%20Report%20document.pdf>.

<sup>ii</sup> Sarah Kuta, “Ex-chair Feared CU-Boulder Would Dissolve Philosophy Department if Sexual Harassment Report Leaked,” *Daily Camera* (Boulder, CO), February 25, 2014.

<sup>iii</sup> Michael Tooley, interview by Don Eron, Boulder, CO, March 4, 2014.

<sup>iv</sup> APA Committee on the Status of Women Site Visit Program, <http://www.apaonlinecsw.org/home/site-visit-program>.

<sup>v</sup> Michael Tooley, interview by Don Eron, Boulder, CO, March 4, 2014.

<sup>vi</sup> Graeme Forbes, email message to Philosophy Faculty, November 20, 2013, quoted in Sarah Kuta, “Ex-chair Feared CU-Boulder Would Dissolve Philosophy Department if Sexual Harassment Report Leaked,” *Daily Camera* (Boulder, CO), February 25, 2014.

<sup>vii</sup> Sarah Kuta, “Ex-chair Feared CU-Boulder Would Dissolve Philosophy Department if Sexual Harassment Report Leaked,” *Daily Camera* (Boulder, CO), February 25, 2014.

<sup>viii</sup> Michael Tooley, interview by Don Eron, Boulder, CO, March 24, 2014.

<sup>ix</sup> Michael Tooley, “The Site Visit Report: Why Hasn’t the Philosophy Department Strongly Criticized the Site Visit Report?” [http://spot.colorado.edu/~tooley/Why\\_No\\_Criticism\\_of\\_the\\_Site\\_Visit\\_Report.html](http://spot.colorado.edu/~tooley/Why_No_Criticism_of_the_Site_Visit_Report.html).

<sup>x</sup> APA Committee on the Status of Women Site Visit Program, <http://www.apaonlinecsw.org/home/site-visit-program>.

<sup>xi</sup> Graeme Forbes, email to Philosophy Department faculty, September 23, 2013.

<sup>xii</sup> Sarah Kuta, “Philosophy Profs: CU-Boulder Shouldn’t Have Shared Private Info,” *Daily Camera* (Boulder, CO), February 24, 2014.

<sup>xiii</sup> Michael Tooley, “Site Visit Report: Result of a CORA request-Correspondence Between Steven Leigh and Professor Valerie Hardcastle, Chronologically Arranged, and with an Included the Site Visit Report Removed [sic],”

---

<http://spot.colorado.edu/~tooley/Valerie%20Hardcastle%20-%20Dean%20Steven%20Leigh%20Correspondence.pdf>.

<sup>xiv</sup> Michael Tooley, “Site Visit Report: My Correspondence with Valerie Hardcastle,” <http://spot.colorado.edu/~tooley/Tooley-HardcastleCorrespondence.pdf>.

<sup>xv</sup> Michael Tooley, interview by Don Eron, Boulder, CO, March 4, 2014.

<sup>xvi</sup> Boulder Faculty Assembly executive committee meeting minutes, February 3, 2014 (original).

<sup>xvii</sup> Boulder Faculty Assembly executive committee meeting minutes, February 3, 2014 (revised).

<sup>xviii</sup> “Report on Site Visit Conducted by the American Philosophical Association (APA) Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) Site Visit Program at University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Philosophy, on September 25-28, 2013,” <http://www.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/attached-files/APA%20Report%20document.pdf>.

<sup>xix</sup> Brad Monton, email to Don Eron, April 6, 2014.

<sup>xx</sup> Sarah Kuta, “CU-Boulder Philosophy Professor on Leave, Barred from Campus” *Daily Camera* (Boulder, CO), March 26, 2014.

<sup>xxi</sup> Dan Kaufman, personal interview, April 4, 2014.

<sup>xxii</sup> Russell Moore, letter to Dan Kaufman, February 28, 2014.