

**REPORT OF AN INQUIRY REGARDING ACADEMIC FREEDOM AT
CRANDALL UNIVERSITY (formerly ATLANTIC BAPTIST UNIVERSITY)
Moncton, New Brunswick**

by

Berkeley Fleming and Jennie Hornosty

In 2006, the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) adopted “Procedures in Academic Freedom Cases Involving Allegations of Requirement of an Ideological or Faith Test as a Condition of Employment” (Appendix A). The CAUT considered that academic freedom is violated at universities in Canada that seek to ensure an ideologically or religiously homogeneous academic staff.

In 2009, the Canadian Association of University Teachers authorized an Ad hoc Investigatory Committee to determine whether Atlantic Baptist University in Moncton, New Brunswick [since renamed Crandall University],¹ might be denying academic freedom to some of its academic staff by requiring a statement of faith – implicitly or explicitly – as a condition of initial and/or continuing employment. Professors Berkeley Fleming (Mount Allison University) and Jennie Hornosty (University of New Brunswick) – hereinafter referred to as “the committee” – were appointed to conduct the inquiry.

A History of Crandall University

Crandall University’s beginnings can be traced as far back as 1836 when the Baptist Seminary – associated with the Fredericton Baptist Church – was opened on York Street in Fredericton, New Brunswick. It is reputed to have been “the first co-educational institution in Canada and the first school open to children of all denominations.”² In the early years of this school, “the Baptists had to fight custom and Church of England monopoly to get ... [public] financial support.”³ The “eventual granting of provincial aid to this school seems to have set a kind of precedent for legislative aid to denominational

¹ Shortly after we were appointed to undertake this investigation, ABU changed its name to Crandall University. In this report we shall use both names, depending on context.

² Brunswick Street Baptist Church, “BSBC History.” <http://www.bsbc.nb.ca.htm>. Accessed gained on May 6, 2010.

³ Katherine F.C. MacNaughton, *The Development of the Theory and Practice of Education in New Brunswick 1784-1900: A Study in Historical Background*. Fredericton: University of New Brunswick Historical Studies No. 1, 1947, p. 100.

schools other than Anglican.”⁴ This was only achieved after years of the House of Assembly having approved a grant and the Legislative Council having rejected it. At the same time as the Legislative Council was refusing to provide public support for the Seminary, “on the grounds that their principle was against giving money in aid of religious or literary institutions for the dissemination of their own peculiar tenets,” the Council was approving annual grants to the Episcopalian King’s College (now UNB, established as the Provincial Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1785), as well as the Anglican Madras Schools.⁵ Finally, in 1842, the Council relented, after repeated protests from the New Brunswick Baptist Educational Society in Fredericton. “Thereafter, for many years, this institution received an annual grant, and from that time forward we find a particularly large variety of schools, many of them denominational, receiving provincial aid.”⁶ These other schools included the Wesleyan Academy, the origin of Mount Allison University, established in 1839.⁷

A little more than one hundred years after the Baptist Seminary began receiving public funds from the New Brunswick Legislature, a report to the United Baptist Convention indicated that more than one hundred young people had left the region, or were planning to do so, to attend Bible Schools elsewhere in Canada or the United States.⁸ As indicated in the Crandall University Calendar,

the United Baptist Convention became concerned about the young people who were leaving Atlantic Canada for a Bible College education. [Although] the denomination had a University in Wolfville, N.S., there was an area of Christian education which was not being covered. In 1949, the United Baptist Bible Training School was founded in Moncton as both a Bible College and a High School.”⁹

By the late 1950s, it had become clear that virtually none of the students at the school were enrolled in the Bible department, so “secondary school offerings were curtailed [and] preparatory courses for people entering lay church vocations, including church secretarial work, musical leadership in the church and Christian education”¹⁰ were

⁴ *Ibid.*.

⁵ *Ibid.*.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 101. The Baptist Seminary building was sold to the Fredericton School Board in 1872. Although Renfree suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 147) that the “financially strapped” Educational Society might have thought there was less need for such schools as theirs and the Horton Academy in Nova Scotia once public education had been introduced, he also noted the creation of a new seminary in Saint John about a decade later. The Saint John seminary, however, lasted but a few years.

⁷ Recognition of a connection between public monies being provided to educational institutions under the sway of religious denominations and there being the need for at least a modicum of state inspection, supervision, and control was slow in coming in New Brunswick, as was the case in much of North America. See MacNaughton, *loc. cit.*.

⁸ Harry A. Renfree, *Heritage and Horizon: The Baptist Story in Canada* (Mississauga: Canadian Baptist Federation, 1988), p. 327.

⁹ “History,” *Crandall University Academic Calendar 2008-2010*, p. 11. According to the “BSBC History”, *loc. cit.*, the 1905 Union of Regular and Free Baptists entailed their henceforward referring to themselves as United Baptists.

¹⁰ Renfree, *loc. cit.*.

introduced. It was understood that Baptist theological training *per se* in the region was to continue to be provided at Acadia University, although some in the Baptist community evidently viewed Acadia with suspicion and alarm, one individual having referred to it in 1934 as “the greatest infidel factory in North America.”¹¹

By 1968, the postsecondary elements of the United Baptist Bible Training School’s program had overtaken the secondary elements, and the institution had become known as “a Bible College and a Christian Junior Liberal Arts College.”¹² In 1970, its name was changed to Atlantic Baptist College accordingly, and at that time it offered “the first two years of university courses in Arts.”¹³

In 1981, a four-year B.A. degree was instituted, with Majors in Biblical Studies, Music, and Christian Education¹⁴ and, in 1983, ABC formally was granted a Charter to offer baccalaureate degrees.¹⁵ The Act was amended in 1991, and again in 1996, when the offerings were broadened, the location of the institution changed, and a new name introduced, Atlantic Baptist University.¹⁶ The Act was further amended in 2008, and in August, 2009 an announcement was made that the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches had voted and accepted another name change, this time to Crandall University.

The Nature of Crandall University

The Atlantic Baptist University Act states that the Board of Governors of Crandall is responsible and periodically reports to the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches (formerly the United Baptist Convention of the Atlantic Provinces).¹⁷ It further indicates that, if the University were to be dissolved or its affairs wound up, its assets would revert to the Convention.¹⁸ Finally, it declares that “[t]he objects of the University shall be to provide for persons of any race, colour or creed, university education with a philosophy and viewpoint that is Christian.”¹⁹ Thus, Crandall University defines itself as a small, private postsecondary institution that is owned by the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches and provides what in its Mission Statement is characterized as a “thoroughly Christian education.”²⁰

¹¹ *Gospel Light*, 1934, cited in G.A. Rawlyk, ed., *Canadian Baptists and Christian Higher Education* (Montréal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1988), p. ix. Interestingly, the library at Crandall University is named after now deceased historian George Rawlyk of Queen’s University.

¹² “History”.

¹³ Renfree, *loc.cit.*.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 327-28.

¹⁵ “History”.

¹⁶ This information, apart from general knowledge, is derived from “History”, as well as from a section on “Accreditation” also in the *Academic Calendar 2008-2010*, and Section 2(1) of Bill 64, Atlantic Baptist University Act, 2008, 2nd session, 56th Legislature New Brunswick, 56-57 Elizabeth II, 2007-2008.

¹⁷ Atlantic Baptist University Act 2008, Articles 1 and 5(2).

¹⁸ Article 11.

¹⁹ Article 3(1).

²⁰ http://www.crandallu.ca/cu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=67&Itemid=59.

There were some 149 students “enrolled in the regular college program”²¹ at Atlantic Baptist College in the 1986-87 academic year. Crandall University currently has about 800 students. 157 degrees and certificates were awarded at its most recent Convocation, held on May 1, 2010.²² Degrees were earned in Biblical Studies, Biology, Business Administration, Communication Studies, Education, English, History, Organizational Management, Psychology, Religious Studies, and Sociology. 47.5% (67) of the 141 degrees granted in 2010 were in Education.²³

The Process of Our Inquiry

We conducted our inquiry into policy and practices at Crandall University using two CAUT policies as our framework. The CAUT “Policy Statement on Academic Freedom” provides in part that “[a]cademic freedom includes the right, **without restriction by prescribed doctrine**, to freedom of teaching and discussion; freedom in carrying out research. . . ; [and] freedom to express freely one’s opinion about the institution”²⁴ The CAUT “Policy Statement on Academic Appointments”, approved by CAUT Council in 2000, indicates that “[a]cademic freedom must be protected. All personnel management practices must be free of discrimination.”²⁵

We viewed our task as ascertaining whether an explicit or implicit “statement of faith” policy exists at Crandall University; verifying whether adherence to any such policy is a condition of initial and/or continuing employment; determining whether faculty and staff at Crandall are entitled to academic freedom without restriction; and making recommendations to the CAUT based on our findings.

The committee began its work in the late summer of 2009 by locating documents on the philosophy, history, and organization of Atlantic Baptist University, as well as information on its relationship to affiliate bodies. Initial information was obtained from ABU’s website,²⁶ which included “A Message from the President,” a Mission Statement, a Statement of Faith, a Statement of Moral Standards, the University Calendar, a brief institutional history, and details on personnel. We also noted an August 2009 advertisement for a Sociology position at ABU.²⁷ The website also provides links to the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches, the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, the Canadian Council of Christian Charities, and an American organization called the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. Crandall is owned by the Convention,²⁸

²¹ Renfree, *ibid.*, p. 328.

²² Cf., <http://www.crandallu.ca/cu/index.php>. Access gained on May 20, 2010.

²³ <http://www.crandallu.ca/cu/images/stories/files/academic/GradListPostingApril282010.pdf>. Access gained on May 21, 2010.

²⁴ <http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=247&lang=1>. Our emphasis.

²⁵ <http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=245&lang=1>.

²⁶ We gained access to the Atlantic Baptist University website in August and September of 2009, and to the Crandall University website on February 15, 2010, that is after the name change had at least partially been implemented. See <http://www.crandallu.ca>.

²⁷ http://www.abu.nb.ca/about/employment/emp_soc.html. Access gained on August 6, 2009.

²⁸ As stated in the Atlantic Baptist University Act, the *Faculty Handbook*, and a job advertisement that we noted in the ABU website in August, 2009.

and is an affiliate member of the latter three organizations. We have examined the content of their respective websites for context.

The Crandall *Faculty Handbook*²⁹ contains a Mission Statement and Statement of Faith, as well as a Statement of Moral Standards pertaining to employment at the University. Crandall University's Academic Calendar³⁰ includes the Mission Statement and Statement of Faith, but not the Statement of Moral Standards. Interestingly, the Crandall website's version of the Mission Statement is somewhat shorter than that in the Handbook, excluding reference to faculty research and to the transforming of lives, although the latter phrase is used in a website note on Crandall's philosophy of education.

On the basis of our initial analysis of the Mission Statement, Statement of Faith, and Statement of Moral Standards alone, we concluded that at Crandall University there appeared not to be a commitment to academic freedom as it is generally understood within the university community in Canada and around the world.³¹ There did indeed seem to be a faith-based test associated with gaining or retaining academic employment at Crandall University. We provide our full analysis of these three documents, and some others, in subsequent sections of this report.

Based upon that preliminary review of documents, we decided that we should seek to speak to Crandall University officials, so as to determine whether we had understood the meaning and import of these documents correctly, and ascertain whether practice at Crandall conformed to what we were taking to be policy there. We also determined that

²⁹ The *Faculty Handbook*, which we were told in the interview had been approved by Senate and is considered legally binding unless or until it were revised, was effective on July 1, 2009, and updated on July 17, 2009, the changes having been approved by the Board of Governors. Provided on our request by Dr. Seth Crowell.

³⁰ Available online at <http://www.crandallu.ca/cu/images/stories/files/academic/AcademicCalendar.pdf>. Access gained on February 15, 2010.

³¹ The CAUT Policy Statement on Academic Freedom articulates the domain assumptions on this matter as they are generally understood in Canadian universities. See <http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=247&lang=1>. Access gained on March 4, 2010. For the international situation, see the guiding principles on academic freedom within the UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel, at http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13144&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html. Access gained on March 4, 2010. Readers might also consult the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) Statement on Academic Freedom and Institutional Autonomy, which can be found at http://www.aucc.ca/pdf/english/statements/1988/aucc_academic_freedom_e.pdf. Access gained on May 4, 2010. There are two foundational documents worth noting. The first is the "1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), based on earlier work done by a joint committee of the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Sociological Society. This document can be found at <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1915.htm>. The second significant early document is the "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure," agreed upon by both the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities), and subsequently endorsed by scores of other professional academic associations. See <http://www.magna-charta.org/pdf/1940StatementofPrinciplesonAcademicFreedomandTenure.pdf>.

we should seek further information and additional institutional documents (for example, concerning the tenure and promotion process and disciplinary procedures); that we should ask senior administrators a number of hypothetical questions, flowing from what we saw as possible implications of various provisions already identified; and that we should enquire as to whether certain specific circumstances had ever arisen over the course of the institution's history, and what generally had transpired if and when they had.

We contacted the President of Crandall, Dr. Brian D. MacArthur, and at his suggestion conducted a single interview with himself, Dr. Seth Crowell, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and Dr. Samuel Reimer, President of the Atlantic Baptist University Faculty Association (ABUFA). Subsequently, having sought copies of other relevant institutional documents, we received the *Faculty Handbook* towards the end of the interview and the template for an employment agreement afterwards.

We also thought that we should seek to interview any interested faculty members currently at Crandall, and to make our mandate more broadly known to those who might have worked at Crandall in the past, or had enquired about or sought employment there, or believed that they had information falling within the scope of our enquiry. We left as an open question whether we would also seek to speak to Crandall students, past or present.

To provide further context, we should also indicate that, as we began our consideration of all of these matters, we were aware that Crandall had sought and was being considered for membership in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), and, as we eventually discovered, Crandall was awaiting a campus visit by AUCC representatives at the time that we conducted our interview with Crandall officials. We would add that over the course of our investigation we noted the publication of a number of Crandall University media releases and statements, on such matters as the nature of Christian education, the change to the University's name,³² provincial and federal government funding for Crandall,³³ and Crandall students' eligibility for a provincial government cap on student debt for those completing their degrees in a timely manner.³⁴ We also occasionally encountered public discussion of these and other Crandall-related matters. Particular attention was paid by members of the public to the question of whether Crandall should have access to public funds while at the same time it apparently banned practicing homosexuals from its employ.

Finally, we should mention that, relatively early in the process, we fielded enquiries about the investigation from representatives of the media, first from the CBC and subsequently from Radio-Canada, and explained our mandate and the process as laid out in the relevant CAUT policy. Consistent with our conception of ourselves as investigators seeking to gather and analyze evidence, we directed anyone seeking information as to

³² http://www.abu.nb.ca/News/new_wel.html. Access gained on August 24, 2009.

³³ http://www.abu.nb.ca/News/new_wel.html. Access gained on July 31, 2009.

³⁴ http://www.abu.nb.ca/news/new_html. Access gained on August 6, 2009. This was actually a letter to ABU students from Donald Arseneault, Minister of Post-Secondary Education, Training and Labour.

what might have led to the establishment of the investigative committee to the Executive Director of the CAUT.

Detailed Consideration of the Central Documents

As indicated earlier, the committee identified three documents that are most pertinent for determining whether a faith test is an implicit or explicit criterion for employment at Crandall University: the Mission Statement; the Statement of Faith; and the Statement of Moral Standards. Each of these is appended to the university's employment contract. Each person hired agrees in signing that document that "[t]he named individual above understands and embraces the university's Statement of Faith, Statement of Moral Standards and Mission Statement." This was also alluded to during the interview.

The University's Mission Statement makes clear that its primary objective is to advance a particular form of Christian education. "At Crandall University, our mission is the provision of: **"Quality university education firmly rooted in the Christian faith."**³⁵

It goes on to explain that this mission is accomplished through

[t]he development of a unified and caring community where its participants are sensitive to the needs of each other, encourage one another in character formation, leadership skills and the integration of faith and learning and are prepared for positions of influence and leadership in the service of God's Kingdom.

The Mission Statement concludes as follows:

Our mission is the driving force behind everything that we do. At our core, we are a thoroughly Christian university with an overarching commitment to our Lord, our students, the church, and our community.

In the *Faculty Handbook* and the University Calendar, but not in the website version, the Mission Statement also includes the following guideline for faculty.

Research by faculty... includes but is not limited to:

- a) Expansion of knowledge within the scholar's discipline;
- b) A standard of excellence that affirms the University's commitment to academic integrity;
- c) Advancing the integration of faith and learning through scholarship and publication that evaluate theories/conclusions in light of a Christian worldview.

³⁵ Note that these words are in bold in the original, both in the *Faculty Handbook* and in the website. See http://www.crandallu.ca/cu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=67&Itemid=59.

In the *Faculty Handbook*, the first sentence also indicates that the mission is "that of transforming lives".

The Statement of Faith³⁶ provides a more explicit declaration of the form of Christianity that is the foundation for teaching and learning at Crandall University. It includes reference to the concept of the trinity, the authority of scripture, the doctrine of original sin, the notion of salvation, the conception of the Church as consisting of “true [and baptized] believers,” the inevitability of a general resurrection and judgement, and the eternal condemnation of “[t]hose who are lost in sin”. Among the specific articles of faith that faculty are required to adhere to are the following:

1. b) Jesus Christ is God manifest in the flesh; we affirm His virgin birth, sinless humanity, divine miracles, vicarious death once for all time, bodily resurrection and ascension
2. ... The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments have their authority from God alone, and are given to us by divine inspiration. They are the only perfect, supreme, infallible and sufficient standard for all matters of faith and conduct
3. ... By the disobedience of the first man and woman sin entered the human race. Through this disobedience all humanity is born sinful

It is interesting and presumably significant that the “Statement of Faith” is the first item in the *Faculty Handbook*.

The “Statement of Moral Standards”³⁷ provides a list of “Christian standards of behaviour to which faculty and staff are required to conform.” The Statement is characterized as a “covenant” concerning “lifestyle and ethical standards,” derived from Christian scriptures and “the culture of the supporting evangelical constituency.” It also outlines procedures that would be followed should an employee fail “to fulfill covenant obligations.” The Statement of Moral Standards makes clear that conforming to these standards is a prerequisite for employment. It states that:

[a]ccepting or continuing employment at Atlantic Baptist University implies a willingness to live within the confines of this covenant, not as a sign of total agreement with every point, but as evidence of respect for the greater group and a desire for the common good.³⁸

Each of the seven standards is linked to biblical chapter and verse. Staff and faculty are obligated: to be “truthful and honest”; to be “respectful of one another”; to be “sexually pure”; to refrain from “blasphemous and vulgar language”; to “affirm Christ’s preeminence”; to abstain from activities “that could result in personal offence or

³⁶ Quotations are from the more recent version, that is, the one found on the website on February 15, 2010. In substance it seems identical to the earlier website version and to the July 17, 2009 version contained in the *Faculty Handbook*.

³⁷ http://www.crandallu.ca/cu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=65&Itemid=1016.

³⁸ The phrase, “not as a sign of total agreement with every point,” is somewhat ambiguous. Based on the interview with Drs. MacArthur, Crowell, and Reimer, it is not clear what in fact one could disagree with and not be in violation of the Moral Standards.

repercussions for the University”; and to be “committed to Christian standards.” While a few of these prescriptions and proscriptions are similar to written and unwritten expectations and guidelines operative at most other universities, the majority clearly require one to conform to particular evangelical Christian standards in both belief and practice. For example, the following requirements are specified.

3. To be sexually pure, refraining from such activities as adultery, fornication, homosexuality, and the use of pornographic materials;
5. To affirm Christ’s preeminence in our lives, refraining from all involvement in the occult;
7. To be committed to Christian standards in all aspects of life, including entertainment choices.

Both at the time of initial hiring and when faculty members apply for tenure, they must affirm their agreement with the three key documents that we have analyzed above. For example, the August, 2009 advertisement for a Sociology position to which we alluded earlier, and which we were assured during the interview was a fairly standard job advertisement, indicates that “[t]o be considered for appointment, candidates must be committed to the mission and the statement of faith of the university and must be enthusiastic about integrating faith and learning.”³⁹ Also, the letter of application for tenure “shall address the issue of the candidate’s agreement with the university’s Mission Statement, Statement of Faith and Statement of Moral Standards.”⁴⁰

The Statement of Moral Standards itself outlines the procedures⁴¹ to be followed should an employee fail “to fulfill covenant obligations.” This refers to a three-stage process for restorative or disciplinary action. The first stage is “restorative”, and “may include gentle rebuke ... intended to elicit repentance” on the part of the employee. The second stage, entered “at the total discretion of [the employer],” might involve “professional counseling and assessment,” followed by “a probationary period ... [entailing] correction of conduct of behaviour,” and culminating in “ongoing support and accountability” for the restored employee, the fact of restoration having been determined by the institution. The third stage constitutes termination of employment, and “the employee accepts that [Crandall], at its sole discretion, may terminate the relationship without further notice or compensation.”⁴²

³⁹ *Ibid.*. The advertisement also alluded to faculty being “encouraged to find their role of service within a local church and their community.”

⁴⁰ *Faculty Handbook*, 4.16.2.1, page 35.

⁴¹ These procedures are said to have been adapted with permission from a CCCC document in August 2001. We are confident that “CCCC” refers to the aforementioned Canadian Council of Christian Charities, rather than the “Conservative Congregational Christian Conference”, the only other religious organization using that acronym that we were able to discover. We were not, however, able to locate anything currently in the CCCC website dealing with such procedures.

⁴² Later we analyze the procedures relating to changes in conviction or practice, dismissal, and related topics. How those procedures, which are specified in considerable detail, relate to the three-stage process for restorative or disciplinary action just reviewed is not entirely clear.

The Interview with Senior Crandall University Officials

The aforementioned interview with Drs. MacArthur, Crowell, and Reimer took place on September 30, 2009. The purpose was to verify whether the Mission Statement, Statement of Faith and Statement of Moral Standards accurately reflected Crandall University's practices and philosophy and to seek additional clarification of these documents. The committee was particularly interested in understanding how these might affect academic freedom as it is traditionally understood. With the permission of those being interviewed, the entire interview, which lasted approximately two and a quarter hours, was recorded. The committee was warmly received, the discussion was cordial,⁴³ and the committee was offered space if we wished to conduct interviews with faculty members on campus.

The interview made clear that the documents accurately reflected hiring practices, including there being a "faith test." It also illuminated the expectations of faculty behaviour and the processes for discipline. Finally, it confirmed the centrality of evangelical Christianity as the foundation for Crandall University.

It was explicitly stated⁴⁴ a number of times that Crandall is "a Christian university." When asked what it means to say that "faculty are required to demonstrate a commitment to integrate faith and learning," it was explained that, philosophically as a "Christian believer," one has faith that "truth is the person of Christ" and in pursuing that truth one attempts to integrate other relevant, disciplinary knowledge into one's scholarship. Integration of faith and learning can also occur at a more practical level, such as seeing one's students as "made in the image of God" and viewing one's role as teacher as serving them "as a servant of Him." Specifically with respect to the integration of faith and learning on the research side, the committee was told that faculty members are encouraged to publish with university presses and in peer-reviewed journals in their field. However, the University is supportive of members also publishing "in venues where their Christian beliefs are evident in their scholarship." "So we encourage the integration of faith and scholarship as well." It was stated that "ideally we want our faculty to be involved in advancing a Christian world view." President MacArthur indicated at different points in the interview that a faculty member might first need to spend a good many years establishing a professional reputation, and that those faculty members who are not theologically trained might well need time to develop or grow fully into the integration of faith, teaching, and scholarship.

⁴³ There was, however, puzzlement expressed concerning why it was that Crandall University in particular had been chosen for investigation, a suggestion made that CAUT might have been more transparent on this score, and pointed concern expressed that the very word "investigation" was semantically loaded, as compared, for example, to the word "inquiry."

⁴⁴ Every effort has been made to ensure that all material in quotations is *verbatim*; however, it is possible that individual words will be missing because of occasional difficulty in discerning them all in the recording. Nevertheless, the committee is confident that the intent of the speaker is accurately conveyed in the quotations.

A number of questions were asked related to hiring criteria and practices. The committee was told that applications are reviewed on the basis of academic criteria; however, during the job interview there are typically questions related to faith issues. For example, church belonging would be a subject raised by a hiring committee: “Are you part of a body of believers anywhere?” “Would you see yourself becoming involved?” “Is that important to you?” could all be asked. If the answer were “no” this would serve as a cautionary sign that this individual perhaps isn’t suited for Crandall. However, it was also stated that, in and of itself, a negative response “would not be a deal breaker.”

The committee asked whether someone with excellent academic qualifications applying for a position would be short-listed if in the application letter there were evident some reason to question the individual’s commitment to the Christian faith. The response was “most definitely” yes. However, it was also made apparent that an operative assumption was that individuals who apply for positions at Crandall self-select based on the University describing itself as a particular type of Christian institution.

The question of faith is said to be part of the interview process. However, at the beginning applicants are informed that, if there were any question with which they were uncomfortable, they have the right to choose not to respond, and it is understood that the “faith question” is one of these. However, it was also stated that those doing the hiring firmly believe that they have a “right” to ask such a question. Dr. MacArthur went on to explain that “ideally we are seeking to attract those who would feel most comfortable and even liberated by being able to teach and be a faculty member in an institution such as this.”

This suggests to the committee that someone who evidently did not share the religious views of the institution, that is pass the “faith test,” would not be hired. The interview verified that a firm commitment to the university mission, statement of faith, and the integration of faith and learning are conditions of employment. This was further confirmed in the discussion as to whether a distinction was made in terms of criteria for sessional and tenure-track appointments. Although there is a procedural difference in terms of who does the hiring, it was stated that “**the Christian university part is all part of every hire.**”⁴⁵ This was characterized to us in the following way:

For part-timers, I have two separate questions – “who is Jesus and who is he to you?” If the answer is “Saviour of the world and mine” then we’re in the ball park; but if the response is “some guy, I’ve heard about him,” well maybe we can continue talking, . . . but in terms of being fair to them and fair to our mission, that then gets a little trickier.

Both those hired on a part-time or short-term basis and those hired for tenure-track positions are required to sign a contract in which they also affirm their commitment to the mission of the university, the Statement of Faith, and Statement of Moral Standards. These documents are appended to the contract, in such a way that prospective employees effectively subscribe to them when they sign the contract.

⁴⁵ Our emphasis.

The committee was told that

[i]n the hiring process we are obviously **seeking an individual who brings the strongest comprehensive expertise and understanding of who we are and can help further the mission.**⁴⁶ So while you think of it in terms of rejection we think of it as a process that brings to the fore the individual who will be the strongest fit.

At the same time, it was emphasized that “enthusiasm for the mission and 100 percent acceptance on faith issues doesn’t qualify it alone – it is not enough.” When asked specifically whether it would be possible for a Jew or a Muslim to be hired, the committee was told that Crandall’s statement of faith is definitely a statement of the Christian faith and it is that which draws the people at Crandall together. Furthermore,

[b]y virtue of the fact that we [Crandall University] have our own statement of faith clear, it clearly delineates us, or is meant to help separate us from the many other faiths so people know what stripe we are, as they make their choices as to whether they see themselves as fitting in here.

The committee attempted to get a clearer understanding of what appears, based on the Statement of Moral Standards, to be discrimination⁴⁷ at Crandall on the basis of sexual orientation. During the interview, it was stated that the position on homosexuality is a broadly evangelical one and an expression of the Christianity with which Crandall is affiliated. Dr. Crowell went on to say that their position on homosexuality “is a statement about behaviour and not of orientation, ... because there have been gays, you know, employed at ABU over the years.” However, it would not be acceptable for a gay person to be involved in a same-sex relationship. It was explained that in signing the Statement of Moral Standards, “that gay person would essentially be covenanting with us to basically not make his or her same-sex tendencies to be a part of his or her behaviour while employed at [Crandall].”

Crandall’s Philosophy of Education

Crandall’s self-conception as providing a “Christian distinctive”⁴⁸ and a “thoroughly Christian”⁴⁹ “faith venture”⁵⁰ brings home forcefully how holistic and integrated a vision there is at Crandall. This is clarified in its philosophy of education, as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* (Section 1.4), as well as in a statement on the website concerning the values of Christian higher education. The philosophy of education is presented as the crux of the difference between Crandall’s approach to providing a liberal arts education and that of institutions offering a “university education based upon secular and

⁴⁶ Our emphasis.

⁴⁷ Human Rights legislation prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

⁴⁸ President’s Message. See http://www.abu.ca/donor/don_pre.html. Access gained on August 6, 2009.

⁴⁹ Mission Statement, *loc. cit.*.

⁵⁰ President’s Message, *loc. cit.*.

materialistic faiths.” The Crandall perspective (“point of view,” “place to stand,” “worldview”) is identified as Christian. “While there is considerable diversity of opinion among both the faculty and student body regarding various theological emphases, we are united in our conviction that life, to be seen clearly and whole, must be seen in the light of God’s saving action in one’s life, through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.” Furthermore, “diligence in academic work [is expected and] students are encouraged to give their best as praise to God.” References to depth and breadth of the curriculum are followed by a note that “... all students at [Crandall] must take a minor in Religious Studies.” The faculty for their part “challenge the students to understand and accept responsibility for their own worldview, professing the Lordship of Christ over all knowledge and activity.”

In a website note concerning the values of Christian higher education, the following argument was directed to prospective Crandall students.

A Christian university should ... teach from a biblical worldview. Ultimately, there is little point in attending a university that calls itself “Christian” if it does not approach all truth as being from God. This is a potential strength as well as a challenge to Christian universities. A biblical worldview will see God as the source of truth in science, history, and all other disciplines. Christians believe that God not only made all things, but also knows them intimately. Therefore, his lordship over our studies is not limited to biblical studies.⁵¹

In a more recent website note, from the 2008-10 Academic Calendar at Crandall, reference is made to the role of faculty in these respects.

Students at [Crandall] are challenged intellectually, spiritually, and socially in preparation for future positions of influence and leadership where as professionals they will serve humanity as they help build the Kingdom of God. A supportive community of Christian scholars is vital to [Crandall’s] mission, professors who model academic integrity and who integrate faith and learning in the classroom. The majority hold earned doctorates in their field of expertise. Availability to students beyond the classroom also distinguishes the faculty at [Crandall].⁵²

Additional Crandall Documents

As mentioned earlier, we received a copy of the *Faculty Handbook* towards the end of the interview. There are sections⁵³ in the *Handbook* that provide significant clarification of the matters we had noted and enquired about during the interview. These sections pertain to faculty qualifications and responsibilities; eligibility, criteria, and procedures

⁵¹ http://www.abu.nb.ca/future/fut_why.html. Access gained on September 2, 2009.

⁵² http://www.crandallu.ca/cu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=194&Itemid=165. Access gained on May 4, 2010.

⁵³ See especially Sections 4.3, 4.8, 4.9, 4.11, 4.15, 4.16, 4.18, 4.19, 4.23, 5.15, 8.8, and 8.9.

for earning tenure and promotion; the implications of changes in conviction or practice; and dismissal procedures. Recall that, according to the interview, the policies in the *Faculty Handbook* are considered binding, if legal action were initiated.

On Faculty Qualifications and Responsibilities

As stated or implied in job advertisements, the Statement of Faith, and the Statement of Moral Standards, and as explicitly provided in Section 4.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*, Crandall University “appoints as faculty members, regardless of gender, age, race or disability, committed and academically qualified Christians who ... [h]ave a personal faith in Jesus Christ and who demonstrate discipleship in the academic community, the Christian community, and the community at large [and h]ave demonstrated personal and professional views which are consistent with the Bible and the [Crandall] Statement of Faith.” Faculty members are also expected to be professionally qualified, competent communicators, good teachers, and experienced researchers, but note in particular that, as indicated in the excerpts above, faculty members are expected to be committed Christians and to demonstrate their discipleship within the academic community and specifically in their professional academic views.

Faculty members at Crandall also have specific corporate and individual responsibilities. The latter are numerous, and include affirmation of “the Statement of Faith, Mission Statement, Statement of Moral Standards, and the Purpose and Objectives of [Crandall] University,” providing students with both “spiritual and academic direction,” maintaining “a lifestyle honouring to Jesus Christ and consonant with the philosophy and goals of the university,” [and] chapel attendance “as often as feasible by using the required attendance policy for students as a guideline.” With respect to chapel attendance, University Policy 8.8 indicates that “... faculty are asked to be faithful in attendance at chapel. Whereas full-time students are required to attend two chapels per week, it is recommended that faculty seek to voluntarily adhere to the same guideline.” Policy 8.9 adds that “[e]ach member of faculty is expected to attend a local church and to be a faithful co-labourer within that church. Formal membership within the church is encouraged.” During the interview, the committee was assured by Dr. Crowell that there was no formal monitoring of faculty members’ adherence to these attendance stipulations.

On Eligibility, Criteria, and Procedures for Earning Tenure and Promotion

Section 4.9 of the *Faculty Handbook* briefly explains the purpose of tenure and indicates that “[t]enured faculty have been recognized by the community (both by their peers and by the university administration) as effective teachers, capable researchers and devoted, Godly servants to their colleagues and community.” The specification of the criteria for the various faculty ranks laid out in Section 4.11 is prefaced by reference to the faculty being “... part of a community of Christian scholars whose priorities include ... denominational duties”

As explained in 4.11, normally, a faculty member appointed to a tenure-track position “shall ... be assessed for tenure in the sixth year of a series of three two-year contracts.”

(4.15.1.1) Typically, a faculty member's performance is evaluated by the Faculty Development Committee "during the first half of the second year of each [two-year] contract." (4.15.1.2) The first evaluation entails consideration and discussion of a substantial dossier of documents, including a statement of teaching philosophy that includes reference to "insights regarding ways to integrate faith and learning within one's own courses and classes." (5.15.1.2.1) The evaluation for tenure itself, normally conducted during the sixth year of appointment, includes consideration of a teaching portfolio, which is to include reference to "how issues pertaining to faith are integrated and incorporated into each course." (4.16.2.1.1) The evaluation of service is to include reference to "service to the Church." (4.16.2.1.3) The letter of application for tenure evaluation "should include a statement of how the candidate has satisfied the requirements for tenure and shall address the issue of the candidate's agreement with the University's Mission Statement, Statement of Faith and Statement of Moral Standards." (4.16.2.1) It would appear from the semantics of this latter quoted passage that reference in the application letter to the three Statements is mandated, while reference to the (other) requirements for tenure is merely recommended.

When tenure is considered, the Faculty Development Committee – normally the VPAA and three elected faculty members – may be expanded at the committee's discretion to include a fifth individual, "... normally ... a Christian scholar from another institution who is a tenured faculty member in the same discipline of (*sic*) the tenure applicant." That individual must be acceptable both to the applicant and to the VPAA "... in consultation with the Faculty Development Committee."

It was asserted during the interview that, "ninety to ninety-five percent of the time," tenure and promotion decisions hinged on whether the applicant's research was sufficient (presumably in quantity as well as quality).

On Changes in Conviction or Practice

Sections 4.18 and 4.19 of the *Faculty Handbook* concern the hypothetical circumstance of a faculty member having disclosed a change in personal conviction as regards the Statement of Faith or the Statement of Moral Standards, and the protocol for handling complaints from another party who had alleged that a faculty member had failed to conform to precepts in one or the other of the statements.

Section 4.18 of the *Faculty Handbook* is entitled "Accommodating a Faculty Member's Change of Personal Conviction Regarding the Statement of Faith and/or Statement of Moral Standards." According to this provision, any individual disclosing a change in belief such that s/he no longer can adhere to the Statement of Faith or the Statement of Moral Standards would do so with the express and written intent of seeking an amicable separation "that will maintain the faculty member's personal integrity and the credibility of the University's mission." For its part, "the University [in such circumstances] desires to work with such an individual in the spirit of cooperation." Under such circumstances, the Vice President for Academic Affairs would meet with the faculty member so as "to formulate a written agreement of mutually acceptable boundaries with regard to the

faculty member's activities in teaching, publishing, conference speaking and general department until his/her employment is concluded at [Crandall]." Later it is indicated that the duration of such an employee's service at Crandall would normally not exceed one year beyond the end of the academic year during which the faculty member had submitted the written statement to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The agreement reached by the two parties would "seek to respect both the change of conviction on the part of the faculty member and the need for the University not to be misrepresented, to its harm, through the faculty member's activities [while continuing to work at Crandall]." Strikingly, it is indicated as well that "[t]he agreement shall also include an understanding of both the timing and content of any statement to be made to the Faculty Association with regard to conclusion of the individual's appointment."

Section 4.19 is entitled "Protocol for Handling Complaints Against Faculty Members Alleging Failure to Uphold the Statement of Faith and/or Statement of Moral Standards." It is recommended in the protocol that any complainant first approach "the faculty member directly and privately for clarification." It requires that any complaint be signed and submitted by the complainant(s) in writing to the VPAA, who might dismiss the complaint on grounds of lack of foundation, triviality, vexatiousness, or its having been made in bad faith, or might adjudge the complaint as possibly having merit or as having sufficient merit to warrant a request for a written response from the faculty member. The protocol clarifies that "[e]vidence that a member of faculty has questioned or challenged any aspect of [either Statement] is insufficient proof in and of itself that a faculty member no longer adheres to, or has violated, either Statement." If the complainant were not satisfied by the respondent's reply, the VPAA might seek to implement mediation, and shall keep a written record of all communications between and among "the VP Academic, the complainant and respondent including all mediation meetings." If one or the other party were to refuse mediation, or if mediation were to fail to result in resolution, the VPAA must submit relevant documents to the Faculty Development Committee (FDC),⁵⁴ which, absent its Chair, the VPAA, shall review that documentation and interview both the complainant and the respondent. The FDC will make a decision, either "(a) dismissing the complaint as failing to prove a violation, (b) affirming that the complaint has merit sufficient to cause concern but insufficient to [warrant the declaration of the existence of] a violation, or (c) (*sic*) that the complaint has merit sufficient to [indicate the existence of] a violation." In the latter two eventualities, the FDC "may invoke disciplinary action against the faculty member that could range from a letter of counsel for less serious concerns, up to recommendation for dismissal on serious

⁵⁴ The FDC includes the VPAA (Chair) and three non-Senate faculty members elected by faculty for three-year terms. The responsibilities of the Faculty Development Committee include overseeing the Faculty Development Program; proposing "changes to faculty development and promotion guidelines and policies"; advising on the approval of leaves of absence, including sabbatical leaves; recommending "renewal of tenure-track employment agreements"; advocating the granting of tenure; approving promotion; and of course dealing with self-disclosed or alleged changes of personal conviction. Also, it is worth noting that the Faculty Development Program at Crandall includes reference to the importance of faculty "spiritual growth", and the need for the FDC to arrange an annual faculty retreat "in order to focus on such themes as faith and learning, the place of prayer and other spiritual disciplines in the life of the mind", and "time set aside for prayer, praise, and reflection." (5.4.4.1) See *Faculty Handbook*, Sections 3.5 and 5.0.

violations wherein the faculty member cannot harmonize his/her views with the Statement of Faith and/or Statement of Moral Standards as previously agreed.” An appeal may be made by the faculty member to the VPAA. The VPAA and the respondent shall subsequently agree on the appointment of an arbitrator from outside of the University, who shall “render a decision [and] recommend that the decision of the FDC and its recommended discipline be upheld, or that the decision of the FDC be upheld, but the disciplinary action be modified, or that the decision of the FDC be dismissed as well as all disciplinary action.” The arbitrator’s recommendation is to be submitted to the President, as Chair of the Senate, following which “Senate shall review all documentation provided, including the submission from the external arbitrator, and shall render a decision [that] shall be final.”

Thus, there are considerably detailed procedures laid out in the *Faculty Handbook* for dealing with situations when a faculty member feels s/he is in conflict with the university’s faith-based policies or in cases where a complaint has been lodged against an individual for behaviour considered inappropriate under those policies. During the interview, the committee was told that in over thirty years there had been no formal instances where an employee had to leave as a result of such conflict. The committee was informed, however, that there have been cases where a faculty member has voluntarily moved on, and while the reasons for doing so were not stated at the time, it was later learned that the individual had drifted away from the faith, and a possible interpretation is that that had been part of the struggle with which they had been dealing. It was also suggested that a reason for leaving might have been an individual no longer wanting to “live a double-life.” This suggests a recognition that there are limits to one’s ability to work at Crandall if an individual no longer feels able to live within the confines of the faith-based policies. Yet, at the same time, the committee was told that “faculty are free to criticize the policies of the university” and, indeed, at one time faculty criticism had led to an investigation of some senior administrators. The impression given was that such criticism, however, is limited to how the university is administered and does not extend to the faith-based policies themselves.

On Dismissal Procedures

Possible reasons for dismissal from a tenure-track position at Crandall include an inadequate evaluation and “[c]onsistent failure to carry out the responsibilities of a faculty member.” (4.23.1.1) Possible reasons for dismissal of an already tenured faculty member also include “[c]onsistent failure to carry out the responsibilities of a faculty member.” (4.23.1.3) It is explained that “[f]ailure to carry out the responsibilities of a faculty member is failure to carry out the responsibilities as defined by the *Faculty Handbook, Section 4.0*.” (4.23.2.1) Section 4.0 includes reference *passim*. to “Christian educators” and “Christian scholars” stimulating student “spiritual ... growth,” providing students with “spiritual ... direction,” evidencing “personal faith in Jesus Christ” and being “devoted, Godly servants,” holding “views ... consistent with the Bible and the [Crandall] Statement of Faith,” disclosing changes of personal conviction, integrating “faith and learning within one’s courses and classes” and providing evidence that one has done so, “joining each other in prayer,” maintaining “a lifestyle honouring to Jesus Christ

and consonant with the philosophy and goals of the university,” attending chapel, performing denominational duties,” and, of course, affirming the various Statements.

Academic Freedom as it is Conceived at Crandall University

The Crandall University *Faculty Handbook* section on Academic Freedom (4.8) reveals a significantly different conception of academic freedom from that provided in the CAUT Policy Statement on Academic Freedom, the fundamental basis of our analysis. During the interview, the committee was told that the Crandall statement on Academic Freedom was written solely by faculty members.

The following excerpts suggest how academic freedom is conceived at Crandall University.

4.8.1. Academic freedom confers the right on members of the [Crandall] faculty to pursue truth in their research and to disseminate the findings of their research in their teaching and publications without arbitrary interference.

4.8.2 [Crandall] views the active questioning of prevailing orthodoxy that academic freedom allows as necessary in order to prevent misconception of truth from being accepted in place of truth itself. The members of the [Crandall] academic community regard academic freedom as an indispensable means of reminding themselves that “we know in part” (1 Corinthians 13.9).

4.8.4. [A]cademic freedom is incompatible with the extreme form of relativism that rejects the idea that there is an independent reality to be investigated and known. [T]he right of academic freedom does not imply the freedom to enjoy the rights and privileges of membership in the [Crandall] academic community while rejecting the fundamental principles upon which that community is constituted.... [A]ccepting the university’s statement of faith and upholding its statement of moral standards is expected of every member of the faculty as a condition of employment.... [M]embers of the [Crandall] academic community voluntarily affirm some elements of the “part that we know” through divine revelation. The university does not believe that there is an inherent conflict between its support of academic freedom and its confessional basis.

From the above, and from the Philosophy of Education discussed earlier, it appears that “academic freedom” at Crandall University is at best limited to working within a particular framework of thought, namely that acceptable to evangelical Christianity. It is restricted by a prescribed doctrine, and faculty are required to teach and do research in a way that accepts it as sacrosanct. This is contrary to the generally understood definition of academic freedom, which states clearly that academic freedom cannot be restricted by prescribed doctrine.

In the interview, the committee asked whether the requirement that faculty sign the Mission Statement, the Statement of Faith, and the Statement of Moral Standards was

viewed as consistent with academic freedom. It was explained by President MacArthur that “we do not regard it as inconsistent.” “In believing all truth is God’s truth, and therefore there should be no threat in terms of pursuing truth – it leads to the question of how you discern truth.” It was acknowledged that truth could mean different things to different people. However, it was added, they “ask people who join Crandall to affirm the interpretation of the truth as understood within the broadest sense of evangelical Christianity.” In the view of the committee, this restricts academic freedom.

For those at Crandall, the CAUT definition of academic freedom appears to be extremely arbitrary and without a supporting rationale. “It seems an assumed position that there is clear evidence that those institutions that have a statement of faith, that it is a genuine infringement of academic freedom.” In contrast, we were told, the AUCC definition of academic freedom is more “inclusive.” One of the administrators reported that Crandall has succeeded in establishing “a solid university atmosphere,” and that students are not required to come to any one particular view. Dr. Reimer, for his part, assured us that he, for example, covered the typical gamut of sociological analyses of various issues in the classroom, and that when he did so he presented the various alternative perspectives as honestly, thoroughly, and convincingly as he knew how.

During the course of this discussion, brief reference was made to the exemption in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms for religious educational institutions. Article 29 of the Charter reads: “Nothing in this Charter abrogates or derogates from any rights or privileges guaranteed by or under the Constitution of Canada in respect of denominational, separate or dissentient schools.” The footnote to this Charter provision refers to Section 93 of The Constitution Act, 1867, and to its footnote. It is not clear to us, since neither of us is a constitutional lawyer, whether the exemption provided religious educational institutions extends to postsecondary educational institutions. We shall leave that for others to consider.

One of the committee members had discussed briefly the 1940 AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure in a preliminary conversation with President MacArthur concerning arrangements for the interview. This matter was alluded to by the committee member during the interview itself, but was not discussed any further. This is germane to our report because, in article 2 of the AAUP Statement, reference is made to a requirement that any “[l]imitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment,” thus implicitly allowing for the possibility of there legitimately being religious limitations on academic freedom as the AAUP conceived it in 1940, as long as those entering such institutions were explicitly made aware of that circumstance. This is consistent with the Crandall notion of their academic employees having entered a covenant with the employer to that effect when they first began their employment. Indeed, that is a condition of employment at Crandall. In that connection, the committee suggests that note be made of the qualifying interpretive comment added to article 2 of the AAUP Statement, and endorsed by the organization’s annual meeting, in 1970. It states that “[m]ost church-related institutions no longer need or desire the departure from the principle of academic freedom implied in the 1940 *Statement*, and we do not now endorse

such a departure.” Furthermore, if one were to examine the 1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, one would encounter an interesting statement of relevance to the debate concerning whether Crandall University, or any other such private university in the Canadian context, should receive public funds of any sort, a debate that we do not propose to enter here. “[A]ny university which lays restrictions upon the intellectual freedom of its professors proclaims itself a proprietary institution, and should be so described whenever it makes a general appeal for funds; and the public should be advised that the institution has no claim whatever to general support or regard.”⁵⁵

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the Crandall University documents that the committee reviewed and the interview conducted with the President, the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, and the President of the Faculty Association at Crandall, it is clear that Crandall University does have a faith test. There are faith-based constraints on potential applicants, actual applicants, short-listed candidates, first-time faculty members, faculty members undergoing evaluation in years two, four, and six of their employment, and throughout the course of faculty members’ employment at Crandall. To be hired at Crandall requires that one have a personal faith in Jesus Christ, that one hold personal and professional views that are consistent with the Bible and the university’s Statement of Faith, and that one’s everyday behaviour conform to the Statement of Moral Standards. While the university has a statement on academic freedom, it is significantly inconsistent with that of the CAUT and the majority of universities across the western world, and assurances that free enquiry is still possible within its constraints are unconvincing.⁵⁶

As a result, the committee recommends that Crandall University be placed on the list of institutions “found to have imposed a requirement of a commitment to a particular ideology or statement of faith as a condition of employment.”

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The Committee’s intent was to interview current Crandall faculty members, former faculty members, and others who had considered seeking or had actually sought employment at Crandall. We canvassed current faculty at Crandall directly and had the Federation of New Brunswick Faculty Associations send a request to individual faculty associations asking them in turn to inform their members as to our interest in speaking with anyone who had had an affiliation with Crandall or had sought employment there. We received a response from a small number of individuals who expressed an interest in speaking with us. Despite a number of attempts we were not successful in coordinating our different schedules and logistics to make this possible. We considered the possibility of providing an opportunity for these individuals to comment on their experiences via e-

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

⁵⁶ It is possible that at least some other professors at Crandall whom we might have interviewed would have given us the same assurances as Dr. Reimer had. As explained below, we chose not to conduct further interviews in the end.

mail, without attribution if they wished. However, we concluded that, given our mandate and given our analysis of all of the relevant Crandall University documents as well as the interview with Drs. MacArthur, Crowell and Reimer, we were unlikely to learn anything that would alter our fundamental conclusions. As a result, and in order to complete this report in a timely fashion, we decided to forego this other step, with regret.⁵⁷ We have communicated our decision not to proceed with interviews to those who had expressed an interest in talking to us, with apologies and an explanation.

We also made a decision not to interview Crandall students, past or present, since it was not really part of our mandate. We would point out that, during the course of our investigation, we did note at least two senses in which Crandall University students would appear to have greater academic freedom than its faculty members. In its Mission Statement, Crandall University indicates “[a]n openness to persons of any race, colour and creed who choose to study at, or become part of, the community of [Crandall] University,” but elsewhere it becomes clear that this declared openness relates to student members of the community only. It does not extend to members of faculty or staff or, for that matter, the administration or the Board of Governors⁵⁸ of the institution. Interestingly, as is made clear in its statement on “Academic Freedom,” students at Crandall are also specifically exempted from the requirement incumbent on faculty members to subscribe to Crandall’s Statement of Faith.

⁵⁷ We regret, for example, that we were unable to learn whether any of the Crandall faculty members wished to suggest that, given their religious views and their lifestyle preferences, they personally experienced more “academic freedom” at Crandall than they would have, or had, experienced at other academic institutions. This was suggested in the interview that we did conduct. It is also, of course, possible that we would have heard of difficulties in reconciling the Statement of Faith or Statement of Moral Standards with one’s work as an academic. We also regret that we were unable to learn why a few individuals who had apparently sought employment at Crandall wished to speak to us about their experiences, or why, for one individual declining the invitation to speak to us, a legal undertaking precluded acceptance.

⁵⁸ A footnote to the Statement of Moral Standards indicates that “[m]embers of the Board of Governors, in having approved this Statement of Moral Standards to which faculty and staff are required to conform, are expected to live within the confines of this Statement as evidence of their identity with, and support of, the mission of the University.”