

Opinions of Administrators, Faculty, and Students Regarding
Academic Freedom and Student Artistic Expression

by

C. David Warner III

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

in

Community College Education

Approved

Samuel D. Morgan, Co-Chair

Don G. Creamer, Co-Chair

Jimmie C. Fortune

Jan K. Nespor

Terry M. Wildman

May 1999

Blacksburg, Virginia

Opinions...Regarding Academic Freedom and Student Artistic Expression by C. David Warner III

Abstract: The primary purpose of this study was to compare the opinions of community college administrators, art faculty members, and art students concerning institutional options and policy alternatives for the exhibition of controversial student art work in the community colleges of Maryland. The research questions addressed the concept of academic freedom, the principle of institutional neutrality, and the context of the presentation.

Three community colleges were selected for the study. Data were collected in two stages. Information gathered in the first stage of this project was used to collect data during the second stage. In phase one the researcher went to each of the three schools and conducted individual interviews to determine the perceived facts surrounding a controversial art incident. The interviews were structured to identify the multiple perceptions of the incident and reactions to how it was handled. The researcher recorded what the participants thought were the issues that contributed to the controversy and what principles they thought were employed in the solution. The researcher prepared a brief and objective case analysis of each incident.

Phase two of this project involved the researcher taking the analysis of each controversial art incident back to the three sites for group interviews. There were three group interviews conducted at each of the three community colleges. One group was made up of two administrators. Another group included two or three arts faculty members and the third group involved four or more art students.

The results of the individual interviews are presented as participant responses to questions regarding the issues involved in the art controversy at their community college, the principles employed in the administration's solution to the controversy, and the individual's personal reaction to their institution's response. The results of the group interviews are presented in three parts. Part one is the participant responses to

questions stemming from the research areas of academic freedom, institutional neutrality, and context of the presentation. Part two group interview results are given as participant responses to questions regarding the issues, the administrative response, and concerns in the three case studies. Part three results are presented as the policy preference of all participants.

The results show different opinions exist between administrators, art faculty, and art students concerning academic freedom, institutional neutrality, and the exhibition of controversial student art. This statement supports the original research hypothesis. It is important to note however, the opinions do not always divide precisely along administrator, faculty, and student classification lines. Furthermore, none of the community colleges in this study had an exhibition policy in place to deal with art controversy. Most of the decisions were made after the controversy broke and were based more on the culture of the college rather than on policy. There is a need for educational institutions to become proactive in this area.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank Dr. Morgan for being my advisor and for guiding me through this project. I want to thank Dr. Creamer for taking over when Dr. Morgan became ill. I relied on you both a great deal. I also want to thank my family for their patience and support.

Table of Contents

	Abstract	i.
	Acknowledgements	iii.
	Table of contents	iv.
	List of Tables	vi.
Chapter One:	Introduction	1
	Purpose	3
	Problem Statement	7
	Significance	9
	Summary	11
Chapter Two:	Review of the Literature	13
	Academic Freedom	14
	Art Censorship	23
	Context of the Presentation	32
	Administrative Responsibility	40
	Summary	43
Chapter Three:	Methodology	45
	Assumptions and Limitations	45
	Definitions	47
	Participants	47
	Demographic Data	51
	Procedure	52
	Phase One Individual Interviews	52
	Phase One Instrumentation	53
	Phase Two Group Interviews	54
	Phase Two Instrumentation	55
	Case Study One	57
	Case Study Two	59
	Case Study Three	60
	Policy Options	64
	Policy Option One	64
	Policy Option Two	65
	Policy Option Three	65
	Analysis	67
	Ethical Considerations	68
	Summary	69

Chapter Four:	Results	70
	Phase One Individual Interviews	71
	Issues Involved in the Controversy	71
	Principles Employed in the Solution	73
	Personal Reaction to the Response	76
	Phase Two Group Interviews	82
	Community College A	82
	Academic Freedom	82
	Institutional Neutrality	85
	Context of the Presentation	88
	Community College B	88
	Academic Freedom	88
	Institutional Neutrality	91
	Context of the Presentation	93
	Community College C	94
	Academic Freedom	94
	Institutional Neutrality	95
	Context of the Presentation	98
	Group Response to Case Studies	99
	Case Study One	99
	Case Study Two	102
	Case Study Three	104
	Policy Preference	106
	Patterns of Response	111
	Academic Freedom Questions	111
	Institutional Neutrality Questions	112
	Context of the Presentation Questions	114
	Identification of Issues	114
	Relationship Between Policy Preference and Issue Identification	115
	Summary	118
Chapter Five:	Conclusions	119
	Overview	119
	Purpose	119
	Method	121
	Findings	122
	Academic Freedom	124
	Institutional Neutrality	125
	Context of the Presentation	126
	Policy Preference	127
	Discussion and Implications	128
Chapter Six:	References	131

Appendices:		139
	Appendix A: Consent Form	139
	Appendix B: Individual Interview Guide	143
	Appendix C: Group Interview Guide	144
	Appendix D: Demographic Information Form	146
	Appendix E: Case Studies	147
	Appendix F: Policy Options	151
	Appendix G: Analysis Plan	153
	Appendix H: Vitae	157

List of Tables

Table 1: Issues the Individual Participants Identified as Contributing to the Art Controversy at Their Community College	74
Table 2: Principles the Individual Participants Identified as Having Been Employed in the Solution of the Art Controversy at Their Community College	77
Table 3: Individual Reactions to the Institution's Response	80
Table 4: Participants Choice from the Three Policy Options Presented in This Study for Handling Controversial Student Art Exhibits	108

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

It is often through art that we are able to see truths, both beautiful and ugly (Zuber, 1992, p. 302).

What is the purpose of art? There seems to be no clear understanding of what art is and how it might function in American society (Becker, 1991). In this country most art is thought of as high culture or entertainment. Most people agree with Plato and think that art exists to infuse the world with beauty and grace. But art is powerful. It can demonstrate valuable sides and connections in events that disturb others (Storr, 1991). It is not understood, except by the art world itself, as a legitimate arena for controversy and debate (Becker, 1991).

What is the purpose of education? Many would argue that the goal of education is to shake up preconceived notions and to cause discomfort. Like art, education is powerful. It can disturb the calm and should calmly disturb. Education can alter and change lives. At the very least, the academy should be the one setting where alternative opinions may be freely voiced (Dubin, 1994). Yet there has been little discussion of the problems relating to the introduction of controversial material into the classroom. There has been little attention given to the special role art faculty play in encouraging students to be creative. There has been little written about the removal of student art work from student exhibits when the work is considered to be politically controversial or sexually offensive (Hamilton, 1995).

Much of the creativity in our society occurs in campus studios and theaters. The link between the campus gallery or stage and the outside arts world is as strong as in almost any academic field. Many composers, conductors, and visual artists are also college teachers. Faculty artists are deeply concerned with restrictions aimed at the arts and anxious about the campus creative community being targeted by people who do not understand the political nature of art (O'neil, 1997). In fact, the one area of our

society in which the free expression of ideas is seriously threatened today is the academy, where a wide range of unpopular opinions are regularly policed by students, professors, and administrators (Storr, 1991). Former Yale president Benno Schmidt believes that “the most serious problems of freedom of expression in the U.S. today exist on our campuses” (Hamilton, 1995, p. 63). In a May, 1994 commencement speech, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., condemned the frenzy for “censorship that currently finds a special location in our universities” (Hamilton, 1995, p. 63). The way in which a college deals with a controversial art exhibit will reveal the relative status of art within the college and the attitude of the neighboring community toward the role of the college as a forum for public discourse (Lyons, 1991).

When people see an art work that they consider sexist, racist, or offensive, they demand that it be taken down (Cembalest, 1994). Censorship of opposing views remains the strongest drive in human nature. People have realized that censorship is a powerful political tool for use in silencing the ideas that offend them (Hamilton, 1995).

There appears to be more artistic censorship now than ever before in this country. One of the most disturbing trends has occurred in educational institutions, traditionally bulwarks of tolerance, diversity, and freedom of expression. There have been numerous instances throughout the country of removed or painted-over murals, canceled theatrical productions, and defaced art works (Morris, 1995).

Cembalest (1994) investigated two hundred incidents of attempted censorship in forty three states between 1992 and 1993. He found that censorship attempts come from across the ideological spectrum, from the religious right to the politically correct left. One of the most shocking findings was the degree of success that occurred. Outright removal of the work occurred forty percent of the time. Sixty six percent of the time the work was removed from the exhibit and relocated. Incidents on college campuses account for twenty five percent of the cases reported (Cembalest, 1994).

PURPOSE

Because art, at its best, seeks to question established social standards, and because art encourages new ideas, artists readily run afoul of the guardians of public morals (Grundy, 1994, p. 241).

Just what is the role of the community college and academic freedom as it relates to the visual arts (Sherlock, 1995)? In April 1990, the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and the Wolf Trap Foundation sponsored a Conference on Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression at the Wolf Trap Center for the Performing Arts in northern Virginia. Their goal was to determine the appropriate scope and nature of artistic freedom in the academic setting. The result of the conference was a position statement intended to serve as a guide for institutions. The statement addresses academic freedom as it relates to the arts, the issue of institutional accountability, the rights of the audience, and the role of public funding (Lyons, 1991). The primary purpose of this study was to compare the opinions of community college administrators, art faculty members, and art students concerning institutional options and policy alternatives for the exhibition of controversial student art work in the community colleges of Maryland. The research questions addressed the concept of academic freedom, the principle of institutional neutrality, and the context of the presentation. The issue at stake was whether academic freedom provides faculty artists the right to select student art work for exhibition or whether artistic value judgments should instead be determined by the dominant culture (Kerka, 1997).

Academic Freedom

Freedom in teaching and in research is fundamental to the advancement and dissemination of truth (Horn, 1993). Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Artistic freedom is an important part of academic freedom. The right of faculty artists to challenge conventional wisdom and values is the foundation of artistic and academic freedom (O'neil, 1997). Faculty artists must possess the freedom to encourage their students to challenge conventional values as well.

Art faculty are always walking a fine line between the exercise of academic and artistic freedoms and the risk of upsetting their constituency. The art teacher's constituency includes students, colleagues, administrators, and other members of the community who believe they are associated with the school, its programs, and its standards. Art educators consistently risk facing the outrage of others as a result of both educational choice and unpredictable occurrence (Lankford, 1994).

Should faculty artists be responsible for upholding the laws and standards of the communities they serve? Standards of the community are seldom clear-cut. Most communities in America are mixed in their cultural and social backgrounds, attitudes, values, beliefs, and opinions. To think that teachers could avoid controversies simply by being more sensitive and responsive to their communities is naive (Lankford, 1994). A teacher cannot be vulnerable to community standards and search for truth.

Faculty must possess the right to encourage their students to engage in the authentic activities of the discipline under study. Research has proven students will learn more and remember more when they become involved in real situations. Academic freedom is supposed to protect faculty in the teaching, learning, and research process. Artists live in a world of ideas that are often provocative and controversial. But when faculty artists encourage their students to be creative and

authentic, the public, as well as other constituents of the college community, often become offended and outraged. When faculty artists determine student art work to be of sufficient quality to be hung in a student exhibition, the works that create the most controversy are targeted for removal. To protect the college and the community, the faculty artist's academic and artistic freedom is sometimes trampled over and the student's rights ignored.

The fundamental issue should not be whether art is offensive or has social consequences. The bigger question is whether academic freedom provides faculty artists the right to select student art work for exhibition based on responsible and informed judgments of its quality, or whether quality should instead be subordinated to populist demagoguery and the idiosyncratic artistic tastes of administrators, faculty colleagues, students, and the public (Sherlock, 1995).

Institutional Neutrality

The principle of institutional neutrality is the idea that an educational institution must create and protect an environment that fosters the free expression of ideas. The institution should remain neutral to opposing ideas.

Some administrators of educational and artistic institutions appear to be abdicating their responsibility to maintain a neutral environment where ideas can be freely exchanged. Campus leaders often search for institutional or community values that will require "offensive" student art work to be restrained in order to protect those they fear may be hurt or offended (Hamilton, 1995). Environmental issues, sexism, racism, violence, crime, politics, and television are just some of the sources of controversy addressed by today's artists. Those educational leaders who remove controversial art work from student exhibitions may have lost faith in the academy as a place to freely voice differences of opinion. When higher education administrators

allow community standards to influence the exhibition of student art work, the principle of institutional neutrality has been violated (Hoffman & Storr, 1991).

Context of the Presentation

A key issue related to the problem of controversial student art exhibits is the context of the presentation. The context of the presentation refers to the space or location of the art exhibit. If an exhibition is located in an area also used for other purposes, such as a student lounge, a building concourse, a cafeteria, or a hallway, administrators may find themselves being forced to decide between the freedom of artistic expression and the rights of an individual not to see the exhibit. If the exhibition is in an isolated gallery, the viewer can decide whether or not to see the art.

Since there are no absolute criteria for judging a work of art, the uninformed public may question its value. Artwork in a college gallery, particularly material that challenges the social norm, is more easily open to general criticism. The general public is quick to judge artwork on an emotional basis. A work of art exhibited in a college gallery has the same neutral relationship to the institution as a manuscript published by a college press. But our perceptions of each can be very different (Dubin, 1994). Only those with an interest in the topic of the manuscript will delve into the contents of the paper. Art exhibits are public events.

Designating a space on campus to be used as an art gallery is only part of the solution. The belief that viewers in a free society have a fundamental right to draw their own conclusions about what they see must be protected in all cases. This requires that the public has access to a wide range of material (Dubin, 1994). The main question is whether or not art is considered protected speech. If the college opens a gallery to the public as a place for expression it should not regulate that

expression any way it pleases just because the gallery is its property or because the artists happen to be a member of the college's faculty or student body (O'neil, 1997).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

“Must art be an in-your-face enterprise?” the answer clearly is a resounding “yes,” and that is particularly true, I believe, in a university setting. I submit that not only art but education must be an “in-your face” enterprise, or else why bother (Foster, 1994, p. 64)?

Campus administrators may be interfering with the free speech rights of student artists, and the academic freedom rights of art faculty, when they remove or relocate controversial student art work from an exhibit on their campus. The primary purpose of this study was to compare the opinions of campus administrators, art faculty members, and student artists concerning institutional solutions and policy options relating to the exhibition of controversial student art work in the community colleges of Maryland. The specific issues of academic freedom, exhibition space, and administrative responsibility for campus neutrality were investigated. The opinions of the participants were examined to identify consistency among groups. The participants' policy choices were compared to determine which policy option each group gave the highest preference. To accomplish the objectives of this study, data were gathered and analysis conducted to answer three research questions:

1. What are the opinions of administrators, art faculty members, and art students in the community colleges of Maryland concerning how academic freedom rights pertain to the exhibition of student art work? Do different opinions exist among the administrative, faculty, and student classifications? How do opinions compare among the participants of

each classification? Which policy options might each classification prefer in dealing with a controversial student art exhibit?

2. What are the opinions of administrators, art faculty, and art students in the community colleges of Maryland concerning the principle of institutional neutrality and the need to protect the institution from controversy provoked by an exhibition of student art work? Do different opinions exist among the administrative, faculty, and student classifications? How do opinions compare among the participants of each classification? Which policy options might each classification prefer in dealing with a controversial student art exhibit?

3. What are the opinions of administrators, art faculty, and art students in the community colleges of Maryland regarding the protection of controversial student art work from outside interference when the work of art is on exhibit in a campus gallery? Do different opinions exist among the administrative, faculty, and student classifications? How do opinions compare among the participants of each classification? Which policy options might each classification prefer in dealing with a controversial student art exhibit?

What obligations do educational institutions have in stating their censorship policies and the range of what they will allow to be put on exhibit? Sherlock (1995) believes education should in fact be a primary site for conflict not cohesion. She suggests the college campus must be a non-violent space where conflicting ideas can be discussed and hotly debated. She believes pronouncements that art work is racist,

obscene, and indecent have no place in an educational institution that should be showing students how and why different forms of knowledge are produced and whose interests they represent.

Horn (1993) believes colleges must protect those who pursue their various truths. Horn argues this may mean putting up with research that is ill-conceived, with works of art that seem offensive, or with ideas that seem foolish and wrong. Horn believes those who want to limit the expression of ideas, even for what may seem to be the worthiest of motives, are enemies of academic freedom. And those who censor themselves to avoid controversy are not freedoms' friends.

The arts embody our attempt to recover our cultural past and translate this knowledge into an expressive form that has meaning for us in the present. Unlike science, the arts are valuable to a democratic society because they have an ideological bias. Helen C. White wrote in 1959, "Essential as freedom is for the relation and judgment of facts, it is even more indispensable to the imagination upon which all discovery in this larger sense depends" (Lyons, 1991, p. 77).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Education is, or should be, one of the sites for talking back
(Sherlock, 1995, p. 3).

Artists live in a world of ideas which are often controversial. Art has become political. Faculty artists are involved in the authentic training of artists. Student art work will be controversial. The academy is one place in society that must be open to the free exchange of competing ideas. Faculty artists are protected by academic and artistic freedom. Yet student art works are removed from exhibitions when they are considered offensive or indecent (Morris, 1995). We must protect the rights of faculty

and student artists to free expression even when that expression is sexually offensive or politically controversial.

We should not limit an artist's freedom of expression or try to obliterate the types of displays with which we do not agree. In a time when so many groups constantly challenge one another's rights and responsibilities, the most important thing we can do is increase the dialogue (Dubin, 1994). Engaging students in discussions about controversial art works might help them learn how to analyze and resolve issues they encounter later in life. Art educators should be introducing controversial art and art issues into their teaching. Faculty artists should be encouraging students to freely express themselves even at the risk of being controversial. And faculty artists must retain the right to exhibit controversial student works without interference. This will provide students with an accurate reflection of the world of art today.

Unfortunately, there is no certain formula for doing that. Art educators must make their choices and take their chances. But those choices should be conscious, informed, fair-minded, courageous, and flexible to suit the context (Lankford, 1994). Additional outcomes of this study may be that art faculty become more aware of the artistic and academic freedom they possess. Administrators may become more aware of their responsibility to uphold the principle of institutional neutrality.

Art departments in the community colleges of Maryland may want to encourage campus administrators to designate specific locations on campus to be used as exhibition sites or gallery space. Community college administrators may want to work closely with art department faculty to design and make public an exhibition policy which covers controversial presentations.

The notion of what is considered "legitimate" art, who creates art, and what are "acceptable" responses to it is expanding (Greene, as cited in Elias et al., 1995).

Artistic value judgments typically reflect the values of the dominant culture. Art faculty should be encouraged to assess what learning takes place and how students have developed their own creativity. Educators should be encouraged not to measure student art work against culturally determined value systems (Jones, as cited in Kerka, 1997).

CHAPTER SUMMARY

In short, which is our most fundamental failure: that we have lost sight of our past, or that we have lost the resolve to envision the future (Hoekema, 1991, p. 47)?

Faculty must possess the right to encourage their students to engage in the authentic activities of the discipline under study. Students will learn more and remember more when they become involved in real situations. Academic freedom is designed to protect faculty in the teaching, learning, and research process. But when faculty artists encourage their students to create provocative and controversial works of art, someone is almost always offended and demands that the work be taken down. The issue at stake is not whether art is offensive or has social consequences. All art work is social and political. The issue is whether academic freedom provides faculty artists the right to select student art work for exhibition or whether artistic value judgments should instead be determined by the dominant culture (Kerka, 1997).

Just what is the role of the college and academic freedom as it relates to the visual arts (Sherlock, 1995)? The goal of the Wolf Trap Conference was to determine the appropriate scope and nature of artistic freedom in the academic setting. The result of the conference was a position statement intended to serve as a guide for institutions.

The primary purpose of this study was to compare the opinions of campus administrators, art faculty members, and student artists concerning institutional solutions and policy options relating to the exhibition of controversial student art work in the community colleges of Maryland. The specific issues of academic freedom, exhibition space, and administrative responsibility for campus neutrality were investigated. The participants' policy choices were compared to determine which policy option each group gave the highest preference.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is organized into four sections. Each section represents a part of the Wolf Trap Conference statement on academic freedom and artistic expression. Part one is an introduction into the concept of academic freedom. The history of academic freedom, how academic freedom relates to the First Amendment, and the concept of art as speech are presented. Part one concludes with a look at some of the various perceptions of academic freedom held by faculty and administrators.

In part two the relevant literature surrounding the issue of art censorship is presented. The impact of censorship and the most common types of art censorship are highlighted. Specific examples of social, political, and moral censorship, as well as the legal definition of obscenity are included. Part two closes by examining some of the different theories that explain why censorship occurs.

The specific issues of gallery space and the rights of an audience are explored in part three. A discussion of the value of art and why it deserves a protected space is included. Part three closes with an account of an incident at Penn State University in 1991. The incident reveals how a protected space for art can become an issue on campus and suggests the appropriate response for an educational institution when a controversy over art arises.

Part four is an examination of the issue of administrative accountability. Three different administrative responses to controversial art exhibits are included. This section closes with a discussion of how an exhibition policy might help guide campus leaders when controversy erupts over offensive art.

The literature base relates primarily to controversial exhibits of student art at four-year colleges and universities. There is little written about the censorship of student art at the community college but the issues are the same. This literature will be

used to help clarify the issues that surround student art exhibitions in educational institutions and to make a case for exhibitions of student art at two year schools.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Academic freedom is the symbol of the professorates vocational mission--the search for truth. It represents the deepest human values of the professor's work and sanctions his claims for cultural and social authority (Morgan, 1984, p. 1315).

Academic freedom is an essential element of the American system of higher education (Xenakis, 1982). In higher education, academic freedom protects college and university faculty from interference in their quest for greater depth and breadth of understanding. College and university faculty are granted the right to teach and research in all areas of human experience and knowledge. Some of those experiences may be socially sensitive, and some of that knowledge may be disputed, but faculty should be protected in their search for truth (Lankford, 1994).

The literature related to academic freedom suggests that differences exist concerning the legal, educational, and philosophical meanings of the concept (Ambrose, 1989). Five general areas of academic freedom protection for faculty members are present within the literature. Ambrose (1989) identified these areas as legal rights related to institutional decision-making, individual faculty member's political or religious beliefs, teaching and classroom discussions, research and scholarship, and conduct outside the classroom.

Another important freedom honored in higher education is artistic freedom. Artistic freedom is defined as the right of artists to choose the media, methods, form, and content of expression they prefer. This concept may be extended to the exhibition and performance of works of art and to attendance at exhibitions and performances. Artists have the right to exhibit, perform, and attend the exhibitions and performances

of others as they choose. Artistic freedom is a concept legally associated with the First Amendment of the United States Constitution (Lankford, 1994).

Difficult questions involving artistic and academic freedoms are generated from both inside and outside the educational institution. Questions aimed at determining a reasonable level of tolerance, or the appropriateness of an expression of outrage, or when to yield one justifiable principle to another are not easy questions to answer. Indeed, the answers may not exist in any real sense. Much depends on individual conscience and context. Forces of conscience, context, freedom, tolerance, and outrage are always at work at all levels of education (Lankford, 1992).

The History of Academic Freedom

In the pursuit of knowledge, many people will be hurt, and this is a reality which no amount of wishing or regulating can ever change. It is not good to offend people, but it is necessary. A no-offense society is a no-knowledge society (Rausch in Hamilton, 1995, p. 161).

Conceptions of academic freedom vary according to their cultural contexts (Anderson, 1980). The conception of academic freedom that developed in American higher education was that professors should be permitted to teach, to conduct research and to publish the results of that research without interference from university administrators and trustees, or from political, economic, and ecclesiastical authorities (Anderson, 1980). This concept of academic freedom developed with the emergence of the modern university (Morgan, 1984). The history of academic freedom is the story of the evolution and development of the university from its religious origins to its public and more secular role today (Lyons, 1991).

For several hundred years after the founding of institutions of higher education in the United States, faculty worked under employment laws which stated that employees had no right to object to conditions placed upon the terms of employment,

including restrictions on free expression. As the modern university developed and professors increasingly challenged the beliefs of the time, the lack of employment law protection for academic speech became a problem. Constitutional protection of freedom of speech for professors did not develop until 1968 (Hamilton, 1995).

Employer interference with professional speech at the turn of the century led professors to organize the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (Hamilton, 1995). The AAUP adopted the concept of *Lehrfreiheit*, meaning the freedom to teach, from the 19th century German university (Horn, 1993). The AAUP pressed university employers to grant professors rights of free inquiry and speech in scholarship and teaching without interference by boards of trustees and administrators (Hamilton, 1995).

The American concept of academic freedom was the outcome of a report by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the American Association of University Professors in 1915. The report highlighted the changes that had occurred in American higher education. Large American universities, based on German models, had emerged to overshadow the small denominational colleges (Anderson, 1980). A theory of knowledge based on evolutionary thinking had replaced the static orthodoxy of the denominational college. New areas of study had developed and professors had gained a professional identity. The major threats to academic freedom no longer came from religious sources, but from benefactors, both public and private, who had specific economic and political interests (Anderson, 1980).

The American tradition of professional academic freedom has grown out of this report. It grants rights to professors to be free from employer interference in research, teaching, and speech. It also imposes on professors the responsibility of maintaining professional competence and ethical conduct (Hamilton, 1995).

Hamilton, (1995) in his book “Zealotry and Academic Freedom,” describes how the American tradition of professional academic freedom actually begins at least two centuries before the formation of the American Association of University Professors in 1915. Hamilton believes the American tradition of professional academic freedom has its foundation in the intellectual system that grew out of the Enlightenment. This intellectual system favors individual freedom, open mindedness, and the use of reason in the discovery of knowledge (Hamilton, 1995). This intellectual system is based on the theory that human thought is imperfect and knowledge is always subject to correction. Humans are capable of error and at any time, any or all of us might be wrong. No belief is above examination for possible correction (Hamilton, 1995).

In this way, this intellectual system protects freedom of belief and speech, but it denies freedom of knowledge. No one has the right to have their opinions taken seriously as knowledge. A person may believe what they want to believe, but if they want their belief recognized as knowledge, they must have their belief examined critically. By checking opinions and cultivating criticism, this system deprives all authoritarians of any force or control (Hamilton, 1995).

Over the years, the American concept of academic freedom has faced challenges and gone through changes. According to Ferdon, (1990) academic freedom has gone through three distinct and overlapping eras. The first was the bureaucratic era. This was the era of negotiations between administrators and professors in the 1920s. The second era was the political era and it was mainly a result of loyalty oaths. Loyalty oaths were initiated after the first World War and escalated again during the 1930s when communism became a major concern. The political era gave way to the legal era when the first academic freedom cases went to the United States Supreme Court in the 1950s.

Hamilton (1995) describes seven waves of zealotry aimed at suppressing academic thought and speech. He discusses the emergence of the modern American university after the Civil War and presents the waves of zealotry in chronological order over the last 125 years. The first wave was the religious fundamentalism of trustees and administrators in the late nineteenth century. The second wave was the unfettered capitalism of trustees at the turn of the century. The patriotism during World War I was the third wave. The fourth wave was the anticommunism prior to World War II. The fifth wave was McCarthyism in the early 1950s. The sixth wave was the student activism in the mid to late 1960s and the seventh wave was the fundamentalism of the radical academic left in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Almost all current knowledge was considered offensive or insensitive to the beliefs of an earlier time. According to Hamilton (1995), the quest for knowledge has caused anguish and pain. The major threat to this intellectual system, and to the academic freedom of professors, has been from political, social, economic, ethnic, religious, or other groups who wish to prevent the anguish and pain that results when their beliefs are challenged and subjected to criticism (Hamilton, 1995).

Academic Freedom and the First Amendment

It was Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, speaking in dissent in 1919, who first articulated the classic theory of free speech: “The ultimate good desired is better reached by a free trade in ideas... the best test of truth is the power of thought to get itself accepted in the marketplace” (Hoffman, 1992, p. 150).

Hamilton (1995) explains why some confusion exists concerning the difference between constitutional academic freedom and professional academic freedom. Both principles address the importance of free inquiry and speech in the university, but each has different legal roots. Constitutional academic freedom is rooted in the First and Fourteenth Amendments. Professional academic freedom, an employment law

concept developed by the AAUP, is rooted in concern over interference by boards of trustees and administrators in professors' research, teaching, and speech.

Constitutional academic freedom prohibits the government from controlling or directing the university in matters concerning the content of speech or the determination of who may teach. Professional academic freedom grants rights to professors to be free from interference by employers in research, teaching, and speech. The AAUP Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure reached the conclusion that offensive speech should not be banned or punished on campus. The committee concluded that offensive speech should be addressed through the educational process and counter-speech (Hamilton, 1995).

A brief history of the Supreme Court cases, using the term academic freedom, reveals the Court's uncertainty in determining what rights were protected by the two types of academic freedom. Hamilton (1995) claims that constitutional academic freedom protects the corporate right of the university, as well as the right of an individual faculty member, against outside content-based government interference. He determined the right of an individual faculty member at a public university against interference in scholarship, teaching, and speech by administrators and regents to be protected under professional academic freedom, employment law, and the general free speech protection given to all public employees (Hamilton, 1995).

The Supreme Court's defense of the First Amendment dates to the late 1930s and early 1940s, when it adopted the Holmes "marketplace of ideas" metaphor. The court recognized the power of the First Amendment to create and protect a space for the type of interaction and debate required to form public opinion. The Court's vision of the First Amendment created a public space for the uninhibited debate of public issues. The First Amendment prohibits dominant cultural traditions from silencing divergent perspectives (Hoffman, 1992).

The First Amendment prevents Congress from limiting freedom of expression. The definition of “Congress” has been greatly expanded through a series of court cases. It includes police departments and local legislatures, as well as schools and transportation companies (Morris, 1995). Thus, the First Amendment prevents colleges and universities from limiting freedom of expression. The definition of Congress does not include every privately owned gallery, theater, or museum that decides to regulate the works of art it presents. The right of these venues to choose which art to display is also grounded in the Constitution, and is as significant as the right of the artist to self-expression (Morris, 1995).

The most recent threat to First Amendment rights, as exercised by the scholarly community, occurred when the United States Congress passed the Communications Decency Act on February 8, 1996, as an overhaul of communications policy. It is now conceivable that such diverse products of the artistic imagination as Michelangelo’s “David” and Joyce’s “Ulysses” might be labeled “indecent” or “offensive” (Loss, 1996). The faculty artist’s rights to freedom of expression may be protected under professional academic freedom as an employment law concept adopted by the AAUP. There appears to be no guarantee, however, that artistic freedom for faculty artists is protected under constitutional academic freedom and the First Amendment.

Art as Speech

As the [Supreme] Court stated in 1943, “The line between the informing and the entertaining is too elusive...what is one man’s amusement, teaches another’s doctrine”. Thus, it has long been clear that “speech” is not limited to words (Hoffman, 1992, p. 150).

The underlying rationale of the academic freedom cases tried in the courts permitted extension of First Amendment protection beyond political speech (Hoffman, 1992). However, some doubt remains concerning the degree to which visual art is

protected as speech by the First Amendment. Robert O'neil, (1997) in his book "Free Speech in the College Community," describes the first artistic freedom case to reach the courts. It happened during the era of campus unrest caused by the Vietnam War. The walls of a corridor in the student union at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, had often been used for the display of original art by members of the campus community. Charles Close, an art instructor, was invited to exhibit some of his works on this corridor. His paintings contained some nude figures, with explicit and detailed genitalia. The display attracted considerable attention and evoked scattered protest.

The administration called the materials inappropriate and ordered them removed. Close sued the university in federal court, claiming a violation of his First Amendment rights. Because of the recurrent use of the corridor for art displays, the district judge decided the site had become a public forum where speech could not be restricted because some people found the content of a particular display distasteful. By calling the display inappropriate, the administration reflected an adverse view of artistic content or message that was incompatible with the First Amendment. The district judge found the university to have acted wrongfully by abridging the artist's freedom of speech and held that it must restore the exhibit. The university appealed and the higher court was more sensitive to the public nature of the site. The court found the university administration had a right to protect the sensitivities of passersby who might be insulted by Close's work.

O'neil found another factor at work here. Although the district judge had found merit in Close's work, the appeals court did not and suggested the paintings may not deserve constitutional protection. The opinion contained a disparaging comment:

There is no suggestion, unless in its cheap titles, that plaintiff's art was seeking to express political or social thought...[Speaker ban cases] involve

a medium and subject matter entitled to a greater protection than plaintiff's art....We consider plaintiff's constitutional interest minimal. (O'neil, 1997)

This opinion implies that words have a higher claim on First Amendment protection than art, especially art that does not embody "political or social thought." The court stopped short of ruling that art is not protected speech, but the opinion contained a disparaging view of visual expression (O'neil, 1997). To this day, confusion exists concerning the degree to which visual art is protected as speech by the First Amendment.

Faculty and Administrators Opinions on Academic Freedom

What people believe often guides their actions (Grubiak, 1996, p. 5030).

Research has shown that administrators and faculty disagree on the importance of academic freedom. Grubiak (1996), in a comparison of Washington State Community College faculty and administrators' opinions and beliefs on academic freedom, demonstrated that faculty members believe academic freedom and tenure are important principles while administrators do not believe they are. Grubiak was able to show that faculty members believe they have rights that prevent administration from controlling curriculum, off-campus teaching and consultation activities, teaching methods and grading policies. The results indicate that administrators do not believe faculty members have these rights.

Keith (1996) demonstrated that faculty define academic freedom primarily as the freedom to teach and conduct research without being interfered with. Keith was able to show that faculty believe they have the freedom to choose their own texts and their own methods in teaching; they believe they have the freedom to pursue truth and share their views; and they believe academic freedom is their professional responsibility. The results indicate that faculty respect the institutional mission and

believe it is inappropriate to use the classroom as a pulpit to persuade students to accept faculty views (Keith, 1996).

Valletta (1993), in a study that assessed chief academic officers knowledge of faculty academic freedom at private colleges and universities, was able to show that the officers demonstrated an inadequate level of knowledge concerning faculty academic freedom. The results indicate that the chief academic officers were not well grounded in foundation principles and legal background pertaining to faculty academic freedom at their respective schools.

Zito (1993), in an investigation of faculty and departmental chairs' levels of knowledge concerning academic freedom litigation in private colleges and universities, reported faculty and chairs as having a good understanding of the aspects of academic employment such as hiring, reappointment, promotion and tenure. The study demonstrated that faculty and chairs had little knowledge about academic freedom as it is applied in private higher education settings.

Given these findings, it is not surprising that some campus administrators believe they are justified in removing controversial student art work from exhibition on campus even though they may be in violation of the faculty artist's professional academic or artistic freedom.

ART CENSORSHIP

If we truly believe in freedom of expression, if we feel that the arts should be valued in our society, then we must oppose any efforts that abridge that freedom or limit the public's access to all forms of artistic expression (Tannenbaum, 1991, p. 77).

Authorities have been censoring art for centuries. William Shakespeare wrote about it nearly 400 years ago with the line "art made tongue-tied by authority" in his sonnet #66. Shakespeare was right in naming "authority" as the entity that had the

power to censor the arts. Authority can exist in many forms; the state, the church, special interest groups, and an enraged public (Noble, 1991, p. 20).

Earlier forms of art censorship, invoked by the authority of the church or state, were essentially trickle-down in their effect. Current art censorship, invoked by the authority of an enraged public, is more accurately described, in Carolyn Bruder's term, as "trickle-up." It begins with a special interest group on a local level and works its way up (Loss, 1996).

We are most likely to identify racial, political, and moral censorship in the context of art (Shusterman, 1984). Objections to art works based on their perceived expression of racial prejudice have been the focus of controversy in recent years. In 1989 a soft-drink advertisement, designed by the Japanese artist Shin Matsunaga, was defaced while on display at the Exhibition Center at Parsons School of Design in New York. The poster contained a caricature of a black man considered by its attackers to be offensive (Lyons, 1991).

At Hampshire College, in Amherst, Massachusetts, James Montford's installation, "The Lipper Constellation," was called racist because it included basketballs and texts detailing social stereotypes (Cembalest, 1994).

Robert O'neil, (1997) in his book "Free Speech in the College Community," describes a 1988 case in which a painting by David K. Nelson, depicting the late Chicago mayor Harold Washington wearing only women's lingerie and undergarments, was confiscated by an angry group of black Chicago aldermen from an exhibition at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Art Institute student David Nelson had submitted the full-length frontal portrait of the late Harold Washington, Chicago's first black mayor, clad only in a white bra, G-string, garter belt, and stockings, as his entry for the annual display of original student work. The portrait apparently reflected an unconfirmed rumor that the mayor was

wearing female underwear beneath his business suit when he arrived at the hospital (O'neil, 1997).

The student exhibit containing Nelson's work was not open to the general public. However, news of the portrait, tantalizingly entitled "Mirth and Girth," quickly spread across the city. Art Institute officials asked Nelson to remove the painting but he refused. The City Council then threatened to terminate city funding for certain institute programs if the portrait remained on display (O'neil, 1997).

Three Chicago aldermen took matters into their own hands when the institute's president declined to intervene. They marched into the gallery, removed the painting from the wall, and were about to carry it out of the building when they were detained by a guard. A city policeman was directed to take the painting into city custody. It was released to the artist late the following day (O'neil, 1997). Beisel (1993) explained the incident as a symbolic lynching. African-American leaders condemned the painting, contending that it evoked past images of the castration of "uppity" black men. Dubin (1992) attributed this incident to the racially charged nature of Chicago politics.

O'neil (1997) describes another campus art controversy that occurred at San Francisco State University in 1994. A ten-foot-square mural was unveiled on the side of a university building. The mural had been commissioned by university officials, though it had not been reviewed or approved before the unveiling. What appeared on the mural when it was unveiled upset and concerned many members of the university community. The mural's central focus was a portrait of Malcolm X. The portrait was, however, bordered by a United States flag, several dollar signs, a Star of David, and a skull and crossbones with the words "African blood." The artist, Semay Dennis, insisted he had meant no offense to anyone. He was only seeking, he declared, to create a graphic image that would recall Malcolm X's outspoken anti-Zionism. The

president of the Pan African Student Union added, “our intention was not to hurt anyone; all art is open to interpretation” (O’neil, 1997, p. 144).

Professor Lois Lyles was the first person to voice concern over the mural. She tried to write “Stop Fascism” next to the mural, protesting what seemed to her its anti-Semitic theme (O’neil, 1997, p. 144). This would seem to be an appropriate response of counter-speech, however; Lyles was arrested for vandalism.

These incidents demonstrate the potential for visual art work to be perceived as racially offensive and create tension on campus. But political censorship has also been exercised on exhibitions at universities. Lyons (1991) describes an incident of political censorship at the University of Mississippi. In 1963, Ray Kerciu, a visiting professor of art, had a solo exhibition at the gallery on campus. The works in this series contained an expressive rendition of the Confederate battle flag, on top of which Kerciu had painted various epithets and slogans from the civil-rights demonstrations of the previous year. One painting included the words “THE SOVEREIGN STATE OF MISSISSIPPI” with all of the s’s in the slogan inscribed backwards. A law student objected to the exhibition and initiated legal proceedings against it, based on a Mississippi statute protecting the Confederate battle flag. By order of the provost, the flag series was removed from the exhibition, despite protests from students and faculty (Lyons, 1991).

A later incident in 1989, and once again at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, involved an installation piece by student, Scott Tyler, titled “What Is the Proper Way to Display the U. S. Flag?” Tyler’s work included a twenty-by-thirty-inch U.S. flag, placed on the gallery floor. In order for visitors to sign the guest book at the installation they had to walk on the flag. The work generated public criticism and the controversy overshadowed the rest of the work in the exhibition (Lyons, 1991).

A more frequent variety of censorship stems from moral objections to the sexual content of an art exhibit (Lyons, 1991). Moral objections to the sexual content of a work of art are often loosely based on the determination that the work is obscene. The measure used for determining obscenity was decided in *Miller vs. California* 413 v515, in 1973. Three factors are required to reach the conclusion that something is obscene. The average person, applying contemporary community standards, must find the work, taken as a whole, appeals to prurient interest; the work must depict or describe, in a patently offensive way, sexual conduct specifically defined by the applicable state law; and the work, taken as a whole, must lack serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value. Very few works will qualify as obscene by these standards and all three must apply (Loss, 1996).

When works of art become controversial due to their sexual content, some campus administrators will have the works removed from the exhibit. These administrators feel obligated to protect the community, both on and off campus, from indecent and offensive art. These campus leaders try to create and maintain an image of their campus as a calm and safe environment.

Atkins (1991) describes an incident involving David Steinberg, president of the C. W. Post campus of Long Island University. President Steinberg demanded that Peter Drake's "The Braid," be moved from a study lounge. The large drawing depicted a female nude entering a bath, with two male nudes and dogs in another room. "The Braid" was interpreted by a few complaining students as a representation of bestiality (Atkins, 1991).

Lyons (1991) describes how the same issue was raised regarding work in a student exhibition hung in the student lounge at Frostburg State University, Frostburg, Maryland. The exhibition had been on view for six weeks before university administrators removed two paintings by Robin L. Price. One of the paintings was a

nude self-portrait inspired by Botticelli's "Birth of Venus." The second painting was a portrait of a partially clothed pregnant woman. University administrators justified their action on the grounds that the student-center lounge was being scheduled for a parent-student freshman orientation and many of those in attendance would not be there to view art. The administration expressed concern that the participants might be disconcerted or made uncomfortable by the images (Lyons, 1991).

The two previous examples are complicated because the art works were not isolated to the campus gallery. They were on display in a student lounge and study hall. But art work is not limited to the gallery. In May of 1994, Stanford University administrators barred four members of the champion men's baseball team from taking part in the NCAA playoffs. The players had rammed a wooden locker-room bench between two of the figures on a recently installed campus sculpture entitled "Gay Liberation." Black paint had been splattered over several of the figures which tastefully portrayed gay relationships (Lyons, 1991).

In 1990, an exhibition of works by the New York artist David Wojnarowicz, organized by Illinois State University, titled "Tongues of Flame," took a frank look at homosexuality and AIDS. Although Illinois State University was aware that the exhibition might generate controversy, the university administration was unwavering in its support of the decision to exhibit the work (Lyons, 1991). Campus administrators bear the responsibility for protecting and maintaining an environment conducive to the free exchange of ideas.

Theories of Censorship

“The law says that when someone deprives you of your ability to express yourself, whether for half an hour or two months, that any period of that restraint is intolerable,” says Harvey Grossman, legal director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Illinois, which represents Nelson. “It was their right to be upset, but not to empower the police to seize the expression. They should have tried to protect the speech, not arrest the speech” (Cembalest, 1992, p. 40).

The impact of censorship, aside from destroying all notions of artistic expression, usually creates worse evils than those it tries to correct (Clifton, 1992). The theoretical basis for examining the impacts of censorship can be found in the literature on psychological reactance theory. Reactance theory holds that whenever a person’s free choice is threatened the result is for the person to want those choices even more. When something is censored and freedom is lost, the expected result would be reactance against the censor and a measurable increase in the desire to possess the prohibited object. There are many who feel that rather than curbing instances of undesirable content, censorship fuels the desire for controversial material (Simmons, 1992).

The literature related to art censorship suggests three different theories useful in explaining why censorship occurs. The theories are based on social, political, and moral reasons. Dubin (1992) argues that actions against art are initiated by governments to divert attention from pressing social problems, by groups who feel their values are threatened by what is depicted, and by moral entrepreneurs.

Dubin argues that censorship emerges when distinct social cleavages have left individuals estranged from one another (Beisel, 1993). The acceptability of art is contingent upon time and place. What is tolerated at one moment may become forbidden in the next. Art controversies serve as markers of cultural crises and signal a society attempting to deal with change (Dubin, 1992).

Beisel (1993) explains censorship as the product of intergroup conflict. Modern censorship movements come primarily from the working and lower-middle classes, and sociologists tend to explain such movements as status-group conflicts or defenses of traditional values. Gans (1974) notes that controversies about art and obscenity tend to arise when “high culture” works are condemned by sexual conservatives who also seek to eliminate pornography, a “low culture” product, from their communities. Gans implies that struggles over obscenity in art are covert struggles over class and status and Gans suggests that the holders of cultural and political power use controversies about obscenity to bolster their social or political positions (Beisel, 1993).

Dubin (1992) believes art battles are part of a much broader cultural war over what it means to be an American and who is welcome within the scope of that vision. Dubin believes some people have been threatened by the cumulative effect of the changes that have come about since the 1960s, with various civil rights movements insisting on greater inclusion into society. African-Americans, women, gays and lesbians, Hispanics, “secular humanists,” and other constituencies have forced society to recognize their respective rights and talents. These movements have shifted power from some groups to others and caused the more established groups to feel left behind or left out (Dubin, 1992).

According to Devereaux, (1993) the political battle over art stems from a philosophical debate concerning the nature of art. Art controversies are driven by a theoretical conflict between two opposing conceptions of art. According to the modern conception, art is intrinsically valuable, deserving of a separate “autonomous” sphere within which artists can be guaranteed protection from government and other forms of outside interference. Devereaux associates this position with Kant, 20th century modernism, and formalist theories of art (Devereaux, 1993).

According to the more traditional conception, the value of art is inextricably linked to political considerations. Art cannot be evaluated without considering its ideology and social value. In this political conception of art, a work might be censored because it is seen as socially disturbing or politically threatening. Devereaux associates this position with Plato and Marxist theories of art (Devereaux, 1993).

Within the academy, and in the culture at large, we are witnessing a change from the modern non-political conception of art to the more traditional and political one. Devereaux (1993) believes this is the result of the dissatisfaction with formalist art criticism, the growth of interest in more broadly cultural approaches to art, the end of the dominance of analytic philosophy, the influence of postmodernism, and the impact of feminism both as a social movement and as a theoretical discipline (Devereaux, 1993).

According to Devereaux, (1993) the increasing public hostility towards art centers on the moral rather than artistic failings of contemporary art. People move to censor “offensive” art when they believe their traditional values are being threatened. Dubin, (1992) in a sample of writings from a variety of conservatives, reveals that an overarching theme uniting them is the sense that America has been steadily sliding into a moral sewer since the 1960s.

Ward (1990) explains two types of moral theories useful in understanding art censorship. Consequentialist moral theories are those which hold that the rightness of an action is determined by the degree to which it produces good consequences. Consequentialist moral theory holds that the best actions are those which produce the greatest amount of good for the greatest number of people. It is the moral theory underlying modern cost-benefit analysis (Ward, 1990).

Deontological theories hold that the rightness of an action depends upon factors other than the consequences of the action. These include such things as the

intentions with which the act is done; whether the action is just; whether it respects the rights of those affected by it; whether the action is consistent with the demands of duty; or whether, whatever its consequences, something in the nature of the action makes it intrinsically wrong (Ward, 1990).

Deontological arguments in favor of freedom of expression and an intellectual freedom in general, are based on claims that people are entitled to freely express their thoughts, and to receive the expression made by others, whether the effects of that speech are desirable or not. Deontological arguments for intellectual freedom and against censorship are stronger than consequentialist arguments (Ward, 1990).

Censorship is undesirable because, whether the ideas censored are true or not, the consequences of suppression are bad. Censorship is wrong because it makes it less likely that truth will be discovered or preserved, and censorship is wrong because it has destructive consequences for the intellectual character of those who live under it (Ward, 1990).

THE CONTEXT OF THE PRESENTATION

A computer-printed sign reading "Gallery" was taped on the door of the reading room, according to Lammie, "to forewarn people that there is art in the room" (Pottsville Republican, 1991, November 16, as cited in Anderson & Garoian, 1994, p. 35).

Location has become an important variable to the recognition of artistic freedom. There is a big difference between barring a work completely from the campus and limiting the places it can be displayed (O'neil,1997). Campus administrators seem less likely to remove controversial art work from the campus gallery. They act quickly, however, to protect an audience when the "offensive" work is displayed in a public area, such as a classroom, student lounge, or hallway.

Jacobsen (1991) describes a case in 1984, in which Kathe Kowalski, a graduate student in photography at Eastern Michigan University, refused to remove a

series of autobiographical photographs from a student show when she was requested to do so by the chair of the art department, who acted in reaction to complaints from unspecified people on campus. The work, which transgresses sexual taboos against explicit representations of sexual activity, also reveals the obscure side of family relationships.

Although she succeeded in preventing the removal of her work, Kowalski felt compelled to self-censor her work in various ways afterward, in order to graduate. Kowalski believes her photos say there is a female audience. She feels her work upsets people who subconsciously reject its message that women are interested in male sexuality (Jacobsen, 1991).

Robert O'neil, (1997) in his book "Free Speech in the College Community," tells the story of William Spater, a graduate student in art at California State University-Long Beach. Spater submitted ten life-size nude figures of plaster and wax as his master's degree project. Some of the figures depicted sexual acts. The issue soon became one of public display, which was the final step in the degree process. The dean of fine arts informed Spater that due to the sexual subject matter of the project and its realistic depiction, it would be inappropriate for there to be an exhibit of the project on campus. The artist demanded a chance to display his work. A number of fellow students protested in support of his claim. The art faculty also backed Spater's wish to display the work. The dean then decided to permit the exhibit, and the president of the college upheld the decision. But within days the issue reached the capitol in Sacramento, where it became the focus of a legislative hearing. Under political pressure, the chancellor of the statewide system reversed the campus head and canceled the exhibit (O'neil, 1997).

O'neil (1997) describes a 1980 case in which Albert R. Piarowski, chairperson of the art department at Prairie State Junior College in Illinois, contributed several

stained glass windows to the annual faculty exhibit. The display site was a highly visible area. The gallery was beside an area where students and visitors passed on their way to classrooms, offices, and meeting rooms on the upper floors. The sexual content of the exhibit generated complaints. Three of the windows drew critical attention. One of the windows had a white cylinder resembling a finger sticking out from or into the naked bottom of a brown woman. On closer inspection the finger is seen to be a jet of gas. The other two windows show brown women from the back, naked except for stockings. One is standing and apparently masturbating. The other is crouching in a pose of respect before a robed white male, and is embracing his outlandishly oversized phallus. Students, custodial personnel, and African American clergy complained extensively about the exhibit. The college had no specific rules governing art displays and did not claim the panels to be legally obscene.

Administrators told Piarowski he must relocate his work to an alternate site near the art department's fourth-floor offices. When the artist refused to relocate his windows, the administration had them removed (O'neil, 1997).

Lyons (1991) describes two incidents of art censorship involving a university. In 1981, the chancellor of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, removed an exhibition of prints by the New York artist Philip Pearlstein from the Concourse Gallery in the University Center to a less visible exhibition space just prior to homecoming weekend. The prints contained images of nudes that the chancellor feared might offend members of the board of regents and several university benefactors who were scheduled to be on campus that weekend. Over 250 faculty signed a petition condemning the chancellor's action. On the Monday following homecoming weekend the exhibition was rehung (Lyons, 1991).

In 1987, the Perkinson Gallery in the Kirkland Fine Arts Center at Millikin University in Decatur, Illinois, presented a group exhibition of work by a Chicago

artists' cooperative. A painting by Joan Lyon depicting a frontal male nude accompanied by three female nudes had been on view for over a week. The university president, J. Roger Miller, saw the image while attending a performance at the fine-arts center and had the piece removed. Miller objected to the painting on the grounds that it was not appropriate for a general audience. He also asserted that he would not have taken such an action if the exhibition had been held in a space that was exclusively an art gallery (Lyons, 1991).

Devereaux (1993) believes that art deserves a protected space. By "protected space" Devereaux means the principle of granting artists control over both their subject matter and means of expression. Devereaux (1993) believes the literal spaces of the museum and gallery embody this figurative space where artists can work without outside interference. Certainly, the campus gallery is no different.

Artists were not granted independence in the past. The separation of artistic institutions from institutions of church and state did not occur until the eighteenth century. The modern view that artists deserve protected independence comes from the liberal democratic conception of individual liberty. Artists, like everyone else, have a right to individual expression. It is this concept of individual expression that is embedded in the American Constitution (Devereaux, 1993).

Devereaux (1993) explains the idea that artists deserve special protections with a concept of genius found in Kant. Kant felt the genius has a natural capacity for originality. Kant believed artists possess an inborn imaginative talent that enables them to "see" in ways others cannot (Devereaux, 1993). Becker (1991) identifies the mirror of self-examination as one of the artist's great values to society. It is through this mirror of self-examination that artists help society become aware of its shortcomings and its strengths (Becker, 1991). If artists help us see ourselves and our culture more clearly or completely, then they can function as critics, reformers, revolutionaries, or

defenders of unappreciated aspects of the status quo. Artists have often served these functions. In this way, art has a high social value. It makes us think twice, think differently, relive the past, imagine the future. It is this social value, not the mad genius of its makers, that warrants protection. In allowing art the independence to function in these ways, we seek to protect a political good. Where artistic and public interests conflict, the presumption should be in favor of the artist (Devereaux, 1993).

Albert Anderson and Charles Garoian, art faculty at Penn State University, tell the story of an art controversy in the Journal of Aesthetic Education, Winter 1994. An incident occurred in 1991, at the Pennsylvania State University Commonwealth Campus at Schuylkill, Pennsylvania, concerning the proper place to display a work of art. Schuylkill is a small branch campus in the Penn State University system. The incident reveals how a protected space for art can become an issue on campus and suggests the appropriate response for an educational institution when a controversy over art arises.

Controversy had been brewing for months over a reproduction of Francisco Goya's "Maja desnuda" that was on display in a classroom. Nancy Stumhofer, an English and women's studies instructor, taught a class in the room and had written several complaints about the reproduction. According to an article in the November 16, 1991 edition of The Pottsville Republican, (as cited in Anderson & Garoian, 1994) Stumhofer had been bothered by the work since it had been purchased over a decade earlier for use with an art history class which was taught in the room.

Paul Miller, a music instructor who also taught in the room, which until fall of 1991 was primarily a music classroom, had refused a previous request by Schuylkill campus administrators to remove the offending work citing the issue of censorship. Anderson and Garoian (1994) report that on November 7, 1991, a memo from campus

executive officer Wayne D. Lammie was distributed to the campus community. It read as follows:

It has come to the attention of our affirmative action office that one of the art reproductions presently hanging in [Room] C-203 could contribute to a chilly climate in that classroom and, thus, be in violation of the law concerning sexual harassment. The reason given is that the reproduction in question, although a recognized art work, is being displayed in a classroom rather than in a gallery or museum setting. Students and faculty are assigned to a classroom while those entering a gallery do so by voluntary choice. Therefore, because we have no defined gallery space for art displays, all reproductions will be removed from C-203 and placed in storage. If a gallery is defined at some future date, the art work can again be displayed. (p. 33)

Stumhofer formally complained about the work at a meeting of the Penn State Commission for Women in October. According to an article in the November 20, 1991 edition of The Centre Daily Times, (as cited in Anderson & Garoian, 1994) the Commission referred the complaint to its Schuylkill Campus Liaison Committee for resolution. The Liaison Committee, to which Stumhofer was the faculty representative, requested a decision on the matter from the University's Affirmative Action Office. Bonnie Ortiz, director of that office, made a recommendation to Lammie to remove the works.

Ortiz claimed the display of the painting was sexual harassment in the legal sense because of a federal district court case decided in the spring of 1991 in Jacksonville, Florida. In that case, the court held that women steelworkers were sexually harassed because the traditionally male environment included in its locker rooms visuals of nude women.

The Goya was not the only work found offensive. Raphael's "The Madonna of the Chair," Bronzino's "Portrait of a Young Man," the central panel of "Crucifixion with Virgin and Saints" by Perugino, a van Ruisdael landscape, "Wheat fields," and the Goya reproduction were finally removed from the wall of the classroom on Tuesday, November 12, 1991.

According to the article in the November 20, 1991 edition of The Centre Daily Times, (as cited in Anderson & Garoian, 1994) Ortiz claimed the combination of the five pictures in the classroom presented an image that was uncomfortable for women. Ortiz said the series of images stereotyped women as mothers and sex objects while portraying men as professionals. No mention was made of the crucifixion or the landscape. According to an article in the November 24, 1991 edition of The Morning Call, (as cited in Anderson & Garoian, 1994, p. 34) Lammie stated: "I did not want to get in a whole debate about what should be up and what should not be up so we took them all down." He also initially took the position that he could not name the complainant out of respect for her privacy.

In a statement issued by the Campus Liaison Committee, (as cited in Anderson & Garoian, 1994) the issue was described as classroom climate, not art censorship. Specifically, the Liaison Committee objected to:

. . . locating graphic sexual images of any type in a classroom (or faculty office) for several reasons. Female faculty find it difficult to appear professional when forced to lecture to a class with a picture of a female nude on the wall behind them. Sexually graphic images create a chilly classroom environment which makes female teachers and students embarrassed and uncomfortable and diverts students' attention from the subject matter. It is difficult to speak to a person whose attention is riveted to a picture of a female nude on a wall.

Students and faculty are assigned to a classroom while those entering a gallery do so by voluntary choice. (p. 35)

In another portion of the statement, (as cited in Anderson & Garoian, 1994) the committee said, "When campus administration removed the reproduction from the classroom, they were abiding by a law which states that graphic sexual images in the workplace constitute a form of sexual harassment" (p. 35).

On Friday, November 15, 1991, a decision was made by University officials to rehang all the reproductions in the Student Center's reading and television room which was, it was later reported, also used for a class. According to the article in the November 16, 1991 edition of The Pottsville Republican, (as cited in Anderson & Garoian, 1994) the reproductions were placed high on one wall of the room, close together in a tight horizontal grouping, without identification. A sign reading "Gallery" was taped on the door of the reading room.

The art faculty at Penn State felt obligated to insure that discussion of the incident take place. Many of their colleagues and administrators, as well as one outside agency, agreed with them and provided support for a public symposium entitled "Sex, Censorship, and the University Classroom: Goya's Maja Maligned?" which was held on the University Park Campus on March 25, 1993. The participants believed that the University, through its School of Visual Arts, had a responsibility to foster discussion of such matters (Anderson & Garoian, 1994).

This issue of the right of an audience not to see work that it might find offensive was also central to an incident at the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1981. Lyons (1991) describes a case that involved the display of a book of lithographs by a graduate student, Kevin Kennedy, in a hallway, depicting acts of sexual aggression against women. The book was vandalized and provoked other art works adjacent to

the display, intended as a critical rebuttal. This might be an effective way to use counter-speech in art exhibits to project a different opinion.

After remaining on display for several weeks, during which time the exhibition became the subject of a heated public debate in the local press, also an opportunity for counter-speech, the work was removed by the dean of education.

In response, the art department issued the following policy statement:

It is not the intention of the Department of Art to promote the depiction of violence against women or to offend members of any race or sex. However, the faculty of the department supports the right of its students and faculty to pursue the study, instruction and display of art in ways they determine are appropriate (Lyons, 1991, p. 81).

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY

Bowing to pressure from the art world and pressure from the African-American community, unwilling to risk further attack, we pulled in to protect ourselves precisely when we should have opened up the institution of the school and the museum to real debate (Becker, 1991, p. 66).

College art departments are responsible for teaching art and training artists. Art faculty are required to educate their students in the authentic activities of art. Because art faculty and art departments are part of the university's educational mission, the established principles of academic freedom must be invoked throughout any controversy involving the exhibition of student art. It is most important for campus administrators to act upon and protect the fundamental principle of free expression. Free expression for faculty, students, artists and institutions is at the core of a university and must not be compromised (Tannenbaum, 1991).

When a controversy erupts on the college campus, the campus administrators are responsible for maintaining the institutions neutrality in the matter and for seeing

that opportunities are created for meaningful dialogue about the controversy. Campus leaders can best protect the freedom of expression for all constituencies by siding with none.

San Francisco State University president Robert Corrigan, failed to do either in his response to the controversy over the Malcolm X mural. President Corrigan first appealed to the student government, hoping it would mediate the rapidly rising tensions. When the student senate was unable to muster a quorum and took no action, the administration ordered the mural painted over. The students responded by removing the paint cover and holding a week of demonstrations both for and against the mural. President Corrigan then ordered the wall sandblasted in a way that left no trace of the offending mural. Instead of encouraging the debate on the issues raised by the controversial painting, President Corrigan had the mural obliterated (O'neil, 1997).

The president insisted free expression was not compromised during this incident. He cited several factors to justify his action: the mural had been commissioned by the university; it was created on school property; and its contents had never been finally approved (O'neil, 1997). According to Grey, (as cited in O'neil, 1997) university officials have the legal right to decide what picture of the university they want to project, but painting over offensive expression is not good enough. Ehrlich (as cited in O'neil, 1997) believes the institution should have done more to address the tension and intolerance on campus.

In a similar incident during the fall semester of 1993, Carol Becker, the Dean of the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, removed the photographs of graduate student Aimee Beaubien from a display case in a second floor hallway of the school. The Dean declared that the hallway of this "private" institution was a "public" space and that Beaubien's sexually explicit photographs of her body were "inappropriate for

unaccompanied children” heading to the cafeteria during their Saturday continuing education classes (Sherlock, 1995).

This incident led to the formation of an exhibition policy at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, requiring all exhibitions to be screened by the school’s Exhibitions and Events Committee. The policy asserts the value of exhibiting student work as a component of the education process, but it allows the School:

. . . the right to relocate or remove any work from exhibition that may be in violation of the law, that may be hazardous to the health and/or safety of viewers or participants, or that may be disruptive to the educational process.

(Lyons, 1991, p. 79)

Jonathan F. Fulton, president of the Parsons School of Design in New York, responded appropriately when he became involved in a controversy over art. President Fulton addressed a letter to the university community in response to a 1989 soft-drink advertisement, designed by the Japanese artist Shin Matsunaga, that was defaced while on display at the Exhibition Center. The advertisement contained a caricature of a black man which some people considered offensive. President Fulton acknowledged that he found “the image deeply offensive and racist” and he lent his own support to the public condemnation of the image (Lyons, 1991, p. 78). Despite this, he asserted the institution’s commitment to remaining neutral in the matter. He believed the advertisement should be protected from bearing a disclaimer or being censored. In his letter to the campus community he asserted:

In the instance of the Matsunaga exhibition, there were other pieces which some found offensive, especially those which employ images that are considered sexist. A disclaimer for one piece in the show would have raised questions about the university’s position on other potentially offensive pieces. It quickly became evident that if the University begins making judgments on

individual instances of expression, then it must make judgments on all acts of expression, a role that is patently inappropriate for an institution of higher education. (Lyons, 1991, p. 79)

Higher education is one place in society where diverse people gather to discuss opposing ideas and search for truth and knowledge. Artists are one part of this environment. One function of art is to force us to look at ourselves and to ask deep questions. There is considerable anguish and pain associated with examining personal beliefs. Student and faculty artists will continue to challenge conventional wisdom and people will continue to be offended by the challenge. Campus administrators bear the responsibility for protecting and maintaining an environment conducive to the free exchange of ideas.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

The review of the literature related to academic freedom indicates that differences exist concerning the meaning of the concept; that administrators and faculty disagree on the importance of academic freedom; and that confusion exists over the degree to which the First Amendment fully protects art as speech. The faculty artist's rights to freedom of expression may be protected under professional academic freedom as an employment law concept adopted by the AAUP, but there appears to be no guarantee that artistic freedom for faculty artists is protected under constitutional academic freedom and the First Amendment.

The literature related to art censorship suggests three different theories useful in explaining why censorship occurs. The theories are based on social, political, and moral reasons. Censorship frequently occurs on campus when controversial art is exhibited in locations other than a specified gallery. When works of art become controversial due to their sexual, racial, or political content, some campus

administrators will have the works removed from the exhibit. Some administrators feel obligated to protect the community, both on and off campus, from offensive art. These campus leaders want to maintain a calm and safe environment when they should be maintaining the principle of institutional neutrality.

College art departments are responsible for teaching art and training artists. Art faculty are required to educate their students in the authentic activities of art. Because art faculty and art departments are part of the university's educational mission, the established principles of academic freedom must be invoked throughout any controversy involving the exhibition of art.

When a controversy erupts on the college campus, the campus administrators are responsible for maintaining the institution's neutrality in the matter and for seeing that opportunities are created for meaningful dialogue about the controversy. It is most important for campus administrators to act upon and protect the fundamental principle of free expression. Free expression for faculty, students, artists and institutions is at the core of a university and must not be compromised (Tannenbaum, 1991). Campus leaders can best protect the freedom of expression for all constituencies by siding with none.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Because effective policy making requires that we thoroughly understand both the nature of problems and any proposed solutions, a sound base of information is needed about people's conditions and behavior, their states of awareness, their feelings, attitudes, and beliefs (Backstrom and Hursh-Cesar, 1981, p. 3).

It was the intent of this study to compare the opinions of campus administrators, art faculty members, and art students concerning institutional alternatives and policy options relating to the exhibition of controversial student art work in three community colleges in Maryland. All identifying information is confidential and all participating schools and group members shall remain anonymous. All participants completed consent forms. The consent form is included as Appendix A.

Assumptions and Limitations

The ontological assumption of research involves the issue of what is real. In this qualitative research reality is viewed as subjective and multiple by the researcher. It is seen to be constructed by the participants in the study (Creswell, 1994).

The epistemological assumption involves the relationship of the researcher to that being researched. In group research the interviewer interacts with the participants. The researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. The interviewer's influence on participants is an important consideration for analysis (Creswell, 1994).

The methodological assumption involves the process of research. Group research involves an inductive process. Multiple factors are shaped simultaneously. Categories are identified through a flexible research process. Context is very

important. Qualitative research is descriptive. The researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding rather than outcomes or products (Creswell, 1994).

The goal in this group research was to understand reality. Because of the inductive nature of group research, greater attention is directed to discovering the manner in which respondents perceived the problem. As a result, the researcher has a clearer fix on how the issue is understood by respondents. If the group research has been carefully conducted and appropriately analyzed, then the user should be able to make cautious generalizations to other respondents who possess similar characteristics. There is a risk in using group data to generalize to a population because the sample is not necessarily intended to be reflective of the entire population (Krueger, 1994).

One of the limitations of group research is the interviewer has less control in a group interview as compared to an individual interview. The group will take detours from the main discussion and will often raise irrelevant issues. Data are more difficult to analyze and must be analyzed according to the group context. Groups can vary considerably and are difficult to assemble (Krueger, 1994).

Other limitations specific to this study include many of the participants at one of the community colleges downplayed the art incident that occurred there and the researcher was employed at one of the community colleges in the study. Also, the researcher found it difficult to return to the community colleges with a case study describing the art controversy that occurred there. The researcher tried to describe the multiple perceptions of each incident as objectively as possible.

One advantage of group research is that groups utilize a socially oriented research procedure. They involve interaction and influence. People are placed in a natural, real-life situation. Inhibitions are reduced and candor is increased. The format allows the interviewer to probe. Group research has high face validity. The

results are not presented in complex statistical charts but rather in lay terminology embellished with quotations from group participants. Group research is relatively low-cost and can provide speedy results (Krueger, 1994).

Definitions

Definitions are provided for the following terms and phrases. These terms were utilized extensively in this research and may not be completely understood by the reader. The *context of the presentation* refers to the space or location of the art exhibit. The *principle of institutional neutrality* is the idea that an educational institution must create and protect an environment that fosters the free expression of ideas. The institution should remain neutral to opposing ideas. Campus administrators can best protect the freedom of expression for all constituencies by siding with none. *Arts faculty* is used to denote professors who teach art, music, and theater courses. The phrase *captive audience* refers to the people who must view a work of art that is placed on exhibit in a public space rather than in a gallery. *Academic freedom* and *artistic freedom* were defined in chapter two.

PARTICIPANTS

A study of a specific institution is a unique study of a unique situation. It does not generalize to other institutions. If we want to conclude about prison inmates nationally, we have to take a national sample of prisons (Backstrom and Hursh-Cesar, 1981, p. 15).

Art faculty members at the eighteen community colleges in Maryland were contacted by telephone. Eleven of them claimed no controversy had ever occurred on their campus over student art. Art faculty at two of the community colleges never returned any of the calls. Five of the art faculty reported an incident and a willingness to discuss it.

The five community colleges with a controversial art incident are listed below. A brief description of each incident is included. Three of the community colleges were selected for this study based on four criteria. Community colleges were included if the controversial art incident involved student artists; if the incident was recent enough that most of the participants were still available; if the incident involved a hallway or gallery as the exhibit space; and if the contact person expressed a willingness to be involved. In two of the three community colleges selected, other sources of data were available. Driving time was also a small consideration. Criteria that eliminated a community college from this study were a controversial art incident which involved artists who were not students and an incident that occurred many years ago.

Community College A

The incident involved some student drawings of male nudes which were exhibited in the hallway across from the art department. A student was offended and sent a letter to the administration. The student also placed post-it notes over the genitalia in the exhibit. The president told the dean of instruction to look into it. The dean asked the division chair to look into it. By the time the division chair talked to the faculty the exhibit was due to come down.

Community College A was included in this study because the artists were students; the incident occurred in the spring of 1997; the display was in a hallway; and the participants were very willing to talk about the controversy. There was literally no driving time involved. A copy of the letter sent to the administration was in the possession of the researcher.

Community College B

The incident involved nude photographs exhibited in a hallway across from the art department during the fall 1998 semester. Students complained. One staff member complained to the department secretary.

Community College B was included in this study because the artist was a student; the incident occurred in the fall of 1998; the display was in a hallway; and the participants were willing to talk about the controversy. The school was within two hours driving distance. The faculty member expressed a desire to include his photography class as the students for the group interview.

Community College C

The exhibit was held in the College's Gallery on July 22, 1998. The controversy broke on August 10, 1998. The art involved a series of drawings depicting activities of the Klu Klux Klan. A meeting of the college's multicultural committee was scheduled for August 10, 1998. There were three complaints from citizens. The president said in a news interview that she wanted to support all views. She believed there was a teachable moment there. The president of the local NAACP called the exhibit offensive. A student called the exhibit offensive. The artist, a former student and recent graduate of the Corcoran, said the message is not offensive. The message is a warning to us not to let fear control society. A news broadcast on August 14, 1998 quoted the artist as telling the president of a local community college that he would pull the drawings off the walls because he was sensitive to the outcry of the community.

Community College C was included in this study because the artist was a former student; the incident occurred in the early fall of 1998; the exhibit was held in

the college gallery; and the participants were willing to talk about the controversy. The school was within two hours driving distance and there was evidence of community outrage. A video copy of the news broadcast reporting the incident was in the possession of the researcher.

Community College D

The incident involved cubist style, water color figure paintings with a subtle reference to the human form. A part-time student was offended and sent a letter to the administration complaining of how God created the human form and man should not distort it. The college administration responded by writing a letter to the student. The exhibit was over in one week.

Community College D was not included in this study because the artist was not a student and the incident was not very recent.

Community College E

The incident occurred some years ago. The faculty member was still there but the student artist and the students who were upset were gone. The class used found objects to create sculptures. The piece that caused the controversy was a sculpture intended as a statement against child abuse. It was a Virgin Mary figure with a dime store baby doll. Mary had a baseball bat in her hand. The bat and the baby doll were bloody. The title upset people. The faculty artist could not remember the title. A group of nursing students saw it as a pro-abortion piece. They felt they were educated to help and protect. Their pinning ceremony, a crowning event in their education, was scheduled in the theater. The lobby to the theater is also the lobby to the gallery. The nursing students wanted the sculpture removed from the gallery. The controversy

went all the way to the president, who is no longer at the institution. The piece remained on exhibit, but had a hard copy explanation attached to it.

Community College E was not included in this study because the incident happened years ago and most of the people who were involved in the controversy had left the institution.

Three community colleges were selected for the study. The three schools were Community College A, Community College B, and Community College C. The president of Community College A made the initial contact with the other two community college presidents to help the researcher gain access. The researcher explained the nature and scope of the study to the president of each community college. This study involved only participants from within each community college. No outside stake holders were included.

Demographic Data

Demographic data were gathered during the phase two group interviews only. Six administrators participated in the research. The President of each community college, one Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, one Academic Dean, and one Dean of Financial and Administrative Services were involved. Three were males and three were females. Two were between the ages of forty and forty nine. Three were between the ages of fifty and fifty nine and one was over age sixty. Two of the administrators had done post doctoral study, three held doctoral degrees, and one held a master's degree. Three of the administrators had been in their current position between one and five years. One had been there for six to ten years. One had been in the position for eleven to fifteen years and one for sixteen to twenty years.

Eight faculty members participated in the study. One full-time ceramics teacher, one full-time photography teacher, one full-time digital imaging teacher and one full-

time painting teacher were involved. Two full-time theater directors participated and two full-time lab assistants were included as faculty members. Six were males and two were females. One was between the ages of eighteen and twenty nine, four were between thirty and thirty nine, and three were between the ages of fifty and fifty nine. Four of the faculty had master's degrees. Two had bachelor's degrees. One had the associate's degree and one had a high school diploma. Three of the faculty had been in their current position between one and five years. Two had been there between six and ten years. Two had been in their positions for eleven to fifteen years and one for more than twenty years.

Sixteen students participated in the study. Nine were males and seven were females. Thirteen were between the ages of eighteen and twenty nine. Three were between thirty and thirty nine. One student had completed a bachelor's degree. One student had an associate's degree and fourteen students had high school diplomas. Every student had been enrolled at their college between one and five years. The demographic information form is included as Appendix D.

PROCEDURE

Data were collected in two stages. Information gathered in the first stage of this project was used to collect data during the second stage. The responses in stage one are individual responses to questions about the art incident which occurred at the participants campus. The responses in stage two are group responses to the three incidents.

Phase One Individual Interviews

In phase one of this research the researcher went to each of the three community colleges and conducted individual interviews to determine the perceived

facts surrounding the controversial art incident. The interviews lasted about thirty minutes and were structured in an attempt to identify the multiple perceptions surrounding the incident and reactions to how it was handled. The researcher recorded what the participants thought were the issues that contributed to the controversy, what principles they thought were employed in the solution, and their personal reaction to how the controversy was resolved.

Phase one individual interviews were conducted at Community College A with two art faculty members, the division chair, and the Academic Dean. Phase one interviews were held at Community College B with one art faculty member, the department secretary, the division chair, and the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Phase one interviews were conducted at Community College C with the Gallery Director, one art faculty member, and the President.

Phase One Instrumentation

The individual interview included eleven questions. The individuals were asked to discuss the facts, as they perceived them, surrounding the controversial student art exhibit that occurred on their campus. The following questions were asked:

How familiar are you with the controversial art incident that occurred here last year? Please describe it.

What was the nature of the art work involved?

Who were the major players involved in the incident?

What do you think are the issues that made it controversial?

How did the student artist respond to the controversy?

How do you think the art faculty wanted the incident to be handled?

What in your opinion, were the reactions of the student body to the controversy?

How did the administration respond to the incident?

What principles do you believe were employed in the solution?

What is your reaction to the institutions response?

Is there anything else you want to add that might help me understand this incident from your perspective?

The researcher prepared a brief and objective case analysis of each incident. The researcher made an honest attempt to highlight the facts and eliminate disputes. The interviews were recorded on audio tape. The researcher created transcripts. The researcher incorporated available print and video materials in this initial research phase. The individual interview guide is included as Appendix B.

Phase Two Group Interviews

In phase two of this project the researcher returned to the three community colleges for group interviews. There were three group interviews conducted at each of the three community colleges. Each community college had one group that was made up of two administrators, another group which included two or three arts faculty members, and a third group which involved four or more art students. The study involved a total of nine groups. The researcher asked the administrators and faculty to participate in the study. The faculty invited the students to participate.

The group interviews consisted of three parts and lasted approximately one hour. In the first part of the group interview each group was asked ten questions aimed at determining the participant's opinion about academic freedom, institutional neutrality, and exhibitions of student art work. In the second part of the interview the nine groups were asked to read and discuss each of the three case studies that had been developed from the phase one individual interviews. Every group participant

read the three case studies. During the third part of the interview the researcher presented the groups with three policy options and asked them to determine which option they felt might provide a better environment for making decisions regarding the exhibition of controversial student art.

The most important questions in phase two of this study were open-ended, free stimulus questions which allowed the respondent the opportunity to structure an answer in any of several dimensions. They provided a blank page to be filled in by the interviewee. The answer was not implied and the type or manner of response was not suggested. Individuals were encouraged to respond based on their specific situation. The major advantage to open-ended questions is that they reveal what is on the interviewees mind as opposed to what the interviewer suspects is on the interviewee's mind. Towards the end of the session the questions became close-ended questions in order to limit the types of response and bring greater focus to the answers (Krueger, 1994).

Phase Two Instrumentation

The opening question was the round robin question that everyone answered at the beginning of the interview. It was designed to be answered rather quickly and to identify characteristics that the participants had in common. It is preferable for these questions to be factual as opposed to attitude or opinion based questions (Krueger, 1994). The opening question for phase two of this study was:

Please tell me your name and how familiar you are with the art controversy that occurred here last year.

The introductory questions introduced the general topic of discussion and provided participants an opportunity to reflect on past experiences and their connection with the overall topic. These questions were not critical to the

analysis and were intended to foster conversation and interaction among the participants (Krueger, 1994). The introductory questions for this study were:

Please describe all of the places student art work is exhibited on this campus.

Please describe how you feel about faculty artists encouraging art students to be creative and unconventional, which may result in controversial art.

What role do student art exhibits play in the learning process of student artists?

The transition questions moved the conversation into the key questions that drove the study. The transition questions helped the participants envision the topic in a broader scope. They served as the logical link between the introductory questions and the key questions. During the transition questions, the participants were becoming aware of how others viewed the topic (Krueger, 1994). The transition questions for this study were:

Who should be held accountable for opinions expressed in an exhibition of student art?

Under what circumstances do you believe it is acceptable to remove controversial student art from an exhibition at a community college?

To what extent is it a violation of the faculty artist's academic freedom when a controversial art work is removed from a student exhibit?

The principle of institutional neutrality is the idea that an educational institution must create and protect an environment that fosters the free expression of ideas. To what extent is it a violation of institutional neutrality when community standards influence the exhibition of student art work?

To what extent are faculty artists responsible for protecting the community college from controversy when selecting student art work to be placed on exhibit?

To what extent are community college administrators obligated to remove controversial student art work from exhibit?

The groups were asked to read and discuss each of the case studies describing the three art controversies. The names of the schools and the individuals involved were changed. There were three key questions in this part. These were the first questions to be developed and also the ones that required the greatest attention in the subsequent analysis (Krueger, 1994). The key questions for this study were:

Please read these descriptions of controversy surrounding the exhibition of student art that occurred at three community colleges.

What do you believe are the issues that made each incident controversial?

In your opinion, how was each controversy handled?

What concerns you about what happened and what was done about it?

Case Study One

This community college does not have an art gallery. The art faculty typically displayed student art on the walls of a hallway outside the art department. In the spring of 1997, a part-time member of the art faculty was teaching a figure drawing class and putting the figure studies on the wall. This was a second semester life drawing class, creating figure drawings from a nude model. The drawings were predominantly graphite or charcoal. They were classical poses.

The drawings were a very loose sort of drawing, designed to get students aware of how to describe three dimensional form very quickly and to train hand/eye coordination. The drawings were gesture studies, done in fifteen minutes or less. They were basically line drawings with small amounts of shading. Depending on where the student was standing in relationship to the model, some were frontal or side views, some were back views, and some were a combination of four shortened views.

A few of the drawings did have frontal nudity. Some depicted genitalia, others did not. Some were lifelike and explicit.

The drawings were up for a week or ten days when a woman came to the President and complained strongly. She had brought her preteen age daughter to the campus. She was very upset that these pictures were located in a place which was her most direct point of access to her classroom. She asked the President if something could be done. She sent a letter to the administration describing the drawings as pornography and asked how they could possibly let this happen on campus. The woman asked people to sign a petition to have the drawings removed.

The administration tried to find common ground. The President asked the Dean if he could do anything about moving the pictures. The Dean went to the head of the department and suggested some other places where the drawings might be displayed that would be less confrontive when someone comes into the institution. The Dean thought it was logical, if the art faculty were willing, to relocate the display inside the art studio. It would have been very accessible to all of the art students, but not very accessible to anyone else.

The faculty wanted the drawings to remain on the wall. Although the drawings remained on display until the faculty decided to remove them, the faculty believed they were pressured into taking them down. They thought the administration over reacted. The faculty did not put the next group of drawings up. The administration believed no action was taken. They thought the faculty over reacted. Faculty and students were offended even though no direct action was taken. The Division Chair decided not to offer figure drawing classes until a place was designated for the display of art work.

Case Study Two

This community college does have an art gallery, but the incident did not occur there. In the spring of 1998, some photography students planned to exhibit their semester long projects somewhere in the community. The location for their exhibit ended up in a hallway of the fine arts center, outside of the art instructors offices. The work was critiqued by faculty and students before and during the time it was exhibited. Some of the photographs were very confronting images of nude females. Some of them were sectional parts of bodies hung together to make up one. A photography faculty member described the work as showing a hard edge to the woman.

The exhibit began to generate some reaction. There was some lively conversation among people and some did not like the nude photos. A few people objected to the content of the photographs and wanted them taken down. A department secretary received a telephone complaint from someone in the community. The complainant argued that the nude photos were not art and should not be on exhibit. The caller did not follow up on the complaint. Some students complained to the Dean. One of the concerns came from the father of a three-or-four year old child whom he had brought to a children's show and whom he had taken down the back hall past the exhibit to use the rest room. When the Dean informed the Division Chair of the complaint, the Chair said we need to sit down with whoever feels offended by the work and discuss it. No one ever came to the Division Chair and said anything at all. The art faculty were unsure of exactly what happened. They heard there were complaints and that some body wanted the photos removed. This was a very mild incident in everyone's opinion.

The faculty wanted to let the controversy go until someone confronted them officially. They were satisfied that no one ever did. The exhibit stayed up until it was time to come down. The administration at one point asked the faculty how long the

exhibit was going to be up and said they hoped it was going to come down soon. According to the faculty, the administration knew what was going on and really supported them. The faculty believed the administration was very level headed and did not panic or over react to the complaints. The faculty believed the issue was the exhibition of art in a public place and the possibility of children being exposed to it. The faculty said they will definitely talk with student artists in the future about this issue and the consequences of what they exhibit. The faculty admitted it was not addressed before this incident.

Although the administration supported the faculty and art students during this incident, they believed the community college was a public institution. They felt they must be concerned with how far they go with certain things. The administration believed the community college was not like a metropolitan museum or national gallery. They stated that in addition to educational goals they need to be aware that there is a public involvement that goes beyond education. They believed students must discuss the controversial issues often found in student art. On the other hand, they admitted to trying to avoid controversy by carefully selecting what is put on exhibit.

Case Study Three

This community college has an art gallery. The incident involved an exhibition of prints by a former student which were on display in the gallery. The artist had a degree in print making from the Corcoran. He was reading about the medieval orders of monks, who were crusaders and priests at the same time, and contemplating the irony of that. He discovered these orders had robes and hoods of all colors. He was also looking at the religious iconography of the medieval era. He was into symbolism and working with how to overcome personal fear. The prints relied heavily on chiaroscuro (the use of dark and light areas) and used symbolism that involved

hooded figures as a way of describing fear and misunderstanding. The prints were very moody. Most of them were black and white, with shades of gray in between.

The show opened in mid July and went through the end of August 1998. There were about twenty prints in the exhibit. Three or four had figures that were in white robes. There were several prints that had dogs in them. One piece had a vague and fleeting reference to the Ku Klux Klan. This particular print had three figures off to the left side of the the piece. One of the figures was holding a cane, which some people misinterpreted as a gun. It was a small drawing, twenty inches high and about twelve or fourteen inches wide. It was called "Target". The artist did not deliberately use the cloaked figures to represent the KKK and racist activities, as much as he used them as a way of describing fear, loathing and ignorance on the part of the KKK. The art work was misunderstood. It was not promoting the viewpoint of the KKK. It was reducing the actions of the KKK into fear, loathing and ignorance.

The exhibition had been up for two or three weeks without incident. The gallery director went on vacation in mid August. A young African American woman, who was in line at the Center registering for a class, decided to go to the gallery and see what was happening. The glass doors to the gallery were closed and a statement was on display. The student saw these hooded figures, made a relationship to the Ku Klux Klan and was offended. The student did not bother going to any school official. The student went home, got a video camera, returned to the gallery and video taped the exhibit without permission. The tape was sent to a television station.

No one was prepared for what happened. Everyone was caught completely unaware of both the breadth and the depth of the controversy. It blew out of proportion quickly and uncontrollably. The gallery director has never gotten a formal complaint, letter or phone call. The President had been off campus for a few days. When she returned she received a phone call from a senior woman activist from the black

community. The woman asked why the college had KKK art in the gallery and why the college was passing out KKK literature. The President said she would be more than happy to check it out. She wandered over to the gallery and immediately understood how someone could have referenced the images to the KKK. The next day the newspapers started to call and the television crews arrived on campus. The TV media and the local paper covered the story inaccurately. The college was not passing out literature, the art exhibit was never intended as a KKK display, and the art was not in the corridors, but rather in the gallery.

The President said the college was not going to back away from controversy. This incident was so emotional and disturbing that she wanted to deal with it up front. She believed the community college was a place for the free exchange of ideas. The President felt she had to gather feathers that had already been scattered to the wind. She had to pull back seemingly an impossible situation and get her arms around it. The President scheduled an open forum where the community, art faculty and other interested parties could come together and try to make sense of this. She gave the concerned parties an opportunity to air their ideas so that she could consider the communities needs and weigh them against the needs of the college. The President wanted a clear idea of how the community felt about this before she made a decision.

The gallery director absolutely refused to take the exhibition down. The President was very supportive. The gallery director had no feeling that she was going to be manipulated in anyway. The gallery director had total access to the President during the entire incident.

The public forum was held a few days later. All constituencies were present and had an opportunity to voice their opinion. The President decided to support the art exhibition, but after some consideration, the artist himself decided to withdraw the work. He decided this on his own because he did not want his images manipulated.

He felt that the work was now something other than what it was originally conceived to be. The artist was also a sensitive individual who felt the pain of the African American community and felt responsible for it.

The gallery director's reaction to the administration's response was very favorable. She believed a lot of explosive smoldering was put out initially. The art faculty believed the administration handled it the best way possible. Instead of closing the incident down, they opened it up. The President received anecdotal and indirect feedback that the faculty were very comfortable and very supportive with how this played out. The President believed the faculty understood that the administration's support for the arts, in all of their forms, was solid.

The President believed the academy was the right place to have controversy. She called this incident the most exhilarating moment of the year. It was sad and frightening, but the college was finally dealing with a real issue instead of parking and copying service issues. The President believed controversial things should be encouraged at the academy, not for their own sake, but so that the community college could be recognized as a place of leadership. The faculty and students should create an ongoing atmosphere where when things go bad, either around the campus or in the community, people know they can come to the campus and get a fair hearing. While the President believed the community college should never shrink from controversy, she also thought it should engage itself in the pursuit of peace and justice. The President believed controversies over art were little blips on the screen that show us we are not nearly where we need to be.

These case studies were actual incidents involving the exhibition of controversial student art. The groups were asked to read the incidents and identify the issues contributing to the controversy. They were also asked to describe how they felt about the institution's response and to make known any concerns, likes or dislikes

they may have had for each case. The group interview guide is included as Appendix C. The case studies are included as Appendix E.

Policy Options

The researcher presented the groups with three policy options and asked them to determine which option they felt might provide a better environment for making decisions regarding the exhibition of student art. The participants were asked to rank the policy options from most to least attractive in providing for better resolution of the problem. Policy one favored complete academic freedom for faculty. Policy two favored group decision making. Policy three gave complete authority to the administration and suggested appointing a committee to review student art.

Policy Option One

Because art faculty and art departments are part of the community college's educational mission, and because art faculty are pursuing the mission of the community college and deserve the same protection of academic freedom as those who work in other disciplines, the established principles of academic freedom will be invoked throughout any controversy involving the exhibition of student art. This community college recognizes the faculty artists' right to select student art work for exhibition based on responsible and informed judgments of its quality. We support "the right of faculty to pursue the study, instruction and display of art in ways they determine are appropriate" (Lyons, 1991, p. 81).

Policy Option Two

Because community college administrators bear the responsibility for protecting and maintaining an environment conducive to the free exchange of ideas, and because the way in which a college deals with a controversial art exhibit reveals the relative status of art within the college and the attitude of the neighboring community toward the role of the college as a forum for public discourse (Lyons, 1991), this community college will provide a forum for public dialogue whenever controversy erupts over an exhibition of student art. The college will strive to foster an environment for critical dialogue concerning the exhibition while maintaining a neutral relationship to the different cultural and religious values characteristic of our society. When art is permitted to function in this way, it can best serve the mission of the college and the community at large (Lyons, 1991). Campus leaders can best protect the freedom of expression for all constituencies by siding with none.

Policy Option Three

Because the administration bears the delicate task of balancing the artist's creative freedom against the need to protect the sensitive student's right not to be coerced into an unacceptable artistic experience, and because constituents may hold community colleges accountable for the opinions or beliefs expressed in an artistic presentation simply because the college provides the space for the exhibit, it becomes the responsibility of this community college administration to weigh the risk of needless offense against potentials for educational benefits (Lankford, 1994). All exhibitions of art will be screened by the college's Exhibitions and Events Committee. The administration at this community college reserves the right to decide what picture of the college it wants to project. The College recognizes the value of exhibiting student work as a component of the education process, but it reserves "the right to

relocate or remove any work from exhibition that may be in violation of the law, that may be hazardous to the health and/or safety of viewers or participants, or that may be disruptive to the educational process” (Lyons, 1991, p.79).

The ending questions brought closure to the discussion and enabled participants to reflect back on previous comments. A summary question was asked after the moderator had given a short two to three minute oral summary of the key questions and big ideas that emerged from the discussion. Participants were asked “Is this an adequate summary?” The closing questions for this study were:

Let’s summarize the key points of our discussion. Does this summary sound complete?

Do you have any changes or additions?

Have we missed anything?

What advice do you have to offer?

The moderator wrote key themes and issues on a large pad and referred to these ideas every fifteen minutes to check for agreement among participants. This served as a validity check and provided field notes from the sessions. The researcher kept a journal with daily entries related to the experiences and feelings involved in this study. One of the first journal entries was an essay outlining everything the researcher believed about the study. The researcher kept a log of field notes for every individual and group interview. Personal feelings and observations before and after each session were noted and important items that happened during the sessions were included. Diagrams of the seating arrangements were drawn and saved in the field note book. Each group interview was recorded on audio tape and the researcher created transcripts. Relevant comments made once the session was officially over were noted as such. No information was disregarded. Everything was examined as data. The researcher took careful handwritten notes on body language and other

nonverbal cues. The first group interview was used to pilot test the study. No changes were deemed necessary. The policy options are included as Appendix F.

ANALYSIS

The challenge is to make sense of massive amounts of data, reduce the volume of information, identify significant patterns, and construct a framework for communicating the essence of what the data reveal (Patton, 1990, in Best and Kahn, 1993, p. 203).

Data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating, or otherwise recording the evidence (Yin, 1984, in Krueger, 1994). The data must be analyzed to address the initial proposition of the study. A key principle to remember is that the analysis is driven by the problem. Krueger (1994) believes analysis begins by going back to the intent of the study. The depth and intensity of analysis are determined by the purpose of the study (Krueger, 1994). The primary purpose of this study was to compare the opinions of campus administrators, art faculty members, and student artists concerning institutional solutions and policy options relating to the exhibition of controversial student art work in the community colleges of Maryland.

The search for meaning is a search for patterns. Stake (1995) explains “correspondence” as the consistency within certain conditions. One can look for patterns while reviewing documents, observing, or interviewing. Patterns can also be discovered by coding records and combining frequencies (Stake, 1995).

Analysis was conducted to reveal patterns of response that suggested the participants’ policy preferences for dealing with a controversial exhibit of student art. A composite picture of each participant groups’ preferences emerged. The analysis included an examination of the consistency of the participant responses. The individual interviews were combined and examined to determine if the individuals identified the same issues as contributing to the controversy at their community college. A list of issues that could potentially contribute to student art controversies on

community college campuses was developed. The group interviews were analyzed in the same manner. Analysis was conducted to compare how the participants' policy choice relates to the participants' issue determination in each incident.

The analysis helped to identify and explain what issues made the incidents controversial and how those issues affected the individual's response. The analysis revealed which policy option each participant selected to cover controversial student art exhibits, and comparisons were made among and between the groups to determine if different opinions exist regarding the research questions. The analysis plan is included as Appendix G.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

“9. Educational researchers should disclose to appropriate parties all cases where they would stand to benefit financially from their research or cases where their affiliations might tend to bias their interpretation of their research or their professional judgments.”
(Ethical Standards of the AERA)

Colleges are highly politicized environments. This researcher considered the sensitive nature of examining these issues and tried not to threaten the people who worked in the environment. The researcher tried to minimize disruption and highlight the benefits directly associated to the individuals involved.

This researcher had consent forms filled out by all the participants in the study and renegotiated the consent throughout the scope of the project. This researcher claimed the right to interpret and publish the findings of this study without censorship or approval of the participants. This researcher wanted the participants in the study to play a role in shaping the research agenda, generating data, and reviewing what was written in preliminary reports.

This researcher followed the ethical standards outlined by the American Educational Research Association. This researcher conducted himself in such a way that did not jeopardize future research. This researcher did not falsify, fabricate or misrepresent any of the information in this study. This researcher honestly and fully disclosed his qualifications and limitations when presenting himself to conduct the study.

This researcher respected the rights, privacy, dignity, and sensitivities of the people in the study as well as the integrity of the institution where the research occurred. This researcher was sensitive to ongoing institutional activities. This researcher communicated the findings of the research in clear, straightforward, and appropriate language to all involved. Informants and participants remained anonymous. This researcher protected the participants in the study and maintained the integrity of the research.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter presents information describing the methodology for the study. The assumptions and limitations are discussed and the unusual terms are defined. Information regarding the selection of the participating community colleges, the size of the groups, and demographic data about the participants is discussed. The procedure for conducting the individual and group interviews is presented. Information about the interview questions is included. The number and type of question is mentioned and discussed as to their role in analysis. Plans for a pilot test are revealed and ethical considerations are provided.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Our interview informants may tell us long and complicated accounts and reminiscences. When we chop them up into separate coded segments, we are in danger of losing the sense that they are accounts. We lose sight, if we are not careful, of the fact that they are often couched in terms of stories-as narratives-or that they have other formal properties in terms of their discourse structure. Segmenting and coding may be an important, even an indispensable, part of the research process, but it is not the whole story (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 52).

The results from the phase one individual interviews and the phase two group interviews are presented in this chapter. The results of the individual interviews are presented as participant responses to questions regarding the issues involved in the art controversy at their community college, the principles employed in the administration's solution to the controversy, and the individual's personal reaction to their institution's response.

The results of the group interviews are presented in three parts. Part one is the participant responses to questions stemming from the research areas of academic freedom, institutional neutrality, and context of the presentation. Part two group interview results are given as participant responses to questions regarding the issues, the administrative response, and concerns in the three case studies. Part three results are presented as the policy preference of all participants.

This chapter closes with a discussion of the participants response patterns to the group interview questions. An examination of the issues the groups identified as contributing to the art controversy in each of the three case studies is included and the relationship between the participants policy preference and the issues they identified is discussed. All relevant data are included. Some data are presented in table form. Implications will be discussed in chapter five.

RESULTS OF THE PHASE ONE INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

Eleven individuals were interviewed in phase one. Four participants were interviewed at Community College A, four were interviewed at Community College B, and three were interviewed at Community College C.

Issues Involved in the Controversy

The individual participants were asked to identify the issues they believed contributed to the art controversy at their community college. Results from the phase one interviews indicate that the individual participants identified similar and different issues in the controversy at their community college. There appears to be very little consistency in the responses from Community College A. One faculty member identified the open display of nudity as the primary issue. This individual responded to the question by saying, "Nudity. It was as simple as that. It was the open display of nude drawings and very, very simple drawings, hardly explicit at all." Another faculty member believed the issue was more about parents becoming offended that their children were exposed to nude drawings. This faculty artist said, "Some people would say to me, there are little children that walk down the hallway. And I said, well, sorry. It is a college."

The Division Chair identified the rights of the artist competing with the rights of individuals as the primary issue. The Division Chair said, "There is conflict between the rights of the artist and the rights of individuals not to be confronted by things that they find offensive." The Division Chair believed the heart of the controversy ". . . was the idea of a child coming in and seeing this and the parent feeling that it was inappropriate." The Dean of Instruction believed the primary issue was ". . . the fact that the art instructor was asked to move the work from a central location in the building to a less obtrusive location in the building."

The participants from Community College B were a bit more consistent in their responses. Three of the four individuals identified nudity as the primary issue in the controversy at their community college. The Division Chair reported never having the chance to understand the issues. Both the Division Chair and the Fine Arts Dean stressed the difference between metropolitan museums, national galleries, and community colleges. The Division Chair said:

We are a community college. We need to be aware of community concerns. At the same time we need to be also aware of to what point do we educate. To what point do we hold back information which ultimately may be important down the line to a student? We are not a major art museum or national gallery. In addition to our educational goals, we need to be aware that there is a public involvement here that goes beyond education and we have to be concerned about how far we can go with all these things.

The Fine Arts Dean suggested the nature of the community and the mission of the community college were important things to be considered when programming artistic productions. She said:

My own feeling is if students cannot talk about work here, then where? But I am very aware of the very conservative area that we live in. And frankly, as we choose shows to be done in the theater, I try to make sure that we are not doing shows that are on the edge. This is not a place that is on the edge. And if they want to see them, they are going to have to go elsewhere. As long as I am here, I mean. There is a place for experimentation but we do not bill ourselves as an experimental house. This is not our mission. So, to be quite honest with you, I have tried to avoid some of these problems before they have come to be problems.

The participants from Community College C were more consistent in their response to the issues than either Community College A or B. This may be due to the high visibility of the controversy. All three individuals identified racism as the main issue. In all three cases, however, each participant offered different secondary issues. The issues, as identified by each participant, can be found in Table 1.

Principles Employed in the Solution

The individual interview participants were asked to identify the principles they believed to be employed in the institution's solution to the controversy at their community college. Results from phase one interviews indicate that participants identified similar and different principles employed in the solution of the controversy. The responses from the participants at Community College A appear to be the least consistent. One faculty member identified avoidance as the principle utilized in the solution. The faculty member said, "I really do think they probably tried to ignore it as long as possible and then felt they had to make some kind of stand." Another faculty member identified the principle of expediency. This individual believed the administration wanted to ". . . act quickly and shut people up. They wanted to remove the controversy. Censor it."

The Division Chair identified the desire to be fair to all as the principle employed in the solution to the controversy. The Division Chair said, "I think that we attempted to be fair to both camps, both the public that we serve and the faculty and students that we serve, because we are slaves to both." The Dean of Instruction identified pragmatism as the main principle employed in the solution to the controversy. The Dean said:

[I] tried to find an area in which students got the opportunity to display their work, the professor had an opportunity to demonstrate the breadth of his teaching skill

Table 1

Issues the Individual Participants Identified as Contributing to the Art Controversy at
Their Community College

<u>Position</u>	<u>Issues</u>
<u>Community College A</u>	
Art Faculty:	Nudity. The location of the drawings and children being exposed to them. A backward community.
Division Chair:	The rights of the artist vs. the rights of individuals. No gallery. A parent complaining about their child seeing the drawings.
Art Faculty:	Nudity and the open display of nude drawings.
Academic Dean:	The faculty artist being asked to move the work.
<u>Community College B</u>	
Art Faculty:	Hard edged, confronting photos of nude females.
Division Chair:	Never got the chance to understand it.
Division Secretary:	Nudity.
Fine Arts Dean:	Nudity. The location of the drawings. A parent complaining about their child seeing the drawings.
<u>Community College C</u>	
Art Faculty:	Racism, ignorance, pain, mistrust, and a provincial area.
Gallery Director:	Racism and viewers misunderstanding history.
President:	The images conjured up past KKK activity, the context of the community, and prior victims of authority figures in the KKK.

and style, and yet the other students in the college were not confronted by something they found offensive.

The participants from Community College B gave the most consistent answer in that three of the four individuals stated there was no response or solution. These individuals believed the incident was so minor the administration chose not to respond to it. That choice was, in effect, the response.

Two of the three participants from Community College C identified trust as the principle employed in the solution to the controversy at their community college. One faculty member said:

I think she [the President] gave the concerned parties an opportunity to come together and air their ideas so that she could then consider the communities needs and weigh them against the needs of the college. I think she handled it the best way possible. Instead of closing it down, she opened it up.

The gallery director said she had total access to the president during the entire incident. She stated, "If anything came up about it, I would call her. She would call me right back. And she was very supportive. I had no feeling that I was going to be manipulated or anything."

The President identified trust as the major principle employed in the response to the controversy. She said:

I would say the trust and faith in the good will of people, trust in the honesty and the integrity of people, and trust in what I will call the intellectual process. We are an academic community and we pride ourselves in processing things to death. We are a safe place for people to have controversy. I think the academy is the right place to have controversy. We should not shrink from controversy. I do believe the academy is the place where controversial things need to be encouraged. Not for their own sake but that this is a place of leadership. We

should create an ongoing atmosphere, along with the faculty and the students, where when things go bad, either around the campus or in the community, people can come here and get a fair hearing. And that was what I heard the most out of this. It was fair. We all got a chance.

The President went on and described the art controversy as “. . . the most exhilarating moment of the year.” She said:

It was sad and frightening and all of those things. But this college was finally dealing with a real issue instead of parking and copying service and how many more dollars we can get for salaries. It was a real academic issue with intellectual pursuits and it was exhilarating in that respect.

Pragmatism, avoidance, weighing community needs against student needs, and trust were the principles most often identified by the participants as being employed in the solutions to the controversies. The principles, as identified by each participant, can be found in Table 2.

Personal Reactions to the Response

The individual interview results indicate that opinions vary as to the personal reaction each participant had to their institution's response. The responses from Community College A were the least consistent of the three community colleges and divided along faculty and administration lines. The faculty thought the response was over acting and weak. One faculty member said, “I thought they over reacted and knuckled under to one complaint.” Another faculty member said:

I thought it was a weak response. I understand that kids can walk through here but you have to understand this is a college. We teach art classes. This is the art area. If you walk into the science lab you can expect to see fetal pigs in jars. This is part of the whole package.

Table 2

Principles the Individual Participants Identified as Having Been Employed in the Solution of the Art Controversy at Their Community College

Position	Principles
<u>Community College A</u>	
Art Faculty:	Ignore and avoid until forced to make a stand.
Division Chair:	Be fair to both camps and take the least obtrusive path.
Art Faculty:	Expediency. Eliminate the controversy.
Academic Dean:	Pragmatism. A little bit for everybody.
<u>Community College B</u>	
Art Faculty:	Communicate and explain.
Division Chair:	Weigh community needs against student needs.
Division Secretary:	Art has the right to be displayed regardless of complaint.
Fine Arts Dean:	Support the freedom issue. Realize it is a conservative area. Avoid controversy and help the public make decisions concerning when college functions are appropriate for children.
<u>Community College C</u>	
Art Faculty:	Concerned parties come together and air ideas. Weigh community needs against college needs. Open it up.
Gallery Director:	Total access and trust.
President:	Trust the natural gifts of peoples intelligence and the intellectual process. Have faith in the good will of people. The academy is the place for controversy.

The Division Chair felt the administration did not do anything. In her opinion the faculty reacted emotionally and did not consider what was done versus what was talked about being done. The Division Chair said, "I thought the institution took the least obtrusive path it could take and serve both publics. Even though the discourse bothered people and they immediately cried academic freedom, it was a moot point because we did not do anything drastic." The Dean thought the controversy was handled appropriately. The Dean described his reaction to the response as "pretty normal." He went on to say:

The reaction we had to this particular instance was very much within the mainstream of this organization's cultural response to this and similar activities. We tend to try to find a middle ground, a little bit for everybody. We do not, very often, play zero sum games where you win and I lose. We try to get something that is consistent. We try to use a broad guideline that says is it good for the student? Is it good for the instructor? Is it good for the college as a whole?

The responses from the participants at Community College B were very consistent. Four out of four participants supported the decision of the administration not to respond to the controversy. One faculty member said, "I think they responded very level headed and did not panic." One staff member said, "If we took down every art show that people did not like for one reason or another, we would never have an art show." This participant shed some light on the exhibition culture at Community College B. This individual went on to say, "I just can not imagine that we would take things down on the basis that a couple of people found it offensive."

The responses from the participants at Community College C were also very consistent. Three out of three individuals supported the administrative response of creating a forum for discussion about the controversy. One faculty member said, "I suppose if I were in her position I would feel forced to do that. I think that given the

situation she probably did the best thing that she could.” The individual reactions to the institution’s response can be found in Table 3.

There is an interesting relationship between the level of controversy, the institution’s response to the controversy, and the personal reactions to the response of the individuals involved in this study. The art incident at Community College B was the least controversial of the three community colleges. Most of the individuals interviewed described it as no big deal. One faculty member said, “My response was not to do anything until it became a big incident. And it never got to that point.”

The Division Chair said:

As a matter of fact, it was a very mild thing because no one actually ever came to me and said anything to me at all. I just sort of heard that there were discussions. There was one person who, I think, went into the Dean’s office and said he was offended by it. But as chair of the department and producer of this fine art center, no one actually came to me to talk about it, which I thought was interesting.

The Fine Arts Dean described the incident as not being controversial at all. She said “. . . because there was not a controversy, I mean an open controversy, I certainly did not get much response from students.”

The institution’s response was viewed by most of the participants as no response at all. The personal reactions to it were favorable. Most of the participants were satisfied. The administration did not have to respond, the faculty felt support from the lack of administrative response, and the student’s work remained on the wall.

The art incident at Community College A was more controversial than the incident at Community College B. The complainants kept the pressure on the administration, demanding action and circulating a petition. The faculty thought the institution’s response was weak and confusing. The administrators described the

Table 3

Individual Participant Reactions to the Institution's Response

Position	Reactions
<u>Community College A</u>	
Art Faculty:	They over reacted. They held back and then caved in.
Division Chair:	It was handled appropriately. No action was taken but damage was done. The administrative discourse bothered people.
Art Faculty:	It was a weak response. They should support the work, not satisfy the minority.
Academic Dean:	Find the common ground. Pretty normal.
<u>Community College B</u>	
Art Faculty:	Favorable. Level headed. It never became a big deal.
Division Chair:	It never got to be a big deal.
Division Secretary:	Positive support for not interfering.
Fine Arts Dean:	Positive support for not interfering.
<u>Community College C</u>	
Art Faculty:	They did the best they could.
Gallery Director:	Very favorable. Very supportive. Not manipulative.
President:	Would do it the same way again.

response as pragmatic. The administration searched for common ground and tried to please everybody. The personal reactions were the least favorable. No one was satisfied. The administration thought the faculty over reacted at the request to relocate the drawings. The faculty thought the administration over reacted at receiving a few complaints about the art work.

The art incident at Community College C was the most controversial of the three. It was aired outside the campus in print and television media. It became very emotional very quickly. It involved students, faculty, administrators, and the public. The institution's response of holding an open forum for discussion was both honest and courageous. The personal reactions were the most favorable. Everyone was satisfied.

The personal reactions to the institutional response when dealing with controversy suggest a need to examine the model of college decision making. The comments given by Community College A and Community College B indicate they tend to operate with a we-they model of governance. The comments given by Community College C suggest they operate more as a team. Community College C created a forum where all views of the controversy could be expressed. They invited all constituents to get involved. They encouraged a team solution to the problem. Community College C was the only college that used its controversy as an opportunity to educate.

RESULTS OF THE PHASE TWO GROUP INTERVIEWS

There were three group interviews at each of the three community colleges. Interviews were conducted with a group of administrators, a group of art faculty members, and a group of art students. A total of nine group interviews were held.

Community College A

The group participants at Community College A included two administrators, three art faculty members, and five students. The President and Dean of Instruction were the administrators. The faculty included one full-time ceramics professor, one temporary full-time painting instructor, and one full-time theater technical director. The students were members of the art club.

Academic Freedom

The group participants were asked four questions aimed at determining their opinion regarding academic freedom and artistic expression. When asked to describe how they felt about faculty artists encouraging art students to be creative and unconventional, which may result in controversial art, the administrator group said creativity should be encouraged. The President said, "It would be part of the art and the humanities tradition and curriculum. I do not think you could talk, teach, or discuss art without covering that area." The Dean added, ". . . part of the intellectual experience is to review art in its many facets and forms."

The faculty group felt they had the right to free expression. One faculty member said, "I am interested in students knowing that in a free society they have the right to express themselves fully even if it means offending people." The faculty group

stressed the importance of teaching students to be responsible for the images they create.

The student group unanimously said they wanted the faculty to encourage them to be creative and unconventional. One student said, "It is great to be encouraged to push the limits. I have always been encouraged to push the envelope and I will always be thankful to those professors who have done that."

All three groups at Community College A believed student art exhibits play an important role in the learning process of student artists. The administrators felt it was a significant part of the full educational experience. The President said, "You display art as you would display student literary work, scientific projects, or any end product of the educational experience." The Dean replied, "Students need feed back. And one of the only ways you can get feed back, positive or negative, is to get it out in front of the public."

The faculty group believed student exhibits were an essential component of the educational experience. One faculty member said:

Exhibitions are absolutely critical. The whole idea of educating people about the arts is to produce the work and then to put it out for discussion. That is the whole idea of what the critique is about. You have to have it critiqued and that involves putting the work up.

The student group said exhibits were very valuable as well.

The administrator group believed it was acceptable to remove controversial student art from an exhibition when the work was in violation of existing law or prevailing social mores. The President responded:

I guess when it is blatantly pornographic. We are in a conservative area, where the Christian right has a toe hold, and as a publicly funded community college

you need to account for that. That is not the driver. You do not make all of your decisions based upon it, but you factor it in.

The faculty group was divided over the acceptable circumstances for removing controversial student art from exhibit. Some of the faculty believed work should be removed only when it caused bodily harm. One faculty member said, "The only thing I can think of is if it actually endangers people to walk into the area to see the piece, perhaps it should be removed for safety issues." Another faculty member felt a very strong and offensive piece that was intentionally harmful should be removed.

The student groups were also divided. Acceptable circumstances to the students included when the majority of artists in the show wanted the piece removed; really tasteless and hardcore pornography; and a piece that was breaking the law or hurting someone. Some students said it was totally unacceptable. They believed there was no valid reason to remove student art from an exhibit.

The administrator group was divided over whether or not the faculty artist's academic freedom was violated when a controversial art work was removed from a student exhibit? The President said:

It would be a violation of the faculty member's academic freedom. I would hope that the faculty member themselves would be persuaded to display it elsewhere. But it would certainly be a violation. But if you are dealing with a segment of the public that is upset with it, you hope you could be persuasive with the faculty member, to take corrective action. Which does not necessarily mean you remove it from the college. I think this college needs a gallery where you can display this stuff.

The Dean's opinion was a little different. The Dean responded, "Without putting words in the mouth of the instructor, I suspect anything but leaving it exactly where it

was, was in his mind infringing on his academic freedom. And that is fine. That is his opinion.”

The faculty group was in agreement that it was a violation of academic freedom. The technical director considered it an insult. One faculty member described the act of removing art from an exhibit as censorship. He said, “It clearly falls within the definition of censorship which means that somebody, or group A, has the power to control the expression of group B or individual B.”

The student group was divided. Some students believed the instructor was representing the college. These students thought the college should have input into how the faculty operate. Other students viewed it as a definite violation. They hoped the college would trust the professor enough to make the appropriate decision. They believed the art professor was the campus art authority.

Institutional Neutrality

The groups were asked four questions aimed at determining their opinion regarding institutional neutrality and artistic expression. The administrator group was in complete agreement over the question of who should be responsible for the opinions expressed in an exhibition of student art? The President and the Dean believed the students and the faculty were responsible.

The faculty group was divided over this question. Some faculty believed the individual student was responsible for the opinions expressed in their art. One faculty member said, “I do not think that faculty necessarily have a role as policeman in what students express. I am not supervising the production of the artist that I am trying to train. That is the definition of censorship in my opinion.” Another faculty member said, “I think it depends on the relative college and the relative region that you are teaching in.”

The student group unanimously agreed it was the student artist who was responsible for the opinion expressed in the art work.

The principle of institutional neutrality is the idea that an educational institution must create and protect an environment that fosters the free expression of ideas. The administrator group agreed that institutional neutrality was not violated when community standards influenced the exhibition of student art work.

The Dean said:

By making another environment available to display the student work, where frankly the feedback would probably be better because it would be from students who knew something about art, I think we were endeavoring to create an environment of institutional neutrality.

The President agreed.

The faculty group agreed it was a violation of institutional neutrality when community standards influenced the exhibition of student art. Some faculty said they needed to be aware of the reality of the community in which they exist. The student groups agreed it was a violation of institutional neutrality. One student said:

We are still an institution of higher learning. This college was not founded on the principle we are a model of community opinions. We are an institute of higher learning and when you limit the thought process, you tend to zap higher learning.

The administrators shared the same opinion regarding the extent to which faculty artists were responsible for protecting the community college from controversy when choosing student art work to be placed on exhibit. The President responded, "You have your commitment to your academic discipline and at the same time you are a public employee. You would hope you would be able to balance these two roles. It is a judgmental kind of thing."

The Dean said:

The other side of that is that you are an instructor and you are educating the entire student. If you are preparing your students to become performing artists, they are going to need to get support from a variety of areas. They should put something together that the audience is going to react to. This is the part of maturity. It is a part of the teaching and learning process.

The faculty group agreed they were training people to go out into the world and be artists. They said the students needed to know how to handle controversy on their own. The faculty did not feel responsible for protecting the institution. The student group unanimously agreed the faculty were responsible for protecting the institution.

The administrator group was in agreement concerning the extent to which campus leaders were obligated to remove controversial art work from a student exhibit? The President said:

I do not think they are obligated. I think you can try to be persuasive. It is almost a case by case issue. If you had a knock down, drag out pornographic work, and you have a lot of folks outraged by it, I guess then you would be obligated to do something about it.

The Dean agreed.

The faculty group agreed an administrator would be obliged to remove a work if it somehow threatened the existence of the college. Although, these faculty found it inconceivable that a student work could possibly have that much power. The student group disagreed over the administrators having the obligation. Some of the students thought a work should be removed if it was ruining the other students art works or creating an unsafe environment. Other students thought a work should never be removed.

Context of the Presentation

The participating groups were asked to describe all of the places student art work was exhibited on their campus. Each group described locations around the campus where student art was put on display. Locations included the hallways of art buildings, classrooms, libraries, lobbies of various buildings, theaters, student centers, and offices. Group answers were similar and consistent.

The administrators, faculty, and students at Community College A expressed the need for a gallery. All three groups felt the art would be safer in a gallery because people would not be forced to go there. Viewers would have the option of choosing whether or not to go into the gallery to see the art. However, student art is exhibited all over the community college campus and is not limited to the gallery. Furthermore, controversy can still erupt over art on display in a gallery. Isolating the work to the gallery is not the answer to the problem.

Community College B

The group participants at Community College B included two administrators, two art faculty members, and seven students. The President and Dean of Financial and Administrative Services were the administrators. The faculty included one full-time photography professor and one full-time theater technical director. The students were members of the photography class.

Academic Freedom

The group participants were asked the same four questions aimed at determining their opinion regarding academic freedom and artistic expression. When asked to describe how they felt about faculty artists encouraging art students to be creative and unconventional, which may result in controversial art, the Dean said, "I

think that they should encourage creativity. I feel as an administrator that we have to be cognizant of the culture of the community. We are a community college. We have to be aware of that as administrators.”

The faculty group agreed that encouraging students to be creative was very important. The theater technical director felt that limiting production was stifling to creativity. One faculty member said there should be no limit on student art work. The student group agreed that faculty should encourage students to be creative. The students said they saw no problem with it. The students said they could not be encouraged to do something they did not want to do.

All three groups at Community College B believed student art exhibits played an important role in the learning process of student artists. The administrators said they needed to give students a full educational experience. The President said:

I feel very strongly that community colleges in particular, have the responsibility to give students opportunity to perform. And that is to do what they do in front of an audience. Whether that audience is in a business class, whether they are making a presentation on a project, a play performance, or an artist.

The faculty and student groups agreed that exhibitions were an important part of the learning process of student artists. One faculty member said this was how students were able to see what other students had created. One student said exhibitions provided incentive.

The administrator group believed it was acceptable to remove controversial student art from an exhibit. The administrators agreed that every instance should be based on its own particular merit. The President said, “I think the question is if it is offensive and it is intended to be offensive, that might be a consideration.” The Dean agreed.

The faculty group agreed on two instances when art work should be removed.

The technical director said:

I think in today's society, with everything that is on the front page, there really should not be anything unless it is just so offensive to a specific group or situation that it is just unfathomable that a person would even think about doing something like this. But I would hope none of our students would have the ability or the want to do something that intentionally harmful.

The art faculty member said, "The only time it should be done is if it was something that was not given adequate warning to the audience."

The student group response varied widely. Some of the students said no circumstance was acceptable. Some of them said it would have to depend on the situation itself. And some students said a piece should be removed if it was breaking a law or hurting somebody.

The administrator group agreed the faculty artist's academic freedom was not violated when a controversial art work was removed from a student exhibit. The President said, "Academic freedom, like every other freedom, at some point has limits. Academic freedom needs to be weighed against the harm that it does to the population that we want to serve." The Dean responded, "When the freedoms of some people begin to infringe on the freedoms of other people than I question whether or not there should be freedom in the first instance."

The faculty group agreed it was a violation of the faculty artist's academic freedom. The art faculty member said it was an insult to the faculty. The technical director said, "You rely on the ability of your faculty. You have hired the faculty to do a job and this is the job they are doing."

The student group said they did not know. They thought it really came down to

why the piece was being removed. They thought it was difficult to get an idea of what an incident might be.

Institutional Neutrality

The groups were asked the same four questions aimed at determining their opinion regarding institutional neutrality and artistic expression. The administrator group was in complete agreement over the question of who should be responsible for the opinions expressed in an exhibition of student art? The President and the Dean believed it was the ultimate responsibility of the administration. The President said:

No matter what we say about who is responsible, the public will hold the college administration responsible. The public does not care what the college's internal processes are. They view the college as the administration in terms of making those kind of policy decisions. So, ultimately, no matter what you say, it is the responsibility of the administration.

The Dean agreed and said:

We have run into areas notwithstanding art, that it does not make any difference what happens at the lower levels, the administrators are the ones that receive the phone calls from outside the campus and are expected to in some way handle it.

The faculty group agreed that the students and the faculty were responsible. The student group unanimously agreed it was the student artists who were responsible for the opinion expressed in the art work.

The administrator group agreed that institutional neutrality was not violated when community standards influenced the exhibition of student art work. The President said:

I do not believe that any institution is truly neutral. We take positions all the time on a variety of issues. We are forced to. I do not think there is that kind of true neutrality. I think that is a myth. The public funds the institution and at some point you need to make a decision about the long term interests of the public good against a short term gain perhaps in academic freedom or students or faculty rights to exhibit their works. In a perfect world we could say that is their right and it goes to any extreme. Ultimately, it comes down to what is in the long term good of the institution and within the law.

The Dean agreed with the President. The faculty and student groups agreed it was a violation of institutional neutrality when community standards influenced the exhibition of student art. The faculty said it was totally wrong.

The administrators had a similar opinion regarding the extent to which faculty artists were responsible for protecting the community college from controversy when choosing student art work to be placed on exhibit. The President responded:

I do not think that they necessarily have a responsibility to protect the institution from controversy. I do think that they have a responsibility to consider all of the potential ramifications of their actions. If what they intend to exhibit is likely to hurt a group of people, I have expectations that as professionals they would consider that.

The Dean agreed and said:

I think that they would need to consider it but I think that we should be careful that it is not the same as being censored. But in some way that the opportunity never happens. But the process I am not sure about. I am not sure that if in fact something was going to be exhibited, that they would think would be offensive in any kind of way, that they would have the responsibility to contact the administration. I am not sure about the process.

The faculty group said they were protecting the values of the institution when they support freedom of expression. The faculty wanted the administration to believe they would work responsibly. The student group said the faculty member was an employee of the college. They thought that everything the college requested of the faculty should be done by them.

The administrator group disagreed concerning the extent to which they were obligated to remove controversial art work from a student exhibit? The President said, "I think there is a place for informed consent to let the public know that this might in fact, be offensive to some groups and that they view it with that understanding." The Dean responded:

If in fact you know that there is going to be hue and cry because somebody else's freedom or rights are going to be inhibited or in some way hurt by some piece of art work, I think as a community college we have the responsibility to deal with it in whatever way that we think we need to deal with it. If that includes taking it down than that decision would have to be made. But I think they would be made on a case by case basis.

The faculty group felt very strongly that the administration was not obligated to remove any work for any reason. The student group unanimously agreed the administrators do have that obligation. The students believed a work should be removed when it was hindering the purpose of the institution.

Context of the Presentation

The administrators and faculty at Community College B agreed the community college was similar to a museum or gallery. They believed museums, galleries, and community colleges were public places open to all age groups. They said in some cases the community college was the only exhibition space in town.

Community College C

The group participants at Community College C included two administrators, three art faculty members, and four students. The President and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs were the administrators. The faculty included one full-time digital imaging professor and two full-time photography lab assistants. The students were members of the digital imaging class.

Academic Freedom

The group participants were asked the same four questions aimed at determining their opinion regarding academic freedom and artistic expression. When asked to describe how they felt about faculty artists encouraging art students to be creative and unconventional, which may result in controversial art, the faculty said they wanted to push the limits. They said the more controversial the art the better. The administrator group responses were not recorded due to a tape malfunction. Journal entries and transcripts suggest the administrators would support faculty encouraging creativity. The student group said the faculty should encourage creativity. One student said, "Art is supposed to make you think. You are not supposed to be censored on it. You are supposed to be able to just go out and do whatever you feel."

All three groups at Community College C said student art exhibits played an important role in the learning process of student artists. The administrators said it was an important part of the educational experience. The Vice President said:

I think exhibition is critical. Part of being an artist is having an opportunity to exhibit. Exhibits also provide a very important social context. I think that is especially important for any artist but certainly an artist that is learning their craft.

The faculty and student groups agreed exhibits were a huge part of the learning process for student artists.

The administrator group believed it was acceptable to remove controversial student art from an exhibition when the work was in violation of existing law or presented an eminent physical danger. The President responded, "My inclination is that for anything that is not illegal, immoral or physically endangering, there is no reason to remove it." The Vice President said, "The administration has to have some window that should be used virtually never. But there has to be a point where the administration can say this certainly cannot continue."

The faculty and student groups agreed there were no acceptable circumstances for removing art from an exhibit. Both groups said it should not be done.

The administrators agreed the faculty artist's academic freedom was not violated when a controversial art work was removed from a student exhibit. The President said, "It is never an offense to faculty rights. I just do not think it is the right of the faculty to be offended by the decision." The Vice President said:

The students rights clearly have to be viewed as important. But if the decision is ever made that [the art] comes down and the student does not want it to come down, it is the students' rights that have been called into question. The sponsoring faculty member does not have an inalienable right to the student's art work.

The faculty and student groups said it was a total violation. Both groups thought it was a total infringement on academic freedom.

Institutional Neutrality

The groups were asked the same four questions aimed at determining their opinion regarding institutional neutrality and artistic expression. The administrator group was in complete agreement over the question of who should be responsible for the opinions expressed in an exhibition of student art? The President said she felt the

artist carried the responsibility for her or his message and the college was responsible for what it exhibited.

The faculty group said the student, the faculty member, and the college administration operate as a team and share in the responsibility. The faculty wanted the college to be responsible. They wanted the administration to take the fire in any controversy surrounding student art exhibits. The student group unanimously agreed it was the student artist who was responsible for the opinion expressed in the art work.

The administrator group agreed that institutional neutrality was not violated when community standards influenced the exhibition of student art work. The President said:

I suggest that the college perform objectively as opposed to neutrally. We probably can not remain neutral in our approach to all of our academic pursuits. I would add that we need to promulgate that as part of our mission, our values and our objectives. That we will offer provocative fine and performing arts or lectures and demonstrations and lab experiences and field trips which are not neutral.

The Vice President said:

I do not believe that institutions can have a healthy exhibition environment and remain neutral. I challenge your nomenclature. I think it must be proactive. The institution must always position itself somewhere the other side of neutrality in that openness must be evidenced by an active exhibition process. That is more than okay you can hang up something if you want to. It must be we will have art. We will have opportunities for the community to engage. That is not neutrality in my view. If the institution is to maintain that, I think it takes a specific effort. It takes resources and it takes a willingness to accept questions from the broader community because they will inevitably come.

The faculty and student groups agreed it was a total infringement. Both groups agreed it was a violation of institutional neutrality when community standards influenced the exhibition of student art.

The administrator group had a similar opinion regarding the extent to which faculty artists were responsible for protecting the community college from controversy when choosing student art work to be placed on exhibit.

The President responded:

I do not see faculty responsible to protect the institution, but to understand and to review and to comprehend liability issues in advance. Given all that, I think the institution is then protected. But I do not see, in their way of producing art, the first order of business is how you protect the institution. I would find that stifling and inappropriate. But they certainly need to do their research and again, context is everything. I do not think we can be protected. I think there will always be somebody out there taking a shot at us. If it is within our purview to do, we do it.

The Vice President said:

I also think that the faculty person, as part of their role as mentor, needs to be introducing to the artist the concept of social context and the need to get into a gallery. And you walk into any gallery in New York, even the most quote liberal, there is somebody who has a yes or no decision. How does the artist negotiate that? That needs to be part of what an artist learns. Once the art is done, the artist has to understand that there are certain social parameters and like any other gallery, ours is subject to them. I would expect the faculty member to be leading and mentoring that, as one topic of interest in learning, in the process of helping mold the capacity of young artists.

The faculty group said there should not be any kind of expectation that the faculty member was going to protect peoples feelings. The student group said it should be completely up to the student.

The administrator group agreed concerning the extent to which they were obligated to remove controversial art work from a student exhibit? The President said: I do not feel obliged to do anything. If the process is in place on the campus to review and to approve context and safety and legality, there would be no obligation to do anything, even if the community rose up. You may choose to do that. But I would still argue that there is no obligation to. The obligation is to the students and to the program and to the curriculum and to the greater good of learning.

The Vice President agreed. He said, "The obligation is not ours."

The faculty group felt very strongly that the administration was not obligated to remove any work for any reason. The faculty said it should not be done even when it involves protecting the image of the college. The student group disagreed over the administrators removal obligation. Some of the students thought a work should be removed if it was intended to be maliciously offensive. Other students questioned how that decision was to be made.

Context of the Presentation

The faculty at Community College C believed they were acting as curator when selecting student art work for an exhibit. They believed as curator, they were making a statement based upon their understanding of the medium and what they wanted to communicate to the students and the public. The administrators at Community College C believed the gallery, museum, and community college were influenced by

the same social parameters. They believed the community college gallery was no different from any other gallery or museum.

RESPONSE TO CASE STUDIES

Part two of the results of the group interviews involve participant response to the three case studies. These case studies were actual incidents involving the exhibition of controversial student art. The nine groups were asked to read the three incidents and identify the issues contributing to the controversy in each. They were also asked to describe how they felt about the institution's response and to make known any concerns, likes or dislikes they may have had for each case.

Case Study One

The three administrator groups identified several different issues in the controversy in the first case. The administrators at Community College A said the controversy grew out of faculty displeasure at being asked to relocate the drawings. These administrators felt the art was displayed in a public space and they stressed the need for the community college in case one to obtain gallery space. The Community College B administrators said the incident was the result of the display of nude drawings. These administrators said the college had every right and responsibility to display student art of the body. They felt the complainant should have been told nudity is not pornography. The administrators at Community College C identified the multiple issues of a child seeing the drawings, the mother's response, free speech, and the faculty's right to display art in their area.

The administrator groups were divided in their opinions as to how the controversy was handled. The administrators at Community College A thought it was handled in the best way the administration could hope for. They pointed out the

drawings were not taken down. The administrators at Community College B thought the college should have supported the display. They felt the drawings were the result of a class. The Community College C administrators questioned the college's system or process for dealing with controversy. They felt more conversation was needed.

The Community College A administrators said the open dialogue in case one was actually reinforcement of academic freedom. These administrators expressed concern that the figure drawing class would not be offered again until a suitable space to display the drawings was found. These same administrators felt the college handed the faculty a club by allowing them to decide when to remove the drawings. The Community College B administrators felt no decision was made in case one. They said no decision is worse than coming down on either side of an issue. These administrators thought the incident could have been used as a learning opportunity. The administrators at Community College C thought the drawings were the result of an art class. They questioned the college system for dealing with complaints. They expressed concern that a few complaints could warrant changing college procedure.

The Community College A faculty group identified nudity, the location of the display, and children seeing the drawings as the main issues in case one. The faculty group at Community College B identified one complainant making demands to change college policy as the primary issue. The Community College C faculty identified the definition of pornography, ignorance, and fear as the main issues in case one. The faculty at Community College C said everyone has the right to an opinion but that right does not include taking action against the piece. They said controversy over art provides a wonderful opportunity for education.

The Community College A faculty said it was inappropriate for the administration to suggest relocating the art work because of a few complaints. They felt the administration should not pressure faculty but rather make them aware of the

complaints. They hoped that future complaints could be discussed in an open forum. The faculty at Community College A said every art department puts drawings on the walls even in buildings they share with other departments. The Community College B faculty agreed the administration should not pressure faculty. The faculty at Community College C recognized people are uncomfortable with issues like these. They thought the college response in case one was weak.

The Community College A faculty group expressed concern that no figure drawing class was being offered at the college in case one. They said they were worried about the preparation of art students for transfer to a four year institution when they were not being provided the opportunity to draw the human form. Both the Community College A and C faculty said they wondered what this action communicated to students. The Community College A faculty thought the complainant should have been told to enter the building another way.

The Community College A student group identified nudity, the definition of pornography, children on campus, and no gallery space as the issues in case one. The student group at Community College B identified American society in 1999, nudity versus pornography, children on campus, and the location of the display as the issues. The Community College C student group identified the definition of pornography and children on campus as the main issues. The students at Community College A thought the incident was handled like any administration would handle an incident like this. The college response was what they expected. The students thought it was the typical response but not necessarily the right response. They felt the administration over reacted. The Community College B students thought the response lacked courage. The Community College C student group said the administration could have removed the drawings and did not.

Community College A student group concerns included no gallery space at the community college; no figure drawing class currently offered; the fact that both the administrators and the faculty thought the other side over reacted; the need for better communication; and there was no student involvement in the issue. The students at Community College B felt the figure drawing class should not have been canceled. The Community College C student group said complaints about nudity had been going on and would continue for years.

Case Study Two

The Community College A administrators felt that some of the issues in case two were very similar to the issues in the first case. They identified these issues as the display of controversial art in a public space instead of in a gallery, the need to factor in the social mores of the community, and the need to balance academic freedom with support for the institution. The administrators felt one's reaction to these issues depended upon the seat one was sitting in. They thought these incidents were a good learning experience for students. The Community College B administrators questioned the notion of how museums, galleries and colleges were different. The administrators said offense over nudity was a personal problem. The administrators at Community College C found parents complaining about their children being offended a particularly interesting issue.

The Community College A administrators thought the incident was handled appropriately. The administrators at Community College B said colleges typically prefer to dance around these issues rather than confront them. They felt the college had missed an educational opportunity. Community College C administrators thought the college's response in case two was more balanced than in case one. They felt the administration in case two showed more understanding and insight. They pointed out

the faculty felt support from the administration and they were willing to talk to students about the consequences of exhibiting. These administrators said case two was more like what the academy is about. The response produced a win win scenario.

The Community College A administrators approved of faculty talking to students about the potential consequences of exhibiting their art. They said it was a no win situation to get into a battle over academic freedom. The Community College B administrators said case two was another missed educational opportunity. The administrators at Community College C said the social mores boundary was one that all administrators grapple with.

The faculty group at Community College A identified some of the issues in case two as similar to some of the issues in case one as well. They thought nudity, location, and children being exposed to the art were the main issues. The faculty felt the politics of funding and educating the public were important issues in case two. The Community College B faculty said everything was offensive to someone. They pointed out the medium was different in this case. Photography is different from drawings and can be more lifelike. The Community College C faculty identified children being exposed to art as the main issue, although they questioned how a three or four year old could be offended by nudity.

The faculty group at Community College A felt the administration was sensitive to education and provided support to the exhibit. The Community College B faculty said the response was okay; no one had a cow. The Community College C faculty thought the response was unorganized, uncomfortable, and lacked communication.

The faculty group at Community College A said schools were sanctuaries. The Community College B faculty group expressed concern over the administration's resolve to limit controversial art exhibits. They questioned what standards would be employed in the decisions. The Community College B faculty group said colleges

were similar to museums and galleries. The Community College C faculty felt this was how bureaucracy should work. It should break down.

The student group at Community College A identified nudity, location, and a child on campus as the main issues in case two. They questioned the big deal being made over a three-or-four year old and nudity. They said the issues were similar to case one. The Community College B student group pointed out the medium was photography and not drawings. The Community College C student group said the issues were similar to case one. They identified nudity and the parent complaint over a child seeing the art.

The student group at Community College A felt case two was handled more realistically than case one. The Community College B student group said the faculty did not feel any pressure from the administration. The Community College C student group said it was handled about the same. They said the administration asked how long would the pictures be up in both cases. The student groups at Community College A and C expressed concern over the administration's attitude. They both wondered if controversial work would be censored in the future. The Community College B student group said they liked the possibility for discussion.

Case Study Three

The Community College A administrator group identified the role of the community college as an environment for the free exchange of ideas as the main issue in case three. They pointed out the unbalanced reporting and media coverage were a problem. The administrators at Community College B expressed concern over what if it was an intentionally harmful exhibit? What if the artist wanted controversy? The administrators questioned if the exhibit would have received the same level of support. The Community College B administrators said they feared intentional rage the most.

They thought none of these incidents were in and of themselves a problem. They felt the bigger danger was when people tried to put the institution into a position of having to choose between academic freedom and social consciousness. The Community College C administrators identified racism and the timing of the incident as the main issues.

The Community College A and B administrator groups thought the incident was handled very well by the college. The Community College A administrators found it interesting that the artist took the exhibit down. The administrators at Community College C said more advanced warning was needed to be proactive.

The faculty group at Community College A identified racism and ignorance as the main issues in case three. They thought case three was a more valid case than case one or two. It was in the press and highly visible, on and off campus. The Community College B faculty group felt the complainant was confrontive and cowardly. The faculty group at Community College C said the complainant went about voicing the complaint in the wrong way. They identified racism and ignorance as the issues.

The Community College A faculty group thought this was a model case. They felt the administration had done the right thing by creating an opportunity to educate. The faculty group at Community College B thought the case was handled well. The Community College C faculty group said they wanted artists to be responsible for the images they create.

The Community College A faculty group expressed concern about the student complainant's behavior. They felt the need for a strong administration to support faculty endeavors. They thought the forum was very positive. The Community College B faculty group thought the pictures worked. They liked how it was handled and they thought the complainant behaved poorly. The Community College C faculty group said galleries should be safe havens.

The student group at Community College A identified racial tension, misunderstanding the art, and the student complainant jumping to conclusions as the issues in case three. Both Community College B and C student groups thought the media exploited the controversy by reporting it inaccurately.

The student group at Community College A said the college handled the incident very well but they did not feel the administration was really tested because the artist decided to remove the prints. The student group at Community College B felt the college stood up for the value of creativity in art school and did not attack the student who was complaining. They thought the administration opened up the controversy and gave everybody involved a chance to be heard. The student group at Community College C felt the administration stood up for themselves. They thought this was the smartest response of the three incidents.

The Community College A student group expressed concern over how many people saw the exhibit and got the point. They also wondered what would have happened if the artist had not pulled the prints from the exhibit. The student group at Community College B felt the controversy erupted very quickly. They thought the student complainant acted inappropriately and the media coverage was inaccurate. The Community College C student group expressed concern over how ignorance interfered with great art.

POLICY PREFERENCE

The third part of the group interview results is presented as the policy preference of all participants. Each participant was asked to select one policy from a list of three options they felt might provide a better environment for making decisions regarding the exhibition of controversial student art. Each participant was asked to

rank the three options from most attractive to least attractive in providing for a better resolution of the problem.

Policy number one favored complete academic freedom for faculty. Policy number two favored group decision making. Policy number three gave complete authority to the administration and suggested appointing a committee to review student art. Table 4 shows the complete list of participants and their policy choice.

There were some interesting comments made by the participants during this part of the group interviews. The President at Community College B said she does not believe in policy that you cannot and will not enforce. The President thought that kind of policy was probably more dangerous than no policy. The President said every art controversy was case by case specific and required a judgment call. She said an exhibition policy was probably not something they would do.

The Dean of Financial and Administrative Services at Community College B said she picked policy option three because the selection process of choosing student art for exhibit was determined by committee and because it provided the administration with the final responsibility. The Dean liked this option because it was risk adverse and proactive.

One of the art faculty at Community College A said he thought if the administration was given the responsibility for determining what student art to exhibit it would lead to the abridgment of academic freedom. The technical director at Community College B said he would continue to look for another policy. He thought all three policies in this study gave the administration the power to decide. The art faculty member at Community College B refused to pick an option. The art faculty member at Community College C said all of this could be avoided if the community had a willingness to be involved in the dialogue of art.

Table 4

Participants Choice from the Three Policy Options Presented in This Study for Handling Controversial Student Art Exhibits

<u>Position</u>	<u>First Choice</u>	<u>Ranked</u>
<u>Administrators</u>		
President	2	2,1,3
Dean of Instruction	2	2,1,3
President	2	2,3,1
Dean of Finance	3	3,2,1
President	2	2,1,3
Vice President	2	2,1,3
<u>Faculty</u>		
Art	1	1,2,3
Art	2	2,1,3
Technical Director	2	2,1,3
Technical Director	1	1,2,3
Photography Lab Ass.	2	2,1,3
Photography Lab Ass.	1	1,3,2
Art	2	2,1,3
<u>Students</u>		
	2	2,1,3
	1	1,3,2
	2	2,1,3
	1	1,2,3

Table 4 continued

Position	First Choice	Ranked
	1	1,2,3
	1	1,2,3
	2	2,1,3
	1	1,2,3
	1	1,2,3
	2	2,1,3
	1	1,2,3
	1	1,2,3
	1	1,2,3
	2	2,1,3
	2	2,1,3
	1	1,2,3

Note. The number represents the policy option. 1 = academic freedom; 2 = group decision making; 3 = administrative authority.

One of the students at Community College A said he thought the policies were arranged in order from the greatest amount of freedom to the lowest. The students at Community College C said the faculty should be the ones to decide. They thought the college should not take sides. Another student at Community College C thought policy option three was horrible. She liked policy option one because it supported total freedom for art.

The results show that different opinions exist between administrators, art faculty, and art students concerning academic freedom, institutional neutrality, and the exhibition of controversial student art. This statement supports the original research hypothesis. It is important to note however, that the opinions do not always divide precisely along job classification lines. There was diversity among the groups. Furthermore, it is important to note that none of the community colleges in this study had an exhibition policy in place to deal with art controversy. Most of the decisions were made after the controversy broke and were based more on the culture of the college rather than on policy.

Administrators disagreed concerning whether or not a policy should be implemented to cover exhibitions of student art at the community college. The Dean of Instruction at Community College A would like to establish a policy for handling controversial art exhibits. The President at Community College B said every controversy over art will be a judgment call. A policy covering art exhibits was probably not something she would install.

Community College C was closest to having an exhibition policy. The administration at Community College C said if the art was not illegal, immoral or creating an eminent physical danger it should be left alone.

The President and technical director at Community College B suggested the community college should be seen as similar to a museum or gallery. Colleges,

museums, and galleries put materials on exhibit and offer educational opportunities to the community. All three are public institutions.

PATTERNS OF RESPONSE

Response patterns were identified by examining the answers given to the group interview questions. The responses of the administrator groups revealed a pattern of concern for the greater public good of the institution and the law. The administrators' comments consistently showed a responsibility to the institution. They were most concerned with legal, moral, and safety issues. The faculty groups answers revealed the faculty do not feel responsible for the institution. The faculty felt most responsible for the education of students. They were most concerned with teaching students to take responsibility for the images they create. The faculty wanted the administration to trust them. They believed most student art was incapable of violating legal, moral, and safety issues. The student groups comments revealed a tendency for students to want it both ways. The students wanted the faculty to encourage them to be creative and unconventional which may result in controversial student art, but they wanted the administration to remove any art that was maliciously offensive, creating an unsafe environment, ruining other student art works, or hindering the purpose of the institution. The students viewed the faculty as employees of the college. They wanted the faculty to operate within the guidelines established by the institution.

Academic Freedom Questions

The administrator, faculty and student groups agreed art faculty should encourage students to be creative and unconventional which may result in controversial art. It is interesting to note the administrators wanted the faculty to be cognizant of the community culture. The faculty were concerned with teaching

students to be responsible for their images. The administrator, faculty, and student groups believed student art exhibits were an essential part of the training of student artists.

The administrator groups believed it was acceptable to remove controversial student art from exhibit when it violated existing law or prevalent social mores, or presented an eminent physical danger. Most of the students agreed. A few students said there was no valid reason to remove art. The faculty were divided like the students. Some believed a piece creating physical danger should be removed. Others said never.

The administrator groups were divided on the issue of if the faculty artist's academic freedom was violated when a student work was removed from exhibit. Some believed it was a violation and others did not. However, all of the administrators reserved the right to do it. Some of the students believed it was a violation but most saw the faculty as employees of the college. They wanted the administration to step in when necessary.

Institutional Neutrality Questions

The administrator and faculty groups agreed concerning the question of who was responsible for the opinion expressed in an exhibition of student art. The administrator groups divided into three sections. One group said faculty and students were responsible. Another group said ultimately the administration and the third group said the student for the work but the college for the exhibit. The faculty groups were divided in a similar manner over this question. One group said students were responsible. Another group said ultimately the administration and a third said it was a team of student, faculty, and administration. It is interesting to note that only one faculty member said just the faculty were responsible. The student groups

unanimously agreed it was the student artist who bears the responsibility for the opinion expressed in the art work.

All of the administrators agreed it was not a violation of institutional neutrality when community standards influenced the exhibition of student art. Both faculty and students agreed it was a violation. Some of the faculty believed the professor must be realistic and work within the standards of the community.

The administrators agreed that faculty were responsible for protecting the college from controversy when selecting student art for exhibit. Some of the administrators were sensitive in that they did not think it should be the first priority. However, these same administrators wanted their faculty to understand the potential ramifications of their actions. They wanted faculty to understand, comprehend, and review liability issues in advance. Most of the students agreed with the administrators. The students believed the faculty were college employees and should follow the guidelines laid out by the college. One student was unsure and another said the faculty were not responsible.

Most of the administrators agreed they were obligated to remove controversial student art from exhibit. Some said they were not obligated but they reserved the right to do it. Others said if a process was in place to review art work that could be illegal, immoral, or presented an eminent physical danger than they felt no obligation. The students unanimously agreed with the administrators. Some students however, challenged the notion of how a student work could possibly be illegal, immoral, or dangerous. The faculty groups were divided over this question. Some faculty felt the administration was obligated to remove any work that threatened the existence of the college. Other faculty said never; not for any reason.

Context of the Presentation Questions

Devereaux (1993) believes the literal spaces of the museum and gallery embody a protective space where artists can work without outside interference. She argues the campus gallery is no different. Participating in any activity held at a gallery, museum, or community college is voluntary. Some of the administrators and faculty in this study agreed. However, most of the administrators and students agreed work should be removed when it violates legal, moral, or safety standards. Most of the faculty said work should never be removed. The majority of administrators and faculty said the administration had no obligation to remove controversial work. Most of the students said the administration had that responsibility.

IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES

In comparing the group's identification of issues contributing to the controversy in the three case studies some interesting similarities and important differences appear. In case one the administrator, faculty, and student groups agreed that nudity was the major issue. The administrators disagreed over the issue of the right to display the work. Some of the administrators believed controversial work should not be displayed in public hall ways. They believed the work should be displayed in a gallery. Other administrators saw the community college as similar to museums and galleries. They believed the faculty were within their rights to display the work in the art hallway. None of the students and only one faculty member mentioned location as an issue. Both the faculty and student groups identified the relatively small number of complaints as an issue. The administrator groups did not.

The groups saw case one and case two as very similar. All of the groups identified nudity as the main issue and again, the administration groups were divided over the issue of controversial art in a public space.

In case three the administrator groups identified the role of the media and inaccurate reporting as the main issues. The faculty groups identified the complainant's behavior as the main issue. The student groups identified the behavior of both the media and the student complainant as the main issues. The administrator groups did not mention the complainant's behavior and the faculty group did not mention the media.

Analysis of the issue identification leads one to believe the administrator groups would prefer a policy that enhances the administration's ability to protect the institution; the faculty groups would prefer a policy which provides the faculty with the most academic freedom; and the student groups would prefer a policy that encourages and supports the free exchange of ideas, while at the same time provides the protection they feel the institution deserves.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLICY PREFERENCE AND THE ISSUES CONTRIBUTING TO THE CONTROVERSY

Three policy options were presented to the participants during the group interviews. The participant groups were asked to determine which option they felt might provide a better environment for making decisions regarding the exhibition of controversial art. The participants were also asked to rank the options from most attractive to least attractive in providing for a better resolution of the problem. Policy number one favored complete academic freedom for faculty. One would expect the faculty groups to chose policy option one. Policy number two favored group decision making. One might expect the student groups to chose policy two. Policy number three gave complete authority to the administration and suggested appointing a committee to review student art. One might expect the administrator groups to chose policy number three.

Six administrators participated in this study. Only one administrator chose option three, the policy which gave complete authority to the administration. Five chose policy option two. As expected, none of the administrators chose option one. Four of the administrators ranked the policy options 2,1,3. One administrator ranked them 2,3,1 and one ranked them 3,2,1. These findings are not what was expected. Five of the six administrators chose policy option two which favors group decision making even after the issue identification analysis suggested they would prefer policy option three. Only one of the six administrators chose option three. Four of the administrators even ranked option three last. Only two ranked option one last as expected.

Eight faculty participated in this study. Only three of the eight faculty members chose policy option one as expected. Policy option one was based on complete academic freedom for faculty. Four chose option two, a policy based on group decision making, although the issue identification suggested faculty would chose option one. As expected, none of the faculty chose option three. One faculty member did not chose. Four faculty members ranked the policy options 2,1,3. Only two ranked them 1,2,3 as expected. One ranked them 1,3,2. One faculty member elected not to rank the options.

Sixteen students participated in this study. Ten of the students chose policy option one. Only six of the students chose policy option two as expected. None of the students chose option three. Nine students ranked the policy options as 1,2,3. Six students ranked them as 2,1,3 and one student ranked the policies as 1,3,2.

Thirty people participated in this study. Six administrators, eight faculty, and sixteen students. Thirteen participants selected policy option one as their preference. Policy option one was related to the issue of academic freedom. Policy option one provided faculty with total freedom in the selection of student art for exhibition and

supported their decision during any controversy. Ten students and three faculty members chose option one. None of the administrators selected option one.

Half of the participants chose policy option two. Policy option two was related to the principle of institutional neutrality. It provided for group discussion during any controversy over student art. Five administrators, four faculty, and six students selected this option. It is the policy option with the highest preference.

One administrator chose policy option three. Policy option three was related to the context of the presentation. It gave campus officials complete authority over art exhibits. One faculty member refused to select a policy option.

Fourteen participants ranked the options 2,1,3. This ranking puts the principle of institutional neutrality as the first choice of the participants in providing for a better decision making environment when dealing with an art controversy. These individuals ranked academic freedom second and selection by committee last. Of the fourteen participants, four were administrators, four were faculty, and six were students.

Eleven participants ranked the options 1,2,3. This ranking puts the principles of academic freedom as the first choice of the participants in providing for a better decision making environment when dealing with an art controversy. These individuals ranked the principle of institutional neutrality second and selection by committee last. Of the eleven participants, two were faculty and nine were students. None of the administrators picked this ranking.

Two participants ranked the options 1,3,2. This ranking puts the principles of academic freedom as the first choice of the participants in providing for a better decision making environment when dealing with an art controversy but it places selection by committee second and the principle of institutional neutrality last. One of these individuals was a faculty member and one was a student. None of the administrators picked this order.

One administrator ranked the options 2,3,1. This ranking puts the principle of institutional neutrality as the first choice of the participant in providing for a better decision making environment when dealing with an art controversy. This individual ranked selection by committee second and academic freedom last.

One administrator ranked the options 3,2,1. This ranking puts the committee selection process as the first choice of the participant in providing for a better decision making environment when dealing with an art controversy. This individual ranked the principle of institutional neutrality second and academic freedom last. One faculty member did not rank the policies.

It seems reasonable to suggest the participants chose a policy option more from the perspective of what was reasonable as opposed to choosing a policy based on the issues in the controversies. It may be that the discussion about the way each incident was handled influenced their decision as well.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

The results of the phase one individual interviews and phase two group interviews are presented in this chapter. Several tables are included showing the issues identified by the individual interview participants as contributing to the controversy, the principles the participants believe were employed in the institution's response to the incident, and the personal reactions of the participants to that response. Group response to the three case studies is included. A table showing the participants policy preference is presented. Participate response patterns are identified and related to the issues the individuals identified as contributing to the art controversy in each of the three case studies.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Faculty must possess the right to encourage their students to engage in the authentic activities of the discipline under study. Research has proven students will learn more and remember more when they become involved in real situations. Academic freedom is supposed to protect faculty in the teaching, learning, and research process. But when faculty artists encourage their students to be creative and authentic, the public, as well as other constituents of the college community, often become offended and outraged. When faculty artists determine student art work to be of sufficient quality to be hung in a student exhibition, the works that create the most controversy are targeted for removal. To protect the college and the community, the faculty artist's academic and artistic freedom is sometimes trampled over and the student's rights ignored.

A key issue related to the problem of controversial student art exhibits is the context of the presentation. If an exhibition is located in an area also used for other purposes, such as a student lounge, a building concourse, a cafeteria, or a hallway, administrators may find themselves being forced to decide between the freedom of artistic expression and the rights of an individual not to see the exhibit. If the exhibition is in an isolated gallery, the viewer can decide whether or not to see the art.

The primary purpose of this study was to compare the opinions of community college administrators, art faculty members, and art students concerning institutional options and policy alternatives for the exhibition of controversial student art work in the community colleges of Maryland. The research questions addressed the concept of academic freedom, the principle of institutional neutrality, and the context of the presentation. The issue at stake was whether academic freedom provides faculty

artists the right to select student art work for exhibition or whether artistic value judgments should instead be determined by the dominant culture (Kerka, 1997).

To accomplish the objectives of this study, data were gathered and analysis conducted to answer three research questions:

1. What are the opinions of administrators, art faculty members, and art students in the community colleges of Maryland concerning how academic freedom rights pertain to the exhibition of student art work? Do different opinions exist among the administrative, faculty, and student classifications? How do opinions compare among the participants of each classification? Which policy options might each classification prefer in dealing with a controversial student art exhibit?
2. What are the opinions of administrators, art faculty, and art students in the community colleges of Maryland concerning the principle of institutional neutrality and the need to protect the institution from controversy provoked by an exhibition of student art work? Do different opinions exist among the administrative, faculty, and student classifications? How do opinions compare among the participants of each classification? Which policy options might each classification prefer in dealing with a controversial student art exhibit?
3. What are the opinions of administrators, art faculty, and art students in the community colleges of Maryland regarding the protection of controversial student art work from outside interference when the work of art is on exhibit in a campus gallery? Do different opinions exist among the administrative, faculty, and student classifications? How do opinions compare among the participants of each classification? Which policy

options might each classification prefer in dealing with a controversial student art exhibit?

Methodology

Three community colleges were selected for the study. Data were collected in two stages. Information gathered in the first stage of this project was used to collect data during the second stage. In phase one the researcher went to each of the three schools and conducted individual interviews to determine the perceived facts surrounding a controversial art incident. The interviews were structured to identify the multiple perceptions of the incident and reactions to how it was handled. The researcher recorded what the participants thought were the issues that contributed to the controversy and what principles they thought were employed in the solution. The researcher prepared a brief and objective case analysis of each incident.

Phase two of this project involved the researcher taking the analysis of each controversial art incident back to the three sites for group interviews. There were three group interviews conducted at each of the three community colleges. Each community college had one group that consisted of two administrators, another group which included two or three arts faculty members, and a third group that involved four or more art students.

The group interviews consisted of three parts. In the first part of the interview each of the nine groups was asked ten questions aimed at determining the participant's opinion about academic freedom, institutional neutrality, and exhibitions of student art work. In the second part of the interview the groups were asked to read and discuss each of the three case studies that had been developed from the phase one individual interviews. During the third part of the interview the researcher presented the groups with three policy options and asked them to determine which

option they felt might provide a better environment for making decisions regarding the exhibition of controversial student art.

Findings

The results of the individual interviews are presented as participant responses to questions regarding the issues involved in the art controversy at their community college; the principles employed in the administration's solution to the controversy; and the individual's personal reaction to their institution's response. Responses were compared among the participants in each case.

Nudity; the location of the presentation; the desire to protect young children from controversial art; and racism were the issues most often targeted by the participants as causing the controversy. This finding is consistent with the literature. Shusterman (1984) reports moral and political issues most likely to be identified in the censorship of art. Sexual material is most often targeted with political subjects, including racism, abortion, and the use of the American flag, close behind. Antireligious themes and homosexuality are frequent targets as well.

There is an interesting relationship between the level of controversy, the institution's response to the controversy, and the personal reactions to the response of the individuals involved in this study. The art incident at Community College B was the least controversial of the three community colleges. The institution's response was viewed by most of the participants as no response at all. The personal reactions to it were favorable. Most of the participants were satisfied. The administration did not have to respond, the faculty felt support from the lack of administrative response, and the student's work remained on the wall.

The art incident at Community College A was more controversial than the incident at Community College B. The complainants kept the pressure on the

administration, demanding action and circulating a petition. The faculty thought the institution's response was weak and confusing. The administrators described the response as pragmatic. The administration searched for common ground and tried to please everybody. The personal reactions were the least favorable. No one was satisfied. The administration thought the faculty over reacted at the request to relocate the drawings. The faculty thought the administration over reacted at receiving a few complaints about the art work.

The art incident at Community College C was the most controversial of the three. It was aired outside the campus in print and television media. It became very emotional very quickly. It involved students, faculty, administrators, and the public. The institution's response of holding an open forum for discussion was both honest and courageous. The personal reactions were the most favorable. Everyone was satisfied.

The personal reactions to the institutional response when dealing with controversy suggest a need to examine the model of college decision making. The comments given by Community College A and Community College B indicate they tend to operate with a we-they model of governance. The comments given by Community College C suggest they operate more as a team. Community College C created a forum where all views of the controversy could be expressed. They invited all constituents to get involved. They encouraged a team solution to the problem. Community College C was the only college that used its controversy as an opportunity to educate. Lyons (1991) believes the way in which a college deals with a controversial art exhibit will reveal the relative status of art within the college and the attitude of the neighboring community toward the role of the college as a forum for public discourse.

The results of the group interviews are presented in two parts. Part one is the participant responses to questions stemming from the research areas of academic freedom, institutional neutrality, and context of the presentation. Part two group interview results are presented as the policy preference of all participants.

Academic Freedom

The majority of participants agreed faculty should encourage students to be creative. The groups unanimously agreed that exhibits were an important part of the training of student artists. The administrators believed it was acceptable to remove controversial student art from exhibit. The faculty believed it was not acceptable. The students were divided on the issue. The majority of administrators said faculty academic freedom was not violated when student art was removed from exhibit. The students agreed. The majority of faculty said it was a violation.

These findings are consistent with the literature. Research has shown that administrators and faculty disagree on the importance of academic freedom. Grubiak (1996), in a comparison of Washington State Community College faculty and administrators' opinions and beliefs on academic freedom, demonstrated that faculty members believe academic freedom and tenure are important principles while administrators do not believe they are. Keith (1996) demonstrated that faculty define academic freedom primarily as the freedom to pursue truth and share their views.

As long as administrators, faculty, and students believe it is important to encourage creativity and to display student art, controversy over student art will continue. As long as administrators believe it is acceptable to remove controversial student art from an exhibit and that faculty academic freedom is not violated in the process, while faculty believe the opposite, tension will remain over this issue.

Institutional Neutrality

There was no clear consensus over the issue of who is responsible for the opinion expressed in the art. The students unanimously agreed the student artist was responsible for the opinion. The administrators and faculty were divided among themselves.

The administrators agreed institutional neutrality was not violated when student art exhibits were influenced by community standards. All of the faculty who responded to the question believed just the opposite. The majority of students agreed with the faculty.

The faculty and student opinion agrees with the literature. Community standards should not influence the exhibition of student art. At the very least, the academy should be the setting where alternative opinions may be freely voiced (Dubin, 1994). The Supreme Court recognized the power of the First Amendment to create and protect a space for the type of interaction and debate required to form public opinion. The Court's vision of the First Amendment created a public space for the uninhibited debate of public issues. The First Amendment prohibits dominant cultural traditions from silencing divergent perspectives (Hoffman, 1992). When higher education administrators allow community standards to influence the exhibition of student art work, the principle of institutional neutrality has been violated (Hoffman & Storr, 1991).

The administrators agreed the faculty were responsible for protecting the institution from controversy. The faculty were divided on this issue. Most of the students agreed with the administrators. The American tradition of professional academic freedom grants rights to professors to be free from employer interference in research, teaching, and speech. It also imposes on professors the responsibility of maintaining professional competence and ethical conduct (Hamilton, 1995). Faculty

artists might feel more responsible for protecting the institution if administrators demonstrate they value academic freedom.

When a controversy erupts on the college campus, the administrators are responsible for maintaining the institution's neutrality in the matter and for seeing that opportunities are created for meaningful dialogue about the controversy. It is most important for campus administrators to act upon and protect the fundamental principle of free expression. Campus leaders can best protect the freedom of expression for all constituencies by siding with none.

Context of the Presentation

The participating groups were asked to describe all of the places student art work was exhibited on their campus. Each group described locations around the campus where student art was put on display. Locations included the hallways of art buildings, classrooms, libraries, lobbies of various buildings, theaters, student centers, and offices. Group answers were similar and consistent.

The administrators, faculty, and students at Community College A expressed the need for a gallery. All three groups felt the art would be safer in a gallery because people would not be forced to go there. Viewers would have the option of choosing whether or not to go into the gallery to see the art. However, student art is exhibited all over the community college campus and is not limited to the gallery. Furthermore, controversy can still erupt over art on display in a gallery. Isolating the work to the gallery is not the answer to the problem.

The results show different opinions exist between administrators, art faculty, and art students concerning academic freedom, institutional neutrality, and the exhibition of controversial student art. This statement supports the original research hypothesis. It is important to note however, the opinions do not always divide precisely along job

classification lines. Furthermore, none of the community colleges in this study had an exhibition policy in place to deal with art controversy. Most of the decisions were made after the controversy broke and were based more on the culture of the college rather than on policy. There is a need for educational institutions to become proactive in this area.

Policy Preference

The last part of the group interview results is presented as the policy preference of all participants. Three policy options were presented to the participants during the group interviews. The participant groups were asked to determine which option they felt might provide a better environment for making decisions regarding the exhibition of controversial art.

Policy option one was related to the issue of academic freedom. Policy option one provided faculty with total freedom in the the selection of student art for exhibition and supported their decision during any controversy. One would expect the faculty to select this option. Ten students and three faculty members chose option one. None of the administrators selected option one.

Half of the participants chose policy option two. Policy option two was related to the principle of institutional neutrality. It provided for group discussion during any controversy over student art. One would expect the student groups to choose this option. Five administrators, four faculty, and six students selected this option. It is the policy option with the highest preference.

One administrator chose policy option three. Policy option three was related to the context of the presentation. It gave campus officials complete authority over art exhibits. One would expect administrators to select this option. One faculty member refused to select a policy option.

These findings are not what was expected. It seems reasonable to suggest the participants chose a policy option more from the perspective of what was reasonable as opposed to choosing a policy based on the issues in the controversies. It may be that the discussion about the way each incident was handled influenced their decision as well.

Discussion and Implications

Devereaux (1993) believes the literal spaces of the museum and gallery embody a protective space where artists can work without outside interference. She argues the campus gallery is no different. Participating in any activity held at a gallery, museum, or community college is voluntary. Many of the administrators and faculty in this study agreed.

If we believe the community college is similar to the museum and gallery then we must not only look at visiting the campus gallery as voluntary but coming to the community college must be seen as voluntary as well. Community college officials should take a proactive position. They should state up front in public relations materials that the community college will tackle difficult issues. The college will have art exhibits, lectures, theatrical productions, and other events that are not neutral and may be considered controversial. The public needs to be aware that when they step on to the community college campus they are entering an environment where controversial issues are debated in an open and free manner.

Campus leaders and faculty members may want to take a fresh look at the principle of academic freedom. Academic freedom protects faculty members in their search for truth. Campus administrators should support academic freedom for all faculty because it ensures the free exchange of ideas. Frank and honest dialogue is

essential to a healthy academic environment. A campus without controversy and debate is a static campus.

Faculty members should realize that the protection of academic freedom comes with the responsibility for ethical conduct. Faculty members should not provoke controversy for the sake of controversy. Faculty should be held accountable for unethical behavior.

If applied properly, the principle of academic freedom can provide faculty with the protection they need to question and examine the cherished perceptions of our time. Academic freedom can also provide administrators with the safeguard they require to protect the institution from individuals who wish to put campus leaders in the position of having to choose between academic freedom and social consciousness.

In chaos there is profit. The profit is an opportunity to learn. Every controversy is a learning experience disguised as a crisis. When college leaders can dismantle the crisis elements and get people to come together, they will create learning opportunities. Community college administrators need to seize these opportunities because it is their responsibility to lead in a learning modality.

The we-they model of college governance is an old model of how a college should work. It assumes there is a partition, an us and them dichotomy, between administrators and faculty. This model of administrative structure is a failure because it creates division. The academy has to respond with different values. Community college leaders must realize that decisions can be made in the larger learning context of a free and open discussion.

A new model of decision making involves administrators, faculty, students, and the public as partner, learner, listener, leader, and follower. This model requires a process which involves healthy dialogue. The test of the administration during an art controversy is to decide whether to be true to the values of higher education and really

involve all of their constituents in a learning discussion or to respond in a knee jerk fashion to either support the art or pull the plug.

The real question in any controversy is whether the community college is going to have its people learn and grow or will the people perish in the absence of vision. The burden on the modern community college is to get beyond the separatism and dichotomy of us and them governance. The administration that is willing to do that charts the best course for all groups. Community college leaders must strive to get to the third piece of the triangle which is synthesis. If they focus only on the micro issues of a controversy they will miss the point of the greater message.

It would be interesting to repeat this research, with the same case studies, at several other community colleges and compare results. Perhaps focus group research could be conducted with three groups of seven to ten administrators, seven to ten faculty, and seven to ten students. It might have made a stronger study to take the case studies to three different schools.

REFERENCES

Ambrose, C. M. (1989). A comparison of faculty members' and administrators' definitions of, and attitudes toward, academic freedom (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50-10A, AAG9007707.

Anderson, A. A. & Garoian, C. R. (1994). Discussion - the Maja incident: Sex, censorship and the university classroom - Goya's Maja maligned; symposium. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 28, 33-65.

Anderson, S. D. Jr. (1980). An analysis of the meaning of academic freedom in American higher education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41-07A, AAG8102063.

Atkins, R. (1991). A censorship time line: 1933-1990. Art Journal, 50, 33-37.

Atkinson, C. (1996, May-June). Silence still equals death: E. Avery's wallpaper-style prints removed from Houston's contemporary art museum. The Print Collector's Newsletter, 27, 58-59.

Backstrom, C. H. & Hursh-Cesar, G. (1981). Survey research (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Becker, C. (1991). Art thrust into public space. Art Journal, 50, 65-68.

Beisel, N. (1993, April). Morals versus art: Censorship, the politics of interpretation. American Sociological Review, 58 (2), 145-162.

Best, J. W. & Kahn, J. V. (1993). Research in education (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Betsalel, K. A. (Ed.). (1992). Introduction. Journal of Arts Management and Law, 21 (4), 283.

Cembalest, R. (1992, October). Underwear and underdogs: Court decision in the confiscation and censorship of David Nelson's Mirth and Girth portrait. Art News, 91, 40.

Cembalest, R. (1994). Sexist, racist or otherwise offensive: Accounts of attempted censorship. Artnews, 93 (4), 42.

Clifton, L. A. (1992, September, 17). Freedom under attack: Artsave, a two-year-old project provides legal counsel and technical assistance to artists and arts institutions faced with the threat of censorship. Artweek, 23, 2.

Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. (1996). Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Devereaux, M. (1993). Protected space, politics, censorship and the arts. Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 51 (2), 207-221.

Dubin, S. C. (1992). Censorship: The knot that binds power and knowledge. Journal of Arts Management and Law, 21 (4), 373-374.

Dubin, S. C. (1994). Art's enemies: Censors to the right of me, censors to the left of me. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 28 (4), 44-54.

Ethical standards of the American educational research association, (1992, October) Educational Researcher.

Ethical Standards. Canadian Sociological and Anthropology Association.

Ferdon, D. R. (1990). The influence of the first amendment on academic freedom (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51-05A, AAG9027704.

Foster, K. J. (1994). Art, culture, and administration. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 28 (4), 62-64.

Greene (1995). The arts, aesthetics and values in adult education. In W. Elias, D. D. J. Jones, and G. Normie (Eds.), Truth Without Facts. Brussels, Belgium: VUB University Press.

Grubiak, M. J. (1996). A comparison of Washington State Community College faculty and administrators' opinions and beliefs on academic freedom and tenure (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57-12A, AAG9716844.

Grundy, K. W. (1994). Quasi-state censorship in South-Africa: The performing arts councils. Journal of Arts Management Law and Society, 24 (3), 24.

Hamilton, N. (1995). Zealotry and academic freedom: A legal and historical perspective. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction.

Hayes, H. R. (1994). The attitudes of the presidents of Lutheran colleges and universities regarding the nature and limits of free expression for students on their campuses (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55-01A, AAG9416954.

Heartney, E. (1991). Pornography. Art Journal, 50, 19.

Hoekema, D. A. (1991). Artists, humanists, and society: Conservatives have the wrong answers, and liberals ask the wrong questions. Art Journal, 50, 45-48.

Hoffman, B. (1992, January). Keeping the marketplace of ideas open. Art News, 91, 150.

Hoffman, B. , & Storr, R. (1991). Censorship 2: Editorials, art, the first amendment and the United States. Art Journal, 50 (4), 14-15.

Horn, M. (1993). The mildew of discretion, academic-freedom and self-censorship. Dalhousie Review, 72 (4), 439-466.

Jacobsen, C. (1991). Redefining censorship: A feminist view, art and politics. Art Journal, 50 (4), 42-55.

Keith, K. M. (1996). Faculty attitudes toward academic freedom: Tenure, teaching and research (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58-01A, AAG9720245.

Kerka, S. (1997, September). Arts and humanities in adult and continuing education. Trends and Issues Alert, ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. Available E-mail: <http://coe.ohiostate.edu/cete/ericacve/index.htm>

Krueger, R. A. (1994). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kvale, S. (1996). Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lamarque, G. (1991). Some thoughts on the chilling-effect: The NEA and censorship of the arts. Art Journal, 50 (4), 56-58.

Lankford, E. L. (1994). Freedom and outrage in art education. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 28 (4), 54-62.

Loss, A. (1996). The censor swings: Joyce work and the new censorship. James Joyce Quarterly, 33 (3), 369-376.

Lyons, B. (1991). Artistic freedom and the university. Art Journal, 50 (4), 77-83.

Morgan, A. C. M. (1984). Academic freedom in higher education: An historical and theological examination of its place and function in the light of five cases (Doctoral dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45-05A, AAG8418051.

Morris, G. (1995 November). Art and law: Censorship and erroneous assertions of censorship. New Art Examiner, 23, 56.

Noble, J. V. (1991). Nude ...or naked? Paintings and sculptures once thought to be indecent are now considered masterpieces. Sculpture Review, 40 (3), 20-27.

Notes and comments: the pc line on censorship. (1991). The New Criterion, 10, 2-3.

O'neil, R. M. (1997). Free speech in the college community. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Parachini, A. (1992 December). Speakeasy: A broadened concept of censorship. New Art Examiner, 20, 10-11.

Sherlock, M. P. (1995). Inappropriate pictures for unaccompanied children: Art education, censorship and the function of cultural institutions. Art Papers, 19, 3-10.

Shusterman, R. (1984). Aesthetic censorship: Censoring art for art's sake. The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 43, 171-180.

Simmons, B. K. (1992). The effect of censorship on attitudes toward popular music. Popular Music and Society, 16 (4), 61-67.

Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Storr, R. (1991). Art, censorship and the first amendment: This is not a test. Art Journal, 50 (3), 12-28.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park: Sage.

Tannenbaum, J. (1991). Mapplethorpe, Robert: The Philadelphia story - censorship controversy. Art Journal 50 (4), 70-76.

Valletta, T. R. (1993). Faculty academic freedom at private colleges and universities: Knowledge assessment of chief academic officers (Doctoral dissertation,

Northern Illinois University, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54-08A, AAG9400670.

Ward, D. V. (1990). Philosophical issues in censorship and intellectual freedom. Library Trends, 39 (1-2), 83-91.

Xenakis, W. A. (1982). The Bruce Franklin issue: The dismissal of a tenured professor from a private university and its implications upon academic freedom (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43-11A, AAG0551141.

Zito, A. M. (1993). An investigation of faculty and departmental chairs' levels of knowledge concerning faculty academic freedom litigation in private colleges and universities (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54-04A, AAG9325005.

Zuber, J. (1992). Do artists have moral rights? Journal of Arts Management and Law, 21 (4), 284-303.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Form

Title of Project:

Group research comparing the opinions of campus administrators, art faculty members, and art students concerning institutional options and policy alternatives for the exhibition of controversial student art work in the Community Colleges of Maryland.

Principal Investigator: C. David Warner

I. Purpose of this project:

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the appropriate scope and nature of artistic freedom in the community college setting. The study will compare the opinions of community college administrators, art faculty members, and art students concerning institutional options and policy alternatives for the exhibition of controversial student art work in the community colleges of Maryland. The research questions address the concept of academic freedom, the principle of institutional neutrality, and the context of the presentation. The issue at stake is whether academic freedom provides faculty artists the right to select student art work for exhibition or whether artistic value judgments should instead be determined by the dominant culture (Kerka, 1997).

II. Procedures:

The researcher will be visiting this institution for a few days during the month of February 1999. The visits will be during regular business hours. The researcher will be conducting individual and group interviews with administrators, art faculty members and art students. The individual interviews will last approximately thirty minutes. The group interviews will last about one hour. The individual interviews will be held in the interviewee's office. The group interviews will be held in a neutral location agreed upon by the researcher and your college administration. The researcher will ask questions designed to gather information about your opinions of a recent controversy involving the exhibition of student art. The researcher is free to interpret and publish the findings without censorship or approval. However, the researcher expects all participants to have a role in shaping the research agenda, to participate in the data generation, and to review what is written in the final report.

III. Risks:

You will not be exposed to any risk at any time. However, the possibility exists that the research experience may be a disturbing one. Every attempt will be made to minimize disturbances and discomfort to research participants. Every attempt will be made to make this a comfortable experience.

IV. Benefits of the project:

The community college is one place in society that must be open to the free exchange of competing ideas. Community college officials should protect the rights of faculty and student artists to free expression even when that expression is offensive sexually or controversial politically. Yet student art works are removed from campus exhibitions when they are considered offensive or indecent. We should not limit an artists freedom of expression or try to obliterate the types of displays with which we do not agree. In a time when so many groups constantly challenge one another's rights and responsibilities, the most important thing we can do is increase the dialogue (Dubin, 1994). Engaging students in discussions about controversial art works might help them learn how to analyze and resolve issues they encounter later in life. Art educators should be introducing controversial art and art issues into their teaching. Faculty artists should be encouraging students to freely express themselves even at the risk of being controversial. And faculty artists must retain the right to exhibit controversial student works without interference. This will provide students with an accurate reflection of the world of art today.

An additional outcome of this study may be that art faculty become more aware of the artistic and academic freedom they possess. Art departments in the community colleges of Maryland should encourage campus administrators to designate specific locations on campus to be used as exhibition sites or gallery space. Community college administrators should work closely with art department faculty to design and make public an exhibition policy which covers controversial presentations.

The notion of what is considered "legitimate" art, who creates art, and what are "acceptable" responses to it is expanding (Greene in Elias et al., 1995). Artistic value judgments typically reflect the values of the dominant culture. Art faculty should be encouraged to assess what learning takes place and how students have developed their own creativity. Jones (1992) urges educators not to measure student art work against culturally determined value systems (Kerka, 1997).

No promise or guarantee of benefits have been made to encourage you to participate. You may receive a synopsis or summary of this research when completed.

V. Confidentiality:

Confidentiality will be maintained at all times. All interviews will be numbered and the researcher will be the only person with the key. The key will identify interviews but that information will not be divulged. No real names will be used. The researcher will use pseudonyms. At no time will any information in this study be released without your written consent.

All interviews will be recorded on audio tape. The tapes will serve as the primary data source. The tapes will be stored in a desk drawer at the

researchers home. No one but the researcher will have access to the tapes. The researcher will do the transcribing. All tapes will be erased or destroyed at the completion of this study.

VI. Compensation:

No compensation is to be earned from participating in this project.

VII. Freedom to withdraw:

You are free to withdraw from this project at any time without penalty. You are free not to answer any questions or respond to any situation you choose without penalty.

VIII. Approval of project:

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, by the Department of Education and Human Resources.

IX. Subject's responsibilities:

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I agree to be interviewed by Dave Warner concerning my experience with a recent art controversy at this campus and my opinion of institutional options and policy alternatives for the exhibition of student art at community colleges.

X. Subject's permission:

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for participation in this project. If I participate, I may withdraw at any time without penalty. I agree to abide by the rules of this project. This consent should be regarded as a process subject to renegotiation over time.

Signature

Date

Should I have any questions about this research or its conduct, I may contact:

C. David Warner

(301) 790-2800 x380

Investigator

Phone

Dr. Sam Morgan

(540) 231-9717

Professor, Committee Chair

Phone

Dr. Don Creamer

(540) 231-9705

Professor, Substitute Chair

Phone

H. T. Hurd

(540) 231-5281

Chair, IRB
Research Division

Phone

You will be given a complete copy (or duplicate original) of the signed Informed Consent.

Appendix B

Phase One: Individual Interview Guide

How familiar are you with the controversial art incident that occurred here last year? Please describe it.

What was the nature of the art work involved?

Who were the major players involved in the incident?

What do you think are the issues that made it controversial?

How did the student artist respond to the controversy?

How do you think the art faculty wanted the incident to be handled?

What in your opinion, were the reactions of the student body to the controversy?

How did the administration respond to the incident?

What principles do you believe were employed in the solution?

What is your reaction to the institutions response?

Is there anything else you want to add that might help me understand this incident from your perspective?

Appendix C

Phase Two: Group Interview Guide

Opening question:

Please tell me your name and how familiar you are with the art controversy that occurred here last year.

Introductory questions:

Please describe all of the places student art work is exhibited on this campus.

Please describe how you feel about faculty artists encouraging art students to be creative and unconventional, which may result in controversial art.

What role do student art exhibits play in the learning process of student artists?

Transition questions:

Who should be held accountable for opinions expressed in an exhibition of student art?

Under what circumstances do you believe it is acceptable to remove controversial student art from an exhibition at a community college?

To what extent is it a violation of the faculty artist's academic freedom when a controversial art work is removed from a student exhibit?

The principle of institutional neutrality is the idea that an educational institution must create and protect an environment that fosters the free expression of ideas. To what extent is it a violation of institutional neutrality when community standards influence the exhibition of student art work?

To what extent are faculty artists responsible for protecting the community college from controversy when selecting student art work to be placed on exhibit?

To what extent are community college administrators obligated to remove controversial student art work from exhibit?

Key questions:

Please read these descriptions of controversy surrounding the exhibition of student art that occurred at three community colleges.

What do you believe are the issues that made each incident controversial?

In your opinion, how was each controversy handled?
What concerns you about what happened and what was done about it?

Please read the following policy options. Please determine which option you feel might provide a better environment for making decisions regarding the exhibition of controversial student art. Please rank the options from most attractive to least attractive in providing for a better resolution of the problem.

Policy Option 1:

Because art faculty and art departments are part of the community college's educational mission, and because art faculty are pursuing the mission of the community college and deserve the same protection of academic freedom as those who work in other disciplines, the established principles of academic freedom will be invoked throughout any controversy involving the exhibition of student art. This community colleges recognizes the faculty artists right to select student art work for exhibition based on responsible and informed judgments of its quality. We support "the right of faculty to pursue the study, instruction and display of art in ways they determine are appropriate" (Lyons, 1991, p.81).

Policy Option 2:

Because community college administrators bear the responsibility for protecting and maintaining an environment conducive to the free exchange of ideas, and because the way in which a college deals with a controversial art exhibit reveals the relative status of art within the college and the attitude of the neighboring community toward the role of the college as a forum for public discourse (Lyons, 1991), this community college will provide a forum for public dialogue whenever controversy erupts over an exhibition of student art. The college will strive to foster an environment for critical dialogue concerning the exhibition while maintaining a neutral relationship to the different cultural and religious values characteristic of our society. When art is permitted to function in this way, it can best serve the mission of the college and the community at large (Lyons, 1991). Campus leaders can best protect the freedom of expression for all constituencies by siding with none.

Policy Option 3:

Because the administration bears the delicate task of balancing the artist's creative freedom against the need to protect the sensitive student's right not to be coerced into an unacceptable artistic experience, and because constituents may hold community colleges accountable for the opinions or beliefs expressed in an artistic presentation simply because the college provides the space for the exhibit, it becomes the responsibility of this community college administration to weigh the risk of needless offense against potentials for educational benefits (Lankford, 1994). All exhibitions of art will be

screened by the college's Exhibitions and Events Committee. The administration at this community college reserves the right to decide what picture of the college it wants to project. The College recognizes the value of exhibiting student work as a component of the education process, but it reserves "the right to relocate or remove any work from exhibition that may be in violation of the law, that may be hazardous to the health and/or safety of viewers or participants, or that may be disruptive to the educational process" (Lyons, 1991, p.79).

Ending question:

Let's summarize the key points of our discussion. (The moderator gives a brief, two minute summary of the responses to questions and reaction to policy options). Does this summary sound complete? Do you have any changes or additions? Have we missed anything? What advice do you have to offer?

Appendix D

Demographic Information

1. What is your age?
 - a. 18 - 29
 - b. 30 - 39
 - c. 40 - 49
 - d. 50 - 59
 - e. 60+

2. What is your sex?
 - a. male
 - b. female

3. What is your highest level of academic achievement?
 - a. high school diploma
 - b. associates degree
 - c. bachelors degree
 - d. masters degree
 - e. doctoral degree
 - f. post doctoral study

4. If you are currently working on a degree, please identify it. (skip if n/a)
 - a. associates
 - b. bachelors
 - c. masters
 - d. doctorate
 - e. post doctorate

5. Please identify your current position at this institution.
 - a. administrative
 - b. faculty
 - c. student

6. How many years have you been in your current position?
 - a. 1 - 5
 - b. 6 - 10
 - c. 11 - 15
 - d. 16 - 20
 - e. 20+

Appendix E

Case Study #1

This community college does not have an art gallery. The art faculty typically display student art on the walls of a hallway outside the art department. In the spring of 1997, a part-time member of the art faculty was teaching a figure drawing class and putting the figure studies on the wall. This was a second semester life drawing class, creating figure drawings from a nude model. The drawings were predominantly graphite or charcoal. They were classical poses.

The drawings were a very loose sort of drawing, designed to get students aware of how to describe three dimensional form very quickly and to train hand/eye coordination. The drawings were gesture studies, done in fifteen minutes or less. They were basically line drawings with small amounts of shading. Depending on where the student was standing in relationship to the model, some were frontal or side views, some were back views and some were a combination of four shortened views. A few of the drawings did have frontal nudity. Some depicted genitalia, others did not. Some were lifelike and explicit.

The drawings were up for a week or ten days when a woman came to the President and complained strongly. She had brought her preteen age daughter to the campus. She was very upset that these pictures were located in a place which was her most direct point of access to her classroom. She asked the President if something could be done. She sent a letter to the administration describing the drawings as pornography and asked how they could possibly let this happen on campus. The woman asked people to sign a petition to have the drawings removed.

The administration tried to find common ground. The President asked the Dean if he could do anything about moving the pictures. The Dean went to the head of the department and suggested some other places where the drawings might be displayed that would be less confrontive when someone comes into the institution. The Dean thought it was logical, if the art faculty were willing, to relocate the display inside the art studio. It would have been very accessible to all of the art students, but not very accessible to anyone else.

The faculty wanted the drawings to remain on the wall. Although the drawings remained on display until the faculty decided to remove them, the faculty believe they were pressured into taking them down. They think the administration over reacted. The faculty did not put the next group of drawings up. The administration believes no action was taken. They think the faculty over reacted. Faculty and students were offended even though no direct action was taken. The Division Chair has decided not to offer figure drawing classes until a place is designated for the display of art work.

Case Study #2

This community college does have an art gallery, but the incident did not occur there. In the spring of 1998, some photography students planned to exhibit their semester long projects somewhere in the community. The location for their exhibit ended up in a hallway of the fine arts center, outside of the art instructors offices. The work was critiqued by faculty and students before and during the time it was exhibited. Some of the photographs were very confronting images of nude females. Some of them were sectional parts of bodies hung together to make up one. A photography faculty member described the work as showing a hard edge to the woman.

The exhibit began to generate some reaction. There was some lively conversation among people and some did not like the nude photos. A few people were objecting to the content of the photographs and wanted them taken down. A department secretary received a telephone complaint from someone in the community. The complainant argued that the nude photos were not art and should not be on exhibit. The caller did not follow up on the complaint. Some students complained to the Dean. One of the concerns came from the father of a three or four year old child whom he had brought to a children's show and whom he had taken down the back hall past the exhibit to use the rest room. When the Dean informed the Division Chair of the complaint, the Chair said we need to sit down with whoever feels offended by the work and discuss it. No one ever came to the Division Chair and said anything at all. The art faculty were unsure of exactly what happened. They heard there were complaints and that some body wanted the photos removed. This was a very mild incident in everyone's opinion.

The faculty wanted to let the controversy go until someone confronted them officially. They were satisfied that no one ever did. The exhibit stayed up until it was time to come down. The administration at one point asked the faculty how long the exhibit was going to be up and said they hoped it was going to come down soon. According to the faculty, the administration knew what was going on and really supported them. The faculty believe the administration was very level headed and did not panic or over react to the complaints. The faculty believe there is an issue concerning the exhibition of art in a public place and the possibility of children being exposed to it. The faculty say they will definitely talk with student artists in the future about this issue and the consequences of what they exhibit. The faculty admit it was not addressed before this incident.

Although the administration supported the faculty and art students during this incident, they believe the community college is a public institution. They feel they must be concerned with how far they go with certain things. The administration believe the community college is not like a metropolitan museum or national gallery. They state that in addition to educational goals they need to be aware that there is a public involvement that goes beyond education. They believe students must discuss the controversial issues often found in student art. On the other hand, they admit to trying to avoid controversy by carefully selecting what is put on exhibit.

Case Study #3

This community college has an art gallery. The incident involved an exhibition of prints by a former student which were on display in the gallery. The artist has a degree in print making from the Corcoran. He was reading about the medieval orders of monks, who were crusaders and priests at the same time, and contemplating the irony of that. He discovered these orders had robes and hoods of all colors. He was also looking at the religious iconography of the medieval era. He was into symbolism and working with how to overcome personal fear. The prints relied heavily on chiaroscuro (the use of dark and light areas) and used symbolism that involved hooded figures as a way of describing fear and misunderstanding. The prints were very moody. Most of them were black and white, with shades of gray in between.

The show opened in mid July and the went through the end of August 1998. There were about twenty prints in the exhibit. Three or four had figures that were in white robes. There were several prints that had dogs in them. One piece had a vague and fleeting reference to the Ku Klux Klan. This particular print had three figures off to the left side of the the piece. One of the figures was holding a cane, which some people misinterpreted as a gun. It was a small drawing, twenty inches high and about twelve or fourteen inches wide. It was called "Target". The artist did not deliberately use the cloaked figures to represent the KKK and racist activities, as much as using them as a way of describing fear, loathing and ignorance on the part of the KKK. The art work was misunderstood. It was not promoting the viewpoint of the KKK. It was reducing the actions of the KKK into fear, loathing and ignorance.

The exhibition had been up for two or three weeks without incident. The gallery director went on vacation in mid August. A young African American woman, who was in line at the Center registering for a class, decided to go to the gallery and see what was happening. The glass doors to the gallery were closed and a statement was on display. The student saw these hooded figures, made a relationship to the Ku Klux Klan and was offended. The student did not bother going to any school official. The student went home, got a video camera, returned to the gallery and video taped the exhibit without permission. The tape was sent to a television station.

No one was prepared for what happened. Everyone was caught completely unaware of both the breadth and the depth of the controversy. It blew out of proportion quickly and uncontrollably. The gallery director has never gotten a formal complaint, letter or phone call. The President had been off campus for a few days. When she returned she received a phone call from a senior woman activist from the black community. The woman asked why the college had KKK art in the gallery and why the college was passing out KKK literature. The President said she would be more than happy to check it out. She wandered over to the gallery and immediately understood how someone could have referenced the images to the KKK. The next day the newspapers started to call and the television crews arrived on campus. The TV media and the local paper covered the story inaccurately. The college was not passing out literature, the art exhibit was never intended as a KKK display, and the art was not in the corridors, but rather in the gallery.

The President said the college was not going to back away from controversy. This incident was so emotional and disturbing that she wanted to deal with it up front. She believes the community college is a place for the free exchange of ideas. The President felt she had to gather feathers that had already been scattered to the wind. She had to pull back seemingly an impossible situation and get her arms around it. The President scheduled an open forum where the community, art faculty and other interested parties could come together and try to make sense of this. She gave the concerned parties an opportunity to air their ideas so that she could consider the communities needs and weigh them against the needs of the college. The President wanted a clear idea of how the community felt about this before she made a decision.

The gallery director absolutely refused to take the exhibition down. The President was very supportive. The gallery director had no feeling that she was going to be manipulated in anyway. The gallery director had total access to the President during the entire incident.

The public forum was held a few days later. All constituencies were present and had an opportunity to voice their opinion. The President decided to support the art exhibition, but after some consideration the artist himself, decided to withdraw the work. He decided this on his own because he did not want his images manipulated. He felt that the work was now something other than what it was originally conceived to be. The artist is also a sensitive individual who felt the pain of the African American community and felt responsible for it.

The gallery directors reaction to the administrations response is very favorable. She believes a lot of explosive smoldering was put out initially. The art faculty believe the administration handled it the best way possible. Instead of closing the incident down, they opened it up. The President received anecdotal and indirect feedback that the faculty were very comfortable and very supportive with how this played out. The President believes the faculty understand the administrations's support for the arts, in all of their forms, is solid.

The President believes the academy is the right place to have controversy. She calls this incident the most exhilarating moment of the year. It was sad and frightening, but the college was finally dealing with a real issue instead of parking and copying service issues. The President believes controversial things should be encouraged at the academy, not for their own sake but so that the community college can be recognized as a place of leadership. The faculty and students should create an ongoing atmosphere where when things go bad, either around the campus or in the community, people know they can come to the campus and get a fair hearing. While the President believes the community college should never shrink from controversy, she also thinks it should engage itself in the pursuit of peace and justice. The President believes controversies over art are little blips on the screen that show us we are not nearly where we need to be.

Appendix F

Policy Options

Policy Option 1:

Because art faculty and art departments are part of the community college's educational mission, and because art faculty are pursuing the mission of the community college and deserve the same protection of academic freedom as those who work in other disciplines, the established principles of academic freedom will be invoked throughout any controversy involving the exhibition of student art. This community colleges recognizes the faculty artists right to select student art work for exhibition based on responsible and informed judgments of its quality. We support "the right of faculty to pursue the study, instruction and display of art in ways they determine are appropriate" (Lyons, 1991, p.81).

Policy Option 2:

Because community college administrators bear the responsibility for protecting and maintaining an environment conducive to the free exchange of ideas, and because the way in which a college deals with a controversial art exhibit reveals the relative status of art within the college and the attitude of the neighboring community toward the role of the college as a forum for public discourse (Lyons, 1991), this community college will provide a forum for public dialogue whenever controversy erupts over an exhibition of student art. The college will strive to foster an environment for critical dialogue concerning the exhibition while maintaining a neutral relationship to the different cultural and religious values characteristic of our society. When art is permitted to function in this way, it can best serve the mission of the college and the community at large (Lyons, 1991). Campus leaders can best protect the freedom of expression for all constituencies by siding with none.

Policy Option 3:

Because the administration bears the delicate task of balancing the artist's creative freedom against the need to protect the sensitive student's right not to be coerced into an unacceptable artistic experience, and because constituents may hold community colleges accountable for the opinions or beliefs expressed in an artistic presentation simply because the college provides the space for the exhibit, it becomes the responsibility of this community college administration to weigh the risk of needless offense against potentials for educational benefits (Lankford, 1994). All exhibitions of art will be screened by the college's Exhibitions and Events Committee. The administration at this community college reserves the right to decide what picture of the college it wants to project. The College recognizes the value of exhibiting student work as a component of the education process, but it

reserves “the right to relocate or remove any work from exhibition that may be in violation of the law, that may be hazardous to the health and/or safety of viewers or participants, or that may be disruptive to the educational process” (Lyons, 1991, p.79).

Appendix G

Analysis Plan

Purpose: The primary purpose of this study is to compare the opinions of campus administrators, art faculty members, and student artists concerning institutional solutions and policy options relating to the exhibition of controversial student art work in the community colleges of Maryland. The specific issues of academic freedom, administrative responsibility for campus neutrality, and the context of the presentation were investigated. The opinions of the groups were compared in order to determine which policy option each group gave the highest preference.

Individual Interviews

1. Examine the individual interview responses to identify the similarities and differences concerning the issues contributing to the controversy. Do the individual participants identify similar issues involved in the separate controversies? Develop a list of factors (issues) that individual participants believe contributed to the controversy on their campus.
2. Examine the individual responses to identify the similarities and differences concerning the principles employed in the solutions. Do the individual participants identify similar or different principles employed in the solution of the separate controversies? Develop of list of the principles employed in the different solutions.
3. Compare individual reactions to the institution's response in order to determine the degree to which opinions vary.
4. The following questions are most important to the analysis of phase one:
What was the nature of the art work involved?
What do you think are the issues that made it controversial?
What principles do you believe were employed in the solution?
What is your reaction to the institution's response?

Group Interviews

1. Identify patterns of response that may suggest the participants' policy preference for dealing with a controversial exhibit of student art. Determine if the participants' preferences are similar or different among the administrator, faculty and student groups. Search for consistency among group answers.
2. Determine whether or not the participant groups identify the same or different issues as contributing to the three controversies.

3. Determine whether or not the participant groups choose the same policy option. Compare how the participants' policy preference relates to the issues involved. Determine how each group orders the policy options based on the research questions.
4. Attempt to explain why differences of opinion may exist based on group answers to the interview questions. Attempt to explain how the issues involved may influence policy preference. Attempt to explain and compare how the same issues might influence the community college's response.

Academic Freedom Questions:

Research Question 1: What are the opinions of administrators, art faculty members, and art students in the community colleges of Maryland concerning how academic freedom rights pertain to the exhibition of student art work? Do different opinions exist among the administrative, faculty, and student classifications? How do opinions compare among the participants of each classification? Which policy options might each classification prefer in dealing with a controversial student art exhibit?

Group interview questions:

Please describe how you feel about faculty artists encouraging art students to be creative and unconventional, which may result in controversial art.

What role do student art exhibits play in the learning process of student artists?

Under what circumstances do you believe it is acceptable to remove controversial student art from an exhibition at a community college?

To what extent is it a violation of the faculty artist's academic freedom when a controversial art work is removed from a student exhibit?

Policy Option 1:

Because art faculty and art departments are part of the community college's educational mission, and because art faculty are pursuing the mission of the community college and deserve the same protection of academic freedom as those who work in other disciplines, the established principles of academic freedom will be invoked throughout any controversy involving the exhibition of student art. This community colleges recognizes the faculty artists right to select student art work for exhibition based on responsible and informed judgments of its quality. We support "the right of faculty to pursue the study,

instruction and display of art in ways they determine are appropriate” (Lyons, 1991, p.81).

Institutional Neutrality Questions:

Research Question 2: What are the opinions of administrators, art faculty, and art students in the community colleges of Maryland concerning the principle of institutional neutrality and the need to protect the institution from controversy provoked by an exhibition of student art work? Do different opinions exist among the administrative, faculty, and student classifications? How do opinions compare among the participants of each classification? Which policy options might each classification prefer in dealing with a controversial student art exhibit?

Group interview questions:

Who should be held accountable for opinions expressed in an exhibition of student art?

The principle of institutional neutrality is the idea that an educational institution must create and protect an environment that fosters the free expression of ideas. To what extent is it a violation of institutional neutrality when community standards influence the exhibition of student art work?

To what extent are faculty artists responsible for protecting the community college from controversy when selecting student art work to be placed on exhibit?

To what extent are community college administrators obligated to remove controversial student art work from exhibit?

Policy Option 2:

Because community college administrators bear the responsibility for protecting and maintaining an environment conducive to the free exchange of ideas, and because the way in which a college deals with a controversial art exhibit reveals the relative status of art within the college and the attitude of the neighboring community toward the role of the college as a forum for public discourse (Lyons, 1991), this community college will provide a forum for public dialogue whenever controversy erupts over an exhibition of student art. The college will strive to foster an environment for critical dialogue concerning the exhibition while maintaining a neutral relationship to the different cultural and religious values characteristic of our society. When art is permitted to function in

this way, it can best serve the mission of the college and the community at large (Lyons, 1991). Campus leaders can best protect the freedom of expression for all constituencies by siding with none.

Context of the Presentation Questions:

Research Question 3: What are the opinions of administrators, art faculty, and art students in the community colleges of Maryland regarding the protection of controversial student art work from outside interference when the work of art is on exhibit in a campus gallery? Do different opinions exist among the administrative, faculty, and student classifications? How do opinions compare among the participants of each classification? Which policy options might each classification prefer in dealing with a controversial student art exhibit?

Group interview questions:

Please describe all of the places student art work is exhibited on this campus.

Under what circumstances do you believe it is acceptable to remove controversial student art from an exhibition at a community college?

To what extent are community college administrators obligated to remove controversial student art work from exhibit?

Policy Option 3:

Because the administration bears the delicate task of balancing the artist's creative freedom against the need to protect the sensitive student's right not to be coerced into an unacceptable artistic experience, and because constituents may hold community colleges accountable for the opinions or beliefs expressed in an artistic presentation simply because the college provides the space for the exhibit, it becomes the responsibility of this community college administration to weigh the risk of needless offense against potentials for educational benefits (Lankford, 1994). All exhibitions of art will be screened by the college's Exhibitions and Events Committee. The administration at this community college reserves the right to decide what picture of the college it wants to project. The College recognizes the value of exhibiting student work as a component of the education process, but it reserves "the right to relocate or remove any work from exhibition that may be in violation of the law, that may be hazardous to the health and/or safety of viewers or participants, or that may be disruptive to the educational process" (Lyons, 1991, p.79).

Appendix H:Vitae

C. David Warner is professor of music at Hagerstown Community College. He holds a bachelor's degree in music education from Shepherd College, a master's degree in music education from Towson State University, and a doctoral degree in community college education from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.