Faulty Survey Discredits Biology at Faith-Based La Sierra University
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INTRODUCTION

In response to complaints from some alumni and others, the Board of Trustees for La Sierra University (LSU)—a faith-based Seventh-Day Adventist institution—surveyed biology students to assess allegations that the professors failed to teach biblical creationism and “intelligent design”. Complaints from alumni, bloggers, and other members of the Adventist community alleged that the faculty had instead offered evidence and arguments favoring evolutionary explanations for the history and diversity of life and had ridiculed students who believed the biblical creation and Flood accounts.

Conservative church leaders and certain members of the LSU Board of Trustees appeared sympathetic to the continuing complaint that Adventist beliefs regarding the Genesis six-day creation narrative and Noah’s Flood had not been sufficiently affirmed by the biology faculty. Some of the conservatives on the Board joined in opposing the biology program.

The survey appears to have been designed to reveal certain “shortcomings” in the biology program, but the initial results were disappointing: there was no clear indication that the professors discredited Adventist interpretations of creation or were ridiculing or marginalizing students who held traditional religious views of origins. However, before the final report was released, a subcommittee of the Board “revised” the data summary in a way that made the state of affairs over teaching evolution seem to be more threatening to Adventist doctrine on origins than it actually was.

Relying on these manipulated results, a self-selected group of trustees issued an Open Letter of Apology publicly admitting that the biology program had certain “shortcomings” and reassuring Church leaders and members that LSU was “committed to being an institution that does not just present the Church’s view of creation, but fully supports it” (Creation-Evolution Study Group 2011). Henceforth, LSU promised that it would adopt recommendations from the Adventist Accrediting Association (AAA) promulgated by the church’s education department.

The fall-out from AAA’s probationary actions was the forced resignation of a long-term biology faculty member, the forced resignation of two administrators, and the removal of three board members. But the real story here is the way in which the data from the survey were manipulated to serve a doctrinal purpose in a struggle to control the students’ exposure to secular ideas that conflict with Church doctrine about the age of the earth and the history and diversity of life.
ADVENTISTS’ CREATIONISM

The Seventh-Day Adventist beliefs are conservative and literalistic: embracing the historical accuracy of biblical texts regarding the origin of the universe and of life, and the geologic history of the earth as a result of Noah’s flood (Numbers 2006). Just as important as the Bible are the writings of the prophetess Ellen G White (1827–1915). With regard to “origins” she claimed that God carried her back in time through a vision to the historic creation week and showed her the sequence of events just as the Bible describes them (White 1864:90). Throughout her life she criticized satanic teachings found in geology and evolutionary science, stating: “God designed that the discovery of these things should establish faith in inspired history; but men, with their vain reasoning, fall into the same error as did the people before the flood,—the things which God gave them as a benefit, they turn into a curse by making a wrong use of them” (White 1891:112).

The first Adventist “scientist” was George McCready Price, a disciple of Ellen White who became most influential in holding the line against Darwinism and geology. Though not a geologist, in his book The New Geology (1923) he tried to poke holes in prevailing geological theories. Price’s work became the foundation in 1958 for the Geoscience Research Institute (GRI). GRI continues to this day to maintain a distinctive emphasis on special creation in six literal days and on the fossil-forming Noachian Flood. Price’s work is also at the foundation of the seminal work of “scientific creationism”—The Genesis Flood (Whitcomb and Morris 1961)—and of the Institute for Creation Research (Numbers 1998).

Adventist perspectives on Genesis creation do not allow for naturalistic processes to produce new species or to agree with the well established geologic column with million year-old fossils. However, more than a few Adventist scientists, theologians, and others accommodate theistic evolution, hoping to reconcile Genesis with a more scientific understanding of the natural world. The tension created by these factions intermittently prompts Adventist leaders to try to restore loyalty to traditional Adventism. Recently, in a speech before a group of scientists and theologians in Atlanta in 2010, Ted Wilson, the newly elected General Conference president and chairman of the GRI Board, admitted, “We don’t have all the answers …” but went on to say there is sufficient evidence for a biblical creation and a global flood. And he described theistic evolution as a meaningless process that challenges “a loving God who created us in His image.” Wilson forcefully stated that he wanted to “see that all Seventh-Day Adventist teachers—whether they are theologians or science teachers—believe and accept the biblical creation as the church has voted and understood it. That is our goal, and that is what we need to move toward” (Campbell 2010).

ADVENTIST SCHOOLS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Adventists maintain an extensive educational system from elementary schools to universities claiming an open mind in searching for “truth”. There are over 100 higher education institutions connected with the Church, thirteen of them in North America. There are three universities with professional programs, including the flagship Loma Linda University, which supports schools in academic medicine and other health sciences, as well as graduate programs in geology, psychology, social science, and religion.

Each institution is a separate non-profit corporation with its own by-laws and board of trustees, all of whom are members of or employed by the Church. The actions of one of
these boards—in response to the perceived threat to Adventist doctrinal purity—are the basis of a recent controversy at La Sierra University (LSU). In some ways, the situation was not unique, but symptomatic of the tension between secular scholarship and sectarian doctrine. Historically, ministerial and theological education has been fertile ground for creating controversy and academic mistrust within Adventist institutions (Bull 2007).

The expectation in Adventist higher education settings is not that evolution should not be taught in Adventist schools. Adventist authorities believe that students should be prepared to go on to further academic work prepared to cope with evolution. Rather, they want the instructors to use the more generic scientific method to point out inconsistencies in natural selection models, faults or inconsistencies within the scientific literature, discontinuities in the geological column, problems with dating methods, and “gaps” in the fossil record as an indirect way to belittle and discredit evolution (Prothero 2007:45).

**The La Sierra University Flare-Up**

During the spring of 2009, several students, parents, alumni, and other prominent Adventists alleged that certain LSU faculty had set about to corrupt the university using scientific biology (Taylor 2009). Some claimed that LSU instructors were knowingly avoiding creationism or professing ignorance of the matter; others revealed that biology faculty were actually teaching evolution as though it were a valid scientific construct. For this, Shane Hilde, one of the contributors on the educatetruth.com blog, stated that certain biology faculty “should both resign because their clear belief in evolution is contradictory to the teachings of the church that founded the university” (Stripling 2009).

In June 2010, the LSU Board of Trustees established an ad hoc Creation-Evolution Study Group (hereafter referred to as the “Committee”) to review the gathering concerns or allegations (Creation-Evolution Study Group 2011). The Board decided to create a questionnaire and ask questions about the science instruction from students graduating or attending LSU in the previous four years. The Committee distilled the issues with the biology program to three allegations that kept reappearing in petitions, letters, blogs, and other social media:

1. The biblical account of six literal consecutive 24-hour days of creation had been discredited and labeled as merely figurative language;

2. The theory of evolution was taught as having greater scientific merit than the biblical account of creation and as more accurately portraying the origin and development of life, and

3. Students who maintained a traditional SDA perspective with regard to creation were marginalized and sometimes ridiculed for holding this position.

To evaluate the validity of these allegations, the Committee distributed a survey instrument containing 16 statements (Table 1). Respondents indicated their level of agreement with each of these statements on a six-item Likert scale using: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree”, “strongly disagree”, or “no basis for response”. The survey was made available on the Internet to all students, including graduates, over the previous four years who had taken biology courses. All responses were kept anonymous.
Of the 369 eligible respondents, 91 (24.7%) completed the survey. The majority (67%) had only completed a first-year general biology course. The remaining 33% were biology graduates, and nearly a third of the participants were non-Adventists. There were no attempts to ascertain if the sample were representative of the students eligible to respond (for example, “Are you a believer in creationism?”). The biologists submitted some questions used in the survey, but were not allowed to reword a few questions they perceived might be misleading in the final questionnaire placed on the Internet.

It should also be noted that there were no questions in the survey referring to specific issues of contention in Adventist doctrine: for example, the historicity of Noah’s Flood, the age of the earth, paleontology or fossil evidence, geologic history, or other topics or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. The LSU Evolution Survey Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is appropriate to present evolutionary theories in biology classes at LSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evolution is presented as a scientific working theory in biology classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The differences between theories, facts, and beliefs were explained in my biology classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The changing and always tentative nature of even strongly-established theories was explained in my biology classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Data relevant to testing the strengths and weaknesses of evolutionary theories were discussed in my biology classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evolutionary theories were taught as the factual explanation of the origin of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My professors presented helpful ways of relating science and religious faith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Seventh-day Adventist view of creation was presented in biology classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Seventh-day Adventist view of creation was supported in biology classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Science is an effective, but tentative, way to understand and explain natural processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Science offers an effective way to prove beliefs about God and God’s creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Science and religion are valid but different ways of understanding the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Science is unable to definitively answer questions about the ultimate origins of human life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Biology professors treated my questions and views on issues of origins, science, and religious faith with dignity and respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Biology professors encouraged my faith in a personal God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Biology professors supported my faithfulness to my religious heritage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
theories related to the history of life on earth that might be discussed in a typical university-level biology class. A “shortcoming” in the biology program would be revealed if the student disagreed with any of the statements in the survey, except for Question 6, which would reveal a “shortcoming” if the students agreed with it.

**Survey Results**

Because of the small number of responses in each category, answers in the “strongly agree” and “agree” categories are grouped together, as are the responses in the “disagree” and “strongly disagree” categories. The initial results indicated, at least according to the students, that the LSU biology department was effective in communicating scientific information about evolutionary theory and scientific practices, while remaining faith-affirming for the students. Strong pluralities agreed with the statements that Adventist views were presented and that students’ faith was supported and affirmed.

When the questions are grouped relative to their relationship with the three allegations that the Board wanted to investigate (shown as the top bar of the pair for each of the questions in Figure 1), the results show no support for the charges that biology faculty at LSU were undermining either Adventist doctrine or the faith of individual students.

The data shown in the top bar associated with each question in the figure were obtained from the computer output after the survey was completed (Creation-Evolution Study Group 2011). However, before its final report, the Committee made an unusual decision on how

![Figure 1. Results of the LSU Evolution Survey.](image-url)
to combine categories of responses. In addition to combining the “strongly agree” with “agree” answers and the “strongly disagree” with “disagree” answers, the committee also chose to add the “neutral” responses to one of the combined categories, and to ignore the “no basis for response” altogether. The effect of these on the impression gathered from the data is shown in the lower bar for each of the questions in the figure.

In every statement the “neutral” responses were added in with the two categories of disagreement, except in Question 6. In this one instance, the “neutrals” were added in with those agreeing with the statement. In Question 6, this meant that the 14.3% of respondents who chose “neutral” were added with those who agreed that evolution was being taught as a “fact” to explain the origin of life (and therefore in defiance of Adventist doctrine).

For all the other questions, the “neutrals” were added to the “disagree” category, which made the data appear to give more support to the allegations than warranted by the way the students actually responded. For 10 of these 15 questions, this increased the percentage of negative answers by at least 11%; and for 3 of the questions, the increase was 20% or more.

Applying a t-test of differences in proportion between the “enhanced” category data reported by the Committee and the original data in the survey indicates that in all cases, the differences were statistically significant. The Committee’s presentation was significantly more negative than the original data, and this led to a distortion of the results that indicated more support for the allegations than the survey legitimately showed.

The weakest effects (1-tailed p<0.05) were in questions 1–4, because in these cases there were only a few neutral responses and fewer than 17% of the total were in the combined “disagree” category. In all other questions, the significance of adding the neutral responses to the “disagree” category were between p<0.013 and p<0.025. The Committee’s results were consistently and significantly more negative than the original data.

Despite this distortion, the results still showed minimal evidence that the biology faculty were undermining Adventist doctrine or the faith of their students. For example, in the questions related to Allegation 3, no fewer than 68% of the students answered each question in a way that indicated that the faculty were both respectful and affirming of their faith. In general, answers that were favorable to the biology program convincingly outnumbered those that suggested a serious conflict with Adventist doctrine.

**Discussion**

**Analysis of Allegation 1: The Biblical account of six literal consecutive 24-hour days of creation has been discredited and labeled as merely figurative language.**

This allegation was frequently made in letters and social media presented by the “truthers” on the Internet. But the questionnaire did not directly address this allegation; for example, there were no questions specifically addressing whether biology classes discussed the literal biblical presentation of six 24-hour days of creation, or labeled creation as merely figurative language. The Committee’s questions seem to focus on the degree to which non-scientific Adventist ideas were generally incorporated into the biology classroom.
The three questions corresponding to this first allegation revealed a relatively high frequency of “neutral” responses (11–25%). Despite a statistically significant distortion of the data in the Committee's report, the general picture is still one in which more students agreed that the professors were teaching the requisite Adventist content in biology classes than disagreed.

Nearly 30% of the students were non-Adventist, and we have no way of knowing if they understood what the survey statements meant by “the SDA view of creation”. Furthermore, nearly 70% of the participants were first-year students—only beginning the study of biology—and 52% of these were in the fall quarter of the year 2009–2010, just getting started. The Committee did not appear to have any way to adjust or modify its analysis to take into account the non-Adventist students taking the survey or that these students were mostly novices in biology.

Analysis of Allegation 2: The theory of evolution is taught as having greater scientific merit than the biblical account of creation and as more accurately portraying the origin and development of life.

All of the questions in this section showed statistically significant differences between the survey data and the Committee’s report, although the difference was somewhat less in questions 1–4. It appears that the number of negative and neutral responses was so small in these four questions to begin with, lumping did not seem to produce a big difference in the proportions of responses supporting the allegation, so only with a 1-tailed test at the level of p<0.05 was there any statistical significance to the difference. From the survey data, one can say that LSU biology faculty were clear and appropriate in their presentation of scientific theories, models, facts, and explanations.

Analysis of Allegation 3: Students who maintain a traditional SDA perspective with regard to creation are marginalized and sometimes ridiculed for holding this position.

This allegation was frequently presented in blog posts, letters to the Adventist community and university and church leaders, and so on. The survey was the most direct way to determine if this allegation were true. However, the results showed this allegation was false. The students did not agree that creation was marginalized in class or that they were ridiculed for their positions and beliefs. Over 68% of the responses on each of the 4 questions indicated quite the opposite: students felt supported and encouraged in their faith by the faculty. This section also had the highest “no basis for response” overall; 7.7% in questions 15 and 16, and 8.8% in question 14.

**Applying the Data**

The final report of the Committee (February 7, 2011)—based on the data presentation that lumped “neutral” data with the data category that presented the more negative impression—came to the conclusion:

Even though there is room for improvement in most of these areas, survey questions 6, 8 and 9 require particular attention. The only way in which to fully benchmark these results, however, would be to have this same survey conducted by La Sierra’s sister institutions in North America. Without such comparisons, any criticism of La
Sierra’s effectiveness at supporting Adventist beliefs relative to other institution is speculative, at best. (Creation-Evolution Study Group 2011:4)

In fact, the original “Interim Report” from the Committee to the executive session of the Trustees on November 11, 2010, was quite favorable to the biology program. There was not even a hint at this point that the biology program was any different than what the faculty had maintained concerning the pedagogy of science education in a Christian environment, including what some perceived as difficulties by some first-year biology students who had not been exposed to scientific biology before coming to LSU. What the Board actually found from the student survey was that LSU biologists:

1. Taught science in an objective manner.
2. Respected students’ opinions and beliefs.
3. Supported students’ religious affiliations.
4. Mentored students and encouraging personnel faith.
5. Help students understand the difference between what they know and what they believe.
6. Helped students integrate faith and learning.
7. Seriously discussed complex and difficult issues with their students.

The report also mentioned that the “Biology Department generally … explains the strengths and weaknesses of evolution … [but] must make a greater effort to present and support the denominational view of creation” (Creation-Evolution Study Group 2011:Attachment 2).

One of the consequences of all this attention to the biology program was the visit on November 15–19, 2010, of a ten-member team from the Adventist Accreditation Association (AAA)—a church-sponsored accreditation body established to make sure that Adventist schools adhere to the Adventist philosophy of education. During the visit, a biologist from the site team, and one familiar with the problems of teaching scientific biology in the Adventist post-secondary schools, asked the Chair of Biology if he could meet with the biology faculty and discuss some of the issues. The North American Division Director of Education Larry Blackmer (serving as AAA team’s advisor) and the Director of AAA, Lisa Beardsley from the General Conference, asked if they also could meet with the biology staff during this same time. During the meeting, the LSU biologists openly shared the struggle over teaching creationism in the classroom and the difficulties in reconciling science with faith. They were honest and told the three visitors that the discussion of biblical creationism was better placed in the School of Religion.

The encounter with the three visitors resulted in a “consultation letter” written on behalf of this “subcommittee”. The letter was addressed directly to LSU President Randal Wisbey. In summary, the “consultation letter” reiterated that the biologists were devoted to “teaching the best science education possible” and that “one of their highest goals was to ensure that they helped their students know Jesus”. But, the letter added, the “biologists stated that they were averse to teaching, much less in celebrating the faith position found in creationism” (Creation-Evolution Study Group 2011:Attachments 1–5). This thread in the letter
became known as the “deviation from the Adventist philosophy of education,” which by now everyone in leadership suspected was at the heart of the controversy. The letter itself was kept secret, and only later was it discovered that some of the things the biologists said were misrepresented.

The ad hoc Board Committee met on January 11, 2011, and reviewed the consulting letter and the initial draft of the AAA report. Three members from the Committee then were commissioned to draft a report that became a memorandum to the whole Board. As a result, the “neutral” opinions were lumped into the “disagree” column in all but Question 6. The survey data now appeared to emphasize certain significant “shortcomings” in the biology program (Creation-Evolution Study Group 2011:Attachments 1–5).

The “final draft” of the accreditation report was issued to the university on February 7, 2011. The AAA site visit team unanimously recommended that LSU receive the maximum possible years for accreditation under the AAA guidelines, but the team also advocated returning before December 31, 2012, to re-examine four important recommendations, the most notable of which was to review expected progress by the administration and faculty to enhance “the classroom for students and faculty with traditional Adventist views, seeking balance by presenting a range of views and supporting student expression according to the principles of academic freedom.” It was becoming clear that the church expected the biologists to affirm creationism in science classes. Furthermore, it was not enough to encourage a personal belief in God or even teach that science is unable to definitively answer questions about the origins of human life; the Bible was to be used in the classroom as a source of cherished principles and of “real” knowledge.

At the next LSU board meeting on February 9 and 10, 2011, after voting to accept the survey results, the Board also voted to hand off the responsibility for discussing the results to the University’s public relations department (Lenny Darnell, personal communication). Instead, during the next month a self-selected group of trustees, including the chairman of the Committee, prepared an “Open Letter of Apology” based on the distorted survey results. This apology letter was taken to the biology department to be signed by all members of the biology faculty. However, by now the biologists had seen the manipulated data and refused to sign. In reaction to this refusal, the LSU administration asked the chairman of the department to sign the apology letter, but he also refused.

So on March 9, 2011, the Open Letter of Apology appeared over the signatures of President Randal Wisbey and Ricardo Graham, chairman of the Board of Trustees. The letter framed the sensitive survey results this way:

From these who have been enrolled in biology classes, the study group learned that the university is doing well in some areas. Two-thirds responded that their professors presented helpful ways of relating science and religious faith, supported their faithfulness to their religious heritage, and encouraged faith in a personal God.

The survey, though, also showed areas in which we have fallen short of what we and our Church want for our students. We found that only 50 percent of the students surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that our Adventist view of creation was presented, and only 40 percent agreed or strongly agreed that our Adventist view was supported. This is not acceptable, and we apologize. We have already begun addressing this in
meaningful ways to ensure that our biology program seriously addresses the topic of creation. (Wisbey and Graham 2011)

In response to this apology, the consultation letter, and reviews from the visitation team, the AAA Board in the General Conference rejected the recommendation for accreditation from the site visit and moved on April 4, 2011, to grant only limited accreditation to LSU until December 31, 2012. There is no doubt that the skewed survey results had a significant effect on the AAA Board's decision (Kellner 2011), giving them the justification they needed to act to rein in the biology department. This matter had other implications for the campus, however.

An earlier visit in the spring of 2010 by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)—a secular accreditation agency—had raised serious concerns during its Educational Effective Review before issuing accreditation to LSU for eight more years. WASC promised to return in a year and review the progress that LSU committed to make in certain administrative areas. On both occasions WASC was aware of the pressure from religious conservatives in the church over issues relating to the teaching of evolutionary biology and creationism. After returning to the campus near the end of April 2011 (following the AAA fiasco and the forced resignation of three faculty and one board trustee), WASC recognized that the crisis over institutional autonomy continued and noted that LSU was still under fire from “some segments of the … Church because of the perception that … faculty teach the biological sciences in a way that could be viewed as inconsistent with Church teachings” (Wolff 2011).

Furthermore, WASC noted that the LSU board appeared to have ignored earlier concerns and had failed to address this challenge in “keeping with generally accepted principles of higher education related to institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and the appropriate roles of the faculty, administration, and governing board.” As a consequence WASC issued a formal “Notice of Concern” on July 5, 2011. The loss of WASC accreditation would be a serious setback for LSU (Wolff 2011) in its aspirations to be regarded as a legitimate university of higher education, allowing students to obtain financial aid, to apply for the GI Bill, and to transfer credits to other higher educational institutions. Hiring faculty in the future will also be more difficult.

WASC was not telling LSU what it could or could not teach. WASC’s concern was related to governance and procedural issues. In response, many “truthers” on social media promoted the unreflective recommendation that LSU should return to being a Bible College and abandon regional (secular) accreditation—not fully understanding the implications of either of these moves for the future of Adventist education.

**Conclusion**

A survey of what the students were actually learning about scientific biology at LSU—a university sponsored by a conservative Christian church that has not always been cordial to evolution—could be a good starting place in a search for weaknesses in biology instruction. As we see here, the Board elected to test only three broad allegations frequently heard from the evolution critics, but many of the specific objections were left out of the questionnaire. Looking at the questions overall, it appears the Committee narrowed its interests to two main issues.
1. Was science given greater priority over biblical creationism (in other words, did science serve as a distraction from teaching creationism)?

2. Were students who held traditional SDA religious views of creation ridiculed or marginalized by the professors?

In the end, the survey search essentially boiled down to questions 8 and 9: the students’ perceptions that biology instruction included and supported the Adventist view of creation. The addition of those with “neutral” responses to the “disagree” category increased the “negative” responses in question 8 by 33% and doubled the “negative” responses in question 9. Even though only about 40% agreed that creationism was supported in biology classes, those disagreeing amounted only to about 27% ... until the 25% of respondents who chose “neutral” was added to the “disagree” category. These distorted results were used as the basis of the Open Letter of Apology from the president and chairman of the board.

The decision to combine all the responses originally marked as “neutral” into one of the other categories significantly changed the interpretation of the survey results, and the resulting responses placed the integrity of the scientific biology curriculum and the extent of academic freedom into question on both fronts. But even with those changes, the results would not support the Committee’s conclusions about biology instruction at LSU. At least one board member, in a letter that became public, protested that the Board’s action in February 2011 “was very clear, and there was nothing in the voted document that involved creating new language, or new policy, let alone ‘apologizing’ for anything...we also voted to release the ... Committee from their duties” (Lenny Darnell, personal communication).

La Sierra University, still enmeshed in this controversy, faces the possibility of losing its accreditation by both secular and religious commissions and the loss of faculty and staff. This outcome threatens LSU’s claims to legitimacy both as a regular institution of higher education and as an Adventist-sponsored school.

Biology is the second largest department at LSU. It is the academic home to many students who plan to become physicians and dentists or gain employment in other health sciences. Actions that weaken this department also weaken both the students’ and the university’s claim on a legitimate scientific foundation for their studies and future professions.

The biology faculty supports the solution to recognize the distinctive difference between science and religion that allows both to coexist, but perform in separate domains. And as shown here, the biology faculty appeared to have learned how to carry out this charge successfully, judging by the student survey. Perhaps most remarkable is that, even though the student survey was inspired by complaints from critics of the biology program, the results did not succeed in producing evidence that the three main allegations were true.

At LSU, the students were taught science, even evolutionary biology, while at the same time treating questions and views on issues of origins, science, and religious faith with dignity and respect, encouraging faith in a personal God, and support faithfulness to students’ religious heritage, whether they were Adventist or non-Adventist. What more could one ask for?
So there must be some other reason to explain why a self-selected group on the LSU Board of Trustees manipulated the data to justify issuing an Open Letter of Apology to the Church and subsequently placing the university at peril for its continuing accreditation. It certainly was not because the survey data themselves lent any support for the perceived “shortcomings” in the biology program.
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