

DEI in the Sciences Fact Sheet

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION
of SCHOLARS

Government Policymakers

Government policymakers, both at the federal and the state levels, should work to remove “diversity, equity, and inclusion” (DEI) policies and programs from our universities. They also should work to restructure American science funding to mitigate the corrosive effects of DEI on American scientific research. Federal policymakers, above all, should condition the vast flows of federal research money on how effectively DEI ideology has been removed from academic science.

- *DEI Ideology:* To remove DEI ideology from university sciences, we recommend four model bills for state policymakers:
 - the [College Finances Act](#), which requires budget transparency in public universities, especially regarding DEI funding;
 - the [Campus Intellectual Diversity Act](#), which prohibits political discrimination and protects intellectual diversity;
 - the [Universities Nondiscrimination Act](#), which prohibits universities from discriminating by race, sex, or other group identity and prohibits discriminatory concepts in administrative trainings; and
 - the [Professional Association Liberty Act](#), which prohibits all state funding or support for any professional association that requires commitments to discriminatory concepts, imposes censorship, or requires abridgement of First Amendment rights, including compelled speech.

Federal policymakers also might pass similar bills to remove DEI from institutions of higher education (IHEs).

- *Finances:* In the long run, both government and academic science would be better for a redirection of government research funds away from academic research and toward supporting research through philanthropic and institutional funds. In the short run, federal policymakers should ensure that federal funds do not allow the subsidy of DEI bureaucracies and policies in the university. We recommend two model bills to achieve this goal:
 - the [Indirect Costs Act](#), which caps university indirect costs surcharges on research grants at a maximum of 10% of the direct costs of the program; and
 - the [Science Depoliticization Act](#), which forbids federal science agencies from funding research at institutions that impose DEI policies or identity-group discrimination.

State policymakers also might pass similar bills regulating their financial support for public universities.

- *Irreproducibility Crisis*: Federal and state policymakers should act to address the irreproducibility crisis. The flood of irreproducible science not only wastes research dollars but also is facilitated by a network of professional incentives that has built up around a funding regime that incentivizes metrics of research productivity rather than discovery. DEI ideology has ridden these perverse incentives to penetrate deeply into university science. We recommend seven model bills in our [Model Science Policy Code](#) to achieve this goal, but above all these two:
 - the [Reproducible Policy Act](#), which requires federal agencies to use only publicly accessible research which (in appropriate disciplines) meets Good Laboratory Practice Standards in the most important regulatory actions and scientific inventories; and
 - the [Reproducible Grants Act](#), which restricts new federal grant funding to publicly accessible research.

University Administrators

University administrators are primarily responsible for the imposition of DEI ideology on universities, so the present body of administrators presumably knows what could be done to rid their universities of DEI. That DEI ideology persists is *prima facie* evidence that they just don't wish to, so they must be forced to do so. They should be required by law and policy to undertake these reforms.

- *Fire the DEI Bureaucrats*. The bloated DEI bureaucracy that afflicts most universities has proven very difficult to dislodge. These bureaucracies are parasitic: the only thing DEI bureaucrats know how to do is impose DEI. If you give them another job, they will turn it into a DEI machine—and they will rally resistance to you. Find out who the DEI bureaucrats are and terminate their employment.
- *Oversee Faculty Hiring and Student Admissions*. Recruitment and retention of faculty and students have traditionally focused on principles of [Merit, Fairness, and Equality](#) (MFE). DEI advocates have subverted this by seizing control of faculty hiring and student admissions. Administrators should monitor both of these processes in detail, and where adherence to DEI ideology has been made a condition for recruitment and retention, take steps to intervene to refocus recruitment and retention on principles of MFE.
- *Remove Faculty Who Explicitly Promote Scientific Misconduct*. DEI ideology promotes scientific misconduct by directing research to narrow political goals and away from querying nature. Too many professors now favor [outright research misconduct in the name of DEI activism](#). Professors who promote scientific misconduct in the name of DEI ideology have committed an offense that merits revocation of tenure and removal from university employment.

DEI in the Sciences Reform Recommendations

by J. Scott Turner and David Randall

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION
of SCHOLARS

Introduction

The National Association of Scholars has spent several years examining how “diversity, equity, and inclusion” (DEI) ideology has penetrated so deeply into our institutions of higher education, including the sciences. As part of this effort, we have conducted forensic case studies of the penetration of DEI ideology at three of the nation’s top institutions of science and technology: the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), the Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech), and the California Institute of Technology (Cal Tech). These case studies examine in detail how identity-politics took over institutions that had built stellar reputations on competence, ingenuity, and intellectual merit.¹

These case studies substantiate the general proposition that DEI has a profoundly corrosive effect on academic science. Universities generally should eliminate their programmatic commitments to DEI, their DEI regulations, and their DEI bureaucracies. This is true for all aspects of the universities, but it is particularly urgent to remove DEI (however named) from our departments devoted to scientific research. It matters that our children understand America’s founding ideals, and it matters that they know the literature of the West from Homer to Tolkien. It especially matters that students know the scientific research that underwrites America’s security, prosperity, and liberty, and why it should not be shackled to DEI ideology. DEI is not only illiberal and destructive of the ideals of individual excellence and achievement but also antithetical to the very idea of the unfettered search for truth, without which science cannot operate.

We therefore make recommendations to different audiences, within and without the university, on how best to remove DEI from the university. We also make recommendations about how best to mitigate the effects of DEI on American science, until such time as DEI can be eliminated. *External policymakers, alumni, boards of trustees, university administrators, professors, students*—all these have a role to play in removing DEI from the universities, and especially from university science.

In practice, external policymakers will have to take the lead to secure substantive reform to remove DEI from the university. The radical cadres devoted to DEI have secured such a stranglehold within the universities that they only will change their conduct when external policymakers give them no alternative. Or, more precisely, when external policymakers condition the flow of money to universities on real and enduring reform to remove DEI.

Within a university, the fulcrum of power clearly lies with university administrators, from the university president to the low-level DEI functionaries. Faculty power is a shell of what it was; “shared governance” is only camouflage by radical activists to seize power internally, and to thwart external reform by pretending that the university administrators don’t have the authority to make necessary administrative changes. We make recommendations to every university audience—but we do so knowing that the conduct of university administrators is the *sine qua non* of university reform, and it is administrators who must lead.

1 Case Studies of DEI at America’s Technical Institutes Series, National Association of Scholars; <https://www.nas.org/report-series/case-studies-of-dei-at-americas-technical-institutes>; and see Turning Over Rocks in the DEI Swamp, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.youtube.com/live/hEN5tnXEY4>.

External Policymakers

External policymakers, both at the federal and the state level, should work to remove DEI from our universities. They also should work to restructure American science funding to mitigate the effects of DEI on American scientific research. Federal policymakers, above all, should condition the vast flows of federal money to university research on how effectively DEI ideology has been removed from academic science.

External policy reform should take into account larger deformations of American science, which have facilitated DEI's corruptions, but are not the result of DEI. The flood of government money into university science since World War II generally has correlated with the decay of the ethic and practice of scientific discovery and has reoriented university science away from discovery and toward the pursuit of government grants.² This has allowed university administrators to use research grant revenues to subsidize the growth of DEI bureaucracies. A parallel deformation of American science has been the rise of the "irreproducibility crisis"—the combination of flawed statistical procedures, publicly inaccessible data, dysfunctional professional incentives, and politicized groupthink that has rendered a vast proportion of research publications useless, unreproduced and unreproducible.³ The politicized groupthink that contributes to the irreproducibility crisis both is a product of and a contributory to DEI ideology and its takeover of the sciences. External policymakers should address simultaneously the entangled pathologies of DEI in the university, the financing of university science, and the irreproducibility crisis.

- **DEI Ideology:** The Trump administration already has promulgated Executive Orders aimed at removing DEI ideology from institutions of higher education (IHE).⁴ They also have made several resolution agreements with individual universities that should encourage other IHEs to undertake similar reforms.⁵ Federal and state policymakers should reinforce the Trump Executive Orders by statutory reform to ensure removal of DEI from academia, above all from the university sciences. We recommend four model bills for state policymakers to achieve this goal:
 - the *College Finances Act*, which requires budget transparency in public universities, especially regarding DEI funding;
 - the *Campus Intellectual Diversity Act*, which prohibits political discrimination and protects intellectual diversity;

2 J. Scott Turner, *Rescuing Science: Recovering Science as Civic Virtue* (New York: National Association of Scholars, 2025), <https://www.nas.org/reports/rescuing-science>.

3 David Randall and Christopher Welser, *The Irreproducibility Crisis of Modern Science: Causes, Consequences, and the Road to Reform* (New York: National Association of Scholars, 2018), <https://www.nas.org/reports/the-irreproducibility-crisis-of-modern-science/full-report>; *Shifting Sands: Keeping Count of Government Science Series*, National Association of Scholars, 2021-2025, <https://www.nas.org/report-series/shifting-sands-keeping-count-of-government-science>.

4 EO 14151, "Ending Radical And Wasteful Government DEI Programs And Preferencing," January 20, 2025, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/DCPD-202500118/pdf/DCPD-202500118.pdf>; EO 14173, "Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity," January 21, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/ending-illegal-discrimination-and-restoring-merit-based-opportunity/>.

5 Resolution Agreement [hereafter Brown University Resolution Agreement], July 30, 2025, https://www.brown.edu/sites/default/files/brown-and-united-states-resolution-agreement_July-30-2025.pdf; Agreement between the United States of America and the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, October 22, 2025, <https://federalinfo.virginia.edu/sites/federalinfo/files/2025-10/US-University-of-Virginia-Stand-still-Agreement-20251022.pdf>; Agreement between the United States of America and Cornell University, November 7, 2025, <https://statements.cornell.edu/2025/documents/cornell-settlement-agreement.pdf>; Resolution Agreement between the United States of America and Columbia University [hereafter Columbia University Resolution Agreement], July 23, 2025, https://president.columbia.edu/sites/president.columbia.edu/files/content/July%202025%20Announcement/Columbia%20University%20Resolution%20Agreement.pdf?utm_source=cio.

- the *Universities Nondiscrimination Act*, which prohibits universities from discriminating by race, sex, or other group identity and prohibits discriminatory concepts in administrative trainings; and
- the *Professional Association Liberty Act*, which prohibits all state funding or support for any professional association that requires commitments to discriminatory concepts, imposes censorship, or requires abridgement of First Amendment rights.⁶

Federal policymakers also might pass similar bills to remove DEI from IHEs.

- **Finances:** In the long run, both government and academic science would be better for a redirection of government research funds away from academic research, to encourage universities to support research through philanthropic and institutional funds.⁷ In the short run, federal policymakers should ensure that federal funds do not allow the subsidy of DEI bureaucracies and policies in the university. We recommend two model bills to achieve this goal:
 - the *Indirect Costs Act*, which caps university indirect costs charges at a maximum of 10% of the direct costs of the program; and
 - the *Science Depoliticization Act*, which forbids federal science agencies from funding research at institutions that impose DEI policies or identity-group discrimination.⁸

State policymakers also might pass similar bills regulating their financial support for public universities.

- **Irreproducibility Crisis:** Federal and state policymakers should act to address the irreproducibility crisis. The flood of irreproducible science not only wastes research dollars but also has come about through a network of professional incentives that has facilitated the imposition of DEI's politicized groupthink on scientific research. We recommend seven model bills to achieve this goal, but above all these two:
 - the *Reproducible Policy Act*, which requires federal agencies to use only publicly accessible research which (in appropriate disciplines) meets Good Laboratory Practice Standards in the most important regulatory actions and scientific inventories; and
 - the *Reproducible Grants Act*, which restricts new federal grant funding to publicly accessible research.⁹

6 College Finances Act, Civics Alliance, <https://civicsalliance.org/college-finances-act/>; Campus Intellectual Diversity Act, Civics Alliance, <https://civicsalliance.org/campus-intellectual-diversity-act/>; Universities Nondiscrimination Act, Civics Alliance, <https://civicsalliance.org/universities-nondiscrimination-act/>; Professional Association Liberty Act, Civics Alliance, <https://civicsalliance.org/professional-association-liberty-act/>.

7 Turner, *Rescuing Science*.

8 Indirect Costs Act, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/policy/model-science-policy-code/indirect-costs-act>; Science Depoliticization Act, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/policy/model-science-policy-code/science-depoliticization-act>.

9 Reproducible Policy Act, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/policy/model-science-policy-code/reproducible-policy-act>; Reproducible Grants Act, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/policy/model-science-policy-code/reproducible-grants-act>; and see Mathematical Modeling Act, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/policy/model-science-policy-code/mathematical-modeling-reform-act>; Weight of Evidence Act, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/policy/model-science-policy-code/weight-evidence-act>; Replication Studies Funding Act, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/policy/model-science-policy-code/replication-studies-funding-act>; Negative Research Act, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/policy/model-science-policy-code/negative-research-act>; Research Integrity Act, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/policy/model-science-policy-code/research-integrity-act>.

Alumni

Alumni donations provide an essential revenue stream for colleges and universities. University administrations have taken advantage of their alumni's fond memories of institutions that were very different from what they have become, effectively using alumni as cash cows to pay for DEI programs and policies they largely do not support. Alumni can exert pressure on IHEs to remove DEI by ceasing their donations to their universities and informing the university administrations that their donations will not resume until DEI programs and policies have been removed. Alumni also can rally public opinion to end DEI in their universities by joining alumni associations dedicated to that end, such as the MIT Free Speech Alliance or the Cornell Free Speech Alliance.¹⁰ Alumni from other universities should form parallel organizations with similar aims.

Boards of Trustees

Boards of trustees are the ultimate authority in universities. They grant appointments and tenure to faculty, they vet, hire, and can dismiss university presidents, and they can veto proposed administrative policies. Practically speaking, while trustees must take responsibility for all university policies, they cannot be expected to micromanage university governance. Rather, they are custodians of the public trust that grants universities their unique place in society. By deferring much of their powers to university administrators, from the president on down, trustees are neglecting their responsibility to the public and our society.

Boards of trustees should set policies removing DEI from all aspects of the university. To make sure these policies are carried out, they must appoint university presidents and high officials (deans, provosts) who will defend the unique mission of the university from political, partisan, or discriminatory policies. Part of this will mean altering the search process for these positions. Faculty committees, which almost universally are committed to DEI, no longer should be allowed to select candidates, since they will veto any candidates who oppose DEI. Nor should Boards employ mainstream executive search firms that make commitment to DEI a criterion of their screening protocols.¹¹ Boards should set up new search processes that will select for university administrators dedicated to removing DEI.

University Administrators

University administrators are primarily responsible for the imposition of DEI on universities, so the present body of administrators presumably knows what could be done to rid universities of DEI ideology. That this ideology persists is *prima facie* evidence that they just don't wish to. To rid universities of DEI ideology, they must be forced to do so. Our advice to university administrators, therefore, is the same advice we would give to a hypothetical university president intent on reform.

¹⁰ MIT Free Speech Alliance, <https://www.mitfreespeech.org>; Cornell Free Speech Alliance, <https://www.cornellfreespeech.org>.

¹¹ David Randall, "Fighting the Status Quo: Reform Faculty Search Committees," National Association of Scholars, September 26, 2025, <https://www.nas.org/blogs/article/fighting-the-status-quo-reform-faculty-search-committees>.

- *Fire the DEI Bureaucrats.* The bloated DEI bureaucracy that afflicts most universities has proven very difficult to dislodge. These bureaucracies are parasitic: the only thing DEI bureaucrats know how to do is impose DEI. If you give them another job, they will turn it into a DEI machine—and they will rally resistance to you. Find out who the DEI bureaucrats are and terminate their employment.
- *Oversee Faculty Hiring and Student Admissions.* DEI advocates have subverted traditional faculty autonomy in screening new faculty colleagues and students, by seizing control of faculty hiring and student admissions. Monitor both of these processes in detail, and where adherence to DEI ideology has been made a condition for recruitment and retention, take steps to refocus recruitment and retention on the principles of Merit, Fairness, and Equality.¹²
- *Remove Faculty Who Explicitly Promote Scientific Misconduct.* Too many professors now favor outright research misconduct in the name of DEI activism.¹³ Professors who promote scientific misconduct in the name of DEI ideology have committed an offense that merits revocation of tenure and removal from university employment.

Professors

Professors already have lost much of their power to university administrators—and, within faculty, cliques of DEI advocates have the power to ruin professional careers. We would prefer that professors speak up fearlessly for merit, fairness, and equality, and to call out abrogations of these principles (and the law) by university administrators and by their colleagues. Practically, many fear to do so, because reputations, careers, and continued research funding can be ruined. Junior colleagues are particularly vulnerable to such damage, which puts a special responsibility on senior professors to call out their colleagues and administrations on their misconduct and subterfuge of academic integrity. Simply speaking up can make a great difference in restoring faculty autonomy and the ethic of discovery to science. Senior professors can also adhere scrupulously to fair and objective grading policies.

Students

Students opposed to DEI are in the most precarious position of all in the university. While there would be some value to speaking clearly against DEI, and organizing against it, even to resist the arrant politicization of education is a distraction from actual study. Students should avoid politicized classes and seek rigorous ones. They should practice the sort of free, fearless, and tolerant speech that is anathema to DEI advocates. They should study to acquire the vocation of true scientists, which requires a truth-seeking and humble character. If they succeed in doing so, they will have defeated the DEI advocates who seek to destroy the sciences, in the most important way possible.

¹² Dorian S. Abbot, Ivan Marinovic, Richard Lowery, and Carlos Carvalho, "Merit, Fairness, and Equality," *Heterodox STEM*, August 5, 2022, <https://hxstem.substack.com/p/merit-fairness-and-equality>.

¹³ Colin Wright, "'Data Activism' and the Death of Truth," *Reality's Last Stand*, November 3, 2025, <https://www.realityslaststand.com/p/data-activism-and-the-death-of-truth>.

DEI in the Sciences

Ideas Op-eds

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION
of SCHOLARS

An effective opinion piece should be 650-800 words. To make the point about the corruption DEI has imposed on university science, you should find a vivid, recent anecdote that makes the point—a politicized class or administrative program, a politicized campus event, a quotation from a professor that makes clear that they cannot distinguish politics from science, or may even have used unscientific falsehood to advance divisive political opinions. A concrete university expenditure for DEI purposes often provides a useful hook.

The anecdote should be followed by a lucid brief explanation of what is wrong with DEI and why its elimination from universities matters. The material in our Model Letters to University Presidents and State Policymakers can be adapted for that purpose. These should explain the issue to readers who don't know anything about DEI or universities—which is the typical reader. Don't write down to the reader; write as if you're explaining the issue to an intelligent friend who doesn't happen to know about this issue.

Use a calm tone. Say what is bad, but don't telegraph outrage. Make sure the vivid anecdote you write makes it clear to the reader what is outrageous. Don't pull punches, but be civil.

Be ready to write again and again and again, each time a new anecdote of DEI malfeasance comes along! If you can discover new information, by FOIA requests or other means, use those to provide material for new op-eds. Concentrate your FOIA requests on a single topic, such as communications with faculty search committees. A series of focused op-eds will be more effective than a one-off.

And, consider setting your own Substack, blog, X account, or other online venue. Newspapers may not necessarily want to publish everything you have to say. You can build an online audience and be your own newspaper!

DEI in the Sciences

Letter to a College President

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION
of SCHOLARS

Dear President {Last Name},

I write as {an alumnus/a long-time donor} to express my concern regarding the penetration of “diversity, equity, and inclusion” (DEI) ideology into {University}, especially the sciences. As the National Association of Scholars has illustrated in several case studies, DEI has a profoundly corrosive effect on academic science.¹ DEI is not only illiberal and destructive of the ideals of individual excellence and achievement but also is antithetical to the very idea of the unfettered search for truth, without which science cannot operate. {University} should eliminate its programmatic commitments to DEI, including the regulatory regimes that support DEI, and the DEI bureaucracies that implement it.

{Vivid example, ideally personal, about University’s DEI policies and their malign effects.}

As {an alumnus/a long-time donor}, I care about how {University} educates our next generation. I want to see my community thrive. But I do not want my donations wasted on politically divisive and educationally counterproductive endeavors. Therefore I urge you to:

- 1. Eliminate staff positions and responsibilities dedicated to advancing DEI and other ideologically motivated policies.** Positions that promote “wellness” and “critical race theory” are about influencing students’ perceptions rather than cultivating knowledge — the main purpose of a university. Additionally, critical race theory and its cousins (diversity, social justice, so-called “anti-racism”) teach students to resent their country based on past actual or perceived injustices, ultimately turning students against one another and against their own country.² I urge you to eliminate all full-time staff positions dedicated to such roles. I also urge you to remove all responsibilities for DEI and other such ideologically motivated policies from jobs with broader responsibilities, such as Student Life and Residential Life.
- 2. Eliminate DEI programs and policies:** I urge you to eliminate all discriminatory, illiberal, and politicized programs, policies, grants, etc., whether dedicated to DEI, social justice, so-called “anti-racism”, or any other similar purpose.
- 3. Eliminate remedial education and related services.** Offering remedial education to bring poorly prepared students up to college-level competency is a failure to maintain admissions standards. Money spent on remedial education is wasted and penalizes students who are properly prepared when they matriculate. Luring unqualified students into {University}, straps them with debt, while setting them up to fail to complete their degree. I urge you to end all of {University}’s remedial education mission states, policies, and programs, including “student success.” I also urge you

¹ *Case Studies of DEI at America’s Technical Institutes Series*, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/report-series/case-studies-of-dei-at-americas-technical-institutes>.

² See David Randall, *Social Justice Education in America*, National Association of Scholars, December 2019, https://www.nas.org/storage/app/media/Reports/Social%20Justice%20Education%20in%20America/NAS_Social%20Justice_Report-Web.pdf.

to encourage prospective students that don't meet **{University}**'s strong admissions qualifications to attend community college, where they can acquire the knowledge they need to transfer to **{University}** or another 4-year college or university.

I am placing my usual donations to **{University}** on hold until such time as you announce and carry out the removal of all aspects of DEI, and similar discriminatory policies, from my alma mater. I very much hope that you will make it possible for me to start giving again to **{University}** as soon as possible.

Respectfully,
{Insert name}

DEI in the Sciences

Letter to a State Policymaker

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION
of SCHOLARS

Dear {Governor/Senator/Representative} {Last Name},

I live in {Town/County} and I'm writing to express my concern regarding the penetration of "diversity, equity, and inclusion" (DEI) ideology into {State University}, especially the sciences. As the National Association of Scholars has illustrated in several case studies, DEI has a profoundly corrosive effect on academic science.¹ DEI is not only illiberal and destructive of the ideals of individual excellence and achievement but also antithetical to the very idea of the unfettered search for truth, without which science cannot operate. {State University} should eliminate its programmatic commitments to DEI, DEI regulations, and DEI bureaucracies, especially in the sciences.

{Vivid example, ideally personal, about State University's DEI policies and their malign effects.}

As {a lifetime citizen of State}, I care about how {University} educates our next generation. I want to see my state's public university thrive. But I do not want my tax dollars wasted on politically divisive and educationally counterproductive endeavors. Therefore I urge you to inform the {State Board of Regents} and the {University President} that they should:

- 1. Eliminate staff positions and responsibilities dedicated to advancing DEI and other ideologically motivated policies.** Positions that promote "wellness" and "critical race theory" are about influencing students' perceptions rather than cultivating knowledge — the main purpose of a university. Additionally, critical race theory and its cousins (diversity, social justice, so-called "anti-racism") teach students to resent their country based on past actual or perceived injustices, ultimately turning students against one another and against their own country.² This is not a suitable use of public monies. They should eliminate all full-time staff positions dedicated to such roles. They also should remove all responsibilities for DEI and other such ideologically motivated policies from jobs with broader responsibilities, such as Student Life and Residential Life.
- 2. Eliminate DEI programs and policies:** They should eliminate all discriminatory, illiberal, and politicized programs, policies, grants, etc., whether dedicated to DEI, social justice, so-called "anti-racism", or any other divisive purpose.
- 3. Eliminate remedial education and related services.** Money spent to bring students up to the standard they should have possessed before they were admitted to college is money wasted by a college that has failed to maintain proper admissions standards. By luring unqualified students into {University}, strapping them with debt, then watching them fail to complete their degree, they are creating a generation of poorer Americans. They should end all of {University}'s remedial education mission states, policies, and programs, including "student success." They also should

¹ *Case Studies of DEI at America's Technical Institutes Series*, National Association of Scholars, <https://www.nas.org/report-series/case-studies-of-dei-at-americas-technical-institutes>.

² See David Randall, *Social Justice Education in America*, National Association of Scholars, December 2019, https://www.nas.org/storage/app/media/Reports/Social%20Justice%20Education%20in%20America/NAS_Social%20Justice_Report-Web.pdf.

encourage prospective students that don't meet **{University}**'s strong admissions qualifications to attend community college, where they can acquire the knowledge they need to transfer to **{University}** or another 4-year college or university, or consider developing a trade in a vocational school.

If the **{State Board of Regents}** and the **{University President}** don't immediately announce and carry out the removal of all aspects of DEI, and similar discriminatory policies, I urge you to end state government financial support to **{State University}** until they do.

Respectfully,
{Insert name}

DEI in the Sciences **Phone Script to a State Policymaker**

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION
of SCHOLARS

I live in {Town/County} and I'm writing to express my concern regarding the penetration of "diversity, equity, and inclusion" (DEI) ideology into {State University}, especially the sciences. DEI is not only illiberal and destructive of the ideals of individual excellence and achievement but also antithetical to the very idea of the unfettered search for truth, without which science cannot operate. {State University} should eliminate its programmatic commitments to DEI, DEI regulations, and DEI bureaucracies, especially in the sciences.

As {a lifetime citizen of State}, I care about how {University} educates our next generation. I want to see my state's public university thrive. But I do not want my tax dollars spent on politically divisive and educationally counterproductive endeavors. Therefore I urge you to inform the {State Board of Regents} and the {University President} that they should:

1. **Eliminate staff positions and responsibilities dedicated to advancing DEI and other ideologically motivated policies.** They also should remove all responsibilities for DEI and other such ideologically motivated policies from jobs with broader responsibilities, such as Student Life and Residential Life.
2. **Eliminate DEI programs and policies.**
3. **Eliminate remedial education and related services.** By luring unqualified students into {University}, strapping them with debt, then watching them fail to complete their degree they are creating a generation of poorer Americans. They should end all of {University}'s remedial education mission states, policies, and programs, including "student success."

If the {State Board of Regents} and the {University President} don't immediately announce and carry out the removal of all aspects of DEI, and similar discriminatory policies, I urge you to end state government financial support to {State University} until they do.

Respectfully,
{Insert name}

DEI in the Sciences

Phone Script to a University

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION
of SCHOLARS

I am {an alumnus/a long-time donor}. I live in {town}.

I'm calling to express my concern regarding the penetration of "diversity, equity, and inclusion" (DEI) ideology into {University}, especially the sciences. DEI has a profoundly corrosive effect on academic science. DEI is illiberal and destructive of the ideals of individual excellence and achievement. It is also antithetical to the very idea of the unfettered search for truth: the core value of the university. {University} should eliminate entirely its programmatic commitments to DEI, DEI regulations, and DEI bureaucracies.

As {an alumnus/a long-time donor}, I care about how {University} educates the next and future generations. I am happy to contribute to helping my community thrive, both now and into the future. But I do not want my donations wasted on politically divisive and educationally counterproductive endeavors. Therefore I urge {University} to:

1. **Eliminate staff positions and responsibilities dedicated to advancing DEI and other divisive and ideologically motivated policies.** I also urge you to remove all responsibilities for DEI and other similar policies from jobs with broader responsibilities, such as Student Life and Residential Life.
2. **Eliminate DEI programs and policies.**
3. **Eliminate remedial education and related services.** By luring unqualified students into {University}, strapping them with debt, then watching them fail to complete their degree you are creating a generation of poorer Americans. I urge you to end all of {University}'s remedial education mission states, policies, and programs, including "student success."

I am placing my usual donations to {University} on hold until such time as you announce and carry out the removal of all aspects of DEI, and similar discriminatory policies, from my alma mater. I very much hope that you will make it possible for me to start giving again to {University} as soon as possible.

Thank you.

DEI in the Sciences Scorecard



NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION
of SCHOLARS

DEI Element	Yes/No
Diversity Statement	
DEI Job Advertisements	
Identity-Group Student Organizations	
Identity-Group Mentoring	
DEI Surveys	
DEI Talks	
DEI Councils (Faculty and/or Administrators)	
DEI Admissions Standards	
DEI Hiring Standards	
DEI Tenuring Standards	
DEI Faculty Research	
DEI Research Grants	
No Expressed Opposition to DEI	