

ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting | April 26, 2022 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm | Zoom

Academic Senator Attendance

Jessica A. Alabi, <i>at-Large</i>	Absent	Cyndee Ely, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	Present
Jason Ball, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	Present	Lee Gordon, <i>at-Large, President</i>	Present
Carol Barnes, <i>Counseling</i>	Present	Marilyn Kennedy, <i>Lit & Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary</i>	Present
Tyler Boogar, <i>Math & Sciences</i>	Present	Doug Lloyd, <i>at-Large</i>	Absent
Nina Calabretta, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	Present	Dan Matulis, <i>Athletics & Kinesiology</i>	Present
Irving Chavez Jimenez, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Leland Means, <i>Visual & Performing Arts</i>	Present
Eric Cohen, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Jeanne Neil, <i>Business & Computing</i>	Present
Sean Connor, <i>at-Large</i>	Present		
Eric Cuellar, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Charles Otwell, <i>Curriculum Chair</i>	Present
Jodi Della Marna, <i>Library</i>	Present	Max Pena, <i>at-Large</i>	Present
Matt Denney, <i>Technology</i>	Present	Loren Sachs, <i>at-Large, Immediate Past President</i>	Present
Tina DeShano, <i>Consumer & Health Sciences</i>	Present	Jordan Stanton, <i>Social & Behavioral Sciences</i>	Present
Rendell Drew, <i>at-Large, Vice-President</i>	Present	Katherine Smith, <i>ASOCC Student Representative</i>	Present

Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In): Jaki Kamphuis, Jeanette Grimm, Kate McCarroll, Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Renee De Long.

1. Preliminary Matters

- A. **Call to Order:** President Lee Gordon called the meeting to order at 11:30 A.M.
- B. **Opportunity for Public Comment:** Anna Hanlon.
- C. **Approval of the Minutes:** *Motion 1: Senator Kennedy moved to* approve the April 19, 2022, meeting minutes; motion seconded; motion approved.
- D. **For the Good of the Order:**

Senator Cuellar: Extended an invitation to the Senate to three different events:

CLEEO 2.0 – Cinco de Mayo: Chicanx-Latinx Platica/Discussion: A roundtable that will host students, staff, faculty and administrators on May 5, 12:15 to 1:15 p.m., with an open discussion on perspectives on Cinco de Mayo and its significance to the Chicanx and Latinx communities, facilitated by Dr. Giovanni Hortua.

CLEEO 2.0 – Respect, Empathy, & Discovery: Seeking Solidarity with One Another: May 4, 1-2 p.m., with distinguished writer, literary scholar, and cultural icon, Professor Helena Maria Viramontes of Arts and Sciences and English at Cornell University. She will be presenting *Respect, Empathy, and Discovery: Seeking Solidarity with One Another*. Professor Viramontes is a significant literary figure who was fundamental in the formation of the Chicanx literary canon.

Heriberto Luna Art Exhibition at the Doyle Art Pavilion: The Doyle Art Pavilion and the CLEEO Project present the nationally acclaimed artist, Heriberto Luna. Her art exhibition will be from May 3-12 with an informal reception on May 5, 5 to 7 p.m.

2. Consent Agenda:

Point of Order 1: President Gordon explained that two senators requested that items be removed from the Consent Calendar: the EEO & Equity Advisory Committee and all the tenure-track committees, and so they will be removed.

There are two open slots on the EEO & Equity Advisory Committee, three faculty who have applied for them, so those names will be drawn from the hat at the E-Board meeting today [and placed on the Consent Calendar next week]. There was a call sent out for the tenure-track committees and we ranked the respondents and put them on the agenda for today, but it was not fully in compliance with the rules of the Senate [[Committee Member and Task Force Volunteer Appointment Selection Process Resolution](#) and CFE Contract 8.5.c (1): *one tenured faculty member appointed by the Senate from outside of evaluatee's discipline.*] so in the E-Board today we will draw the names from the hat for each tenure-track committee and select one Senate representative for each; these will go on the consent calendar for next week.

Point of Order 2: Senator Kennedy noted that the Curriculum Committee Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) representative does not need to be on the Consent Agenda, as that is an elected-by-the-division position and does not require Senate approval. The Curriculum Committee SBS representative was removed, as that person was elected by the division.

Temporarily Relinquishing the Chair: President Gordon noted that there are three positions for senators-at-large, and since he is one of two volunteers, he was handing the gavel for this vote over to **Vice-President Drew**. Vice-President Drew announced the positions on the Consent Agenda for acclamation:

Senators at-Large: Lee Gordon & Loren Sachs

Motion 2: Senator Kennedy moved to approve the consent agenda for the senators at large; motion seconded; motion approved. Vice-President Drew returned to gavel to President Gordon to proceed with the meeting.

3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. President and Vice President's Reports:

President Gordon's Report:

Summer Courses: Stated that two important courses are on the summer 2022 class schedule: (1) There is a new program on non-profit management and one of its courses, Non-Profit Accounting, is scheduled with Professor Ely, Tuesday evenings, 6:30 p.m., for five weeks starting on June 14. (2) Professor Rudmann will be teaching HIST A198 - The World at War, which is on World War I and World War II. The course meets Monday through Thursdays, at noon, June 13th through July 7th.

Faculty Hiring: When the Office of Instruction had checked enrollment records and the viability process records, it was verified that there has been low enrollment for Electronics and so there was concern about the ability to offer a full load in electronics instruction if a full-time faculty member is hired. In discussions with the College President and the Vice-President of Instruction, Vice-President Drew and President Gordon agreed that it is in the best interests of the college to make a change in one of the positions slated for full-time faculty hiring this year. They will not be hiring an electronics instructor this year but to fill the

thirteenth and final position, the College President has agreed to turn to the next ranked position on the full-time hiring prioritization table and hire a philosophy professor. He thanked President Suarez for her cooperation. Due to the urgency of time, President Gordon will ask the Executive Board to designate a member of the Senate to serve on the philosophy tenure review committee at today's E-board meeting. [\[Committee Member and Task Force Volunteer Appointment Selection Process Resolution and CFE Contract 8.5.c \(1\) \(d\): One tenured Faculty Member appointed by the Senate from outside of the evaluatee's discipline.\]](#)

COVID Mandates: In a four-to-one vote, the Coast District Board of Trustees voted Wednesday to shift Board the policy language *from* "mandates" *to* "strongly recommends" masks, testing and vaccine COVID 19 mitigation strategies — to be effective June 1st. There will no longer be mask or vaccine mandates in the summer. Chancellor Weispenning said that "Given the difficulty of maintaining an ongoing testing protocol, continued enforcement of a vaccination mandate would have diminishing returns and rising costs." The Chancellor also predicted that if the District did not adjust its COVID policies, approximately 30% of Coast District students would attend a different set of community colleges outside of the CCCD.

Vice-President Drew's Report:

DEIA Plan: Stated that today we will be discussing the DEIA Plan. They are finishing up the input for the plan. This is the first time that the college designed a plan like this; it is a very significant step. All senators should have had the opportunity to review the plan. As a member of the President's Taskforce on Equity and Inclusion there was a discussion at the last meeting on how to collect the feedback and how it will be brought back. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is responsible for analyzing the feedback and sending it out to the leads. He would like to see a higher response on faculty feedback. This is their chance to have tangible input that is being heard. This will also be part of the Educational Master Plan.

Point of Order 3: Senator Kennedy noted that the E-Board does not have the philosophy professor appointment volunteer names, but we do have a draw at the E-Board today for all the tenure-track committee members and since there are more volunteers than tenure committee positions, we will have somebody from those volunteers who we can put on that committee and that way everybody knows it will be done at the meeting.

B. Union/Bargaining Unit Report – CFE President Rob Schneiderman:

CFE President Schneiderman stated that they have not had any additional negotiations on Competency-Based Education with the District, as the session was canceled last Friday. There is a session scheduled for this upcoming Friday and there is an additional issue now: there is a little trouble determining minimum qualifications for one of the positions that is being hired right now. He is concerned because HR said in an email that determining minimum qualifications "was not solely faculty purview."

C. Academic Freedom Committee Report—Co-Chair Marilyn Kennedy

Co-Chair Kennedy stated that she would summarize the longer Academic Freedom (AF) Committee report she is submitting to the Senate for the record [\[see full report in the Appendix at the end of these minutes\]](#). The AF Committee met twice in the last three weeks. They met first on Competency-Based Education (CBE). The decision at that meeting was to ensure faculty academic freedom, CBE education *must* go through the

OCC curriculum process and that any CBE be taught only by OCC full-time or part-time faculty. The union should deal with any compensation issues.

They AF Committee also met last week to discuss the Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Plan as per its impacts on academic freedom. They committee is in dialogue with the Foundation for Individual Rights and Education ([FIRE](#)) about two aspects of this issue: academic freedom and First Amendment rights. The AF Committee reviewed the whole plan and focused on areas that had to do with those issues:

- 5.1.3 Design a syllabus review process with peer and student reviews, reviewing every faculty member's syllabus
- 2.1.2 Provide anti-racist learning and include this as part of the evaluation process
- 2.1.4 Create required training

Overall academic freedom and constitutional rights were reviewed; they are two separate issues. The discussion and analysis that followed focused on the syllabus as a faculty member's intellectual property. **Emeritus Professor Arismendi-Pardi** was at the meeting discussing that in detail. Requiring a mandated personal statement in a faculty member's syllabus and having it peer reviewed by faculty and students removes that faculty member's academic freedom, intellectual property, and also takes away from the intellectual classroom environment necessary for faculty and class discussions of difficult subjects. This is also true of any evaluation based on this. In addition, as a faculty member has individual constitutional rights and therefore required statements violate the faculty member's individual First Amendment rights by compelling speech via a government entity, as OCC is a public college.

Secondarily, there was a discussion and analysis on mandated training and there was no disagreement about mandated training per se. The concern is that there would be backlash to this training, as research is showing this to be the effect and was discussed in the last two weeks in the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* and other places. Additionally, training that might require a faculty member's agreement with a statement or belief to complete or certify the training is compelled speech and that would not be acceptable.

There is a long statement in the full AF Committee report about the need for diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. It is important, essential, and valued. There is a statement from the American University Senate about that, as well as the Academic Freedom Alliance. The AF Committee is also communicating with FIRE about these two issues that have to do with academic freedom and First Amendment rights to continue to have the diversity, equity, and inclusion process move forward but in a way that works so that it does not violate those two important freedoms.

- D. Faculty Handbook Subcommittee - Vice President Drew:** Reported that the subcommittee met on April 20. That is the last meeting of the semester. They have made a lot of recommendations, collectively and individually, to implement the handbook. He will have a full report at the end of the semester with the major recommendations that they are making to the VPI Office to include in the handbook.

4. Unfinished Business

A. Diversity, Equity, Inclusiveness, and Accessibility (DEIA) Task Force Report:

Vice-President Drew: Stated that as a part of the President's Taskforce in Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Accessibility, they spent a lot of time going through the plan that was first presented to the Senate three weeks ago.

Professor Anna Hanlon: Shared a PowerPoint Presentation and noted that previously, they came to the Senate on April 5 and requested feedback through a Google form specific for the faculty. The plan was to return to this meeting, review the feedback, and get a potential endorsement.

In terms of the data, because of the complexity of the feedback, the DEIA Taskforce has asked that the research analysts at the Office of Institutional Effectiveness conduct the qualitative analysis of the feedback and they can report back key themes and clusters of ideas to the DEIA Taskforce for consideration. This provides a variety of benefits. First, the analysis will be completed by those who are truly trained in qualitative analysis. It keeps the data very secure, supporting the DEIA Taskforce's intention of keeping the feedback anonymous and confidential. By having them do it and then reporting back their analysis to the DEIA Task Force, it is a better way to go.

This is still a draft, and they are also asking for an endorsement [of the draft]. If there is feedback that results in any significant change to the document, they will return in the fall with that for additional vetting of that document and ask for a second endorsement.

She reiterated Dr. Suarez's commitment to the faculty purview over the areas of 10+1. She has repeatedly reminded the Taskforce about that purview, and she is genuine in her asserting that and making sure that that happens. As of today, they have received 36 responses, 69% of those are from full-time faculty and 30% from part-time faculty [Per the [OCC Atlas](#), [OCC has 736 faculty members.](#)] In terms of the outcome of the review, there were 34 of the 36 that responded. Those responses split in terms of feeling that there needed to be revisions or some revisions and recommendations.

President Gordon: Asked for clarification as to what is going to happen to the commentary that comes out of the Senate meeting today. Is it correct that because the Office of Institutional Research has quantitative analysis skills that they are going to be the parties to filter the responses that come today and to decide which ones make it through and which ones do not?

Professor Hanlon: Stated that "filter" is not the correct term. They are trained in analysis, so they are going to look at the data because it is complex. That is not saying that Dr. Drew and she could not do it and it is also something that they can be part of because with the comprehensive evaluation of processes they had a quantitative data collection that Kelly Holt and she participated in. However, their role is not to filter.

President Gordon: Stated his concerns are that the Senate will have specific objections that are going to be raised to this report and those will be clustered. Those clusters may, in fact, filter and bury the individual responses into a categorical response. He believes this is a qualitative not a quantitative issue. Instead of using this clustering method which has been used before at OCC, where responses disappear into clusters, that they use a qualitative response system so that the Senate can know that the points made will make it through.

Professor Hanlon: When they talk about clusters, they might find that there is a cluster that says, "a change in the language." For example, Senator Kennedy made the comment

about a requirement of training, so there might be a recommendation to change that word to optional or there might be recommendations to add verbiage regarding academic freedom. Those might be clustered in terms of changes in the text, but then under that, they would list all the individual changes. They are different recommendations for changes in the language.

President Gordon: Does not prefer the clustering process as he has been through the clustering process at OCC and has seen where specific individual requests disappear into the clusters. This is too important for that. These issues should be taken up and considered by the committee on merit. The Senate should not yield its purview to a clustering process outside of the Senate's control. If necessary, the Senate can delay the process by having the Senate take all of the analysis and have a separate meeting of the Senate and have all of the issues held. He does not want to see these items disappear in the clustering process which he has seen happen before at OCC. This is too important to allow that to happen.

Professor Hanlon: Asked what the recommendation is so she can take that back to the DEIA Taskforce.

President Gordon: A different system than the clustering method.

Vice-President Drew: Made the recommendation not to vote on this item today and have it brought back next week on May 3. That would also give the faculty more time to look the document over and consider President Gordon's input about the clustering methodology. As Professor Hanlon stated, they do not tell the Institutional Effectiveness Office what to do or how to package their research and present out. The hope is to get the direct input and put it down because if they do that, they will still have that quantifiable information to the clustering effect. These statements and concerns will be brought to the Taskforce.

Professor Hanlon: Stated that the feedback received from reviews so far is split in terms of deletions, additions, or other edits. She went over the demographics of the responses today. The feedback link will be put on chat again.

Senator Kennedy: Added that there are issues in terms of academic freedom and First Amendment compelled speech in public education. Even if everybody thought those were great ideas, it does not eradicate the fact that there are still constitutional rights that would be violated. There are a lot of things in the proposal that are great and the in the Academic Freedom Committee we discussed that we want this to be successful.

Professor Hanlon: Thanked Senator Kennedy for her comments and noted that there are other documents on campus that have academic freedom statements in them, to make sure that their processes are not meant to trump any academic freedom rights. She added that the plan is a broad general view. The Academic Senate is identified as being the lead. The Senate will determine how the details will be implemented and what actions will be taken.

Vice-President Drew: Reviewed each one of the goals and objectives of the DEIA plan and commented on the recommendations made to improve those and how they are attached to the Educational Master Plan. He reviewed the first goal to create and sustain a diverse and equitable infrastructure, increase the diversity of hiring committees and recruitment and mentoring of new employees, plus others aspects to create this infrastructure throughout the college. This will be back on May 3 for a vote on endorsement.

B. Competency-Based Education (CBE)/Coast District – Loren Sachs & Charles Otwell

President Gordon: Asked President Emeritus Sachs and Curriculum Chair Otwell to further comment on the extent to which there had been the realization on the part of OCC faculty leadership at the time that this CBE item was first advanced, about a year ago, and whether there was an understanding of the scale of the idea and provide a bit of a historic retrospective.

President Emeritus Sachs: Stated that it has been about a year-and-a-half ago since this topic stated first being discussed at the District; it was something that the District was just exploring. The fear then was that they were going to do something district-wide and that would not be something acceptable because each college was unique, each college had their own curriculum committee, etc. The idea of a one-size-fits-all was never part of it. There is now a perception at the District that all three colleges have known about this proposal to the policies all along and that is not the case. This is not what the Senates at GWC and OCC agreed to.

President Gordon: Reiterated Senator Sachs' point which is that the narrative from the District now is why are the OCC and GWC academic senates revisiting this issue now? This is a settled matter. This was presented to the colleges more than a year ago so why are they doing this? A year ago, OCC and GWC never indicated an acceptance of this initiative, and they had no idea the scale with which it was going to be proposed to be implemented.

Curriculum Chair Otwell: What came up about a year ago was Credit for Prior Learning. We were worrying about the District trying to dictate to OCC how its processes should work. Competency-Based Education came out much more recently. We have known about the statewide senate push on this for over a year, but he did not know anything about Coastline's plans until very recently. They did have a District curriculum meeting last week where he asked the chairs from Coastline about this, and they did not know that much about it either yet. They are thinking that curriculum-wise, there will be an addendum for a competency-based education option for a course. They will do it with the addendum process, which would make sense because then they can ask for separate approval of the addendum as a piece of curriculum. At this point that is all he knows about CBE.

Senator Kennedy: As the OCC representative at the Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (BPAP) meeting on Friday, I will be required to vote on this. My take is that the Senate wants me to vote "no." Do you want me to request changes, as well? In response to a request from President Gordon, she noted that the faculty vote is not predominant on the BPAP committee, and this CBE issue is primarily and faculty purview issue. She is concerned about that. This affects all teachers everywhere on campus. We need a stronger voice.

President Gordon: Stated the relative voting strength of faculty on that important district-wide board policy and administrative procedures committee in terms of the representatives of the OCC and GWC Academic Senates, etc., indicates a weakness in shared governance at the district level, not at the college level. They have vigorous shared governance and effective shared governance at the college level. Even though the District is under the same laws and structures as the College, the College, in fact, is a unit of the District. In this case where there seems to be clear opposition by the faculties of the two colleges which combined represent a substantial majority of the entire District are not able to have their voice heard effectively because of the structure of this District committee. In the next academic year, it might be worthwhile to look at a way to have more effective shared governance at the level of the Coast district.

C. Fall Flex Day: Faculty Ideas – Vice-President Drew: Not enough time to go over this agenda item. This will return next week

5. New Business

No items under new business.

6. Adjournment of the Regular Meeting

President Gordon adjourned the meeting at 12:29 p.m.

7. Approval of the Minutes:

MINUTES: First draft written by Beatriz Rodriguez, Administrative Assistant to the Senates. Revision of first draft and Senate-approved drafts written by Senate Secretary, Marilyn Kennedy, who also distributes the final Senate-approved version to the Chancellor, Board of Trustees members and secretary, union presidents, GWC and Coastline Academic Senate presidents, OCC College President and faculty as per OCC Senate bylaws.

Voting Tallies Chart

Motion 1	Motion 2	Senate Membership
4/19/22 Minutes	Consent Agenda	

Please note that the Presiding Officer's vote shall be recorded as an abstention, unless breaking a tie vote.

Absent	Absent	Alabi, Jessica A.: Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Ball, Jason: Part-Time Senator (2021-2022)
Aye	Aye	Barnes, Carol: Counseling Senator (2021-2024)
Aye	Aye	Boogar, Tyler: Math and Sciences Senator (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Calabretta, Nina (Part-Time Senator (2021-2022)
Absent	Absent	Chavez Jimenez, Irving: Senator-at-Large (2021-2024) 11:49 arrival
Aye	Aye	Cohen, Eric: Senator-at-Large (2021-2024)
Aye	Aye	Connor, Sean: Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Cuellar, Eric: Senator-at-Large (2021-2024)
Aye	Aye	Della Marna, Jodi: Library & Learning Support Senator (2020-23)
Absent	Aye	Denney, Matt: Technology Senator (2020-2023) 11:34 arrival
Aye	Aye	De Shano, Tina: Consumer Health Sciences Senator (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Drew, Rendell: Vice President , Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Ely, Cyndee: Part-Time Senator (2021-2022)
Abstain	Abstain	Gordon, Lee: President , Senator-at-Large (2019-2022)
Aye	Aye	Kennedy, Marilyn: Secretary , Lit and Lang Senator (2019-2022)
Aye	Aye	Lloyd, Doug: Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Matulis, Dan: Athletics and Kinesiology Senator (2020-2023)

Aye	Aye	Means, Leland: Visual and Performing Arts Senator (2021-2024)
Aye	Aye	Neil, Jeanne: Business and Computing Senator (2019-2022)
--	--	Otwell, Charles: Curriculum Chair (Non-Voting)
Aye	Aye	Pena, Max: Senator-at-Large (2019-2022)
Aye	Aye	Sachs, Loren: Senator-at-Large (2019-2022)
Aye	Aye	Stanton, Jordan: Social and Behavioral Sciences Senator (2019-2022)

Appendix

Academic Freedom Committee Report and Statement

There was review and discussion of the following portions of the OCC DEIA Plan that mandate particular positions or ideologies in the form of written or oral statements, per syllabi, syllabi peer review and student review, faculty evaluation, and required training:

- 5.1.3. Design syllabus review process with peer-review and standard rubric, involving students in the process of review.
- 2.1.2. Provide antiracist learning (accessible learning, accountability in evaluation, standard of DEIA)
- 2.1.4. Create required and compensated professional development and training programs that addresses culturally responsive curriculum and pedagogy for faculty. (OCC DEIA Plan, April 8, 2022)

Academic freedom and constitutional rights research was reviewed, with the subsequent discussion focused on two issues: (1) the academic freedom of the professor and (2) the U.S. First Amendment constitutional rights of the individual.

Discussion and analysis focused on the syllabus as a faculty member’s intellectual property. Therefore, requiring a mandated personal DEIA statement in a faculty member’s syllabus and having it peer reviewed or student reviewed for conformity to some standard violates a faculty member’s academic freedom and also dismantles the intellectual classroom environment that facilitates the robust investigation of ideas. This is subsequently true of any evaluation based this. . Further, a faculty member has individual constitutional rights; therefore, this also violates the First Amendment rights of the faculty member by compelling speech via a government entity.

There was additional discussion and analysis on mandated training. We are not against mandated training per se, but research strongly suggests that the consequences will likely create a “backfire” effect (*Washington Post, New York Times*). However, training that would require a faculty member’s agreement to an ideology or statement would result in additional removal of the faculty member’s academic freedom and add an extra burden of individual loss of constitutional rights by compelling speech. These concerns bear more profundity at a public university [government entity], which must uphold First Amendment rights, by law.

The Academic Freedom Alliance acknowledges that

It is a serious intrusion on the freedom of speech of the faculty to mandate or otherwise direct that such statements must be included in individual course syllabi or otherwise adopted or embraced by individual professors. The inclusion of anti-racism statements in course syllabi must be voluntary and left to the conscience of individual professors.

Mandatory anti-racism statements currently being developed are in principle indistinguishable from myriad other statements of belief that university officials have

sometimes attempted to force members of the faculty to endorse in the past. No matter how widely shared or normatively desirable any particular statement of values might be, individual professors should not be directed or coerced to endorse or accept such statements.

For public universities, mandating that professors embrace such statements is a clear violation of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

These statements and quotes above are made concurrently with the acknowledgement that the issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion need not come at the expense of academic freedom. In fact, a central purpose of academic freedom is precisely to support diversity, equity, and inclusion. The right to dissent – in a civil and respectful manner – must remain sacrosanct in the classroom. Academic freedom and freedom of expression are central to the academic enterprise, and faculty autonomy in the classroom must accompany these. For that reason, we defend the dual principles of professorial responsibility for syllabi content and professorial obligation to engage students in dialogue about competing ideas. We understand the concern of students and other community members that more plural voices and broader perspectives should be incorporated in our curricula, and we share that goal. There are multiple strategies for achieving diversification, including classroom activities and assignments that offer choices for students and value their diverse voices. However, some of the seemingly inclusive strategies may lead unintentionally to the opposite result. For example, dictating syllabi content through majority vote—either of the whole faculty or the student body or some combination—could lead to greater uniformity of content rather than greater pluralism. At the other end of the spectrum, expecting student leaders to vet syllabi concentrates too much power in a small number of hands. Equally dangerous, in our view, would be a system in which syllabi content is dictated by a university’s administrators or trustees, no matter how wise and enlightened the individuals might be. (American University Academic Senate)

In order to ensure ongoing faculty academic freedom and uphold individual U. S. constitutional rights, it was determined that no statements or ideologies should be mandated or required in a professor’s syllabi, be a part of a professor’s evaluations, or be in a professor’s mandated training that requires them to agree with a position statement or ideology.
