

| Policy Name | Commenter | Comment | Response to Commenter |
|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous | 30 days seems far too long and requires significant planning and lengthy periods of time to bring in a speaker. Students would have to propose the idea, wait over 30 days for approval, likely more since SLT would need to determine an answer after the comment period. Then they would have to schedule with the speaker which could take time. They would not be able to set a date prior to approval if the speaker wasn't approved. The period should be a few day review where it is posted on JCU today or another venue that it could be viewed. Waiting this long to get a speaker seems absurd. | There is no reference to 30 days in the policy itself. I think you may have been confused by the fact that the policy was available for comment for 30 days? The timeline is submission at least 2 weeks before event, reviewer decision within 5 days, Appeal decisions will also be made within 5 days of receipt of the appeal. |
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous | I feel that this policy is too restrictive for anything that may be considered to go against Jesuit and/or Catholic viewpoints. While John Carroll is obviously a Jesuit institution to disallow speakers and events that present viewpoints counter to those the school was founded on is akin to sticking one's head in the sand. Listening to other viewpoints is actually part of the Ignatian worldview and should not be hindered because some people may not be open to or might be offended by others' beliefs, teachings, or way of life. It is only through the sharing of thoughts, ideas, and individual knowledge that we can truly find our commonalities. Ignorance is what perpetuates our differences. | The Guiding Principles attachment includes many of these very ideas as part of the guidance for making a decision in light of mission: "Speakers with diverse perspectives, events with challenging topics, and texts which raise more questions than they may answer serve a crucial role in public society and in the Church." and "deep personal engagement of perennial questions across the whole range of human experience and global religious and philosophical traditions." |
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous | Given our current financial situation and the urgency that is being placed upon us all to increase enrollment and cut costs, why are we spending our limited resources on such an activity? I assume that there is current policy. What has caused the administration to find that policy lacking? Specifically, what recent events? It also seems overly convoluted and difficult to understand. Finally, and far from least, despite the introductory rhetoric about protecting freedom of speech and academic freedom, this seems to trample academic freedom. | There is no current policy for non-student events. The Provost has carefully considered academic freedom in crafting this policy and the various items explicitly excluded from the policy make space for such concerns. This policy has yet to have any impact positive or negative upon revenue or enrollment and it is frankly hard to imagine how it could. The only resource consumed here is time. |
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous faculty (submitted by Dan Kilbride) | It is so heavy handed and stifling I feel I must respond. I honestly don't understand what prompted this as a need and I feel that this will stifle creativity and create an environment of fear. 2 months before an event to get permission is a bit much in my opinion. I'm curious to see what others think, I suppose. More than that though I feel like these committees are creating a labyrinthine bureaucracy which I personally find tiresome and anti-intellectual. | Are core applications "heavy handed" and "stifling"? How about room reservations? Just trying to gain some perspective here. It is our intention to make this process as quick and simple as possible in most cases. As for need, I encourage you to be more alert to issues that rise to the level of comment at multiple faculty meetings. While two months is the suggested timeline, two weeks is the minimum; honestly, if hosting a public event, one would need two weeks to guarantee the availability of the room. As someone who has, no doubt, prepared a syllabus, you understand the importance of clear policies and unfortunately, even an institution of our size will require some bureaucracy to implement good practices. There is much about life in higher education that is "tiresome;" I think we can all agree to that. When decisions are made unilaterally by a single person, or worse, by multiple people, based purely on the circumstances of the moment, there can be a marked lack of consistency and equity. Those who have made the request often feel powerless or blindsided. A decision guided by policy made by an identified group with guidelines for the requestor and a clear explanation of appeals processes is crucial to our goal of transparency in decision making. |
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous faculty (submitted by Dan Kilbride) | If the university is committed to shared governance I think the appeals committee should have faculty representation. It is fine for the original decision to be left to administrators, I assume most decisions will not be controversial, but when something is controversial you need faculty input. As a practical matter some of the requirements will be impossible to meet. We are hosting a conference here in April where there will be perhaps 100 students giving short presentations. I will only know their names and presentation title about 2 weeks before the conference. Would I be expected to get bios from all these students? | While we appreciate the desire for a faculty presence on the appeals committee, the group's voting members are exclusively members of the Senior Leadership Team who will need to assemble, review, and act quickly; a smaller group is more nimble, and the Provost will clearly represent the faculty perspective in these matters. We have developed a separate form for conferences sponsored by the University, a department, or faculty or staff member that will include more appropriate questions (name of organization, identities and topics of keynote addresses, copy of the call for proposals, etc.). |
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous faculty (submitted by Dan Kilbride) | I read the proposed Speaker's Policy and I have some big issues. Every year I host a scientific conference organized by the local sections of the Society for Applied Spectroscopy, American Chemical Society, American Vacuum Society, and the Microscopy Society of Northeast Ohio. It consists of the simultaneous tracks with approximately 35 different presenters and 25 different poster presentations. It is unclear to me how to obtain approval for such an event BEFORE the speakers are known. It would be necessary to obtain approval before issuing the Call for Papers. A similar situation arises when the local American Chemical Society section holds its Meeting-in-Miniature on campus. I suppose that departmental seminars would be exempted if they are part of a formal class. The various "career-events" of the CAS Professional Development program would not be similarly exempted. It is also unclear if I would need to get approval to take my class on a field trip to a local industry. I understand the rationale for such a policy, but I am afraid that the policy as written is too encompassing and would soon become unwieldy for the Reviewers to handle, essentially limiting our student's experiences. | We have developed a separate form for conferences sponsored by the University, a department, or faculty or staff member that will include more appropriate questions (name of organization, identities and topics of keynote addresses, copy of the call for proposals, etc.). Seminars are excluded, CAS Professional Development events are not currently. This policy has no impact on field trips whatsoever. |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous faculty (submitted by Dan Kilbride) | Re: screening questions -- "Minimally, these details need to be included in the policy itself." | The policy language and screening questions will be aligned prior to adoption. |
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous faculty (submitted by Dan Kilbride) | I strongly oppose this policy of letting the administrators decide who can speak on campus. First, it is an obscenely narrow definition of academic freedom to confine speakers to the classroom. Second, the appeals process is to more administrators. Third, some of the criteria for rejection are so broad, that any speaker could be rejected (e.g. as anti-Catholic or antiJesuit). I believe the Jesuits would be ashamed of this policy, it's boorish anti-intellectual and self-serving. | I would raise a simple counter question: who should decide? If a faculty member proposes a speaker, the deciders are either faculty members or adminstrators with faculty status. Indeed, the Appeals committee would look strongly to the Provost in such a scenario. It seems that your primary concern with "criteria" lies with the denigrate language. The Committee wrestled for quite a while with that very phrase, which is consistent with the Faculty Handbook ("However, continued open advocacy in the classroom or in assigned University activities, of viewpoints which contradict explicit principles of Catholic faith or morals is opposed to the specified aims of this University." p. 20). For now, the Committee elected to leave the language alone (although the one instance of "disrespect" was removed (to improve internal consistency). Other alternatives (such as "inconsistent" with mission) were rejected for being too broad. The Jesuits on our campus have all had an opportunity to respond and none did so publically. Finally, I can certainly see why you might choose "anti-intellectual" (although we prefer to see it as trying to balance our mission, free speech concerns, and an ethic of care for members of our community), but I am struggling to see how this might be "self-serving." And as for "boorish"? Nothing more "boorish" than name-calling, is there? |
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous | "host speakers and events involving non-University faculty, staff or students" Would/should alumni fit into this? "Sponsor must provide a biography/resume of any speaker or performer, as well as a written description of the content, purpose and educational goals" What kind of bio? What would need to be included? I see at many places similar policies for student organizations. Expanding this to academic programs and departments hosting speakers outside of a particular class seems a significant step. It feels like we are trying to solve a particular problem by increasing the burden and bureaucracy for all. In our department this would mean additional work to simply bring in speakers to talk about scientific research and professional development for students which doesn't always take place in the context of a particular course. Is there a problem with academic talks sponsored by departments or programs that take place outside of the classroom? Are we 'solving' a problem? I also wonder whether this even provides the kind of cover that the University might have wanted when it came to the Drag show, since it is still up to particular folks to judge whether the topic/speaker would "denigrate the Jesuit Catholic identity or mission of the University." | Alumni are "non-University" for the purposes of this policy. Most speakers are accustomed to providing a bio for events. Departments would still be allowed speakers and events without approval through this policy: One of the screening questions asks "Is the speaker or event in service to the student learning goals of your department/program AND is the primary audience for the event students in the department/program? If yes, stop, you do not need approval through this process. You should obtain permission from your dean." |
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous | 1. Many academic departments require faculty candidates to include one or more talks during their on-campus interviews. These talks generally are not associated with any particular JCU faculty member or class. How does the policy apply to this situation? 2. Some departments hold ongoing, regularly scheduled seminars dealing with a specific academic field, but not with any particular class. Some such seminars welcome faculty and graduate students from other colleges and universities. How does the policy apply to this situation? | It was not the Committee's intention to include hiring presentations, and the policy has been amended to explicitly exclude such talks. This policy also extends to program-level goals. One of the screening questions asks "Is the speaker or event in service to the student learning goals of your department/program AND is the primary audience for the event students in the department/program? If yes, stop, you do not need approval through this process. You should obtain permission from your dean." |
| Speakers and Events Policy | anonymous | The paragraph beginning with "The University reserves..." is so vaguely worded that any protest of a speaker or event could be misinterpreted as a "public safety concern" or disrupting of "safe and orderly campus operations." Such an undefined and open-ended opportunity to misrepresent a speaker or event could lead to charges of viewpoint discrimination or violation of freedoms of speech and association. JCU would do well to learn from the recent court decisions in re: UC Berkeley (YAF v. Napolitano) and Kennesaw State (YAF v. Harmon) and others. | The Committee wrestled for quite a while with the "denigrate" language, which is consistent with the Faculty Handbook ("However, continued open advocacy in the classroom or in assigned University activities, of viewpoints which contradict explicit principles of Catholic faith or morals is opposed to the specified aims of this University." p. 20). For now, the Committee elected to leave the language alone (although the one instance of "disrespect" was removed (to improve internal consistency). Other alternatives (such as "inconsistent" with mission) were rejected for being too broad. The court cases you cite all concern public institutions, who have the additional burden of representing the government, bringing with that all of the free speech issues raised by the First Amendment, and are therefore not necessarily fair comparisons. I am sure you are aware that questions of free speech are also integrally tied to the question of platforming. Speakers who wish to engage in speech that violate this policy are free to do so, but the University is not required to give them a platform for doing so. Indeed, freedom of religion means that private institutions are allowed to practice viewpoint discrimination (indeed, given our accreditor's focus on mission as guidance for all activity, one might argue that we are required to do so). |