

UFC Meeting

Thursday, April 22, 2021

2:00 pm to 4:00 pm

ZOOM meeting - <https://pepperdine.zoom.us/j/83391035879>

Members

Seaver = Christopher Doran, Matt Joyner, Jennifer Smith, Hollace Starr

PGBS = Mark Chun, Bob McQuaid, Richard Walton

GSEP = Veronica Kuhn, Dennis Lowe

CSOL = Shelley Saxer, Mark Scarberry

SPP = Ted McAllister

Admin = Jim Gash, Rick Mars

AGENDA

1. Prayer –
2. Opening remarks - Bob
3. Covid update; questions/issues to address for Fall semester
4. Academic Freedom discussion
 - a. QUESTION 1 - If we decide that we want to create a university-wide statement, we need to figure out if we want to
 - i. adopt an Academic Freedom statement (like AAUP Statement), or
 - ii. a freedom of expression statement (like Chicago Statement).
 - b. QUESTION 2 - Once we have decided that, we also need to decide if
 - i. we want to adopt one of the pre-existing statements, or
 - ii. write our own.
 - c. QUESTION 3 - In any event, we must decide
 - i. whom should be included, and
 - ii. what limitations or responsibilities accompany such protections.
5. Other business
6. Schedule future meetings
7. Adjourn

Additional Business

1. Philosophy of Christian mission and academic excellence as framed in university planning documents
2. Review composition of UFC representation

Attachments:

Academic Freedom powerpoint (reproduced below)

[Academic Freedom Compilation of Statements of Peer Institutions](#)

[Academic Freedom and Non-CDI \(Creedalism, Denominationalism, Institutionalism\)](#)

Our statement (from the Tenure Policy) compared to 1940 AAC/AAUP statement

University Tenure Policy Statement

The University realizes that academic freedom and economic security are essential for acquiring and maintaining a strong faculty. The faculty member must enjoy that freedom characteristic of the best in higher education as it has developed in Western culture. A faculty member, while recognizing a special responsibility to the University as a contributing scholar, requires freedom of discussion in the classroom and freedom of professional research and publication of results. Dedicated to the free pursuit of truth, a faculty member should consider it a basic duty to encourage freedom of inquiry in peers and in students. While abiding by and supporting the policies, ideals, and procedures of the University, the faculty member has the right of peacefully seeking revision of policies. Free inquiry and the pursuit of truth are indispensable conditions for the attainment of the goals of any university. A faculty member, while enjoying academic freedom, shares responsibility with the administration for the preservation of this freedom. Therefore, a faculty member is free in the quest for truth within a broad but intricate framework of responsibility to colleagues and students as sharers in this quest, to the University with its ideals and purposes, and to society with its basic mores and morals.

¹ (note 4 in AAUP) = Second 1970 comment: The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is “controversial.” Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject

1940 AAC/AAUP statement

1. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

2. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.¹ Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.²

3. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.³

² (note 5 in AAUP) - Third 1970 comment: Most church-related institutions no longer need or desire the departure from the principle of academic freedom implied in the 1940 “Statement,” and we do not now endorse such a departure.

³ (note 6 in AAUP) – too long to reproduce

Comments on University Tenure Policy Statement

The University realizes that academic freedom and economic security are essential for acquiring and maintaining a strong faculty. The faculty member must enjoy that freedom characteristic of the best in higher education as it has developed in Western culture. A faculty member, while recognizing a special responsibility to the University as a contributing scholar, requires freedom of discussion in the classroom and freedom of professional research and publication of results. Dedicated to the free pursuit of truth, a faculty member should consider it a basic duty to encourage freedom of inquiry in peers and in students. While abiding by and supporting the policies, ideals, and procedures of the University, the faculty member has the right of peacefully seeking revision of policies. Free inquiry and the pursuit of truth are indispensable conditions for the attainment of the goals of any university. A faculty member, while enjoying academic freedom, shares responsibility with the administration for the preservation of this freedom. Therefore, a faculty member is free in the quest for truth within a broad but intricate framework of responsibility to colleagues and students as sharers in this quest, to the University with its ideals and purposes, and to society with its basic mores and morals.

Key paragraph from Chicago Principles

Of course, the ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is not the proper role of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can never be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.