

John Tomasi:

Welcome to the panel on higher education reform, changing campus policy and culture. I'm John Tomasi, I'm the president of Heterodox Academy. Some of you may remember that I gave the lunch talk last year at the summit just three months after leaving my tenured position at Brown, where I had a lovely, comfortable endowed chair, to join my dear friend, still my friend, John Haidt, leading Heterodox Academy. You may also recall, or have perceived, that at the time, I didn't know what I was doing. And I don't just mean that I didn't know what I was doing in the sense that my family and friends said to me, "You're leaving a job for life at Brown? You don't know what you're doing." I mean I didn't know what I was doing in the sense that I didn't know what to do with HXA, what to do with Heterodox Academy.

What I saw was that we have this organization of professors all around the world, at the time, 4,000 professors, who had each agreed publicly to affirm three principles that are fundamental to HXA, and had agreed publicly to do what they could to promote these three principles at their university or college where they taught, and the three principles are open inquiry, viewpoint diversity, and construct a disagreement. And you can see over here, we're 5,600 now, and we grow, we're still growing. We're on a lot of campuses, we're in a bunch of countries. We have these really cool virtual communities of HXA economists, HXA classicists, some are geographic, like HXA Sweden, HXA New Zealand, so we have all that.

But I didn't really know then what to do with it. But I left my job at Brown because I believe in these things, and because John told me that if I did this and joined him, he would let me really decide what should be done and what could be done. And what I've decided to do since I saw you last was very similar to something Chuck Davis was saying this morning strategically. Chuck was asking, as I heard him, how do you make change at universities, and how do you make those changes stick? How do you make them stick, he said. And every constituency has a role to play, but let's be frank, students come and go, presidents come and go, policies come and go. What endures? Alumni endure and faculty endure.

If, I thought, our individual members could start being brought together into groups on campuses, that would be a powerful enduring thing that could actually make change and make it stick. And if, by the way, down the road, as our network grows and your alumni network grows, they could be connected so that they support one another, they could call on alums locally to send letters at key moments when our groups are pushing for reform, and you guys could have insights what's happening on campus through our networks too, then we could do really some powerful sticky stuff. Sticky times two, MIT person can make sense of that.

So just quickly, what I did since I've seen you, we put out a call for applications to our members last fall. We were thinking we'd start three or four pilot campus communities this spring, and we put out a call for application to all of our members, "Find one HXA member on your campus who will join with you to commit for three years to start building a campus network of faculty members on your campus who care about these things, and are willing to be a bulwark for change from the inside of the campus."

We expected, as I said, to create a few of these. We got flooded with applications. The team and I met with every, we had over 50 campuses applied to have campus communities on their campuses. My team and I met with every one of them. We eventually chose 23. We chose 23 campuses mainly in the US and Canada, we had one from abroad applying too, but for now, we did US and Canada. We're launching 23 this semester 'cause that was just our capacity, we couldn't do more than that.

But we've got 50 more who want to go, 50 more campuses who want to launch, and we're looking for opportunities to support that and make that happen. Once this thing gets going, I think, there could be dynamic funding opportunities from groups like you and other groups of alums, but now, we're just looking for ways to get this thing up and going and get it started. And you can see we're all around the

place. If you're interested in having one of these communities on your campus that you care about, alumni support matters to us, moral support as well as financial, my colleague Malik is here, you could talk to him or to me.

So we're going to go into a panel. We're going to go down the line, each say a few things about the different things we're doing to make this dream of our common dream of reality. Then I may ask them a few questions so I can find ways to make them uncomfortable, that's what we're here for, or I'll open it up to you guys and you guys can ask questions too. So do you want to start, Jenna?

Jenna Robinson:

Absolutely. I'm Jenna Robinson, I'm the president of the James G. Martin Center for Academic Renewal, which is a nonprofit public policy organization in Raleigh, North Carolina, and I've also served on the board of UNC AFSA and the National AFSA Group, and so, I've been working on these issues since 2007. But specifically in North Carolina, I want to talk about some of the good things that are going on.

So I first started working specifically on free speech in 2010, when the Martin Center partnered with FIRE, to have every school in North Carolina given a free speech rating. And at that time, I think we had zero schools with green lights. But since then, once we had that information in our hands, we were able to take that information to people who cared about free speech, including the North Carolina General Assembly, and in 2017, we got a campus free speech bill, and in that free speech bill, it basically said, clean up your speech codes. Board of governors, you have to have a committee on free speech, you have to put free speech in freshman orientation. And also, it had the seeds of institutional neutrality in that bill. So that bill was the starting point. And now, in North Carolina, 15 of our 17 UNC institutions have green lights from FIRE.

But it's gone further from there, and I think it's gotten to the point now that one institution, UNC Chapel Hill, has a virtuous cycle of policy and culture working together. And so, I'm going to talk about some of the things that are going on at UNC Chapel Hill. Several years ago, the faculty at UNC Chapel Hill adopted a version of the Chicago Principles, the trustees at UNC Chapel Hill have also adopted the Chicago Principles and the Kalven Committee report, and recently affirmed a commitment to prohibit compelled speech on campus, making UNC Chapel Hill the only public university in the nation to have followed in Chicago's footsteps with adopting all three pieces of protecting academic freedom and free speech on campus. And those are the policies, I think, that they've gotten right.

But there have also been cultural changes at UNC Chapel Hill. There is a Heterodox Academy campus community at UNC Chapel Hill, there is a program for public discourse, there is a committee for academic freedom and free speech amongst the faculty at Chapel Hill. And recently, they have completed two rounds of survey for students, as well as adopted a campus, I think, decency pledge. It was a civility pledge, I think it's a decency pledge now. And it's a voluntary decency pledge, and so it's not mandating anything, but inviting members of the campus community to treat each other civilly and treat each other by the golden rule. And I think that all of that has happened because the policies and the people were working together.

Thank you to Ramsey White in the audience who's a member of the UNC Chapel Hill Board of Trustees. But there have been people from the faculty, to the administration, to the board of governors of the UNC system, and to our general assembly, who have all made this a priority. And I think by having those people in place, and having the policies ready to go, ready to recommend, we have gotten this virtuous cycle at Chapel Hill. And so, I expect that there will be more things. It's not perfect, the Federalist Society keeps getting its speaker shouted down, but the progress is palpable, and I think the feeling on campus is different than it was five years ago. I think the progress at Chapel Hill is very, very significant and I'm excited about where it's going in the future.

John Tomasi:

Thank you, Jenna. Steve?

Steve McGuire:

So my name's Steve McGuire. I'm the Paul and Karen Levy fellow with the American Council of Trustees and Alumni. Somewhat like John, I was a professor and recently left my position. I was a professor at Villanova University, where I also directed a center, the Matthew J. Ryan Center, where we investigated questions related to living in a free society. I decided I had this opportunity to join ACTA, we were working on free speech issues, free expression issues, at Villanova, and I saw an opportunity to do that on a national scale, and so I jumped at it, and I've been with ACTA now since last May.

When I joined ACTA, I discovered that they were in the process of beginning what is now called our Campus Freedom Initiative, which is generously supported by the Diana Davis Spencer Foundation, so thank you. The centerpiece of the Campus Freedom Initiative is our Gold Standard for Freedom of Expression, which you all have in the folders that you were provided today, and I'll say a little bit more about that in a second.

In terms of the theme of our panel, policy and culture, reforming higher education, somewhat like Jenna just mentioned, I think there's a virtuous circle there where these two things mutually impact one another, and so we need to work on both at the same time. Policy affects the way that people behave, and then the way that people behave can, in turn, change, improve, reform policy. I'm a political theorist by training. One of the great debates in the history of political thought is, how do you achieve the good society? Do you do it through education, or do you do it through institutional change? And I think the answer is both, and so that's what we need to do. And if you look down the list of the 20 points that we have in our Gold Standard for Freedom of Expression, you'll see that some of these are policies that we want universities to implement, and others are practices or behaviors that we think that they should adopt, and then you can build together.

In terms of what we're facing, I would look at both education and policy and say, okay, let's take education, two points. On the one hand, students aren't getting the education that they need in terms of understanding the importance of free expression, and why it is a central tenant of the American experiment. At the same time, they're being educated in ways of thinking that are antithetical to a culture of free expression. They're being taught that disagreement is harmful, or even violent. They're being taught that safety and inclusion are more important than robust debate and truth seeking. So we need to change both of those things. We need to give students a proper education, a proper civic education, as well as experience engaging in dialogue and debate, and experiencing for themselves how productive and valuable that can be. And at the same time, we need to tackle these false notions that they're being taught that work against understanding those things.

Similarly, with policies, a lot of colleges and universities do not yet have very great policies in terms of protecting free expression. Jenna just mentioned, UNC stands out for doing things that really, objectively speaking, should be common sense. It just shouldn't be that hard. Sometimes, when I think about it, I'm very aware of the reality in which we live, but sometimes, when I think about it, it's mind-blowing to me that it's difficult to convince people that we should do these things, because they're so obvious to me that they're essential to the functioning of a university. And then, at the same time, they also have negative policies and practices, like bias response teams or requiring diversity statements for hiring. That's another one. I see people saying, "Oh, these aren't litmus tests." As a former faculty member, I can tell you, they are litmus tests. I don't know how people think they're going to convince people that they're not litmus tests.

So again, if you looked at the Gold Standard, you'll see that we're tackling these things. We're recommending positive policies, we're recommending that certain kinds of policies be removed, and we're also, like I said, recommending that certain kinds of activities take place on campus. So as far as what can alumni do, well, my suggestion would be to take the Gold Standard and apply it to your institution, go down the list and put a check mark beside each point that your institution meets. My guess is that you'll end up with somewhere between about four and seven check marks. We have 20 on the list. Then you can look at the rest and say, "Well, what's doable?" And that's going to be determinable on an institution-by-institution basis. It depends on, do you have faculty allies? Do you have administrative allies? Do you have allies on the board of trustees? Do you have legislative allies in your state? So there's different approaches you can take, and there are different policies that may be easier to achieve.

And so, my suggestion would be to do an analysis, and at ACTA, we're more than happy to help with that. If you look at the Gold Standard, and you think that there's some things listed there that you'd be interested in implementing at your alma mater, then by all means, shoot me an email, and I'd be happy to talk to you about that. Thank you.

John Tomasi:

Thank you, Steve. Lindsey?

Lindsey Burke:

Great. Well, thanks to ACTA for having me here today, really appreciate the opportunity. I'm Lindsey Burke. I direct the Center for Education Policy at the Heritage Foundation. As Secretary Guidera mentioned earlier, I'm also on the board of visitors at George Mason University, which has been a great experience so far, very informative experience being on a university board. I'm one year into my tenure there, so looking forward to the next couple of years too.

So you just posed a question, Steve, what's doable? And I want to talk about that for a minute using Florida as a case study. I think we're all well aware of everything Governor DeSantis has done in Florida, but I want to talk a little bit about why I think he has been successful. So if we look, there are a couple of factors at play there, of course, but if we look just at what he's done on abolishing DEI in particular, and then reforming university boards, I think those are the two that would rise to most people's lists of things that he has certainly had a significant effect on.

In January, of course, Governor DeSantis had announced plans for public universities to think about ways in which they would start to wind down their diversity, equity and inclusion bureaucracies on public university college campuses, so he puts that charge out in the ether, and nothing had happened yet in terms of the Florida state legislature. And so, if we're thinking about from policy to culture, this is a cultural move that he was able to affect prior to the legislature even considering the question.

So he puts out that charge in early January, and then what do we see? We see the 40 public university college presidents issue a letter, a statement, on what Governor DeSantis had said to dismantle these DEI bureaucracies. And I think to most people's surprise, that letter was supportive of what the governor had done, and there are reasons for that. I think that many of these university presidents actually welcome that air cover. I don't think that they are particularly enamored with the DEI bureaucracies that are on their college campuses, and so I think that that gave them something to point to.

You probably all read the letter when it came out, but I do think it's worth highlighting. So the university presidents in the Florida system said, "The Florida College System Presidents will ensure that all initiatives, instruction and activities do not promote any ideology that suppresses intellectual and

academic freedom, freedom of expression, viewpoint diversity, in the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning." Excellent. They continued, "As such, our institutions will not fund or support any institutional practice, policy or academic requirement that compels belief in critical race theory or related concepts, such as intersectionality, or the idea that systems of oppression should be the primary lens through which teaching and learning are analyzed."

That was a pretty righteous statement from a large group of public university presidents. And then, in that letter, they committed to fully eradicating critical race theory by February 1st. So if you go back to my timeline, that was January 18th that they released that letter of this year, before the legislature kicked off in March. And so, they're still now currently debating bills to defund DEI in Florida public colleges and universities, but we have already seen the public university system move in the direction that the governor had charged them to move.

My colleague at Heritage, Jay Green, had a really good article in the Washington Examiner recently thinking about how it was that DeSantis has been able to affect such significant change on DEI in particular. And he had pointed out that, prior to DeSantis taking office, it was widely believed that DEI bureaucracies were like the weather, that it was just something that we have to live with, and what DeSantis has shown, I think, the real innovation, is that DEI is not beyond the reach of elected officials when it comes to these public institutions. And as Jay points out in that piece, public universities are like any other state agency. They're like the Department of Motor Vehicles or the Department of Game and Fish Commissions in a state. They have their own boards of trustees, they're ultimately boards that were created by the state, and they can be modified through legislation, among other vehicles.

So as Jay points out in that piece, he says, "In the past, state officials have really refrained from addressing the rise of DEI bureaucracies in public universities, not out of an ability to do so legally, but from a conviction that it was somehow inappropriate for them to interfere." And this is, Jay points out, DeSantis's innovation was to recognize that this self-restraint was unnecessary and counterproductive, and based largely on a misunderstanding of what DEI bureaucracies actually are.

These are not teaching faculty, and certainly it's the case that many faculty have a deep commitment of their own to the ends of DEI, but DEI bureaucrats on college campuses are not teaching faculty, and therefore the university is in a position, the state is in a position, to actually wind down this DEI infrastructure. These individuals tend to act as political commissariat to enforce the left-leaning orthodoxy that is so prevalent on college campuses and really suppress any other descent.

So I think Florida is a fascinating case study. As Jenna pointed out, UNC is another excellent case study of what can actually be done, but I think that's why what is happening in Florida is so exciting, is because it does really demonstrate the power that a public official, the governor in particular, has at moving from policy to cultural change pretty rapidly.

John Tomasi:

Dawn?

Dawn Toguchi:

Hello, my name is Dawn Toguchi, and I am the executive director of Open Discourse Coalition at Bucknell University. Bucknell is a small liberal arts college in central Pennsylvania of about 4,000 students. I am a Bucknell alum, our co-founders are all Bucknell alumni, and we're a very proud member of AFSA, and so grateful for the support of AFSA and ACTA in our work.

I want to speak a little to what we are doing at Bucknell to impact culture on campus, and the culture towards intellectual diversity and free speech, and we've done that in two key ways. And that has been

by prioritizing direct student interaction through our programming, and seeking key allies on campus and in the community. So what that has looked like for our student interaction is that we have an office very close to campus that we keep open, and encourage students to stop by as much as possible, and to attend programs that we hold there.

And we also sponsor programs on campus through supported faculty, many of them members of Heterodox Academy, and through student groups as well. We work hand-in-hand with them to find great opportunities to bring speakers and panel discussions to campus that support our mission, exposing students to a variety of intellectual viewpoints, and encouraging civil rigorous discourse. So that has ranged, really, in size, from big events, like Jordan Peterson, we had Edward Snowden Zoom in from Moscow last year, but we also do small book discussions, and we have a leadership seminar that we hold every September, and we have lunch and learns with professors tackling some thorny issues.

We attract students from all sides of the political spectrum, all different backgrounds, because they understand that, at our programs, we welcome and encourage civil disagreement and learning from each other's perspectives. We encourage mentorship and interaction with both the faculty we support, as well as the alumni who are involved in our organization. And those alumni are just critical in both the support of our organization and in changing the culture on campus.

We have trustees and trustees emeriti who actively support our organization, we have current trustees on our advisory board. That has been fantastic in legitimizing our work and putting some real heft behind what we are trying to accomplish, and showing that there is institutional support for that. Some of Bucknell's major donors also have stepped up and said, "This is an important issue to us as well," and publicly supported our work. As I mentioned, we have some very brave faculty members who have worked alongside us to develop these programs and lead many of them. And we also have great relationships with local elected officials. The Mayor of Lewisburg is a Democrat, Bucknell alumnus, and she is involved in a lot of our programs, and that's thanks to relationships and the culture that we are really working to develop at Bucknell.

In terms of policies at Bucknell, there are still a lot of ways that we can improve. When the Chicago Principles were brought up for a faculty vote at a meeting last year, it was voted down 191 to 32 to even discuss voting on Chicago Principles. Our speech code rating is a yellow, however this prioritization on the campus culture is what we believe is going to allow policies to change, and for that virtuous circle to complete. We saw in the last year that our free speech rankings jumped 70 spots. We went from the worst Pennsylvania school ranked to the best Pennsylvania school ranked, and I only want to see that increase. So we really prioritize that work directly with students, and I would encourage you all to do that as much as you can as well.

Administrative change and faculty change is incredibly important and often slow moving. I cannot tell you how encouraging it is to see hundreds, thousands of students come through our programs. They are excited to have interesting dialogues presented to them. We get feedback that they never get to hear disagreeing viewpoints. "It's the first time I've heard two respectful opinions on an issue such as gun control or abortion." They're thrilled to hear speakers who can back up what they are talking about, or to ask difficult questions, and to know that they're in a space where they can do that and they can disagree with each other. They become our ambassadors, they bring more students, and that is where we are able to see growth just in leaps and bounds in culture change, because students are excited for this.

So I'm really grateful for everyone represented here, and all the work on policy as well, because it really is such a circle to work hand-in-hand in how we are going to change our institutions.

John Tomasi:

Thank you. So it's my job to keep the clock, we have 42 minutes left for this session. We very much want to go to you and ask your questions, so please think of questions. I'm going to turn to you in a few minutes to invite you to ask questions. Let me just start by asking questions to the panelists, just brief questions, and I'll ask you just to be brief with your answers if you can, and then we'll move to our audience.

I'll just start down the row. Dawn, it's so exciting to hear your description of what's happening at Bucknell, and especially going from worst to first in that way. I'm wondering, to what degree are people at Bucknell, the senior administration, or, say, the board of trustees, are they aware of the brand differentiation opportunities for Bucknell? If Bucknell is competing, or wants to compete, with other elite liberal arts colleges, the Middleburys of the world, Williams, other places, Oberlin, dare I say, is the leadership of Bucknell aware of this brand differentiation opportunity, and what can you tell us about that?

Dawn Toguchi:

That's something that we are trying to emphasize as much as possible. Initially, I think that there was a lot of skepticism that was comparative advantage, but they're seeing it more and more that this is a differentiator to Bucknell, this is something that they can tell incoming students or skeptical parents, that is something that sets Bucknell apart. I want to be seen as an organization that our admissions team and fundraising can brag about as something that makes Bucknell so special, and I am starting to get that feedback, it's coming slowly. And I can tell you that when we jumped in the FIRE rankings, a trustee that I knew was supportive of what we were doing, but I rarely hear from him, he emailed me back right away, "I can't wait till we are number one. This is awesome." And I know that he's going to take that to the trustees meeting.

And I also heard from a professor that he saw on one of the mobile billboard type things that always just has ads running for Bucknell, a Bucknell education, that this is a place for free speech, and we are number one in Pennsylvania. So it's possible, and there's a lot of room to grow, to embrace that more and more, but I think that that is going to be critical in how we continue to frame the need for changing that culture.

John Tomasi:

Thank you. Lindsey, if I may, I'd like to have you say some more to us about what role you see for the state as an exogenous shock, I think that's how... And in particular, you talked about Florida.

Lindsey Burke:

Yeah.

John Tomasi:

What I want to ask a question though is this. There's a doctrine, an old doctrine that began around 1915, while the modern university was just emerging, there's a classic statement by the American Association of University Professors in response to an incident that happened at Stanford University, where Jane Stanford, who had just created this university, wanted to see a professor fired. In 1915, this statement was made that said, "Universities are a public trust. They're not owned by any person, they're not like a Fish and Game Department. They're this weird kind of institution aimed at the truth. And for that reason," the AAUP statement of 1915 stated, "The only way to protect open inquiry and academic

freedom is through faculty self-governance, 'cause the faculty are the only ones who can really understand what the search for truth requires."

Now, fast forwarding 100 years past that statement, do you see us having lost faith in that? Is Florida acting on that loss of faith? Do you see it that way? How is it different than a Fish and Game Department?

Lindsey Burke:

I think they are. So on the ground, of course, is different than a Fish and Game Department. I think just from the pure legislative grounds that can be engaged in on the part of government actors, that there are similarities in their structure, emphasis on the public. The public trust, these are public institutions that we're talking about, that are paid with public taxpayer dollars, and therefore, there is a role for the state, for legislatures, to play in ensuring that these are institutions where freedom of academic expression and free speech can flourish.

So there are a few things that states in particular should be doing, and then I think a few policy reforms too at the federal level, even, that would be appropriate. If you look at the state level right now, for instance, Texas is considering a bill to reform tenure. This is something that other states have considered as well. But if we think about how tenure might interact with freedom of expression on college campus, tenure can have a chilling effect on junior faculty in particular. If they are walking on eggshells for fear of not getting tenure down the road, that can have a chilling effect on free speech, if they, as faculty, are self-censoring. That chilling effect that results from the current tenure structure has a negative trickle-down effect onto free speech among students on college campus as well, where they will self-censor. So I think tenure reform is something at the state level that should be considered.

Many other reforms are largely university reforms that they have to make from within, but at the state level, Goldwater's model policy that they have on free speech, I think, is an excellent model. It would eliminate campus speech codes, prevent administrations from dis-inviting speakers that students have invited to college campuses, allow students who have been censored to bring lawsuits, for example. So I think the Goldwater model is very strong. But then, from the university perspective, if they're looking inward on reforms, and Jenna mentioned a few of these, but sanctions on students for campus shout downs of speakers, freshman orientation came up earlier, having free speech as a major topic during freshman orientation, handbooks for both faculty and students outlining the commitment to free speech, even things like campus tours. When your campus tour guide is taking prospective students around campus, the stories that we hear about even those campus tours, what they are saying to students, is pretty mind-boggling. And so, making sure that that tour guide is also talking about how free speech is safeguarded on college campus.

So tenure reform, eliminating bias response teams, that came up earlier as well, and, of course, the diversity statements as political litmus tests have to go. So I think there's a role both for the state, the universities themselves, and then really quickly, at the federal level too. I think accreditation is often overlooked as a way in which free speech is not protected and maintained on campus, and a lever that should be considered for safeguarding free speech.

So a couple of reforms that we've put forward, that we've worked with ACTA on over the years, doing things like breaking up the regional monopolies when it comes to accreditation, making sure... At the federal level, there's this wonky little thing, Michael gets really excited about the Elastic Clause in federal policy. So in that Elastic Clause, boy, is it elastic. It really allows these accreditors to dictate to universities things far beyond the scope of what is authorized in the statute of the Higher Education Act. So moving away from the Elastic Clause, eliminating it altogether, and I think fundamentally just making

sure the Federal Government is no longer a gatekeeper via these accrediting entities to access to Title IV funds to student loans and grants.

Again, that sounds like a backdoor answer on free speech, but enabling alternative models to pop up, models like Heterodox, to flourish, enabling students to take individual courses and courses of study, I do think creates that virtuous cycle where we're both safeguarding free speech through a real proliferation of options, and making sure that the heavy hand of any level of government isn't interfering too much.

John Tomasi:

Thank you. And of course, accreditation is a double-edged sword. Some of us, I'm very involved at the University of Texas, Austin, that new initiative in accreditation is on their minds very much.

I'm going to ask Steve and Jenna one question and ask you to answer it together, that means, for the rest of you, that your turn's about to happen. So if you've got a question in your head, now is the time to refresh it. So just to Jen and Steve, I wonder if you'd just tell us, and you can choose one or the other, if you like, or you can do both, I'll leave it to you.

When you think about change in the culture on a particular university campus, or in the campuses you look at, Steve, across the landscape, what's the biggest obstacle you see, or what's the biggest opportunity you see? And you can do both, if you like, but if there's something, if you're lying in bed at night, thinking to yourself, "I can't do this job, it's not going to work." What's that thing that you worry about? When you wake up in the morning and you think to yourself, "I can't wait to go do this. I'm going to do something, it's going to work." What's that thing you think about? What's the biggest obstacle or biggest opportunity that you each see?

Steve, why don't you answer first, if you don't mind?

Steve McGuire:

Yeah, it's a good question. There's so many obstacles, it's hard to pick just one. That's the biggest obstacle.

John Tomasi:

You don't sleep much?

Steve McGuire:

No, I don't, but that's because I have a four-month old at home. I think, especially with private institutions, it's really difficult to motivate many of the people who are in charge to do something about it, because I think a lot of them, there are, of course, people who think there are problems, but there's many people who just don't think there's a problem. And they're either out of ideology, like Judd's comment earlier, or self-interest. One way or another, they don't see change as being something that's desirable.

With public institutions in particular, there are pressures that you can bring to bear on them, and there are expectations that you can try to get them to live up to, and there are, to some degree, with private institutions as well. Obviously, one major source of potential change is alumni at private institutions who can bring some pressure to bear, either by restricting the purse strings or exercising their voice in unison, various other things. So I would say that reticence to change and that unwillingness to recognize that there's a problem at all. I certainly experienced that myself as a faculty member, is we would try to

bring up our concerns to our colleagues, to our department chairs, to our deans, and they just don't see it, they don't understand it's a problem.

In terms of opportunities, we are seeing some successes. We're seeing that some institutions are adopting some policies. There's obviously the growth of alumni interests. This is remarkable. I think historically, looking at the inertia that we're gaining here, in terms of people who are recognizing that there are problems and that something needs to be done about it, legislative, alumni, and then students as well. I was a director of a center, we would work with students who were mostly volunteers, all of our programming was extracurricular. We would hold conferences, where we would discuss the value of free speech, and they would sign up and spend a Saturday doing that for no reason other than just to do it, which, in my view, is ultimately what a university should be about, the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake.

And so, you can see that students are really interested in this. As soon as they start talking about it, as soon as they're exposed to thinking about it, they see, "Oh yeah, this is important, this is interesting. I want to think about this more. I want to hear what my fellow students have to say." What my colleague, Doug Sprei, does, along with Braver Angels, the campus debate programs, every single one of those that I hear about, everybody walks out of the room like they've had a revelation, it's amazing. So I think there is a lot of room for hope too.

John Tomasi:

Thank you. Jenna, do you want to...

Jenna Robinson:

Sure.

John Tomasi:

Greatest hope, greatest fear, whatever angle you want to go?

Jenna Robinson:

So I think that the biggest challenge is what Cherise Trump talked about earlier, and that's the fear on campus, especially among students, that's the reason they're self-censoring. And I think even an environment when you get 90% of the policies right, and you've got the Chicago Principles, you've got these protections for free speech, students are afraid of being canceled by their classmates. And even, like I said, when you do have those policies right, it doesn't ensure that you're not going to be canceled by your classmates. And some brave students have to be the first ones to start speaking up. And so, I think that fear is the biggest challenge.

That said, I think my hope is that we are seeing really innovative ways to deal with that. I was just hearing this morning about a Duke civil discourse dormitory, where you create a place of trust so students can have those conversations that they wouldn't be able to have a 30,000 person campus just in any class, but they can have it in this one place. And so, I think establishing innovative ways to overcome that fear, I'm excited about what I have been hearing.

John Tomasi:

Give us a hope too.

Jenna Robinson:

Oh, a hope? I hope that a lot of institutions follow UNC's lead and adopt policies to prohibit compelled speech, and to adopt the Kalven Committee Report, in addition to the Chicago Principles that they've already adopted, I know a lot of your institutions have already done that. But adopt all three and make your commitment to free speech really robust by doing that.

John Tomasi:

Thanks. I wanted the panel part to end on a positive note, so we're going to turn to your questions now. I'm going to ask you to keep your questions brief.