

Written, February 10, 2025
For Hearing, February 11, 2025

Cameron Hite, Advocacy Director
AIAS Kent
132 S Lincoln Street
Kent, Ohio 44240

1. Line 114 The Bill's Removal of Voting Power From Student's Will Promote Indoctrination

By eliminating the power of students to vote on the Ohio Board Of Education, it will create an educational experience that students do not have the power or opportunity to shape in any way. As students are the ones paying for their education, they should be the ones in charge of what is taught and how it is taught. To remove voting power from students is undemocratic and implies ill-willed intentions outlined within the rest of the Bill.

2. Line 181 The Bill's Term Changes Will Politicize Board of Education Members

The longer term length and inability for immediate re-election protects board members from politicization in their role. If your goal is to keep political bias and agendas out of education, then how would increasing the role politics plays in election campaigns of board members align with that strategy.

If you are afraid of having a more diverse group of people leading the board of education, maybe you are afraid of diversity in thought. If the only way to uphold your standards is by having the same people there, they are programmed to think a certain way and allowing rooms for outsiders to enter the role would destroy certain political agendas that rely on a small group of loyalists that go against logic.

3. Line 491 The Bill's Publicized Syllabus Requirements Will Prevent Critical Discussion

By forcing professors to upload their course syllabus, it will enable politicians to attack and censor their discussions with students or ultimately keep important topics from being discussed for fear of public outcry.

4. Line 587 The Bill's Requirement of Intellectual Diversity for Politicized Topics Will Create Unproductive Conversations

If every topic is to be treated equally and worthy of varying viewpoints then it is impossible to build up to logical conclusions from agreed upon fact. We cannot subject facts to be reduced to nothing more than political opinion, especially deferring real topics to be nothing more than "political". If in a math class we were discussing what 2+2 equals and the teacher required that

students have a discussion of intellectual diversity that hears out all viewpoints then it would be painting the solution, that $2+2 = 4$, as equally valid as a student that merely believes that it equals 5. With topics such as climate change and others having a large amount of misinformation and illogical opinions being argued with equal weight to fact, it becomes impossible to promote solutions that respond to an existing problem if we are forced to discuss forever what the problem is and whose fault it is rather than facing it head on.

5. Line 600 The Bill Prohibiting “Political Topics” From Being Discussed Will Impede Professional Development And Understanding Of Reality

Any topic could be considered “controversial” even beyond what you have defined within the bill. If political news sources chose to begin writing articles challenging the narrative that $2+2 = 4$, would we then consider that to be “politically controversial”? It is my belief that this is what has happened to topics such as climate policies and DEI as you have outlined in the bill. It is a verifiable fact from researchers that climate change is happening and as an Architect, it is imperative to understand this and to design buildings that achieve climate related goals. By preventing the discussion of this, we will only be delaying action that will have long lasting impact, such as in the lifetime of a building and the next generation of Architects that will either create buildings that are aware or unaware of how their buildings are impacting human health and ecosystems.

6. Line 613 The Bill’s Prohibiting of DEI Will Destroy Opportunity For White Kids To Meet Non-White People And Learn About Who They Really Are As Opposed To What People Tell Them They Are

A college student’s opportunity to discuss racial and ethnic differences in culture, opinion, and lived experiences is many Americans’ only opportunity to use personal experiences to connect with non-white people. This is important for promoting diversity of thought, as people from different countries, backgrounds, etc. have different viewpoints on issues that genuinely vary for different people, rather than artificially simulating diversity in thought through a room of all white people challenging verifiable facts and history.

The Bill claims that it aims to create an environment of differing views and opinions on topics, but without non-white people having equitable opportunity to participate, the diversity is artificially fabricated. If we could focus on creating diverse groups of people, diversity in opinions and thoughts naturally follows.

One Proponent said “DEI is widely used as a tool for racial and political discrimination. ... There’s no good evidence that DEI actually improves race relations, and there’s considerable evidence that it makes them worse.” Once again flipping the script in the benefit of white people’s perception of race relations over the reality of marginalized people’s access to academic and professional opportunities. The perspective of educational opportunities and access for non-white people is immeasurably more impactful in that person’s life than the idea of protecting race relations for a white person.

7. Line 644 The Bill's Prohibiting of Research Grants Will Prevent Meaningful Learning Experiences And Important Work From Being Done To Protect Communities

My friend is doing work on the Cleveland Climate Action Plan which aims to reduce carbon emissions for the city, therefore protecting them from exposure to harmful pollutants as well as the effects of climate change. This Bill will impede upon work like this that makes a real difference for people and my question is what are we gaining in alternate to this. Are your political beliefs more important than saving real quantifiable human lives?

The opportunity for exemption exists but this greatly hampers the research process for people who are focused on getting work done rather than dealing with the bureaucratic system so that they can be allowed to keep doing important work.

8. Line 1037 Deletion of Degree Programs Producing Less Than 5 Graduates Within 3 Years

The Bill will cause the loss of important specialized professional degree programs. Simply because a degree program does not produce a large number of graduates does not make it less valuable for society. I can think of many programs in my college of Architecture such as Healthcare Design, Landscape Architecture, etc. that are incredibly important, but do not have large numbers such as more generalized professions. Contrary to the purported nature of the bill this will delete intellectual diversity.

9. Line 1237 Meritocracy Must Be Allowed To Be Challenged

By erasing the topic of meritocracy from being discussed you will effectively prevent the topic from being fully understood. The role that historical injustices and crimes have played in differing the access to opportunities that build merit for certain groups of people must be understood for other topics to be fully understood.

10. Line 1974 Prohibition of Striking Will Procure Lower Quality Faculty

It's not that students want faculty to strike and delay our education, but precisely the fact that they can strike which incentivises Universities to offer fair compensation which will then bring in professors that are up to higher standards. By prohibiting striking and teachers unions it will effectively attract worse talent that is willing to be paid less. In the interest of students we want professors who are paid desirable wages.

Thank you,
Cameron Hite