

Testimony for Senate Bill 1
Submitted by: Gabrielle Miranda
Organization: N/A
Testifying as Opponent

Chair Roegner, Vice-Chair Cirino, Ranking Member Ingram and Members of the Higher Education Committee

My name is Gabrielle Miranda and I live in Cincinnati, Ohio. I am an educator, student, and concerned citizen, and I am asking this committee to oppose Senate Bill 1 which will make Ohio colleges and universities responsible for the harms SB1 will cause historically marginalized voices, such as women and people of varied abilities, as well as the violations against education workers' rights.

I attended optional summer school ages 11-13 in order to prepare for my eventual transition to an independent high school. This was part of a rigorous program dedicated to "reaching those who reach higher." My peers and the alumni from this non-profit scholarship program are some of the most dedicated and generous people I've ever met. Over the years, we assumed roles where we could give back to our diverse communities. We also witnessed many nonprofits, major corporations, cultural centers, and schools commit themselves to principles of inclusion. That those commitments can be so blatantly revoked is a testament to the necessity for academics and all citizens to fight loud and hard for our right to learning environments conducive to growth and functional interdependence.

I am sure many others will testify enumerating reasons I also support. I would like to share this [list](#) verified by the Washington Post which illustrates the words that will signal cause for retrenchment and other forms of censure at the national level. Though perhaps a preliminary set of screeners, words like "bias," "institutional," and "historically," become flags of offense. The implications presented at a federal level are indicative of a departure from centuries of development in scientific inquiry and other important disciplines. What is research without awareness of bias? At a local level, this bill undermines institutions of higher learning, as opposed to giving them tools to address the emotional, social, and material problems created by a contentious political sphere, and a country with a very particular first amendment. Tools to support this landscape of learning and professional development can be fashioned to give opposing views the space to sit with each other. We can do more to listen more, and we can do more to learn about all of our histories. Removing reasonable provisions for faculty and students who come from a legacy of resistance to classroom segregation is a disservice to the goals I present.

Removing the ability for academic laborers to protect their rights is an even more disturbing prospect. I teach in my city of Cincinnati. I have a five year old sister who is learning to read. Do we really want to be a state that collapses its principles in order to mandate a prescriptive educational experience? In what ways do our social dynamics eclipse our professional goals, in general? Is that not a problem better addressed in its immediate context, rather than through legislature that anticipates the biases without anticipating accord?

I respectfully urge the Senate Higher Education Committee to consider my testimony and to vote NO on SB1. Thank you for your time and the opportunity to testify in support of this legislation.

Gabrielle Miranda