

Chairwoman Roegner, Vice Chair Cirino, Ranking Member Ingram, and members of the Senate Higher Education Committee,

Thank you for allowing me to testify today. My name is Ella McCormick, and I am here as a private citizen and do not represent the views of my university. I am a 4th year in my final semester at the Ohio State University double majoring in Spanish and Politics, Philosophy, and Economics (what we call PPE), with a minor in Legal Foundations of Society, and I am strongly opposed to Senate Bill 1. I would like to provide you all with a glimpse into my experience at OSU and its inconsistencies with the reasoning behind this bill.

In my PPE class, which aims to synthesize our previous course work in Political Science, Philosophy, and Economics, we are presented with a variety of views on certain topics, such as social and political change. In each of these, we are given readings that reflect traditional views, progressive views, and utopian views. Never once has the professor claimed that one of these frameworks is better or more compelling than the other, his job is to provide us with the available perspectives and allow us to draw our own conclusions, a job which he is actively performing. Under the participation section in the course syllabus, it clearly states: "I will encourage disagreement in class discussion, welcoming all perspectives. I will ensure that all sincere and constructive input is taken seriously and that class discussion remains respectful."

In another course I recently took, called Law and Politics, my experience was similar. This professor also made it clear that he would not be revealing his personal views on any of the concepts we were to investigate, and emphasized that what would gain us credit in the course was a critical investigation of the course topics and an ability to communicate, synthesize, and critique them using the US legal framework established by the courts. Our final assignment in this course was a classwide debate in which we were allowed to pick our topic, but were assigned a side by the professor. In my debate, concerning the First Amendment and felon disenfranchisement in Virginia, the side representing Glenn Younkin, a staunch conservative, was voted as the winner by our class and given a higher grade by the professor.

If I had more time in this testimony, I would be able to list countless examples of this same tendency of current Ohio professors to favor reason over opinion and educational prowess over conformity and groupthink. From my understanding, not a single student from a public institution that would be affected by this bill spoke at last week's proponent testimony. I implore you to listen to and digest the perspectives of students and professors around this room who **will**

experience the consequences of this far reaching, intrusive bill, and who can speak much more accurately on the current state of our educational institutions. For these reasons and many more, I will ask the committee to vote no on Senate Bill 1.

I will now take any questions you may have.