

We are grateful for Chairperson Corey's response. On March 19, 2014 we sent Dr. Corey an e-mail and afforded him the opportunity to present his side of the October 28, 2013 meeting with Iymen Chehade and the subsequent section cancelation that launched this academic freedom case. We received no response and six days later issued our report. We mention the absence of a response in the March 25, 2014 report. The day following our e-mail to Professor Corey, Academic Vice President/Interim Provost Louise Love sent an unsolicited e-mail to the committee. It appears that Dr. Corey sought pre-approval from university counsel and believed he should not respond directly to our inquiries. We believe the timing of Dr. Love's e-mail was hardly a coincidence and that our e-mail to Dr. Corey had found its way to the interim provost's office. It is obvious that Dr. Corey saw the e-mail prior to the issuance of our report. He does not deny that. We assumed Dr. Love, as the chief academic officer of Columbia College, was speaking for the institution including Dr. Corey, and her response is cited thoroughly in our report.

To your response to our first e-mail question of March 19: We recognise there is a dispute over the reason for the cancelation of Mr. Chehade's second class. We state that in our report. Our report concluded with appropriate nuance that the reasons for the elimination of the second section six-days after the student complaint were communicated to the professor were "linked events." We are aware that the Israeli/Palestinian Conflict course enjoyed healthy enrollment and we were persuaded by the exhaustive P-fac data analysis during various steps of the Chehade grievance proceedings, that the cancelation was based on factors in addition to customary determination of course offerings: that it was a response to the student complaint about bias in presenting material such as the film, *5 Broken Promises*, on the Israel-Palestinian conflict.

To your response to our second and third e-mail questions of March 19: We believe we have substantial documentation including that of several Columbia College administrators that is inconsistent with your statement. Our report includes Dr. Love's letter to P-fac representative Susan Tyma on March 13, 2014 that unambiguously asserts that you raised the issue of balance with Mr. Chehade: "Mr. Chehade was made aware of the student complaint in a meeting of October 28, 2013, in which Department Chair Steven Corey discussed the importance of presenting issues in a balanced way." In addition another document not cited in our report sustains and affirms our conclusions of academic freedom violations. Assistant Provost Pegeen Quinn's letter to P-fac representative Susan Tyma on February 6, 2014 describes Dr. Corey's interaction with Mr. Chehade at their October 28 meeting: "According to Dr. Corey, at the meeting he discussed the value of a balanced delivery of the subject matter with Mr. Chehade" {Emphasis added} Assistant Provost Quinn also states Mr. Chehade at the grievance hearing testified he was "alarmed" at the October 28, 2013 meeting due to the "power imbalance at the meeting." Mr. Chehade has also informed Illinois Committee A that you raised the issue of

the need for pedagogical balance at your meeting. These gratuitous reminders about the “importance of” and “value of” the need for balance have a chilling impact on academic freedom.

To your response to our fourth e-mail question of March 19: We note you asked the student whether she or he had spoken to Mr. Chehade. However, you do not deny the report’s assertion that neither you nor Dean Holdstein *directed* the student to first discuss the complaint with the instructor. Feeling comfortable is not the criterion under which a student decides whether to initially speak to an instructor concerning a complaint. Our report stands by its assertion that the student should have been asked to first raise the complaint with the instructor before Mr. Chehade is subjected to his chair and interim provost reminding a part-time faculty member, with several years of teaching at the College, about the need for balance in the classroom. We construe this as an intrusion on his academic freedom in attempting to manage or shape his pedagogy. It is fact that Mr. Chehade does not know the name of the student, never received a copy of the student’s e-mail complaint and was never given the opportunity to challenge his accuser. It is fact no administrator or department chair instructed the student to first raise the complaint with the instructor. We believe the handling of the student complaint and the content of your exchange with Mr. Chehade was a violation of his academic freedom.

Peter N. Kirstein

Chair, Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure (Illinois)