

FREE SPEECH AND THE INCLUSIVE CAMPUS

Deliberative Dialogue Moderator's Guide

This guide is provided to assist moderators hosting forums using the *Free Speech and the Inclusive Campus* issue guide. We have provided suggestions for keeping your forum on-time while ensuring that each of the options receives equal deliberative attention. The times indicated for each section assume a 3 hour forum; if you have more or less time for your forum, please adjust the times accordingly.

Introduction and Ground Rules

20 minutes

- Explain what deliberation is and why it matters.
- Introduce ground rules.
- Introduce the issue.

Purpose: Look at Alternative Approaches to the Issue and Hear Different Points of View

- This is not a debate; we're not here to "win" an argument. We're here to listen and learn.
- We'll look carefully at alternative approaches—all of them with trade-offs and drawbacks.
- At the close of the forum, we'll reflect on what we've heard—looking for common ground, but also recognizing remaining areas of tension. We'll identify areas where we ourselves might be willing to reconsider.
- We'll try to think about what matters most to us and what we're willing to give up to make progress on resolving this issue.

My Role: Serve as Impartial Facilitator

- I'm here to help us have a conversation that is as deliberative as possible.
- I'll encourage everyone to consider different viewpoints.
- I'll watch the time to ensure we talk about all the options and have time for reflections at the end.
- From time to time, I may point to specific questions and ideas in the guide, especially if they represent voices not in the room or trade-offs we haven't talked about.
- This is your conversation. Please talk to and listen to each other.

Structure: The Four Parts of a Deliberative Forum

- Ground Rules
- Personal Stake
- Deliberating on the Options: Option 1, Option 2, Option 3
- Closing Reflections

Some sample ground rules used by forum moderators

- Focus on the options.
- Listen to other voices. Listening is as important as speaking.
- Consider each approach fairly, looking at its benefits and its trade-offs.
- Everyone is encouraged to participate. No one or two individuals should dominate.
- It's okay to disagree, but do so with curiosity, not hostility. Learning more about how others think is one of the most interesting parts of a forum.
- Keep an open mind. Avoid coming to conclusions until we've deliberated on all the options.

Are there additional ground rules we would like add?

Do we all agree to follow these ground rules and hold one another accountable to them?

Table Introductions

10 minutes

- Ask everyone to state their name and where they're from—without titles or background!

Personal Stake

25 minutes

- Allows all participants to speak and listen early in the forum. Passing is allowed, but encourage all to share.

Some questions moderators often use to encourage participants to talk about their personal stake in the issue

- Why did you come out to the forum today?
- When you think about this topic on your campus, what concerns you the most?
- What do you think is the biggest challenge facing your campus related to this topic?

OPTION 1 Prioritize student safety and well-being.

25 minutes

This position asserts campuses are responsible first and foremost for protecting student safety and well-being. Campus personnel have a duty to protect students, faculty, and staff from harassment and discrimination and from the impact of harmful speech. People who hold this position believe it is the institution's primary responsibility to protect student safety—both actual and perceived—and physical and psychological well-being, no matter the cost. Threats to safety can disrupt learning and should be curbed when necessary to protect students from harm.

Primary drawback: Campuses would prioritize safety at all costs.

Questions for deliberation:

- What do we like about this option? What don't we like?
- Are there actions associated with this option that we can't accept?
- Are there actions that carry trade-offs we can't accept?
- How should we respond to racism and hate within the campus community to ensure student safety?
- In cultivating a safe campus community, should institutions allow speakers or groups with no formal affiliation with the institution to use the campus space? Even if the presence of those groups or their message make certain student groups feel unsafe?

OPTION 2 Affirm the educational value of intellectual curiosity and engaging with ideas across difference.

25 minutes

This position asserts the primary role of higher education is to stimulate intellectual curiosity and build students' capacity and skills to engage meaningfully in conversations across difference. People who hold this position believe learning often requires discomfort. Instead of limiting that discomfort, we should embrace it and guide students through interpreting their feelings, thoughts, and experiences when they are exposed to ideas that make them uncomfortable. Institutions should invest in support services, campus safety, and guest speaker protocols to encourage student engagement across difference. Through exposure to a range of viewpoints, students learn to question their assumptions and biases, clarify their own values, develop their own ideas, and cultivate a sense of agency in responding to those with whom they disagree.

Primary drawback: Students could be exposed to ideas that may be harmful.

Questions for deliberation:

- What do we like about this option? What don't we like?
- Are there actions associated with this option that we can't accept?
- Are there actions that carry trade-offs we can't accept?
- What should colleges and universities do to encourage freedom in the classroom as well as flexible and responsive critical thinking?
- How should colleges and universities provide the academic freedom needed for lifelong learning?
- Can we meet the needs of our national, state, and local economies without addressing campus culture and inclusivity?

OPTION 3 Uphold the ideals of free speech.

25 minutes

This position asserts institutions should welcome free speech in all its forms, as the university was created to be a marketplace of ideas. Campus environments should welcome public debate and provide space for diverse opinions and ideas—even when they are potentially controversial and/or offensive.

Primary drawback: Open access does not automatically equate to equal opportunity.

Questions for deliberation:

- What do we like about this option? What don't we like?
- Are there actions associated with this option that we can't accept?
- Are there actions that carry trade-offs we can't accept?
- How should colleges and universities prepare for the questions and contests between academic freedom and structural discrimination?
- How do campus cultures understand trigger warnings and microaggressions, which can include statements, actions, or incidents regarded as instances of indirect, subtle, or unintentional discrimination against members of a marginalized group such as a racial or ethnic minority?
- Where are safe spaces allowed, and for whom?

Closing Reflections

25 minutes

Acting on the ideas and proposals presented here will bring about changes that affect all of us, in every city and town, at every higher education institution, and none of them is guaranteed to produce the results we want. It is important to think carefully about the implications of the ideas presented here—to consider how they could improve our politics and, equally important, how they might misfire and make our problems worse.

As we think back on our conversation, here are some important questions to consider:

- Where do we agree?
- What are some of the tensions we experienced?
- Where do we need to talk more?
- Who else should we hear from?
- How do the ideas and options in this guide affect what we do as individuals, as student affairs professionals, and as members of our campus communities?

Additional questions if there's time:

- Now that we have deliberated about these options, are there ideas or viewpoints you hadn't considered before?
- Did you have any second thoughts about any of your initial views?
- What trade-offs are you personally willing to accept? What about the group as a whole?
- Can you identify any tensions that came up during the forum?
- What questions remain? What work do we still need to do? Who else do we need to hear from?
- How has what you heard affected your thinking about what you might do? About what the community might do? About what we want our elected officials in Washington, D.C., to do?

Questionnaires

20 minutes

- Prompt participants to think about what worked well during the forum or what was confusing or difficult.
- If you are collecting paper copies of the questionnaire, be sure to leave time for participants to complete them before leaving the room.
- Participants can also complete the questionnaire online by going to <https://www.naspa.org/project/issue-guides-for-deliberative-dialogue> and clicking on the link for Participant Questionnaire.
- You can either complete and mail your Moderator Report or complete it online by going to <https://www.naspa.org/project/issue-guides-for-deliberative-dialogue> and clicking on the link for Moderator Questionnaire.

FREE SPEECH AND THE INCLUSIVE CAMPUS



NASPA[®]

Student Affairs Administrators
in Higher Education

Moderator's Report

HOW DO WE FOSTER
THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY
WE WANT?

Thank you for your participation in a campus deliberative dialogue using a NASPA issue guide. As the moderator you have a unique perspective. The information you share is vitally important to understanding the forums and reporting on their results.

Please tell us about the forum by responding to the following questions. If you held multiple forums, please fill out a Moderator's Report for each one.

1. What was the forum date?

2. Where was this forum held?

On-campus Off-campus

City/Town

State/Province

ZIP/Postal code

3. How many people attended your forum? (your best estimate)

4. During your forum, did any specific ideas or concerns come up repeatedly among different participants?

Yes No I'm not sure

If yes, please briefly describe what came up repeatedly in the forum.

5. To what extent did the group seem to be divided on the issue?

- Not divided
 Somewhat divided
 Very divided
 I don't know

On what aspects of the issue did participants seem most divided?

6. To what extent were participants willing to make trade-offs about this issue?

- Not willing
- Somewhat willing
- Very willing
- I don't know

Please briefly describe the trade-offs participants seemed MOST willing to make.

Please briefly describe the trade-offs participants seemed LEAST willing to make.

7. After deliberating, did the group seem to have a shared vision for next steps?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please briefly describe the next steps that were identified.

8. Did any memorable or powerful moments occur during the forum?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please briefly describe an example of these moments.

9. Your name:

10. Your email address:

11. Not including this forum, how many deliberative dialogue forums have you attended?

- 0
- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7 or more
- I'm not sure

12. Do you think deliberative dialogue forums like this one would help your campus address other problems or issues?

- Yes
- No

If so, for what other topics would you recommend NASPA create issue guides?

If you moderated this forum, **please fill out a Moderator's Report** (available at <https://www.naspa.org/project/issue-guides-for-deliberative-dialogue>).

If you are filling out the enclosed Moderator's Report, please return the completed form to NASPA, Civic Learning & Democratic Engagement, 111K St. NE, 10th Floor, Washington, DC 20002.