

Clarifications re: President Mary Lyons' Justifications for Rescission of Professor Tina Beattie's Invitation to USD, Fall 2012

Between October 19 and October 27, there were various communications and meetings between the CCTC Director and senior administrators of USD (albeit none from the President). These focused in the main on the complaint concerning Prof. Beattie's published writings. The conclusion of all such communications was that all administrators were adamant that Professor Beattie's visit to come and speak at USD was clearly a matter of academic freedom and must go ahead.

There follows a synoptic presentation and analysis of the President's various statements made in justification of her October 27 decision to rescind the invitation to Prof. Beattie. It is clear that these statements focus upon seven areas, *viz.*, USD donors/benefactors, the key reasons President Lyons gives for taking her decision, the issue of 'dissent'/church teaching and teaching authority, the mission of the CCTC, the timing of President Lyons' decision, the question of whether or not the status of visiting fellow was a university 'honor' or not and the issues surrounding the communication concerning Professor Beattie's visit between senior administrators and the CCTC Director between October 18 and 27.

This also helps illustrate what did not happen – due process and university policies, **particularly on academic freedom, shared governance and on inclusion and diversity (as well as on guest speakers)**, were clearly ignored and violated by USD's senior administration.

NB: ML = President Mary Lyons; TB = Prof. Tina Beattie; VP M&M = Vice President for Mission and Ministry; CAS AA = College of Arts and Sciences Academic Assembly; AAUP = American Association of University Professors; PBK = Phi Beta Kappa

President Mary Lyons' Justifications for Rescission of Professor Tina Beattie's Invitation to USD, Fall 2012

1. Donors

Oct. 27 to TB	Nov 2 to Senate Chair	Nov. 6 to CAS AA	Nov. 8 to USD Faculty	Nov 13 to Chair CAS AA	Nov. 15 to Faculty Senate (minutes)	Nov. 20 to AAUP	Nov. 21 to PBK	Dec 4 Forum with AS Students	Dec. 13 to USD Students
<p>ML speaks of “intentions of those who have financially supported the Center”</p>	<p>ML states: “While I seek consultation in these matters, my decisions have been made without regard to pressure groups or donor influence”...</p> <p>“I personally solicited benefactors [for CCTC] who support mission” as defined below.</p>		<p>“I and the CCTC’s first Director solicited benefactors, generous men and women who were champions of our effort to enhance the Catholic identity of the university. Never would they imagine that their gifts would be used to provide honors to Catholic theologians who publicly dissented from the Church’s teaching in the matter that occurred here”.</p> <p>“In addition, offering her an honorary fellowship would be a betrayal of those benefactors who supported the Center with that purpose in mind.”</p>		<p>Donors expect official church teaching to be presented by CCTC. Yet TB urging dissent from church authorities.</p> <p>“Lyons explained that the exercise of her professional responsibility as president includes ensuring the integrity of USD’s Catholic mission and obligations to those who provide funds. This was a problem for her because of the precise mission of the center and the way in which she personally sought support for the center”.</p> <p>ML “has a responsibility to USD’s benefactors and partners, and in this case the issue with which she was confronted would have been a disrespect for the mission and a disrespect for those who have partnered with USD on behalf of the mission”.</p> <p>Yet... “she had no discussions with any of the donors for the CCTC prior to her decision; donor pressure was not a factor in her decision. It was simply providing honors to Dr. Beattie and that would be a breach of her obligation to those donors who had supported the center with the understanding that it would be a place on campus to get a true understanding of the basics of the Church’s traditions”.</p>	<p>CCTC is “privately funded”; TB posed challenge to ML’s obligations to benefactors; the benefaction of those who support mission.</p> <p>Yet ML “had no communication with donors to the CCTC prior to my decision”.</p> <p>Those “who presume my decision was motivated by donor pressure are in error”.</p> <p>“What is a factor in my decision is the ethical obligation to use gifts for their intended purpose”.</p> <p>Giving honors to TB would breach such.</p>	<p>“no off-campus groups’ complaints played any role in my decision making”.</p>	<p>ML: the key thing is that she “went out to benefactors to create the CCTC”.</p> <p>This decision shows USD’s integrity and consistency to its “benefactors”.</p> <p>ML: her decision demonstrated USD keeps its commitments especially to its benefactors.</p> <p>ML said funds have to be used for their specific purpose. The mission has to be followed with integrity.</p>	<p>“nor was I influenced by donors or others”.</p>

2. Key Reasons for Decision									
Oct. 27 to TB	Nov 2 to Senate Chair	Nov. 6 to CAS AA	Nov. 8 to USD Faculty	Nov 13 to Chair CAS AA	Nov. 15 to Faculty Senate (minutes)	Nov. 20 to AAUP	Nov. 21 to PBK	Dec 4 Forum with AS Students	Dec. 13 to USD Students
<p>TB= Catholic Theologian invited to deliver public lectures. TB “dissents publicly” from Church’s moral teaching and ergo contradiction between CCTC mission and TB’s “public stances as a Catholic theologian” (plural)</p>	<p>Mentions ML’s responsibility for Catholic identity of USD.</p> <p>“heart of this matter” = Beattie’s signing a letter “urging Catholics to dissent from official Church teaching”</p> <p>and TB “signed the letter as a ‘theologian’”</p> <p>“One might assume that Catholic theologians to whom we offer a public platform and an honorary fellowship, particularly when offered through the CCTC, would give evidence by their own public positions of support for both the mission of the Center and the Catholic character of the University”.</p>	<p>“it would be a contradiction to provide a Catholic theologian, who publicly opposes Church teaching, an honorary and public platform, particularly” one offered through CCTC.</p>	<p>“Dr. Beattie was not invited to the university by one of our academic departments. She was invited to hold an honorary position and represent the University through the CCTC”.</p> <p>“The invitation to Dr. Beattie was not extended under” the circumstances of academic freedom” had it been so, there would have been no problem.</p> <p>TB’s “public position in opposition to Church teaching, as a Catholic theologian, is incompatible with the CCTC’s purpose.”</p> <p>Offering honorary fellowship would be betrayal of donors.</p>		<p>“decision was very narrow in scope”</p> <p>“When Dr. Beattie used her office as a theologian to urge Catholics with fully informed conscience to oppose that teaching authority she posed a great challenge that was brought to Lyons’ attention”.</p> <p>“The issue for Lyons was holding Beattie up with an honor, as an honorary fellow, because when you give an honor you affirm or approve that person’s position. Particularly for the CCTC it seemed incompatible to honor someone who had very recently taken a position to advocate, in her capacity as a theologian, that Catholic laity should think about, and urge them, to oppose the rightful teaching authority of the Church – that was the issue. It isn’t about same-sex marriage; it had to do with her role as a theologian”.</p> <p>“Her decision was based on the inappropriateness of a Catholic theologian to receive honors from the CCTC” which donors felt should present official church teaching.</p> <p>“at a Catholic university there is a special responsibility that all share for the mission and the integrity of the Catholic</p>	<p>TB invite not “offered through one of our academic programs or departments”.</p> <p>“Dr Beattie used her office as a Catholic theologian urging Catholics – albeit with fully informed consciences- to oppose the [church’s ‘hierarchical structures and its rightful teaching authority’]... which is what she did by signing the August 13 letter to the Times in London’.</p> <p>“responsibilities’ of ML to insure “the integrity of our Catholic mission and our obligations to those benefactors who supported the CCTC”.</p> <p>“honors (and thus affirmation)” cannot be given to a Catholic theologian, “when sponsored by a Catholic Center with a mission as described above and supported by those whose benefaction was provided in support of that mission”</p> <p>Decision = “a narrow decision about giving honors within the</p>	<p>TB’s actions in signing <i>Times</i> letter “incompatible with the original invitation”.</p>	<p>“made for sound reasons”.</p> <p>ML said it was all about the integrity of mission and the congruity of what we say we are and how we hold it all together. TB’s public statement as a Catholic theologian was urging people that the legitimate teaching authority of the church need not be heeded. The CCTC was one place where people could find out what the church officially teaches.</p> <p>ML: all about integrity and congruity. It was all about the congruity between what we are and who we honor.</p> <p>ML stated “nobody died, let’s get real here” and also that “nobody’s academic freedom had been violated, not even Professor Beattie’s”. It was ‘not about same sex marriage’. But TB had chosen an unusual step improper for a Catholic theologian, by urging Catholics to oppose the “legitimate teaching authority of the church, i.e., the bishops”. She then said TB and any USD a faculty member is</p>	<p>“my decision was based solely on dissent from the Church’s legitimate teaching authority”</p>

				mission of the university". "Lyons said absolutely Dr. Beattie could come to USD to speak; no one was interfering with that right to speak. It was the honor to which Lyons objected".	context of the CCTC".		entitled to do this but the key was she could not come here and hold an institutional honor.	
--	--	--	--	---	-----------------------	--	--	--

3. Church Teaching/Doctrine/Authority									
Oct. 27 to TB	Nov 2 to Senate Chair	Nov. 6 to Chair CAS AA	Nov. 8 to USD Faculty	Nov 13 to Chair CAS AA	Nov. 15 to Faculty Senate (minutes)	Nov. 20 to AAUP	Nov. 21 to PBK	Dec 4 Forum with AS Students	Dec. 13 to USD Students
<p>Novel presumption that CCTC’s mission included need for consistent presentation of church’s moral teachings and TB dissents publicly from such (i.e. plural instances of dissent).</p> <p>[NB: the understanding of the CCTC mission in each of these statements is totally novel to CCTC staff].</p>	<p>“Dr. Beattie’s extensive record of scholarship has been well known, addressing issues that many would presume to be controversial, e.g. abortion and sexual orientation”.</p> <p>“It is my considered judgment that Dr Beattie’s decision to exercise her office as a Catholic theologian and sign a public document dissenting from the Church’s official teaching is what led me to rescind the invitation”.</p>	<p>TB “took a public position in opposition of Church teaching”.</p>	<p>Dissent in “the matter that occurred here” = key issue.</p> <p>TB “in her own scholarly writings she has taken positions that many would say challenge Church teachings. Would this have been a reason to question her selection as a fellow in the CCTC by me? Absolutely not.”</p> <p>“on August 13th 2012, Dr. Beattie had joined others in issuing a public statement within the UK stating that ‘it is perfectly proper for Catholics, using fully informed consciences, to support the legal extension of civil marriage to same-sex couples.’</p> <p>Whether you agree or do not agree with this position, it is a stance in direct conflict with the Church’s own teaching” .</p> <p>TB “publicly dissents from Church teaching”.</p>		<p>“CCTC that was designed and supported by those who expected that the center would be a clear and consistent presentation of the Church’s position, particularly, in this case, with respect to the teaching authority of the Church”.</p>			<p>The issue with TB was that she was a Catholic theologian in this context of providing guidance to the Catholic laity. ML speaks of traditional importance of links between Catholic theologians and the ecclesiastical authorities and how licenses were necessary for theologians in the past.</p>	<p>Dissension from teaching authority (i.e. bishops) <u>not</u> dissent from particular teachings now the issue: “I did not take the topic of that dissent into account when making my decision”.</p>

4. CCTC Mission according to ML post Oct. 27									
Oct. 27 to TB	Nov 2 to Senate Chair	Nov. 6 to CAS AA	Nov. 8 to USD Faculty	Nov 13 to Chair CAS AA	Nov. 15 to Faculty Senate (minutes)	Nov. 20 to AAUP	Nov. 21 to PBK	Dec 4 Forum with AS Students	Dec. 13 to USD Students
<p>“Center’s primary mission ... to provide opportunities to engage the Catholic intellectual traditions in its diverse embodiments”</p>	<p>“exists to provide opportunities for its participants to learn about the Church’s intellectual tradition in its many dimensions, including its doctrinal, moral, spiritual, social, aesthetic contributions”.</p>		<p>“to be a resource for others, especially the faculty, inviting them to explore through the lens of their own disciplines and research interests how a scholarly life pursued within the context of a Catholic university provides a vast landscape for their intellectual pursuits, one that reckons with the reality of the sacred and rests upon the foundation of a rich and vital wisdom tradition. The CCTC’s purpose then is to present that tradition with accuracy and respect”.</p>		<p>“created and privately funded with a mission to invite the university community into dialogue with the intellectual, social, cultural, moral and spiritual heritage of the Roman Catholic Church, which includes a clear and consistent presentation of the Church’s hierarchical structures and its right to teaching authority”.</p> <p>CCTC “is an independent center of the university whose mission is primarily and objectively to help universities like USD to give evidence of their Catholic character”.</p> <p>“The center was created and funded so those on campus, particularly faculty, could be invited into programs and experiences starting from the lens of their discipline, not from theology. Its purpose is to be an independent center with a mission of the traditions of the Church. It reports to [Vice Provost] because it would be more useful to have it report within the Provost’s Office, but it could report anywhere”.</p> <p>F “commented that the center’s name is the Center for Catholic Thought and Culture and there are a variety of Catholic thoughts and cultures within Catholicism. He is hearing that the center is about a doctrinal, canonical, Church approved way of thinking, being,</p>	<p>“Put plainly, the CCTC was created and privately funded with a mission ‘to invite the university community into dialogue with the intellectual, cultural and spiritual heritage of the Catholic Church’ This would include a clear and consistent presentation of the Church’s hierarchical structures and its rightful teaching authority”.</p>		<p>CCTC was to be a resource for faculty but just not faculty. It exists to help others learn more about the Catholic tradition (then contradicts herself by saying it exists only to help faculty learn about the different components of Catholic intellectual, social and moral traditions). The “Center exists as a place where the teachings of the Church would be authentically available” for those who wanted to know more about them.</p> <p>ML: the Center was founded to be a place where official church teaching was presented.</p> <p>ML: the “CCTC exists as a place where folk can go to learn what the Church does indeed teach in its dogma”. It is not a place “where those particular principles are presented in a demeaning manner”.</p>	

				<p>seeing the world. He asked why the center is so named. Lyons responded that there could be a long debate about the design of the center. The word “diverse” in her letter describes the diverse embodiments of the Church’s traditions. One of the Church’s traditions is its moral, its structure, and its hierarchical tradition. The idea is that when one encounters the center that it is one resource, all that it is meant to be, where people can learn about the Church’s hierarchy and Church teachings”.</p> <p>M “presented two questions from Peace Studies faculty. Why is it presumed that honorary fellowships convey some sort of application on someone’s views whether they be academic or political and rather than the way in which that person has chosen to struggle with the issues that they deal with in their academic or political lives. Secondly, given the fact that the Catholic Church does not tolerate dissenting views within its own ranks, do we not as a Catholic university have a special obligation to host these types of conversations, especially at the CCTC, that might not be able to happen otherwise? <u>Lyons responded to the second question and said that the Church does tolerate dissent and for theologians part of their vocation is to dissent because that is how the tradition develops.</u> We are a <u>Catholic university at its best when we become a crucible for that sort of collision of ideas.</u> In terms of the first question, the institution has the obligation, right and responsibility to say who gets honored and who doesn’t. There</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>is academic freedom for individuals and institutional academic freedom. USD has the right to not honor a person. Lyons explained that it is inappropriate to hold someone up for honors who has taken a stand that is antithetical to the mission of the center. Can she speak anywhere, yes. Do we respect her as a theologian and her ability to be as controversial as she feels appropriate in the exercise of her scholarly work, absolutely. It is also true that USD has the right and freedom to say USD will not honor her”.</p>				
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

5. Timing:									
Oct. 27 to TB	Nov 2 to Senate Chair	Nov. 6 to CAS AA	Nov. 8 to USD Faculty	Nov 13 to Chair CAS AA	Nov. 15 to Faculty Senate (minutes)	Nov. 20 to AAUP	Nov. 21 to PBK	Dec 4 Forum with AS Students	Dec. 13 to USD Students
<p>Decision arrived at “with great and thoughtful consideration”.</p> <p>[On Oct 30 writes to TB who had suggested finding some creative alternative way around this ML: “my decision stands”. Decision made public on Oct. 31].</p>	<p>Decision was instance of ML exercising “prudential judgment” that was “thoughtfully considered”,</p> <p>“my considered judgment”.</p>	<p>Had additional information been available ML “it may have been possible to make other arrangements and, I would not have been put in a position’ of cancelling visit with short notice” but then states she made the right decision in any case.</p>	<p>“no time for making other arrangements that might have ameliorated the situation”.</p>		<p>“The decision was made with very little time; if there had been more time and a little bit of opportunity the decision may not have been made – that is important.”</p> <p>“If the information had been available in advance she may have been able to work something out”.</p> <p>G “asked three questions: 1) Is the Senate to understand that the only reason that the offer to Beattie was rescinded was because the original invitation included an honorary fellowship?</p> <p>2) After the rescission took place Beattie made public statements and also made public a letter sent to Lyons which states “If you are willing to reconsider your decision I will do everything in my power to support you and to show my solidarity with you.”</p> <p>G “asked why the honorary status could not have been eliminated at that point. 3) The Academic Freedom Policy states “The university maintains that academic freedom is compatible with the university’s Roman Catholic identity. The university poses no religious limitation on academic</p>	<p>ML “should not have had to make this decision, particularly at the last minute as I was forced to do” with more notice ML is convinced “some arrangement might have been made to accommodate Dr Beattie”</p>	<p>Time to “discuss and potentially find alternative arrangements to facilitate Dr Beattie’s visit” was “severely cut short”.</p>	<p>ML insisted she made the right decision and did so for sound reasons. There was no time to take any other course of action.</p> <p>Student asks why ML’s original letter did not just say Tb could come but without ‘honor’. ML says there was no time.</p>	<p>“While I earnestly wish that timing and communications in advance of my decision had allowed for a better and more consultative process, I was not given that opportunity.... I deeply regret the way my decision was communicated.”</p>

				<p><u>freedom.</u> The statement makes no distinctions among <u>different units, centers, institutes</u> or other entities on campus. Nonetheless, <u>the CCTC has been isolated and excluded from the essence of the university's academic freedom.</u> He asked how she understands academic freedom and the Catholic identity of USD. Lyons responded that the policy also asks for respect of the Catholic character or identity of USD. In this case, in her opinion, that is what was at stake in the center and the honorary fellowship. In response to the first question, Lyons stated that it was holding up Beattie in an honorary way within the CCTC and within the context of the decision that she made. That is the crux of it, not her other writings, etc."</p>				
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

6. 'Honor'									
Oct. 27 to TB	Nov 2 to Senate Chair	Nov. 6 to CAS AA	Nov. 8 to USD Faculty	Nov 13 to Chair CAS AA	Nov. 15 to Faculty Senate (minutes)	Nov. 20 to AAUP	Nov. 21 to PBK	Dec 4 Forum with AS Students	Dec. 13 to USD Students
No mention – instead speaks of CCTC “visiting fellow”	“honorary fellowship”	“honorary fellowship”; “Honorary and public platform”	“a one month honorary fellowship within the CCTC” [In fact Beattie was due to be here for almost six weeks but in no “honorary capacity, simply as visiting fellow”].	“honorary fellowship” in CCTC. “honorary affiliation with the University”.	<p>“Lyons clarified that the center should have academic freedom. Beattie could have come to speak, it was only about the honor”. “Lyons said ... There are many speakers who come to campus who have positions that may be very controversial. She doesn’t enter into who comes and who speaks. In this case, it came to her attention because it is a Catholic theologian getting an honor in the CCTC.”</p> <p>Lyons admits there is no process to determine what constitutes an honor and who should get one at USD.</p> <p>E “said his understanding of the letter is that the invitation was rescinded, not the offer of the honorary title. Lyons responded that she didn’t make a distinction in the letter between the honorary fellowship and the invitation because in her mind the invitation was to hold the honorary fellowship”.</p> <p>Q “asked whether there is a criteria for this particular fellowship? Lyons responded that as far as she knows a donor funded a lecture. She doesn’t know what the nature of the fellowship was. However, when a fellowship is granted you are granting an honor. [F] commented that when he is invited to be a speaker he considers that as an “honor.” He understands the distinction between that and an endowed chair or fellowship. He is struggling with the distinctions between which honors matter and which honors don’t and placed that before the Senate for discussion”.</p>	“honorary fellowship” in CCTC. “Providing honors to Dr Beattie within the CCTC” would breach “ethical obligations” to benefactors.	TB can come only “without the honorary affiliation that had been associated with the previous invitation”.	ML “a visiting fellowship is an institutional honor, “an institutional imprimatur, if you will”. She said it goes back to congruity – to hold up TB in the CCTC is incongruous and “not consistent with the integrity of the mission”.	
						TB “would be welcome to come and speak in the CCTC without honors being conferred”.		<p>“This happens elsewhere” - she compared the Beattie affair to the former President of Mexico being disinvented from Texas state (one student said it was the precise opposite).</p> <p>Another student asked why, given what she said, that she cancelled TB’s visit at all and did not just let her come without “honor”. ML replied there was no time and “that’s why this got kicked upstairs. It happened in August and people knew about it and did nothing” [not true]. So TB can come but not with honor, that’s the key difference, ML said.</p>	

7. Consultation									
Oct. 27 to TB	Nov 2 to Senate Chair	Nov. 6 to CAS AA	Nov. 8 to USD Faculty	Nov 13 to Chair CAS AA	Nov. 15 to Faculty Senate (minutes)	Nov. 20 to AAUP	Nov. 21 to PBK	Dec 4 Forum with AS Students	Dec. 13 to USD Students
<p>Copies TB letter to GM:</p> <p>ML's decision arrived at "with great and thoughtful consideration".</p>	<p>ML seeks "consultation" when making such decisions.</p>				<p>"Lyons responded that when she was traveling her executive team was trying to have that discussion and they never had any response." [Not true]</p> <p>"Lyons was away from campus at the time and her executive team assessed the situation. Between October 19 and October 25, [VP for Mission & Ministry] made several efforts by email and telephone to learn from the director the circumstances surrounding the issue in order to advise whether or not to continue with Beattie's invitation. The director was invited to a meeting and he deferred characterizing the issue as much to do about nothing. Later [VP for M&M] called [CCTC Director] suggesting a call to Beattie's bishop, who had previously cancelled a lecture of hers after the August letter. The director offered to arrange it, but [VP for M&M] said to hold on it because it may not be needed. Later, [VP for M&M] told [CCTC Director] the call was needed and it was urgent. VP for M&M asked [CCTC Director] twice, first he was told the bishop might be in Rome and there was a time zone change, and then there was no response from the director [not true]. The information never came that might have helped mitigate this even though at that point there was little time left. On October 27, without an opportunity to have any consultation or communication, she sent a notice to Beattie and on the same day to [CCTC Director]. There was a breakdown in communications on both sides and became a very untenable circumstance for her."</p>	<p>ML claims Vice President for Mission & Ministry made several attempts by telephone and email between Oct. 19 and 25 "to learn from the Director the precise circumstances surrounding the issue in order to advise whether or not Dr Beattie's action warranted some response from the University. The Director was first invited to a meeting; he deferred, [not true] characterizing the issue as 'much ado about nothing', or words to that effect, and was adamant that nothing should be done. The Director initially offered to arrange a call with Dr Beattie's own bishop to clear things up, and the Vice President for Mission and ministry contacted the Director to ask that such a call be arranged. Despite two follow-up requests, citing the urgency of the matter, and despite the Director's initial offer, no call or communications were arranged". Therefore ML was put into position of having to make the decision.</p> <p>"the 'breakdown' in communication is obvious. It would have been far better to discuss with the Director why continuing to offer honors to Dr Beattie was problematic."</p> <p>"While the communications between and among those involved could have been better, I do believe I exercised my own professional and ethical responsibilities in this particular instance'.</p>		<p>ML spoke of a "rather fruitless effort to find out what was going on".</p> <p>Student asked why the Director of the CCTC had not been consulted in all this. ML said there "was an effort made for some dialogue and it didn't happen" [not true].</p>	<p>"While I earnestly wish that timing and communications in advance of my decision had allowed for a better and more consultative process, I was not given that opportunity.... I deeply regret the way my decision was communicated."</p>

				<p>B “asked whether Lyons had had a conversation with the CCTC director about an easy solution and how to solve the issue. Lyons responded that she was out of town and [VP M&M] contacted him as soon as they found out about her public statement. A meeting was called but [CCTC Director] didn’t attend. [In fact Director was <u>not</u> invited and had been told no meeting was necessary]</p> <p>[VP M&M] told but [CCTC Director] they would get back with him and then later when it was more urgent but [CCTC Director] suggested a skype call with her bishop in the UK. [VP M&M] agreed to that and as it became more urgent he requested the call right away. Efforts were made for the call, which were followed by no response from [CCTC Director] [not true] and the call didn’t happen. There were efforts made but to no avail.”</p> <p>N “asked whether there was any consideration given before the email was sent of changing the title under which she came. Lyons responded that there could have been any number of solutions that might have worked given the opportunity and efforts that were made to discuss this before she issued her email and letter, but they were not followed through. There was no consultation and there should have been”.</p> <p>N “stated that if the only point of issue was that Beattie was to be given an honorary fellowship then the simplest solution would have been to address that issue. If the president could rescind the invitation why could not the terms of the invitation be altered in order to address the concerns? Lyons responded that when she was traveling her executive team was trying to have that discussion and they never had any response [not true]. Lyons said that the letter appeared in The Times on August 13 and she found out about it October 18. It was that time</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>in between that something could have been done and she didn't have the opportunity". [In fact there was no issue to deal with prior to October 18 and the 'anonymous complaint'].</p> <p>N "asked whether the solution, the problem with the title, happened after the firestorm or was it part of the discussions prior to that? Lyons said she didn't extend the offer of the fellowship. She was only taking issue with the invitation that was to hold up as a public platform, an honor under those circumstances. [N] asked whether the solution that was offered recently had been a solution that had come up in discussions with her executive team prior to the rescission. Lyons responded that it had not. Her team had made the effort on her behalf to have discussions and there were no discussions. In retrospect, it would have been a great idea".</p> <p>[In fact this very idea was put to ML by Prof Doak, THRS (on Oct 28) and Prof Beattie offered to jointly find 'creative solution' (Oct. 30); CCTC Director also proposed ways forward (Oct. 29)]</p> <p>E "stated that another element is the issue of consultation that has concerns of shared governance. Within the academic units there is the feeling that faculty governance is weaker as a result of this situation. Lyons agreed that it is a problem and it should not have happened. There should have been time for consultation".</p> <p>K "remarked that for there to be time for consultation the director would have needed to anticipate that someone would think that academic freedom didn't protect Beattie even though she would be speaking on campus on an unrelated topic".</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>N “asked whether there was a conversation about the decision with [CCTC Director’s] supervisor, Dr. Herrinton, before the invitation was rescinded. Lyons asked Herrinton to respond. Besnoy stated that Herrinton is at the meeting at the request of Lyons and is not a guest of the Senate. Herrinton said that he had conversations with the provost who talked with the president before the invitation was rescinded. He assumed that his conversations with the provost were communicated to the president”.</p> <p>K “expressed concern that the short amount of time available for a decision was not utilized in an effective way to consider alternatives. Lyons responded that that is a fair criticism. It was an inelegant process from the beginning. She regrets that there wasn’t more time and consultation. She owns up to both sides taking responsibility for failures of communication”.</p>			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

The Key Issues

There exists clear and irrefutable evidence on the following points, all of which demonstrate that each and every one of President Lyons’ justifications for her decision to rescind the invitation to Prof. Beattie do not withstand scrutiny:

- a. The CCTC is an academic unit of USD and its mission includes and has always included open, inclusive, rigorous and critical engagement with aspects of the Catholic intellectual, social and cultural traditions.
- b. Prof. Tina Beattie’s signing of the letter in the *Times* did not constitute dissent from official church teaching.
- c. Even if had done so, USD’s policies on academic freedom should have protected her against President Lyons’ decisions.
- d. There was no ‘honorary’ status to the planned attachment of Professor Beattie to the CCTC.
- e. There was no attempt to consult or communicate with the CCTC director before this decision was taken.
- f. President Lyons has refused to admit any wrongdoing or error in any of this and has repeatedly ignored multiple requests from students, faculty and beyond campus that she apologize to those most affected by this, along with the wider university community.
- g. USD process and policies, especially relating to academic freedom, shared governance, inclusion and diversity and guest speakers were ignored and violated by USD administration.

Whichever way one explores this sorry episode in USD’s history, it boils down to the fact that **there was no justification for President Lyons’ decision**. Each justification falls apart upon examination. For example, if there was no dissent, end of story, whether the visit was honorary or not. If not honorary, end of story, whether there was dissent or not (according to Pres. Lyons’ own logic in later statements). Even if one or all of her reasons did contain any truth, USD, WASC and AAUP policies would still mean the decision was wrong.