ISP 171

**Feedback from Lori Hall:**

I totally understand that faculty may use the brand and logo within a teaching environment, but as the marketing department, we are charged with protecting the brand in all of its public/external uses. And here is where the lines get blurred to me. In 2015, the Board of Education approved the new brand identify and the brand style guide, which states “Logo and mascot usage must be reviewed and approved prior to printing, publishing, posting, embroidery, silk-screening or ASG stamping to confi­rm the logos are being used correctly and effectively.”  My understanding from this board-approved document is that anything that is created for public consumption with our logo on it needs to go through the brand  approval process.

I also question the use of “spirit and intent of brand guidelines.” What does this mean and what is the threshold? The last batch of classroom posters I saw had the icon in the wrong color, a skewed logo, a logo that was blurred around the edges and one that was way too small. I would like to see more structure in the ISP than “spirit and intent.” At what point would a poster or some other material not be produced and distributed without correction? Can that be outlined in the ISP?

Standard #3 is causing me to question why the rest of the ISP is even needed. Why not just have everything produced in the classroom not have the logo?

I guess my biggest concern is that even though these documents are being created in the classroom, once they are out in the public, the consumer cannot differentiate between student work and college-produced materials, which holds the college libel for any inaccuracies, trademark violations and the general standard of our logo and branding. Two years ago, the college received a letter of  intent of a lawsuit from a photographer regarding a nearly 10-year-old postcard promoting a music event that had an unauthorized photo from the photographer and had our logo on it. We are pretty sure the postcard was not produced by the college, but we were still held accountable for it. Would you be opposed to adding a standard in the ISP that all student work used for marketing and promotion needs a “student-produced work” label on it somewhere?

There are other items the marketing department looks out for in the brand review process:

·         Confirmation that accurate class names, codes, times, credits, instructor names, claims of degree/transfer requirements are used (confirmed by Curriculum and Scheduling by the request of Curriculum and Scheduling).

·         Determination if CCC’s Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodations statement needs to be used or confirmation that it’s being displayed correctly (legal requirement).

·         Confirmation that the graphics/photos/illustrations used in materials are from a source that is royalty-free or that gave permission for its use (which you have already identified in the ISP).

·         Confirmation that the campus location is displayed. This is a new issue that has arisen with the expansion of the Harmony campus and more offerings in Wilsonville.

How can we adapt the ISP to cover the above items? Also, what are the protocols to ensure instructors are adhering to the standards and who monitors that?

One other issue that student-produced work that doesn’t go through the marketing review process causes is issues in duplication. We have heard that files are frequently not properly formatted for duplication, which causes extra time and problem-solving in production.

If there is something on our end to make the brand approval process less onerous or cumbersome so we can accommodate you? How can we work together to find a solution that works for all of us?

**Response from Matthew Warren:**

ISP 171 was created to protect the right to academic freedom of the individual from the institution. This is a right afforded by the law and upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. Violation of this right by the current brand policy of the College has been an ongoing issue for years now, and it is one that faculty Senate worked diligently to remedy all last year.

You are correct that students and faculty are protected under this right when using the College logo for educational purposes in the teaching environment. ISP 171 was created, though, to make clear to the College that the teaching environment includes not just the work of the classroom, but also the publication and public display of that academic work (student-made posters promoting an upcoming CCC class or event, for example). This right to academic freedom of the individual from the institution is necessary precisely when the individual and the institution are in conflict, which can occur, for one example in this case, when a student—engaged in the work of learning—determines a use of the logo that falls outside the College’s branding guidelines. While the College may not like a decision a student makes when using the logo, the individual student is protected in doing the work of learning because of the right to academic freedom. This is the scope of the Senate’s conversations last year with David and Tim, and why Senate was encouraged to bring this to ISP (where it was sent to College Council, sent back to ISP, and sent again to College Council for a second read without any notes from either group).

The Board-approved document (“Brand Update,” dated November 29, 2017) was one of the documents referenced last year by the Senate in making the case for clear ISP language regarding academic freedom. For instance, the document stipulates that one must, “Place the CCC logo at the bottom of the page where it acts as a “seal of quality” and endorsement.” This is an example of a College brand approval requirement that violates the individual student’s right to academic freedom from the institution because it mandates where the logo must be placed in a design, which may be (and has been) in conflict with the student’s decision-making in the work of learning they’re engaged in. While faculty appreciate this is a Board-approved document, it appears the Board’s approval did not take into account the right to academic freedom of the individual from the institution. This document, along with a number of other documents, policies, and procedures related to Duplication, ASG, etc., I’m sure, will need updating once ISP 171 is approved.

Perhaps the easiest way forward is to refine ISP 171 and remove the need for the logo on any materials created by students and faculty for the purpose of “academic use” (essentially Standard #3 in the current ISP draft), as you implied. That way when displayed publicly it is clear which materials the College created, and which materials students or faculty created on behalf of the College.

My only hesitation in doing so is this: what are we telling our students who create materials on behalf of the College (to promote course offerings or events that benefit the College)? That their work is somehow not good enough for the College brand? That they’re not allowed to use the College brand because they have ideas for how the logo should be incorporated into a design that do not adhere to College branding guidelines? That seems to run counter to the messy work of learning and discovery we are all here to do.

I need to make a few additional points here for context because, again, this is an issue that has been going on for some time and important details in this decision-making have been lost:

1) We are here to educate students not only to learn how to navigate the rules and guidelines that currently exist in the world, but to leave the College with the tools and skills they need to go into the world to challenge those current rules and guidelines—to interrogate and discover and create new ideas for ways of doing things; and that discovery and creation requires learning to be a messy and oftentimes imperfect process, especially at a 2-year institution where the most a student can accomplish in terms of an earned degree is to become “associated” with a discipline, not master that discipline. Our students are on a learning continuum, and this is why the right to academic freedom of the individual from the institution in that learning is so important—to allow safe, protected space for the room and opportunity to learn, discover, and grow. And the authentic assignments we are talking about here—those for which students produce work for public display to a real-world audience—are invaluable to the student and to the institution in that effort toward learning.

2) To the other items you mention that are part of the current College brand approval process, including the role Duplication and ASG have in that process: I agree—these are most certainly considerations we must make. Once an ISP protecting the right to academic freedom of the individual from the institution is in place, communication of the ISP to invested parties and any necessary revision to the associated processes will most certainly have to take place. Hopefully, though, once these changes are in place it will save everyone—faculty, students, staff—time that can be dedicated elsewhere. And, it will provide non-academic areas, such as CRM or Duplication, an opportunity to support and reinforce the work of learning that happens in the classroom. For example, students who don’t properly format a design for printing usually means that they included improper bleeds or crop marks on their design file, which means Duplication must reset its trimmer to accommodate; *OR*, it means Duplication trims material as it’s presented by the student. This results in what looks like a “mistake”—and this is precisely *HOW* learning happens, and why it’s so messy: students can see their mistake and learn how to remedy it in the future, but they also learn that such a mistake does not mean the whole product is flawed or unfit for display to a real-world audience, not at this stage of their learning; and out of that “mistake” students can often discover a new way of perceiving a challenge and a new way of creating something useful for an audience. For anyone at the College—faculty, staff, or administration—to impart a fear of failure on students utterly undermines the work of learning we’re here to do. So, I and other faculty have made clear to Duplication, for example, that they needn’t make adjustments in their normal workflow to accommodate a student’s error; that way students can see what their mistakes were, and, again, learn from them.

3) Official materials created by the College have included the use of the College logo that violates the College’s own branding guidelines—one need look at the back covers of recent College catalogs, including this year’s, for an example. If a student had decided such a use of the logo was a good idea fit for public display, said use of the logo would not have been approved according to the College’s current brand guidelines; however, it’s somehow acceptable to use the logo in this manner when done officially by the College. This, again, seems to run counter to what it is we are here to do—help students learn, discover, and grow, not control how they learn, discover, and grow (that’s the two-way street of how learning happens between the teacher and the student).

4) I saw mention that CRM was not aware of ISP 171. I spoke with the brand manager approximately one month ago and let him know there was an ISP moving through the committee, what the ISP was for, etc. He seemed thankful and appreciative for the heads-up. This was before the 1st read at College Council. I agree that CRM is an equal voice in this decision-making, but there has been ample time for CRM to be involved in the ISP process this term. And this issue appeared for the first time at the ISP committee last spring term. Further, Senate’s conversations with leadership about this issue and the best path forward, we assumed, meant that CRM was aware this was a concern being dealt with through ISP.

5) Please know that ISP 171 is concerned with protecting the right to academic freedom of the individual from the institution. There will most certainly have to be adjustments to policies and procedures for various areas once ISP 171 is approved (again, Duplication, ASG, etc.), and faculty is ready to assist in that work. This years-long effort is not about disrespecting the work individuals, teams, or departments/areas on campus do; it’s about making sure rights are protected so students can engage the difficult, messy, and exciting work of learning.

I’d like to see what others—those in this email chain and in faculty Senate—have to say about the best way forward here to protect this right for students and faculty, while balancing other needs for the College. I am happy to have this conversation with you and your team, Lori, but I am not comfortable suggesting on my own what changes can or should be made to the current version of ISP 171. I think the draft is striking a fair balance as-is in protecting the right to academic freedom of the individual from the institution, and in protecting the College’s brand and logo. I would like to hear what other people think to move this forward.

**Additional Feedback from Lori:**

My biggest question is whether this can be an ISP. The board of education approved the brand style guide with the expectation that “Logo and mascot usage must be reviewed and approved prior to printing, publishing, posting, embroidery, silk-screening or ASG stamping to confi­rm the logos are being used correctly and effectively.”

According to Inside Higher Ed, *“Academic freedom protects faculty members and students from reprisals for disagreeing with administrative policies or proposals. Academic freedom does not give students or faculty the right to ignore college or university regulations, though it does give faculty and students the right to criticize regulations they believe are unfair.”* [*https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2010/12/21/defining-academic-freedom*](https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2010/12/21/defining-academic-freedom)

**Lori communication with Denice:**

In 2015, the board approved of the brand style guide. What does their approval actually mean? Does it become a regulation that all staff and faculty are expected to adhere to? Just wondering what kind of strength is behind their approval. Thank you for any insight you might have on this.

**Response from Denice:**

Yes, it does mean that staff and faculty are expected to follow the brand. It doesn’t really have any consequences for not doing so, though.

I went back and looked at the notes and there is an clear approval that we will have an identifiable logo and brand, unlike the hodge-podge of different ones in the past.