SB37 Potential Unintended Consequences on Texas Academic Healthcare Institutions

Texas Conference of the
American Association of University Professors
aaup.texas@gmail.com or agarcia@texasaft.org

March 26, 2025

Potential Consequences on Patient Care

1. **Suppression of Evidence-Based Medical Practices**
   - Politically motivated restrictions could prevent teaching or application of established care (e.g., reproductive health, gender-affirming care, vaccine protocols).
   - Extremist narratives may discourage open discourse on clinical innovations.
2. **Delayed Access to Clinical Trials and New Therapies**
   - Overregulation or ideological scrutiny of research protocols can slow down the pipeline from lab to bedside, especially in cancer treatment.
3. **Erosion of Trust in Clinical Providers**
   - Patients may lose trust in providers affiliated with politically compromised institutions, especially in marginalized communities.
4. **Reduced Provider Competency**
   - Faculty may self-censor, skip controversial topics, or avoid research lines due to fear of political repercussions—leading to underprepared graduates.
5. **Burnout and Faculty Exodus**
   - Increased ideological pressure and decreased autonomy drive away top-tier clinicians, increasing workload for remaining staff and reducing quality of care.
6. **Undermining Academic Freedom and Debate**
   - Faculty and students may self-censor or disengage from meaningful inquiry, weakening the foundation of academic medicine.

Potential Consequences on Biomedical Research

6. **Politicized Research Prioritization**
   - Certain topics (e.g., environmental health, health equity, gun violence, or reproductive science) may be deprioritized or defunded due to ideological bias.
7. **Loss of Federal Funding and Partnerships**
   - Perceived lack of academic freedom or institutional independence may deter NIH, NSF, and private foundations from funding Texas research centers.
8. **Chilling Effect on Innovation**
   - Researchers may avoid risky, controversial, or groundbreaking studies to stay within politically safe boundaries, hindering scientific progress.
9. **Disruption to Translational Research**
   - Barriers between clinical and research missions slow down the development of real-world treatments, particularly in fast-moving fields like oncology.
10. **Barriers to Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration**
    - Restrictions on hiring in non-STEM areas (e.g., ethics, communication, social sciences) fracture the comprehensive research teams needed for complex health issues.

Potential Consequences on Institution and State Reputation

11. **Damage to Accreditation Standing**
    - Accrediting bodies expect shared governance and faculty autonomy. Political interference puts this at risk.
12. **Decline in National Rankings and Prestige**
    - Perceptions of ideological control may lower institutional standing among peers, affecting residency placement and student recruitment.
13. **Brain Drain**
    - Top faculty, trainees, and students may avoid or leave Texas institutions, weakening the intellectual and clinical ecosystem statewide.

14. **Loss of Industry Confidence**
   o Biotech and pharmaceutical partners may hesitate to invest in institutions perceived as unstable, partisan, or at odds with scientific norms.
15. **Public Perception of Bias and Censorship**
   o Patients and families may view institutions as politically compromised, eroding trust in care and scholarship.

Summary Table
Patient Care-Level

Risk Area	Description	Potential Consequences
Broad Faculty Input Loss	Structure for broad faculty participation and input (representative body) eliminated, leading to reduced input into institutional direction and decisions	Weakened clinician input into patient care standards and policies
Interdisciplinary Hiring Barriers	Governing Body control over hiring in non-STEM areas essential to holistic care	Delayed or blocked hiring in areas like ethics, public health, communication
Faculty Attrition	Loss of autonomy and morale could lead to departure of experienced clinician-educators	Reduced continuity in care, supervision, and medical education. Current hiring challenges in healthcare due to burnout.
Curriculum Constraints	Oversight of content could suppress sensitive or evolving clinical topics	Inadequate training in key care areas (e.g., reproductive health, telehealth, disparities)
Accreditation Challenges	Diminished faculty governance may conflict with accrediting body expectations	Risk of negative reviews or loss of accreditation affecting patient education programs
Faculty Burnout and Morale Decline	Increased oversight and reduced engagement can lead to increased burnout	Lower faculty effectiveness in clinical supervision, communication, and safety
Disruption to Clinical Training	Pipeline interruptions if faculty leave or programs face scrutiny	Fewer graduates and decreased workforce capacity for state and affiliated hospitals

Institutional-Level

Risk Area	Description	Potential Consequences
Governance Erosion	Faculty senates will have selected and potentially biased representation. No leadership accountability to faculty.	Loss of faculty engagement; eliminates shared decision making
Recruitment & Retention	Perception of reduced academic freedom	Difficulty attracting or retaining top talent
Curriculum & Research Stifling	Governing Body control over academic content and hiring	Reduced innovation and breakthroughs; potential censorship in sensitive subject areas; decreased stewardship of research resources
Accreditation Risk	Potential misalignment with accreditor expectations on faculty governance	Negative reviews; jeopardized accreditation status
Institutional Reputation	Perceived politicization of biomedical academic operations	Damaged standing in national rankings and peer institutions

Texas State-Level

Risk Area	Description	Potential Consequences
Statewide Brain Drain	Out-migration of talent due to restrictive biomedical academic climate	Loss of innovation capacity and expertise Oppositional to objectives of CPRIT
Reputation & Investment	National image as hostile to academic freedom	Reduced research funding, philanthropy, and collaborations
Workforce Pipeline	Constraints on curricular agility for healthcare education	Shortages in healthcare professionals; limited adaptability
Public Trust Decline	Increased public perception of political interference in healthcare education	Lower confidence in higher education system