

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF INQUIRY  
TARRANT COUNTY COLLEGE  
JANUARY 19, 2012  
A REBUTTAL**

**BY**

**PAUL DERENGOWSKI, THM**

**FEBRUARY 3, 2012**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF INQUIRY: A REBUTTAL

February 3, 2012

### Preface

The following is a rebuttal to Tarrant County College's Executive Summary of Inquiry statement made in lieu of its investigation done in response to the incident November 8, 2011 during the Great Religions of the World class taught by Professor Paul Derengowski. The class commenced at the Southeast Campus in Arlington, Texas on Tuesday and Thursday evenings from 7:00 p.m. to 8:20 p.m.

The Summary stems from complaints offered by two Muslim students and three non-Muslim students, the former of which accused Professor Derengowski of a range of charges, but are countered by the claims of the non-Muslims students. The rebuttal is offered by Mr. Derengowski and will show that not only were the Muslims accusations specious and defamatory, but that TCC officials were negligent in their duty, as well as religiously prejudicial and discriminatory in their actions. So much so, that in their effort to appease the Muslims, his freedom to express himself was sacrificed on the altar of expedience.

Moreover, it will be demonstrated that no investigation actually took place and that the non-Muslims students, as well as the professor's, complaints were ignored in favor of the two Muslims, which further substantiates the charge of religious prejudice and discrimination.

The Executive Summary of Inquiry is ten pages in length and was published by Tarrant County College and appeared first in the Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* newspaper, online version, January 19, 2012. Its full contents are found in the text body.

The rebuttal is found in the 115 footnotes. The total length of the rebuttal, therefore, is 28 pages and carefully documents not only the numerous misleading statements and outright lies told by both the Muslim students and TCC officials, but points out several anachronisms, confections, and inconsistencies in the testimony.

By a careful reading of the contents it will become clear to the reader that not only was the final decision based on numerous untruths, but that Professor Derengowski was unjustly libeled by his accusers and the college district for "slandering" the religion of Islam and "creating a hostile learning environment." The reality is, he told the truth, just like he has all along, and they had no intellectually honest response. So, they exchanged the truth for a lie and demonized the truth-bearer while providing a safe haven for the liar.

"It is impossible for a man to be a successful liar unless someone believes him."—McKenzie

**Executive Summary of Inquiry: A Response**  
**Great Religions of the World Classroom Incident**

**January 19, 2012**

This inquiry report combines five student complaints related to Philosophy 1304, Great Religions of the World, taught by Mr. Paul Derengowski, part-time instructor (adjunct faculty, at the Southeast Campus during the fall 2011 semester. This report also addresses Mr. Derengowski's complaint related to his resignation.<sup>1</sup> Part I of this inquiry reviews complaints by two Muslim students who reported religious discrimination and harassment by creating a hostile learning environment in violation of TCC policies.<sup>2</sup> In addition, Part I of this inquiry reviews Mr. Derengowski's complaint that he resigned under duress.<sup>3</sup> Part II reviews three student complaints against the two Muslim students for disruptive behavior, defaming the instructor, and TCC administrators for failing to act.<sup>4</sup>

**Part I of Inquiry**

**Complaints by Two Students against Mr. Derengowski**

---

<sup>1</sup> It is not proper protocol or professionally ethical to combine a series of individual complaints, some of which have been officially filed in writing with those which were merely verbal, and then publish them to a news media outlet (*Fort Worth Star-Telegram*). What TCC should have done was to address each individual complaint and then issued written statements accordingly, as per what is written on the TCC Student Complaint/Grievance Form. Moreover, TCC combined an employment issue with a student issue. Therefore, TCC officials not only violated their own stated protocol, but engaged in ethical malfeasance.

<sup>2</sup> It is interesting that TCC chose to begin this report by addressing the alleged Muslim complaints first. In fact, they begin with the November 15 events, rather than provide a timeline by addressing Mohamad Khorchid's ("Student B") disruptive behavior early on in the semester. It is indicative of TCC's mindset: to cater to the Muslims, while essentially neglecting everyone else? It is a reason why the reader is soon to discover just how disorderly, convoluted, and discriminatory TCC's commentary is as well.

<sup>3</sup> This is actually misleading since Mr. Derengowski did not file any complaint. All he did was submit an addition to his Personnel File to correct the misconception that he had voluntarily walked away from his teaching duties, as if nothing compelled him to resign. TCC officials merely took it upon themselves to try and rebut something that does not exist, namely a complaint.

<sup>4</sup> The reality is the student complaints were marginalized by proffering an untrue replay of the events on November 3 and 8, and then returning to the testimony of the Muslim students and how they felt so poorly treated and discriminated against, the latter of which is patently untrue. In essence, the student grievances were never dealt with, even after two months of having them on the desks of TCC administrators, and followed up by numerous written and verbal inquiries asking what TCC officials were going to do.

**Allegations:** Two Muslim students, Student A and Student B, complained to TCC officials about Mr. Derengowski, instructor of Great Religions of the World class.<sup>5</sup> On November 15, 2011, Student A called the Office of Human Resources and stated she was calling for herself and on behalf of Mr. Student B to report that Mr. Derengowski was teaching their religion of Islam in a very biased and hateful manner and that Student B had spoken out in class about how Mr. Derengowski was teaching, stating that Mr. Derengowski was making statements about Islam that were wrong and out of context.<sup>6</sup> Student B stated that Mr. Derengowski was slandering the Islamic religion and making many ugly statements about it instead of teaching the actual religion.<sup>7</sup> She stated she and Student B felt discriminated against and that they had departed

---

<sup>5</sup> It is important to understand that these so-called “complaints” originated with a failure to follow proper protocol when a student has an issue with the professor. At no time did either student approach the professor with their concerns, but created a hostility between them and he by attacking him personally in class and through maliciously written commentary, both on a dubious Mormon web blog and then through a libelous email sent to all the other students. As will be seen TCC officials justified their “complaints” by falsely charging the professor with a whole range of misdeeds which completely contradict the evaluations of the professor by the same officials earlier while teaching at TCC. Moreover, there was no written complaint filed by the two Muslim students. They merely complained and TCC officials jumped to their beck and call.

<sup>6</sup> First, the confession should be noted on the part of TCC that the female Muslim student “called” Human Resources, which is not proper protocol in dealing with this kind of issue. Second, again, there was no written complaint. It was purely hearsay and there was no due process. Third, one student complaining in behalf of another student is not proper protocol, since it is hearsay. Fourth, if the professor was doing as alleged, then why did not either Randa or Mohamad address the lecture itself, which included reading directly from Islamic scholars and sources, verbatim? Why did Mohamad spend all his time attacking the integrity and person of the professor, and then interrupt the class and get ugly with the other students in the class when they attempted to ask questions and/or opine about certain topics? Clearly if Mohamad was doing as stated in this report, then he should have had no problem doing what hundreds of other students have done preceding him by simply asking questions and making statements in a civilized manner, which addressed the topic itself, and refrained from his belligerent outbursts which only served to stifle the education process, rather than promote it. Moreover, if Randa was as concerned as she alleged, then why did she not (1) consult with the professor in private, (2) go through the proper chain of command, if she could not find solace, or (3) file a written grievance rather than merely making a phone call?

<sup>7</sup> It is interesting that when Randa wrote her defamatory diatribe of an email that she admitted: “It wasn’t about the information and facts we were debating,” meaning that slander was not possible, since the information and facts were correct. And why would that be the case? Because all the professor was doing at the time when Randa and Mohamad became combative and belligerent was read from Islamic sources—*The Life of Muhammad* by Husein Haykal—including the Koran, that answered their question about sources explaining what their beloved Muhammad condoned, which was the murder and enslavement of some Meccan caravan drivers, and the theft of their goods to support his dictatorial effort at Medina after fleeing Mecca. It is a

class early because they did not want to continue to hear Mr. Derengowski slandering of their religious beliefs.<sup>8</sup> The two students, Student B and Student A, also complained to the Southeast Campus administrators, making similar allegations.<sup>9</sup>

Student A said she and Student B felt that Mr. Derengowski had created an inappropriate learning environment<sup>10</sup> filled with many “misstatements and lies”<sup>11</sup> about the Islamic religion and that he also posts “bad and ugly” things on his personal website that are “untrue and very misleading” about the Muslim community<sup>12</sup> including referring to her religion as a “cult.”<sup>13</sup>

---

well-known event for those familiar with Islamic history, which both Mohamad and Randa claimed at the start of the lectures on Islam when they said they were knowledgeable.

<sup>8</sup> Please note the acknowledgment of guilt that Randa admits to leaving class early. Earlier she threatened in an email to the professor that she would see Ms. Wettengel because she denied leaving early. Now it comes out in the TCC report that she did leave early after all, vindicating the professor’s testimony.

The reality is there was no discrimination or slander because the professor was quoting from Islamic material that directly contradicted the preconceived notions that both Muslim students had about their religion. Muhammad did condone the raids at Nahklah. Apostasy from Islam is punishable by death. The Koran does contradict the Biblical account of the creation. All of those topics were covered during the November 8 lecture, as the Islamic scholar, Husein Haykal, the Koran, *Reliance of the Traveler*, and al-Bukhari’s *Hadith* were quoted, verbatim, to answer not only the Muslim student’s questions about sources, but other questions coming from other students in the class.

This has the appearance of an orchestrated effort on the parts of Randa and Mohamad to stifle open inquiry, all for the sake of safeguarding Islam from exposure to the truth.

<sup>9</sup> This is evidence that the actions of the two students was backwards and that TCC allowed it in order to appease their religious complaint. It is also contradictory in how TCC handled not only the complaint of the professor, but demonstrated prejudicial disrespect of the three students who *did* follow protocol in their grievance filings. The two Muslim students were given an immediate hearing, while the three students waited through months of intentional delays and were still never heard, and TCC rendered an immediate judgment without any due process or proper appeal.

<sup>10</sup> This is not verbiage that Randa would use. All one has to do is look at her libelous email and blog entry, as well as to have graded her papers, to understand the point. Instead, it is what TCC has concocted and then placed in Randa’s commentary. They spoke for her, in other words.

<sup>11</sup> It is interesting that this allegation keeps getting repeated, but no one has ever actually pointed out just what these alleged “misstatements and lies” are. The expression is merely stated without any supporting evidence, as if to continue to repeat something, it then becomes true. The fact is, the two Muslim students created an atmosphere of lying and deception to safeguard Islam and then TCC colluded with them in their scheme.

<sup>12</sup> This follows on the heels of the previous comment and is equally unsupportable. Besides, what the professor has written on his website concerning Islam has no relevance in this discussion, since nothing from the website on Islam was required reading. Dr. Coan tried to make it an issue by jumping to conclusions during the meeting that she ordered held with her, Josué Munoz, Sharon Wettengel and Mr. Derengowski, whereby she assumed that because the

Student A stated that she and Student B were requesting that the College review Mr. Derengowski's teaching presentations in order to put an end to all the "slanderous and untrue comments" he makes in class about their religion (Exhibit 1).<sup>14</sup>

### **Issues Reviewed:**

- Did Mr. Derengowski violate FDE (LOCAL and LEGAL) policies (Exhibit 2) by creating a hostile learning environment in the classroom for two students based on religion?
- Did Mr. Derengowski violate FJ LOCAL, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, (FERPA) (Exhibit 3) by releasing names of at least two students enrolled in his class and naming them on his website after his resignation?
- Did Mr. Derengowski resign under duress as he alleged?
- Did Mr. Derengowski's behavior and conduct in the classroom violate DH LOCAL, Tarrant County College's Employee Code of Professional Ethics? (Exhibit 4)

**Background Information:** On November 15, 2011, Human Resources staff contacted Dr. Coan, Vice President of Academic Affairs, at the Southeast Campus to advise her of the

---

students were to read articles dealing with cults and cultism, Mormonism, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Scientology, that the students would automatically read any of the articles on Islam and be adversely affected. She is assuming that the students could not think for themselves or perhaps she does not want them to. The irony is that while she tried to shame the professor into a position of believing it was a bad thing to keep the students out of the cults by having them read the material, she contradicted her neutrality position by nixing the syllabus and preventing the students from reading any of the material; all of that why stating that she agreed with much of what was written on the site. Therefore, for either Randa or TCC to push the website issue, as it pertains to Islam and that without ever actually reading or rebutting the commentary, in context, is nothing more than a red herring argument.

<sup>13</sup> First, at no time was Islam referred to as a cult in class. Second, the article referred to is 22-pages long and no one ever addressed the comments in it to show where the professor might be incorrect. It is merely assumed that because the label has been used to refer to Islam as a cult, that it is somehow dubious, which is false. Therefore, until someone actually reads and rebuts the documented evidence found in the article, then this sensationalistic attempt to condemn the professor, who has done the research to back up his conclusions, is nothing more than anti-intellectual bullying and religious bigotry at its worst.

<sup>14</sup> Of course the assumption is that both Randa and Mohamad actually provided a substantiated list of the so-called "slanderous and untrue" comments. The fact of the matter is all they did was make accusations; otherwise the administration would have provided a verifiable and documented list to the professor for his response. But no one has provided anything, apart from a few web pages that have no relevance to what was actually taught in class on November 3 and 8. They are all mere assumptions and accusations to once again appease the two Muslim's religious sensitivities to the exclusion of other's rights to do the same.

complaints by the two students.<sup>15</sup> Next, Dr. Coan asked to meet with Mr. Derengowski the evening of November 15 at approximately 5:00 pm, two hours before the class was scheduled to begin. The individuals at the meeting were Dr. Barbara Coan, Mr. Munoz, Divisional Dean, and Ms. Sharon Wettengel, Department Chair. The purpose of the meeting was to inform him of the student complaints.<sup>16</sup> While meeting with him, she also discussed the police report he filed related to two Muslim students on November 8.<sup>17</sup> Mr. Derengowski was asked if he felt he or any of his students were in any danger since he had filed a police report about the two Muslim

---

<sup>15</sup> Once again, this is not proper protocol. This statement is interesting in the respect that it was only Friday, November 11, that Randa had sent her threatening email in protest to the grade and absence she received to the professor. On Sunday evening, November 13, at 4:59 p.m. she posted her libelous diatribe on a disreputable Mormon web blog, ranting about how “evil” the professor is. On Monday morning, November 14, she sent out another libelous piece in the form of a class-wide email, but excluded the professor from her email list. Now, if she contacted the HR department prior to all her devious deeds, then ran to them for assistance without letting them know what she had already done, would that not demonstrate her hostility toward the TCC system, as well as the professor, but used that same system to carry out her agenda?

If she contacted the HR department after the blog article and malicious email, then one has to wonder how they had the time to respond in 24 hours or less to her complaint, when it took them over two months to respond to the non-Muslim student grievances against Randa and Mohamad. And yet, they allegedly not only received the complaint, they acted upon it without ever contacting the professor directly or spoke with the other students, and then contacted the VP for Academic Affairs and made her aware of all the “facts” concerning the case, who then called the professor in to discuss them with him.

This story does not make sense given that it not only completely breaks protocol, but it is characteristically impossible given subsequent inaction on the part of TCC. Otherwise, why run to the HR Department before talking to the professor, the Department Chair, the Department Dean, the VP for Academics, the VP for Student Development, unless of course, Randa was not really interested in discussing the substance of what took place on November 8, much less her behavior? Was TCC expecting her? Could it be that she had the professor’s employment in mind all along, and rather than actually discuss the events of November 8, TCC was only too willing to receive her testimony, so all she had to do was make a religious complaint?

<sup>16</sup> Please note that the purpose of the meeting was to address the student complaints rather than what the professor had been reporting since the previous Tuesday evening, which was the student’s misbehavior. In fact, it would not be until the end of the meeting when the student’s misbehavior, which warranted expulsion, was brought up—and that was by the professor! In other words, the disruption in class (accompanied by a police report), threatening email, malicious blog entry, and subsequent libelous email, were essentially ignored to favor the trumped up charges of the two Muslim students, which was really nothing more than a continuation of what started the previous Tuesday. The administration bought into the perversion hook, line, and sinker.

<sup>17</sup> The “discussion” amounted to nothing more than a criticism of the professor. It was not even taken as serious until the Muslim students continued their character assassination campaign, even though the professor made the administration aware of what took place the

students alleged behavior and leaving his class early. He stated, “No,” that he just wanted others to be aware that he felt the students had acted improperly by leaving early. (Exhibit 5)<sup>18</sup>

During the November 15, 5:00 pm meeting it was agreed that Mr. Derengowski would teach the class, make sure the students were prepared to continue the class, and arrange a meeting with the two students who had allegedly disrupted the class.<sup>19</sup> The meeting lasted approximately 45 minutes.<sup>20</sup> He along with the campus administrators were to meet with the two students.<sup>21</sup> At this meeting, it would be determined what, if any, action would be taken against the students.<sup>22</sup>

---

following morning after it was filed, Wednesday, November 9th, as well as subsequent instances where the Muslims were clearly in violation of TCC standards of acceptable student behavior.

<sup>18</sup> This is an abject lie. No one, at any time, ever asked the professor anything about continuing or non-continuing danger. Again, all Dr. Coan did was criticize the professor for allegedly not stating in the report what he wished to have happen as a result of filing the report, which, if one simply reads the report, it is stated quite clearly, and is even reported later in this Executive Summary of Inquiry.

<sup>19</sup> This agreement was evidently made between the administrators after the professor was dismissed from the meeting, because he was not a part of any decision-making, including whether his syllabus should be nixed or whether he had the right to express himself in class on the subject of religion. Besides, the professor was already teaching the class; did they have something else in mind, given that they “agreed” to allow the professor to teach? Finally, to assert that the professor agreed to some meeting with the Muslim students is a blatant falsehood, since he had expressed in the meeting, and will be witnessed in this Executive Summary of Inquiry, that he wanted them expelled. Their offenses were that egregious and warranted such action according to the TCC Student Handbook.

<sup>20</sup> This is a factual error of time. The meeting began at 5:00 p.m. and lasted until 6:10 p.m. for the professor, when he was dismissed from the meeting. Dr. Coan, Dean Munoz, and Ms. Wettengel remained in the meeting, behind closed doors, for at least another five to ten minutes, as they finalized the termination of the professor’s syllabus. So, the meeting actually lasted 70 to 80 minutes, not the 45 as reported above.

<sup>21</sup> This, once again, is untrue. The professor wanted the students expelled. He had no intention of meeting with them, nor should he have been obligated to, especially after the libelous email was sent out.

<sup>22</sup> Please note the backward handling of this case once again. Rather than deal with the student’s misbehavior, the professor is called in, chastised, stripped of his syllabus, has his freedom of speech bridled, a censor was to be put in the class, and then his reports of student misbehavior and mayhem are ignored. Then, after he is sufficiently censored and rendered useless as a professor, the administrators want to talk about possibly disciplining the students who caused all the chaos to begin with and that in the presence of the professor who was just humiliated. Can one just imagine what it would have been like to sit in that environment, especially given what the administration ultimately concluded in the Executive Summary of Inquiry? There would not have been one ounce of duress imposed on the professor, now would have there been?



Dr.<sup>23</sup> Derengowski was asked to use the approved textbook in his class as required by the District Master Syllabus.<sup>24</sup> His Instructional Course Requirements (ICR) listed his personal web site as required readings for the remainder of the course from November 15 to the end of the fall semester. Rather than teach from the required textbook, his ICR indicated his students were required to use his personal web site for the remainder of the semester. (Exhibit 6)<sup>25</sup>

After the 5:00 pm meeting ended, Mr. Derengowski went to the break room. After a few minutes, Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel went to the break room and it was then that Mr. Derengowski suggested to Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel that the class be canceled that night.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Mr. Derengowski does not have his doctorate yet. He is a doctoral candidate at the University of Pretoria, South Africa.

<sup>24</sup> There are at least three problems with this statement. One, it implies that the textbook was not being used, when it was, in its totality. Second, it refuses to report that the pre-approved syllabus for the course, which was essentially the same one used since 2008, was unreasonably and unfairly terminated by Dr. Coan during the meeting. It was unreasonable and unfair because while she was preaching neutrality in the classroom, she was not practicing neutrality in the meeting, which in turn imposed an absolute decision upon everyone in the class. Third, the assumption is that the authors of the book were “neutral” in their religious worldviews when writing the book, which is completely false. Lewis Hopfe graduated from Baylor and Southwestern Seminary, meaning that he had a Christian worldview with a Baptist preference. Mark Woodward graduated from Arizona State and the University of Chicago Divinity School, meaning that he also had a Christian worldview, although leaning more to the left of center than many conservative positions. It is from those worldview perspectives that they researched, wrote, and taught when it came to comparative religions. ***It should also be added that the book itself was actually selected by Professor Derengowski, not anyone in the department, as the class textbook, even though the department approved of the text when it also approved his syllabus.*** So, why did not Dr. Coan, Mr. Munoz, and Ms. Wettengel nix the book as well when they nixed the syllabus?

<sup>25</sup> This is a distortion of the facts, for it makes it appear as if only the website contents were read to the exclusion of the book. The fact is, upon finishing the lecture on Islam on November 8, the book was finished as well, since Islam is the last subject in the book. The web articles simply extended to other religions which are prominent in religious study. By nixing the syllabus in the manner that Dr. Coan did, she not only deprived the students of the very thing that they paid for when TCC approved the syllabus at the beginning of the semester, she religiously discriminated against the professor—who is a professed Christian and admitted such to the class that he was approaching the World Religions class from a Christian worldview—in favor of the Muslim students and their specious complaints. In other words, Dr. Coan paid absolute deference to the Muslim perspective out of complete disdain for the Christian perspective, even when the subjects no longer involved Islam.

<sup>26</sup> This is a total fabrication and has nothing to do with the truth. At no time did the professor ever suggest that the evening’s class be canceled or dismissed. It was Dean Munoz and Ms. Wettengel who came looking for the professor in order to inform him that ***they*** had decided to cancel the class for the evening. A clear understanding of why they arrived at their decision was never made, probably because they had a school function to attend at 7:00 p.m. and

Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel agreed that the class should be canceled due to the uncertainty of the situation.<sup>27</sup> Mr. Derengowski suggested earlier that the two students be expelled from his class and be given an F for the class grade.<sup>28</sup> He also suggested that another instructor take over his class for the remainder of the semester.<sup>29</sup> Mr. Derengowski, The administrators and instructor agreed that they would consult the next day, after they met with the two students.<sup>30</sup> Then Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel left the meeting and walked toward her office. Mr. Derengowski caught up with Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel in the hallway outside of Mrs. Wettengel's office said that he decided to resign instead.<sup>31</sup> He was not asked, either directly or indirectly, to resign but did so voluntarily on the evening of November 15. (Exhibit 7)<sup>32</sup>

---

did not want to take the time to elaborate. Prior to the surprise announcement the professor sat stunned in the break room wondering what he was going to say to the students, many of whom were already in their commute to school for that evening's class.

<sup>27</sup> This must have occurred in the private meeting held between Dr. Coan, Mr. Munoz, and Ms. Wettengel after the professor was dismissed from the meeting 15 minutes prior. The professor, however, had no say in the decision. They merely imposed it upon him and the class.

<sup>28</sup> This is an anachronistic statement which has been conflated at this point. The recommendation that the students be expelled occurred during the meeting with Dr. Coan, Mr. Munoz, and Ms. Wettengel, not when Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel showed up to announce that the class had been canceled for the evening. This is one of many anachronistic, conflated, or untrue statements found throughout this Inquiry.

<sup>29</sup> This is an abject lie. At no time did the professor ever suggest that another professor take his position as an instructor. In fact, the only time the professor ever asked for a fill-in or substitute to take his classes was when he was either ill (which was rare) or when he had to attend a doctoral seminar out of state. What was suggested by Mr. Munoz was that he could find another instructor if the professor chose to hold to the attitude that the rest of the semester be cancelled because of what the administrators had chosen to do by nixing the syllabus.

<sup>30</sup> This is a restatement of an earlier falsehood that supposedly took place in the earlier meeting, except it is being conflated here, probably for emphasis. In other words, repeat a lie enough times and before long people will begin to believe it. At no time was any agreement ever reached that the professor would meet with the students. Again, the professor recommended expulsion, not consultation, due to the gravity and severity of the insubordinate behavior of the two Muslim students.

<sup>31</sup> A convoluted falsehood is the best way to describe this statement. Because it does not make any sense that the professor would supposedly make all these agreements and suggestions, only to turn around within a few seconds, walk down to the administrators, and suddenly change his mind and resign.

After Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel announced the cancellation of the class and then left, all of which took about a minute, Mr. Derengowski sat in the break room for about another minute, got up, went out in the hallway and stood there for another 30 seconds, and then decided to go to Ms. Wettengel's office to announce that he was resigning. Clearly, aside from being terminated, there was no other course to take. The syllabus was gone, his freedom to express himself in the class was gone, the two Muslim students were not going to be disciplined, and it was suggested in the meeting by the administrators to put someone in the class to monitor the situation (i.e. make sure the professor did not stray). The handwriting was on the wall, starting

Following Mr. Derengowski's announcement of his resignation, Dean Munoz met with the class the evening of November 15 and advised the students they should read their assignments and be prepared for the next class session which would meet as scheduled.<sup>33</sup> No other information was given to the students at that time.

According to Mr. Derengowski's website, his resignation was not voluntary, but was submitted under duress. On January 10, 2012, Mr. Derengowski sent an email to the Human Resources staff requesting that his reasons for his resignation be placed in his file. His email states,

“that, first of all, it was never my intent to resign in the first place, but Tarrant County College administrators (1) failed to reprimand or expel two Muslim students when they assaulted me both verbally and in writing, (2) failed to reprimand or expel the same two Muslim students for disrupting the class taught on November 8, (3) terminated my pre-approved syllabus for arbitrary reasons, leaving me with no reasonable direction to take the World Religions class, and (4) prohibited my freedom to express myself as the professor.”

The following day, an email by the Office of Human Resources was sent to Mr. Derengowski and requested him to provide specifics on each of the four points made regarding his resignation. Mr. Derengowski has not responded to TCC's request.<sup>34</sup>

---

with the ten to fifteen minutes of stunned silence coupled with the unexpected announcement that the class was to be canceled that evening. They were forcing the professor out to appease the Muslims.

<sup>32</sup> This is HR code language designed to cover Tarrant County College, but it is rooted in falsehood. Otherwise, why was the professor already prepared to lecture that evening, waiting in the teacher's lounge, only to have Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel show up and cancel the class, if the professor, for no good reason, was planning to resign? It is because of all the oppressive decisions and stipulations that the administration made and then placed upon the professor, that he was forced to make the decision that he did. He was no longer a professor, or at least being treated like one. He was subordinate to the actions of the two Muslim students and their ill-conceived actions as the TCC administration placated them and dehumanized the professor.

<sup>33</sup> This is another abject lie and does not make any sense at all. Why show up and tell the students to “read their assignments and be prepared for the next class session,” when the reading assignment, according to the now defunct syllabus, dealt with cults and cultism? Moreover, that evening's class included the viewing of the History Channel's video on “Cults: Dangerous Devotion,” the second part of which would have been viewed the night Dean Munoz said would be regularly scheduled. The reality is that Dean Munoz showed up, had the students sign-in, and then dismissed the class without any explanation why. He did not say or advise anything else.

<sup>34</sup> The reason that there was no response is because at the time Erin Mersino at the Thomas More Law Center advised Professor Derengowski not to respond. Ms. Mersino has

Upon Mr. Derengowski's resignation, TCC administrators took immediate action and assigned another adjunct faculty member to the class, Mr. Mark Austin. Mr. Austin began teaching the next scheduled class period, November 17. Ms. Wettengel introduced Mr. Austin to the class and responded to questions regarding Mr. Derengowski,<sup>35</sup> who had emailed the students informing them of his situation.<sup>36</sup> The Southeast Campus administrators acted to ensure that further disruptions in the class were minimized,<sup>37</sup> grading was not negatively impacted,<sup>38</sup> threats to the safety of the students were investigated fully,<sup>39</sup> and students could successfully complete

---

since been dismissed from the case. That aside, Dr. Coronado's questionnaire was unnecessary given that all of his questions were already answered in the lengthy resignation tome that the professor had already written and then posted on his website. It remains there to this day.

<sup>35</sup> The idea that Ms. Wettengel addressed the class and its questions is misleading and untrue. Questions were asked, but all she provided were HR evasion responses. What TCC wanted was to sweep the whole incident aside as quickly as possible without ever having to explain to the students why. Therefore, no questions were truly answered, the two Muslim students were allowed to "sabotage" the class, and a ruse of an "investigation" took place which laid all the blame on Professor Derengowski, and that without due process.

<sup>36</sup> This is another abject lie. The only students who were emailed by the professor, letting them know what was going on, were those students who first emailed him. There was no class-wide email sent out by the professor notifying anyone of what he had been forced to decide. Instead, another student in the class took it upon herself to send out an email to the class notifying everyone that the professor had resigned.

<sup>37</sup> This is an interesting admission that apparently TCC administrators are unaware of, since they now admit that disruptions did take place. But, if the two Muslim students were not guilty of anything, as will be later asserted, then who caused the disruptions? What did the disruptions consist of and just what did TCC officials supposedly do to quell further disruptions, much less why was there even a need to do so, if the professor, who was blamed for everything, was already gone? Besides, as TCC tells the story, there was no immediate danger, except for the male Muslim student, who suddenly felt unloved and insecure because of something the professor said—nine days after he resigned! More on that later.

<sup>38</sup> This cannot be true, since Mr. Mark Austin contacted Mr. Derengowski to ask for advice on the grade curve for the class. Several students ended up receiving lower grades because they were so disgusted with how TCC mishandled the case that they ceased going to class altogether. Also, when the two Muslim students griped about receiving zeros for leaving class early on November 8, TCC administration overturned those grades by giving them full credit, which negatively impacted the other students. Interestingly, TCC did not overturn the absences, meaning that the two Muslim students received scores for not even being present! Clearly, there were all kinds of negative results stemming from what TCC administrators did in collaboration with the Muslim students. One simply needs to cut through all the subterfuge to see it.

<sup>39</sup> Sending out a cheesy questionnaire nearly two months after the fact, and receiving ten responses from the students, while never sitting down and talking with anyone except the Muslim students is hardly worth the label of an "investigation," much less that it was done "fully." TCC officials are simply engaging in more self-aggrandizing, claiming to have done something that clearly they were negligent and careless about. If it was not for the professor

the class. The class met on Tuesday and Thursday nights and continued through the remainder of the semester without any further disruptions.<sup>40</sup> It should be noted that no students dropped the class from November 15 to the end of the semester.<sup>41</sup>

## **Part I—Findings**

- Mr. Derengowski posted information identifying the two Muslim students by first name and last name without their consent on his web site in violation of FJ (LOCAL), Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).<sup>42</sup>

In his resignation to the College, which was sent to all the students in his class except the two Muslim students and posted on his web site, he stated that, “To Student A and Student B, your actions betray your true characters. Not only did you act shamefully, despicably, and carelessly, you provided the perfect illustration of what happens to those

---

filing the police report out of concern for the safety of the students and himself, which no one followed up on, as per his recommendation, then the subject of safety would not have even been brought up by the administration. It could not have cared less.

<sup>40</sup> “Further disruptions”? Again, that would mean there were disruptions beforehand. See note 36.

<sup>41</sup> Why should such a thing be noted? It would seem that TCC is trying to create the illusion that the atmosphere in the class became so peaceful and serene upon the departure of the professor no one would even consider dropping the class. What TCC is leaving out of the story, though, is the continued unrest between the non-Muslim students and the Muslims, and the students who had filed complaints and grievances against the school for its total mishandling of the case. In fact, in response to this Inquiry that TCC has submitted, there is now a new round of appeals being made by the students who are not satisfied with its so-called findings. Also, what TCC is not mentioning is that the last day to drop the course was November 19, or only two days after Mark Austin formally took over the class, meaning that there was actually little time for the students to fully grasp what was going on in order to make the most prudent decision over whether to drop or remain in the class. Some students simply quit attending class altogether and suffered lower grades. Yet, that is not reported by TCC either. So, the illusion, like all mirages, is simply that. If the Muslims would have disrupted the class earlier in the semester and the professor railroaded like he was, then there would have been a mass exodus from the class; the emails and outspoken support from the students subsequent to his resignation provides the evidence.

<sup>42</sup> This is legalistic grandstanding that has no basis in fact. FERPA laws are in place to prevent the dissemination of student records to parties not privy to them. At no time were Randa or Mohamad’s academic records revealed to anyone apart from the records they shared publicly with everyone in their attempt to smear the professor. Moreover, FERPA law cannot apply to someone unassociated as an employee with the educational institution. When the professor resigned on November 15, his identification of those who libeled his good name was for information purposes, since Randa had gone public with her and Mohamad’s campaign.

who really and truly follow Islamic principles. Lying, cheating, and stealing all for the sake of Allah. Surely you must be proud. My heart breaks for you.”<sup>43</sup> (Exhibit 8)

In Exhibit 8, Mr. Derengowski devotes several paragraphs, within his Website, in his resignation to the two Muslim students<sup>44</sup> and addresses them in a disrespectful, discriminatory, and undignified manner and calls them derogatory names.<sup>45</sup>

- Although Mr. Derengowski alleges that he resigned under duress, there is no evidence to support his allegation.<sup>46</sup> Mr. Derengowski has publicly stated and has confirmed on his web page that he resigned because he was asked to remain neutral in his teachings of Great Religions of the World.<sup>47</sup> His decision to resign was totally his own.<sup>48</sup> The

---

<sup>43</sup> This is another repeated falsehood, for only email responses were sent out to those students who had emailed Professor Derengowski first to inquire what was going on. More importantly, though, is the fact that what is quoted above is a snippet from my resignation tome, which only appeared on my website. It was not emailed to anyone.

<sup>44</sup> This is an insult, as the professor did not resign to the Muslim students. He resigned when TCC administration placed him in a position whereby he could no longer teach as he had been employed to teach the previous three and one-half years.

<sup>45</sup> First of all, what Randa and Mohamad did was disrespectful, discriminatory, and undignified. Therefore, to point out those character flaws and misbehavior, as the professor did, is the honorable thing to do, not the dishonorable. The dishonorable thing to do is what TCC administrators did by calling the Muslim student’s disrespectful, discriminatory, and undignified behavior laudable, and then condemning the professor. Second, aside from labeling Randa an “uncivilized animal” after the order of what her illustrious “prophet,” Muhammad, had done, no one was called any “derogatory names.” Instead, consistent and precise commentary was offered to describe the “disrespectful, discriminatory, and undignified” behavior behind Randa’s libelous and defamatory email that she sent around to the class, excluding the one she defamed! So, for TCC to be running to the defense of the indefensible only shows just how irrational the administrators were when the facts of what really took place are considered.

<sup>46</sup> This is factually untrue. Starting with the disruption, that TCC now admits took place, in the classroom on November 8, orchestrated by the Muslim students, coupled with Randa’s libelous email, the administration mishandling the case, and the student grievances, there is plenty of evidence for the objective person willing to see it.

<sup>47</sup> Yet, this has nothing to do with rebutting whether the professor resigned under duress, but instead confirms it. It is an admission that what Dr. Coan imposed upon the professor put him in an impossible position to teach. For no one can teach any subject, much less religion, neutrally. It is a pure myth; a myth, when imposed as fact, only causes duress, it does not alleviate it.

<sup>48</sup> This is a non-sensical statement, for the professor, as all people do, only makes decisions pertinent to him. He doesn’t decide for others. What is important are the factors involved in making the decision. He did not just resign for any good reason or no reason at all. He resigned because of all the adverse factors involved which were imposed upon him. The professor was forced into a no-win situation, and it was either resign or be fired. In essence, the TCC administration created the very hostile learning environment, because of its appeasement of

College administration was left with no other alternative than to take prompt, immediate action in assigning another instructor to teach the Philosophy 1304 class vacated by Mr. Derengowski, in order to ensure the students enrolled in the class could continue to the full and satisfactory completion of the class.<sup>49</sup>

- An email and letter was sent, via US Postal Service, to the 38 students who had enrolled in Mr. Derengowski's fall 2011 Philosophy 1304 class (28 active students and 10 who had dropped the class prior to the November 8 incident). They were asked if they felt threatened at any time during Mr. Derengowski's class, and, if so, to explain, including specific actions and/or comments which caused them to feel threatened; and did they feel discriminated against based on their religion, and, if so, to explain including specific actions and/or comments which caused them to feel discriminated against. Lastly, they were asked to make any other comments or statements they wanted to make.<sup>50</sup>
- Ten of the 38 students responded. Although the students' responses generally reflect no feeling of discrimination based on religion, there are statements indicating certain biases on the part of Mr. Derengowski demonstrated by requiring students to read his personal web site describing Islam as a cult.<sup>51</sup> Generally, the students' responses do not confirm a

---

the two Muslim students, yet shifted the blame to Professor Derengowski for allegedly creating the same. Worse yet, TCC created a hostile employment environment by failing to appropriately deal with two unruly Muslim students according to the very Student Handbook that it had authored.

<sup>49</sup> This is another grandstanding comment designed to try and make TCC look as if it was placed in a position where it could do nothing other than go find someone to fill in for the professor, since he just up and left the school for no good reason. The fact of the matter is, and as others have pointed out, if TCC administrators would have been doing their jobs and upheld the guidelines found in the Student Handbook, then they would have retained one of the best professors on the campus and done away with the troublemakers. Instead, they were completely negligent and incompetent in handling the incident, sided with the perpetrators of all the trouble, and forced that professor into resignation. Therefore, the class ended in controversy, the students were deprived of their education, and another "evil" was successfully perpetrated upon society, while TCC officials patted themselves on the backs for a job well done.

<sup>50</sup> The whole questionnaire maneuver is such a laughable joke that only the most gullible person would buy into it as something credible given the whole ordeal. Not only was it issued long after the time had elapsed for TCC to respond to the initial grievances, it was a complete insult to the integrity and honor of those who filed the grievances in the first place. It was participated in by a third of the class, asked questions that were vague and not well-thought out, and proved absolutely nothing. It was more of a public relations stunt designed to cover TCC legally, than as an instrument designed to arrive at the truth and then render justice where it was due.

<sup>51</sup> This is a sensationalistic statement centered on an article that none of the TCC officials have ever read, nor did any of the students. The whole goal in writing the comment, therefore, was not to deal with the facts or the truth, but merely to continue the smear campaign against the

feeling of discrimination during Mr. Derengowski's class, although it was stated he made it clear that he came from a Christian worldview.<sup>52</sup> Some of the student responses state that Mr. Derengowski taught his class based on the TCC-approved syllabus and that the history, philosophy and beliefs of each faith were presented with discussion of the pros and cons of each.<sup>53</sup> Other responses state there were occasions when Mr. Derengowski voiced his opinion about what was right and what was wrong about certain faiths based on his personal beliefs.<sup>54</sup> One of the students who dropped out of the class prior to November 15 stated that Mr. Derengowski had presented overly biased views and had expressed overt criticism in his class about certain religions (Exhibit 9)<sup>55</sup>

- Based on the information reviewed, the evidence suggest that Mr. Derengowski created a hostile learning environment for the two Muslim students in violation of FDE (LOCAL and LEGAL) policies.<sup>56</sup>

---

professor who has taken the time and effort to respond to a religious question that a previous student, in a completely different semester, had honestly asked, namely why I categorized Islam as a cult.

<sup>52</sup> And this means something? Of course they reported the professor was teaching from a Christian worldview. He told them that on the first day of the semester and then gave them the options of either speaking with him about it, after class, or to drop the class altogether. There was nothing covert about his teaching method or position. So, this so-called "finding" is absolutely irrelevant, if not another example of the religious discrimination that TCC took part in by listening only to the Muslim students to the exclusion of the professor.

<sup>53</sup> It is true that the professor taught from a pre-approved syllabus that was submitted to TCC administration at the start of the semester. It is essentially the same syllabus that he had been using since the first semester in the fall of 2008, and was turned in each semester prior to its commencement for approval. Each class was taught as an open forum whereby the students were allowed to express themselves, so long as it was done respectfully. There was nothing secretive or covert about any of this.

<sup>54</sup> Once again, this means something? Of course the professor expressed himself in terms of right and wrong, good and bad, rational and irrational, when it came to religion. That's not only what the U.S. Constitution guarantees, it is what professors and teachers have been doing since day-one when the first professor or teacher began to profess or teach. Yet, upon hearing the gripes of the two Muslim students, all of the sudden TCC officials decided to bridle the professor's right to express himself in order to appease them.

<sup>55</sup> Overt criticism? This description is nonsensical given the previous testimony. Overt simply means to be open, observable, unhidden, apparent, etc. The opposite would be closed, unobservable, secret, occult, covert, etc. So, aside from another sensationalistic attempt to smear the professor, TCC has not done itself a service by presenting this comment, as part of its Inquiry, to justify its irresponsible actions or inaction.

<sup>56</sup> This is a complete lie. The evidence, stemming all the way back to 2008, suggests that the professor was doing what he was hired to do, and that is teach on world religions, which included answering the question of the two Muslim students about sources, in as objective a manner as possible, so that the students could make informed decisions. It only became hostile when the Muslim students objected to the information taught. *That is by their admission.* And



- Based on the information review, the evidence suggest that Mr. Derengowski violated TCC Policy, DH (LOCAL), in his conduct during class and actions toward the two Muslim students which in part states:

In order to express the affirmation of the College District's professional responsibilities more adequately, the employees of the College District, with the full support of the Board, do adopt and hold ourselves and each other subject to the following *Code of Professional Ethics*:<sup>57</sup>

Place the educational welfare and success of College District students as the College District's highest priority. Strive to help each student realize his or her full potential as a scholar and as a human being.

Treat all persons with respect, dignity, and justice, not discriminating against anyone on an arbitrary basis such as race, creed, sex, age, religion, or disability.

Refrain from any conduct deemed to be sexual harassment, racial harassment, or any other form of illegal harassment. Report immediately any violation through the chain of supervision.

Encourage and defend the unfettered pursuit of truth. Support the free exchange of ideas and observe the highest standards of academic honesty, integrity, scholarship, and tolerance of other viewpoints.<sup>58</sup>

Recognize the necessity of many roles in the educational enterprise and work in such a manner as to enhance teamwork and collegiality among students, faculty, administrators, and support staff.

Recognize and preserve the confidential nature of professional relationships, neither disclosing nor encouraging the disclosure of information or rumor that

---

instead of acting in accord with the Student Handbook, they became hostile, combative, and insulted the professor and other students in the class, and then broke protocol by running to the TCC HR Department to air their religiously discriminatory complaint that TCC colluded with in its decision.

<sup>57</sup> If the TCC administrators actually subscribe to this Code, then why did they treat the Muslim students more favorably than the non-Muslim students, who were Christians, in the sense that the former received an immediate hearing to their trumped up complaints, while the Christians were basically ignored for nearly two months? Moreover, if the administration subscribes to such a Code, then why did they not back the professor, who is also a Christian, by giving him a fair hearing before his accusers, rather than carry on a covert operation behind closed doors? Finally, if TCC administrators subscribe to such a Code, then why has it neglected to do as the professor implored them the night he resigned, by failing to tell the truth?

<sup>58</sup> Wow. If TCC really believes that the professor did not do this the night the two Muslim students did everything in their power to undermine this particular ideal, then it is quite evident that TCC administrators have no clue what is going on to this day.

might damage, embarrass, or violate the privacy of any person unless required by law. This is not to indicate that persons of good judgment should not apprise College District officials of legal or ethical violations of College District policy.<sup>59</sup>

## **Part II of the Inquiry**

Shortly after Mr. Derengowski's resignation, three students, Student C, Student D, and Student D<sup>60</sup> filed complaints with Southeast Campus administrators.<sup>61</sup>

### **Allegations by Student #1<sup>62</sup>**

Summary of Complaint: Student C states the following in her complaint, "The Humanities Administration has Failed the students of TCC Phil 1304-41244 by failing to act responsibly on the behalf of all students involved Student B was allow to threaten Professor Derengowski in front of the class, with NO action taken. My documentation is attached, as I've tried to meet w/administration."

Outcome Requested: "According to the Student handbook, Student B should absolutely be subject to disciplinary actions. Prof D should be reinstated." (Exhibit 10)

### **Allegations by Student #2**

---

<sup>59</sup> All-in-all this whole quoting of this particular Code is pure subterfuge that has nothing to do with the professor's exemplary conduct, as is evidenced in both his Personnel File and the comments of many of his students, both in the particular class in question and those who have taken his classes previously. It simply more sensationalism infused into the discussion where otherwise there is no substance to support their condemnation.

<sup>60</sup> Please note the sloppiness with this typo. And this is an "Executive Summary of Inquiry" no less.

<sup>61</sup> After reading each of these complaints and the subsequent emails to the administrators begging, pleading, and asking for a fair and judicious hearing, what is presented below as the responses is nothing more than an absolute insult. Not only do they totally ignore the complaints and requests, it becomes quite clear that all TCC officials were doing was going through the legal motions to try and cover their legal selves. They had no intent at all, whatsoever, of listening to the students. Because if they did listen, then they would have had to reprimand the Muslim students in the manner requested by the professor at the beginning. He would also have been vindicated, rather than condemned, and reinstated as the professor, rather than forced out due to the impossible stipulations placed upon him to appease the Muslims.

<sup>62</sup> The sloppiness carries over to the identification of the student complaints. Is Student #1 also Student C? D? or D? Once again, to appear official and supposedly add clarity and resolve to the situation, all TCC has done is provide another example of incompetence and added confusion to the mix.

Summary of Complaint: Student D states the following in her complaint, “My complaint why the rest of the class were treated poorly and unjustly by TCC administration I felt discriminated. My rights as a student of TCC were violated.”

Outcome Requested: “Hope that my classmates and I will get a fair treatment and respect as TCC student the way Student A and Student B were treated. And Prof. D’s right as a teacher were violated, because he was insulted by Student B. I think he should be reprimanded and open an investigation on this one.” ( Exhibit 11)

### **Allegations by Student #3**

Summary of Complaint: Student E states, “The Student Handbook has policies on both students continually disturbing a class and e-mails relating to defamation related to a person. Please see the emails attached to this form. This box isn’t big enough for the information.”

Outcome Requested: “That TCC will adhere to their policies setforth [sic] in the Student Handbook on the issues I’ve addressed.” (Exhibit 12)

### **Issues Reviewed:**

- Did the Southeast Campus Humanities administrators fail to act responsibly on behalf of the students involved?
- Did the Southeast Campus Administrators violate any TCC policies?
- Did Student B threaten Mr. Derengowski in violation of TCC Student Handbook, VII. Student Discipline Policy? (Exhibit 13)
- Did TCC Administrators fail to take disciplinary action against Student B in accordance with TCC policies?
- Did Student A’s email or information that she sent to classmates violate TCC policy on student conduct?
- Did any of the other students suffer from discrimination based on any legal or prohibited factors including FDE (LOCAL)?

**Background:** It is alleged that on November 3, 2011, instructor Derengowski began a lecture on Islam and spoke of Mohammad as a murderer and thief and spoke in negative terms about Mohammad and Islam.<sup>63</sup> On November 8, 2011, it is alleged that the instructor continued to lecture on Islam and spoke only negatively about Islam.<sup>64</sup> It is alleged that Student B became

---

<sup>63</sup> Where in any of the Student Complaints (C, D, or E) was this alleged? The fact of the matter is, it was not alleged. What TCC officials are doing is immediately ignoring the complaints and falling back on Muslim testimony which is abjectly false, prejudicial, and defamatory.

<sup>64</sup> Let it be repeated, where in any of the Student Complaints is this alleged?

upset and began insulting the professor, interrupting him, challenging his credentials and insulting his choice of reference books in front of the class.<sup>65</sup> Late in the same class, Student A and Student B walked out of class two minutes before class was dismissed because they were upset by the instructor's negative portrayal of their religion.<sup>66</sup> It is alleged that the instructor held a mock trial on October 13 as one of the class assignments, choosing the Ft. Hood, Texas, case where Nidal Malik Hasan, a Muslim, had gone on a shooting spree.<sup>67</sup> The instructor is alleged to have chosen two male Muslim students to role-play the legal case, having named Student B as the defender and the class as the jury concerning the shooting spree.<sup>68</sup> The other male Muslim dropped the class prior to the mock trials.<sup>69</sup> Student A reported to academic

---

<sup>65</sup> This is not an allegation, it is a fact; a fact that was reported by multiple students and the professor. Given the number of eyewitnesses, only a jury or judge that was already prejudiced against the evidence would have ruled like TCC did when it blamed the professor, rather than the Muslim students, for the disruption of the class on November 8.

<sup>66</sup> Please note the admission of insubordination on the parts of both Muslim students. They both left early, which is against classroom conduct as stated in the syllabus and expressed by the professor at the start of the semester. Interestingly, Randa attempted to deny that she left early in another threatening email sent to the professor, only to turn around and admit that she left early in later testimony. Secondly, please note the lack of any substantive examples to validate the claim. Also, there is no reference to the Islamic material that was used in class by the professor to not only answer the Muslim's questions, but to support what he was teaching in class. It is merely asserted that the professor did something nefarious, when the opposite is actually the case, and that the Muslim students were actually engaging in dubious behavior instead.

<sup>67</sup> Again, this is not an allegation, but a fact. It is an event that has been held every semester, sometimes twice during the semester, ever since the professor has taught the class going back to the fall of 2008. The case trials are selected prior to the semester beginning. The criteria centers on their timeliness, relevance, and interest. Generally the teams are aligned according to their interests and associations to provide the best representation as possible given the topic. At other times students will volunteer for specific roles, of which the professor always granted the request. At no time, though, has anyone ever been segregated or selected for the purpose of embarrassment or humiliation, but strictly for educational purposes.

<sup>68</sup> This comment is more than misleading, as it makes it appear as if the two Muslim students were segregated against the rest of the class. The fact is there were seven members on the Defense team as there were seven members on the Prosecution. Mohamad Khorchid was one of three lawyers who were defending four witnesses, one of which was the other Muslim male. At no time was there any objection raised by either student concerning their roles, even though both Mohamad and Brandon Tipton (the other Muslim male) played their roles poorly, which eventually reflected in the grades that the jury and judges (one of whom was Randa Bedair, the female Muslim) gave them when the trial concluded. But, once again, none of this has any relevance to the three Student Complaints/Grievances.

<sup>69</sup> This is an abject lie. None of the Muslim students ever dropped the class. Instead, one of the Defense team's mock lawyers, who was *not* a Muslim, dropped the class on November 9. He was an undisciplined student who failed to show up for the mock trial, and it was in his best interest to drop the class later because of low grades or sporadic attendance.

administrators that she felt as if she had been violated and discriminated against,’ with the way Mr. Derengowski is teaching this World Religions course.”<sup>70</sup>

On November 15, 2011, Professor Derengowski was asked to attend a meeting with Academic Administrators where he was informed of the complaints filed with the Dean by Student A and Student B.<sup>71</sup> Vice President of Academic Affairs Dr. Barbara Coan, Dean Josue Munoz, and Ms. Sharon Wettengel reported that in the November 15 meeting he was asked if he felt he or his students were in danger, since he filed a police report, and he answered, “no.”<sup>72</sup>

On November 17, 2011, the students, Student A and Student B, met with Humanities Dean, Josue Munoz, and Ms. Wettengel individually to express their concerns, with Student B expressing concern over his personal safety based on comments made by the instructor and others in the class regarding Muslims.<sup>73</sup> He is quoted by Dean Munoz as saying, “he now realized that there was a lot of hatred toward him as a Muslim and that he didn’t feel safe on campus.”<sup>74</sup> Student B explained that around mid-September a class assignment required students

---

<sup>70</sup> Again, Randa’s conflated comment here is irrelevant, since this section of the Inquiry is supposed to be addressing the three student complaints, not how Randa supposedly felt discriminated against. This is clearly intentional on the part of TCC, as well as vindication on the part of the students who filed grievances, *that they were never heard*.

<sup>71</sup> If there were complaints filed, then why is it that the professor never saw? They are not in the huge file of documents (603 pages) that TCC compiled to eventually write the Executive Summary of Inquiry. They are not in the professor’s Personnel File. The fact is there were no complaints filed, as previous testimony points out. What occurred is that Randa contacted Human Resources, made a verbal plea, and then everything back-filled from there.

<sup>72</sup> This whole paragraph is irrelevant, as well as factually untrue. It is irrelevant, since it does not address the three student complaints. It is factually untrue, if not simply nonsensical, since no question was ever asked of the professor. Otherwise, why would the professor ask for a police presence in the hallway while teaching, as well as ask for the campus police to investigate and observe Mohamad, if there was no further danger of anything happening? Finally, why would TCC administrators acknowledge that there were disruptions that took place on the parts of the two Muslims, only to run to their aid claiming that it was all the professor’s fault?

<sup>73</sup> Whether the Muslim students met with some of the administrators, all of the administrators, or the Governor of Texas, to express their personal problems is irrelevant. What is relevant are the complaints of the three students who filed actual hardcopy grievances, which apparently whoever wrote this Inquiry is trying to avoid through all the red herring testimony. Moreover, without any hardcopy complaint filed by the two Muslim students, then all the TCC administration did was react according to their hearsay.

<sup>74</sup> Unless Mohamad, who was Student A or B earlier, is now being identified as Student C, D, or E, then whether he felt safe or unsafe on campus after the professor’s resignation is, once again, irrelevant. Nevertheless, as a side note, is it not ironic that Mohamad—who was instrumental in causing one disturbance after another throughout the whole semester, culminating in his outburst on the evening of November 8—would complain about feeling unsafe? And yet, when several of the students who complained about him and his threatening demeanor do so to the same administration, their grievances are dismissed without so much as a

to research a religion other than their own. Student B chose Buddhism and asked to meet with the instructor. He alleged the discussion turned instead to God and Christianity, with the instructor quoting the Bible and telling the student (Student B) he was lost if he didn't believe in Christianity.<sup>75</sup> Dean Munoz and Ms. Wettengel reported that at a meeting with Student B and Student A, they were advised of proper classroom behavior to ensure they were aware of the proper way to handle issues in the classroom.<sup>76</sup>

During the meeting with Dean Munoz and Ms. Wettengel, Student B explained his statement to the class which was in response to one of the students who said, "I am scared" in a sarcastic tone to which Student B responded, "you should be scared..." as being in reference to him (the instructor), saying that the class should be scared of the instructor, Mr. Derengowski.<sup>77</sup>

---

hearing. Instead, they receive a form letter telling them "that the two Muslim students mentioned in your complaint for alleged disruptive behavior and defaming the instructor did not violate TCC policies in their conduct." Simply incredible.

<sup>75</sup> Again, the conversation that took place between the professor and Mohamad is irrelevant, as well as misleading and a lie, given that it leaves out many details involved in the discussion the night the two met. And because of the irrelevance and lack of detail, it is concluded that it was placed at this junction of the Inquiry simply to demean and defame the professor, rather than provide a clear account of the event. In addition, it provides nothing of relevance toward the student complaints.

<sup>76</sup> Several admissions are worth noting in this statement. First, that Mohamad and Randa were guilty of misbehavior in the classroom, which included recording the class lecture on November 8 against TCC and the professor's policies. That in itself contradicts TCC's statement above that Randa and Mohamad did not violate TCC policies with their conduct. Otherwise, why advise someone about something that they were innocent of committing? Second, that neither Mohamad nor Randa went through the proper chain of command to air their grievances or complaints. Instead, they went over the head of the professor to Human Resources, to spread as much defamation, demagoguery, and damage as possible, without ever having to be held accountable for their own misbehavior. Third, the hypocrisy of the TCC administration, which advised the Muslims students "of the proper way to handle issues," only to turn around and accept the improper way the Muslims chose to air their complaints, and those at face value, no less. Then to add injury to insult, the three students who did file the complaints and grievances in the "proper way," were neglected, ignored, and even asked if they wished to pursue their complaints, while being stonewalled when they asked for responses in a timely manner. Clearly TCC officials erred multiple times while dealing with these incidents, *one of which was to err based on religious preference, which is against the law.*

<sup>77</sup> There are two interesting insights about this statement. First, Mohamad admitted to making the statement, "you should be scared," which was clearly perceived to be a threat. It is something that several students, including the professor, had been testifying to, yet TCC officials had turned a deaf ear toward. And even at that, they still managed to ignore what everyone, but Mohamad, said by rendering a decision totally inconsistent with the facts. Second, Mohamad's explanation is about as dumb and convoluted as they come. Another student comments that Islam's prophet was "scary," because he demonstrated a consistent pattern of thuggery and mayhem, part of which included the beheading of between 600 and 900 Jews personally, and

Likewise, Dr. Coan reported that when instructor Derengowski was asked if there was a safety issue for him or the class, he replied that there was not.<sup>78</sup>

The instructor stated in his police report that the student's behavior caused him to question what else the student might do. However, he also concluded that statement by suggesting only that the police investigate/observe.<sup>79</sup> In speaking with police, Mr. Rusty Fox, Vice President of Student Development at Southeast \Campus, confirmed with the police that there was no threat and confirmed that there was no cause for concern of safety for Mr. Derengowski or the students enrolled in the class.<sup>80</sup>

It is important to note that the instructor filed a police report with the Tarrant County College Police Department. In the report there is no statement concerning a specific threat made to him or the class.<sup>81</sup> The instructor does say after learning his lecture had been recorded that, "it was at

---

Mohamad makes a comment that "you ought to be scared" and applies it to the professor? Such an explanation makes absolutely zero sense, and is another reason why it may be safely concluded that the administration already had its mind made up the instant Mohamad and Randa showed up on its door to carry out their calculated smear campaign. The administration was afraid of the Muslims to the discrimination against the Christians and rendered its decision accordingly.

<sup>78</sup> This conflated, and factually untrue, statement is totally out of context, given that it was stated elsewhere in a completely different context, and has absolutely nothing to do with Mohamad's convoluted explanation.

<sup>79</sup> The attempt to mitigate the seriousness of the police report and the recommendation of the professor is demonstrative of just how incoherent and careless, if not devious, the administration was in handling this whole case. It is trying to show a contrast where none exists, and that because they were not responsible enough to actually speak with the professor about it, much less consider the professor's report to Ms. Wettengel the day after November 8. The administration merely jumps to unwarranted conclusions, not in the best interest of the professor or students in the class, but to, once again, for self-preservation purposes.

<sup>80</sup> First of all, where is the written statement to corroborate this testimony? Second, Rusty Fox has been totally irresponsible and negligent in mishandling this whole case from the get-go. So, his testimony here is more than contrived. In fact, it is an outright lie. Besides, giving his advice to the non-Muslim students to follow proper protocol and take up their matter with Ms. Wettengel, Mr. Munoz, and Dr. Coan before he would intervene, this testimony contradicts his own advice. Add to that the professor's attempt to get Mr. Fox involved as a disciplinarian, which is part of his role as VP of Student Development, only to be rudely told that he would have to take up his complaint with Dr. Coan and have it resolved with her, once again, totally contradicts this whole story about Rusty Fox contacting the police for any reason, much less for safety concerns. It is contended that he contacted no one, because he did not want anything to do with the conflict, just like he wanted nothing to do with the Muslim Student Association incident in 2009, when he bailed on that case as well.

<sup>81</sup> As noted in the resignation tome of the professor, there is no mention of the price of tea in China, either. Therefore, should one necessarily conclude that because the price of tea in China is missing, that no threat was imminent? No. Why? Because whether or not the price of

that moment my concern for the safety of my being crossed my mind.”<sup>82</sup> because 1) the student was “willing to break class rules by recording the lecture without permission, and 2) totally disrupt the class in the abrasive manner that he did,” he therefore questioned, “what else might he do.” He states that “official police investigation/observation is prudent, at least from my point of view, for me and the rest of the students.”<sup>83</sup>

No statements or documentation from the police regarding any immediate or specific threat or related history of disruption have been made, either by the instructor or classmates. The evening Mr. Fox, the Vice President of Student Development, was notified of the November 8 incident, he spoke directly to the sergeant on duty, Sergeant Jeffries, who indicated there was no threat. Ms. Sharon Wettengel also informed Mr. Fox that she had also confirmed with police that there was no danger.<sup>84</sup>

---

tea in China is mentioned at all is irrelevant to what was discussed, both in person and in the report, which expresses concerns surrounding what actually took place that evening. The professor, the students, Mohamad and Randa, and even the administration (which was not even in the room that evening) all report the same story of disruption and chaos that broke out that evening, and given the history of Islamic threats and actions against those whom the devoted Islamist deems as an enemy, the reasonable person would conclude that a threat was imminent, regardless of whether the price of tea in China was mentioned or not. Add to that the testimony of Sergeant Jeffries, who is retired military and served in the Middle East, and it was more than clear to both he and the professor the need to investigate and observe Mohamad’s actions thereafter. Sergeant Jeffries had already experienced enough of what the Mohamad’s of the world would do if one chose to act irresponsibly, like the administration did, by turning a blind eye to him.

<sup>82</sup> This comment is total nonsense. It was when Mohamad blurted out that “you should be scared,” and then shortly thereafter bolted from the room, that the safety issue came to mind. It is also the reason why so many of the students stayed after class, as they felt threatened by Mohamad’s words and actions. Let it be added that the professor did not find out about the recording until after the class had concluded, when the student sitting next to Mohamad came forward and told the professor that Mohamad covertly recorded the class session.

<sup>83</sup> These few sentences merely serve to vindicate the imminent threat that Dr. Coan and her coterie chose to conclude did not exist. In fact, the threat still exists today, despite their irrational denials.

<sup>84</sup> This comment is boorish, ridiculous, and ignorant. It is boorish given the previous testimony found in the Student Grievances, all of which report the constant misbehavior of Mohamad Khorchid. It is ridiculous in that it assumes that unless every action or comment is reported to someone and then written down in Nexis legalese, then everyone must be lying about it when it is reported. It is ignorant in the respect that despite all the so-called investigating that Rusty Fox allegedly conducted or the conversations he supposedly had, he never discovered that Ms. Wettengel had been told about Mohamad’s behavior earlier in the semester by the professor. During that conversation the professor told Ms. Wettengel that he would handle the situation, but if things could not be resolved, he would be sending Mohamad to her for further counsel. This agreement had been enacted upon before in other semesters and worked quite well.



In an effort to ensure the safety of the students and others, Mr. Fox asked the Lieutenant of Police and Dr. Coan, the Vice President for Academic Affairs for the Southeast Campus, if any other records or reports existed that indicated disruptions or threats reported by the instructor, other students or anyone involved. No documentation of threats or patterns of disruption were reported.<sup>85</sup>

After reviewing the complaints of the three students, the Office of Human Resources contacted each of them to follow-up on their complaints and take any information from the students.<sup>86</sup>

## **Part II Findings**

- There was no threat made toward the instructor from Student B. Mr. Derengowski stated in the police report that Student B “left me feeling uneasy and in need of speaking with campus police officials.” He concludes the police report by suggesting that, “official police investigation/observation is prudent, at least from my point of view, for me and the rest of the students until this incident passes from Student B’s immediate memory.” Thus, no disciplinary action was taken by TCC administrators against Student B.<sup>87</sup>
- The evidence reveals that the administrators took immediate and appropriate actions and measures to ensure the safety, security and well-being of students, faculty, and staff based

---

Nevertheless, such boorishness, ridiculousness, and ignorance is what typically occurs when one is negligent and hasty in concocting a story that is inconsistent with the facts; where self-preservation is more important than preserving and upholding the truth.

<sup>85</sup> This is simply a repeat of a previous error. See notes 36, 40, 89.

<sup>86</sup> Here another abject lie is being propagated, for none of the students who filed grievances were contacted, apart from being sent a form letter, much less followed up, to either share results or answer questions. Instead, the students wrote several emails going all the way back to November to ask whether they were going to be heard. Perhaps the most revealing bit of evidence which shows the total negligence and carelessness of the TCC administration and its attitude toward the students is when the final results came out. Instead of writing and informing the students of TCC’s ill-conceived decision, TCC had it published on the Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* website and the students found out about it when the professor contacted them. And he only found out when the newspaper editor contacted him for a response! When the students contacted Mr. Bill Lanier in the HR office, he told them that by them contacting him that was their notification; that there would be no formal notification in writing. A few days later Dr. Roberto Coronado sent the students a form-letter via U.S. mail stating essentially what was in the Executive Summary of Inquiry posted on the *Star-Telegram* website. If all of this is not a clear case of disrespect, incompetence, and a violation of TCC regulations, if not the law, then nothing is.

<sup>87</sup> As seen above, the testimony from Mohamad Khorchid was convoluted and inconsistent in contrast to several persons of much more stable and reliable testimony. Therefore, TCC is complicit in the assault upon the professor by exonerating the student of any wrongdoing.

on information and facts.<sup>88</sup> They also took appropriate steps to make sure the students did not have any further disruptions to the class.<sup>89</sup> Police were immediately consulted and involved.<sup>90</sup> Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Student Development Services took appropriate steps immediately when notified.<sup>91</sup> Department Chair Ms. Wettengel and Mr. Mark Austin met with the class at the next class meeting.<sup>92</sup> The Department Chair heard student concerns and explained plans for the continuation of class.<sup>93</sup> A new instructor was identified immediately and class continued with only one missed class time, November 15, the evening Mr. Derengowski unexpectedly resigned.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> This is a complete lie. The only immediate action that TCC administration took was to attend to the complaints of the two Muslim students and that to the neglect of everyone else. The fact is, rather than respond to the student grievances and complaints in the posted 10 days that TCC was supposed to respond, those in charge waited over two months to finally conclude anything, and then managed to publish its conclusions in the local newspaper. Moreover, the student grievances still have not been addressed, but instead were ignored, only to repeat the same pitiful drivel that the Muslim students concocted in an effort to finalize their assault upon the professor.

<sup>89</sup> Here is an admission that there were disruptions, again, just like as had been reported by the professor and the students. Now, if the professor did not cause the disruptions and neither did the students, then who is left as the cause, other than the Muslim students? And since there is this admission, and the Muslims students are culpable, then how is it possible to render a decision that is completely opposite of what the facts warrant? How can someone be guilty and innocent of the same charge, which occurred at the same time and in the same setting?

<sup>90</sup> This is only true if speaking about the professor. All other parties did nothing until things got way out of hand, and then only acted out of self-preservation, not out of a willingness to preserve integrity and the truth, as well as the safety of the students.

<sup>91</sup> This is another abject lie. Rusty Fox did nothing, has done nothing, and continues to do nothing, but avoid the issue, just like he did nothing back in 2009 with a similar ordeal.

<sup>92</sup> An illusion is repeated to try and garner effect. The reality is Ms. Wettengel showed up and pulled a PR/HR stunt, avoided questions, or only provided vague replies. Moreover, she promised something she could not deliver on by stating that the class would move “forward,” when the reality is it digressed backward: all the way back to the beginning of the book, which Mr. Austin was instructed to “teach” to try and conclude the semester. Interestingly, in another attempt to appease the Muslim students, a pro-Islam video was shown to the class on the last day of the semester over protests from the non-Muslim students earlier when he wanted to show it, but decided not to.

<sup>93</sup> This is another misleading statement based in falsehood. For while Ms. Wettengel might have listened, mainly because the students were outraged by what they already knew, she explained nothing, much less made plans for the class other than, once again, to promise something she could not deliver on. She, along with Dr. Coan and Mr. Munoz, had already nixed the syllabus, so the only direction this class could go was backwards, which it did.

<sup>94</sup> Of course this statement fails to report the numerous student absences, as well as students who simply quit going to class, after TCC decided to conveniently try and sweep everything aside as if nothing ever happened. The very next day after Mark Austin was

- There is no evidence to support students in the class being treated poorly by administration.<sup>95</sup> College policy and procedures were followed.<sup>96</sup> Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel spoke with the two students involved in the matter and stated that it was their assessment that Student B and fellow student, Student A, were provoked, and that arguing and then leaving abruptly were preferable choices to remaining in the class, given the tone of the classroom environment.<sup>97</sup> Dr. Coan explained that the website the instructor lists as a resource for his class lists Islam as a cult, and the instructor made derogatory and discriminating statements about Islam and Muslims, further indicating that the students' concern that the presentation in class was offensive to some students was valid.<sup>98</sup> After reviewing and discussing the matter with the two students, the administrators did not recommend disciplinary action at that time but did counsel with the two students as previously stated.<sup>99</sup>

---

introduced as the instructor, November 22, he recorded seven absences, and then completely failed to keep attendance thereafter. So, to state that the class "continued" is a ruse at best, and everyone has Dr. Coan, Mr. Munoz, Ms. Wettengel, and Mr. Fox to thank for the grand illusion.

<sup>95</sup> This is an abject lie. TCC administration ignored student complaints against both the Muslim students and the administration's handling of the case. The truth is the professor did not treat anyone poorly.

<sup>96</sup> This is an abject lie. Not only were specific citations of student misconduct highlighted for Ms. Wettengel when she asked for them, when those citations were re-cited for Dr. Coan, Mr. Munoz, and TCC attorney Angela Robinson, they were summarily dismissed with a wave of the hand.

<sup>97</sup> It should be pointed out that amid all the self-congratulating on the part of TCC administration that only the Muslim students, once again, are mentioned when it comes to addressing the three Student Complaints/Grievances. Instead of actually addressing the testimony of the students who filed the grievances, the Muslim students are again held up as paragons of moral virtue, and then used as the point of reference to denounce any and all critical testimony to the contrary. Moreover, the administration is basing their assertion on hearsay; hearsay that only comes from the Muslims.

<sup>98</sup> What Dr. Coan opines at this juncture is irrelevant, since the professor's website had nothing to do with the student's complaints which address the misbehavior on the part of the Muslim students on November 8. Add to that the fact that Dr. Coan has never read the article on Islam as a cult, nor has she ever proffered a substantive or legitimate rebuttal concerning its contents, and one should readily see just how irrelevant, if not religiously bigoted, this conflated statement truly is.

<sup>99</sup> Once again, please note that only the two Muslim students are mentioned, almost as if their approval is what drove the administrator's so-called "investigation." It should also be noted that the administrators actually "discussed" the matter with the Muslim students, but did no such thing with anyone else. Instead, Dr. Coronado sent out a ridiculous questionnaire via email, thinking that by doing so it was equal to discussing the matter personally. Finally, if the Muslim students were unworthy of discipline, then what was the purpose of counseling them: to commend them on a misdeed well done?

- Ms. Thomas<sup>100</sup> further alleged that Student A defamed Mr. Derengowski. She submitted the statements made by Student A as evidence that she defamed Mr. Derengowski. The College addressed Student A's conduct under the Student Handbook and does not find evidence to support that she violated any TCC policies when she sent an email to classmates, objected to his presentation, questioned his credentials, and stating that his information was false, in her opinion of his instruction on religion.<sup>101</sup>
- Based on all the information presented and available, the investigation revealed that in the Philosophy 1304 class there was no pattern or history of disruptive behavior by Student B.<sup>102</sup> No pattern or history of disruptive behavior was reported by the instructor, campus administration, or police.<sup>103</sup> Neither has academic administration noted previous disruptive behaviors in the class.<sup>104</sup> Likewise, the police verify that no record of previous incidences have been reported for this class or these students.<sup>105</sup> The day the incident

---

<sup>100</sup> Not only did TCC violate the student's rights by mentioning her by name, it took the student notifying TCC of its *faux pas*, whereby it had to redact her name from the document, which had already appeared in public on the *Star-Telegram* website. It finally ended up taking Ms. Thomas three months to get the *Star-Telegram* to remove her name, no thanks to TCC.

<sup>101</sup> What a completely contradictory statement. TCC claims to have based its conclusion on the evidence, or lack of evidence in this case, only to turn right around and provide a catalogue of evidence supporting Ms. Thomas' claims. And clearly from the Student Handbook it is a serious violation, worthy of expulsion, for a student to verbally or in written form to unlawfully defame another person, which is exactly what Randa did. Yet, TCC ignores the evidence, even though it admits that Randa committed the violation, and exonerates her because she claimed she was discriminated and provoked into doing it. With that kind of defense half the prisoners on death row in Huntsville could walk.

<sup>102</sup> Once again, TCC officials are ignoring the evidence on the one hand, while admitting it on the other. For how could there have been further disruptions (see notes 37, 40, and 89) if there was not already a history of them prior to the major disruption by Mohamad Khorchid and Randa Bedair on November 8? In addition, what about all the testimony from the other students in the class which testifies to the fact Mohamad continually and repeatedly interrupted the class, even after being spoken with by the professor?

<sup>103</sup> This is another repetitive lie, since Professor Derengowski did notify Ms. Wettengel earlier in the semester concerning Mohamad's disruptive propensity. What Ms. Wettengel did with the information only she would know. But, it was reported, regardless of the denials.

<sup>104</sup> This is a ridiculous statement. Unless one was in the class on a consistent basis, then how would one note what did or did not take place in it?

<sup>105</sup> Of course there is no police record of additional accounts of misbehavior, since only one report was filed that required police involvement. But just because there is only one police report does not negate the fact that several students complained, whether verbally or in writing, about Mohamad Khorchid's constant disruptions in the class. Once again we have the testimony of one Muslim student being the standard for deciding what the truth is, rather than taking the majority account and then acting in accord with the truth.

was reported to Mr. Fox, Vice President for Student Development Services office, spoke directly with the sergeant on duty, Sgt. Jeffries and indicated there was no threat.<sup>106</sup>

Likewise, Dr. Barbara Coan, Vice President for Academic Affairs, informed Mr. Fox that the instructor had also confirmed that there was no threat of danger to him or his students.<sup>107</sup>

- Based on the information reported, the two Muslim students who departed Mr. Derengowski's class two minutes early on November 8 were outspoken in class but were reacting to what they considered false, inflammatory, and derogatory statements about the Muslim religion that Mr. Derengowski had made in class.<sup>108</sup> The two students met with Sharon Wettengel, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Social Work Chair (Department Chair), and Dean Munoz to express their concerns, at which time proper classroom behavior was discussed to ensure the students were aware of the proper way to handle issues in the classroom.<sup>109</sup> The semester continued without any further interruptions.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> This is a fabrication on the part of TCC officials who wish that Rusty Fox would have done his job as he should have. Instead, Rusty Fox, as noted previously, avoided the incident much like he avoided the dozens of emails sent to him asking to act judiciously. And only now that Rusty Fox and the administrators have let things progress to the point that it has, all of the sudden they are crediting themselves with working the problem with precision and care, when the exact opposite is true. To prove this all one needs to ask is: If Rusty Fox and the SE Campus administrators were so on top of everything, then why was it necessary to pass along all the whole mess to the District Office to have some kind of lame "investigation" take place to try and resolve the issue?

<sup>107</sup> Regardless of how many times this statement is repeated (and this is the third time thus far in this report) it is still untrue, senseless, and irrelevant. But sticking to the belief that the more times a falsehood is repeated, before long people will start believing it is true, TCC administration keeps repeating this lie in hopes that people will believe it, but also that it might absolve it of any possible backlash for not doing what it was supposed to do by punishing the wrongdoers in order to protect the innocent.

<sup>108</sup> And once again, the student grievances/complaints are judged as false based on what the two Muslims said, rather than based on the merits of those who filed them. This is prejudicial bias and discrimination based on religious preference if there ever was any.

<sup>109</sup> What about TCC administration meeting with the rest of the students in the class to hear what they had to say about November 8? Does not their testimony count for anything? The fact is, TCC dragged its feet so badly and used the holiday breaks to avoid having to deal with any of this. Therefore, the semester ended, as well as the year itself, without any further comments from the students, and when the New Year began, only a handful of students responded to the silly questionnaire that Dr. Coronado sent out. Once again, the findings were based on religious prejudicial bias and bigotry and nothing else. Besides, TCC admits, one more time, that the two Muslim students were guilty of improperly dealing with the issue, even though

**Conclusion:** This inquiry reviewed the five student complaints to a philosophy class, Great Religions of the World, taught by Mr. Paul Derengowski, part-time instructor (adjunct faculty), at the Southeast Campus. It was determined that Mr. Derengowski voluntarily resigned from his teaching responsibilities without duress as he alleged.<sup>111</sup> Part I of this Inquiry reviewed complaints by two Muslim students who reported religious discrimination and harassment by creating a hostile learning environment in violation of TCC policies.<sup>112</sup> The findings are that Mr. Derengowski created a hostile learning environment for the two Muslim students.<sup>113</sup> Part II reviewed three students' complaints against the two Muslim students for disruptive behavior, defaming the professor, and TCC administrators for failing to act and it was determined that the two students did not violate TCC policies in their conduct.<sup>114</sup> Furthermore, TCC Southeast Campus administrators acted appropriately during the incident.<sup>115</sup>

---

TCC cannot even see the contradiction of their admission if the students were as innocent as TCC is leading everyone to believe.

<sup>110</sup> Again, TCC admits to interruptions, but refuses to identify who the perpetrators were. How convenient.

<sup>111</sup> And the evidence is quite clear that that was not the case, nor could it have been, given all the admissions that TCC officials made in this report.

<sup>112</sup> Yet, no evidence was provided to substantiate the charges. They were merely assumed, based on faulty reasoning and religious prejudice, bigotry, and favoritism.

<sup>113</sup> Such defamation is typical given all that is included in this Summary. The findings are not only illusory, the means by which they were arrived at are predicated on the same kind of libelous testimony found in the email that Randa Bedair first sent around to her classmates when she commenced her smear campaign.

<sup>114</sup> To assert that TCC's review dealt with the complaints of the three students is fanciful at best. The second part of the Summary was based as much on the Muslim student's testimony as was the first part. Instead, the student testimony was totally ignored, just like the testimony of the professor was ignored as well, all in an effort to appease the two Muslim students.

<sup>115</sup> Based on all things said, both in and out of the Executive Summary of Inquiry, only someone who completely disregards the facts would agree with what the Tarrant County College administration is crediting itself. Not only did it act in the same reckless manner as the Muslim students, it was complicit in their carelessness, defamation, and religious bigotry as well.

**N.B.** It should be noted as well that prior to the Muslim assault upon the character of the professor, that TCC extended an offer to the professor to teach the Great Religion of the World class in the spring of 2012. Now, if the professor had created this so-called "hostile learning environment," which should have been more than noticeable long before ever making such an offer, then why would TCC do such a thing?

**N.B.** Another question concerning the creation of the hostile learning environment is in order as well. If Professor Derengowski did as alleged, then why did all of the students stick around after class the night Mohamad Khorchid stormed from the class in a threatening huff? Surely if the professor was the creator of hostility, then all of the students should have left immediately after the class and filed similar complaints as the two Muslims against him. But, they didn't. Why is that?