

# The University of North Carolina Schools

## Appalachian State University

### Speech Codes

Appalachian State University maintains several unconstitutional speech codes. Its Department of Housing and Residence Life maintains a harassment policy that provides, in relevant part: “Bigotry has no place within the residence hall community, nor does the right to denigrate another human being.... Harassment or the use of abusive language, insults, taunts, or challenges directed toward another person are prohibited.” This policy is unconstitutionally overbroad.

The Supreme Court has held that for student conduct to constitute unprotected hostile environment harassment, it must be “so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively bars the victim’s access to an educational opportunity or benefit.” *Davis v. Monroe County Bd. of Educ.*, 526 U.S. 629, 633 (1999). By contrast, this policy requires only that the conduct “denigrate,” “insult,” or “challenge” another individual, without reference to whether the conduct is objectively offensive or to whether it interferes with that individual’s access to educational opportunity. Moreover, this policy indicates that

a single instance of insult or offense is sufficient to establish a violation. This contradicts both Supreme Court precedent and the federal government’s interpretation of the relevant harassment laws. In its July 28, 2003, open letter to college and university administrators, OCR stated that “the offensiveness of a particular expression, standing alone, is not a legally sufficient basis to establish a hostile environment under the statutes enforced by OCR.” *First Amendment: Dear Colleague Letter*.

Appalachian State’s Code of Student Conduct also defines harassment as “conduct that has the effect of emphasizing” sexuality or race “in a manner deemed offensive by a reasonable person....” Although Appalachian State makes an effort to comply with the First Amendment here by introducing a “reasonable person” standard into this policy, the policy is still unconstitutionally overbroad.

A school cannot prohibit merely “offensive” speech, even if a reasonable person would find it offensive. Rather, the applicable “reasonable person” standard is as follows: a school can prohibit only speech “severe or pervasive enough to create an objectively hostile or abusive work environment—an environment that a reasonable person

would find hostile or abusive.” *Harris v. Forklift Systems*, 510 U.S. 17, 21–22 (1993).

## Nondiscrimination Policies

Appalachian State maintains a nondiscrimination policy for student organizations that requires student organizations to “afford opportunities to members on the basis of personal merit and not race, sex, creed, sexual orientation, age, religion, national origin or ancestry.” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students’ right to freedom of association.

## East Carolina University

### Speech Codes

East Carolina University prohibits “[u]sing obscene, vulgar, loud, or disruptive language or conduct directed toward and offensive to a member or visitor of the University community.” This policy is unconstitutionally overbroad.

As an initial matter, “obscenities,” as used in common parlance, are not unprotected obscenity. Rather, unprotected obscenity has a highly specific definition: obscenity must “depict or describe sexual conduct,” and must be “limited to works which, taken as a whole, appeal to the prurient interest in sex, which portray sexual conduct in a patently offensive way, and which, taken as a whole, do not have serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value.” *Miller v. California*, 413 U.S. 15, 24 (1973).

Moreover, the Supreme Court has made clear that most so-called vulgar language is constitutionally protected. In *Cohen v. California*, 403 U.S. 15 (1971), the defendant was convicted under a California statute for wearing a jacket bearing the words “F\*ck the Draft” into a county courthouse. The Court overturned Cohen’s conviction, holding that the message on his jacket, however vulgar, was protected speech. The Court wrote that “one man’s vulgarity is another’s lyric. Indeed, we think it is largely because governmental officials cannot make principled distinctions in this area that the Constitution leaves

matters of taste and style so largely to the individual.” *Id.* at 25.

In *Papish v. Board of Curators of the University of Missouri*, 410 U.S. 667 (1973), a journalism graduate student was expelled for distributing a newspaper that contained “indecent speech” in violation of university policy. The two objectionable items in the newspaper were a political cartoon depicting policemen raping the Statue of Liberty and a headline reading “Motherf\*cker Acquitted,” which discussed the trial of an individual who was a member of a group called “Up Against the Wall, Motherf\*cker.” The Supreme Court ordered that the student be reinstated at the university, holding that “the mere dissemination of ideas—no matter how offensive to good taste—on a state university campus may not be shut off in the name alone of ‘conventions of decency.’” *Id.* at 670.

East Carolina also maintains a residence hall policy on “respect and courtesy” stating that students do not have the right “to denigrate another individual on the basis of age, physical challenge, national origin, sexual orientation, race, political affiliation, gender, or religious affiliation.”

East Carolina’s “respect and courtesy” policy requires no showing of severity or pervasiveness, thus conditioning the permissibility of speech on the subjective reaction of the listener. Moreover, the policy goes beyond the legally protected categories of federal anti-harassment law and prohibits “denigration” on the basis of “political affiliation.” The policy requires students to guess at what it prohibits, likely leading to self-censorship. What, exactly, does it mean to denigrate someone on the basis of his or her political affiliation? Would a student’s impassioned argument that Republicans don’t care about

*Students who don’t want to risk punishment might censor themselves from engaging in these types of discussions and debates, which should form the heart of university life.*

minorities or the poor “denigrate” a Republican student on the basis of political affiliation? Would a student’s impassioned argument that Democrats tacitly support anti-American terrorism “denigrate” a Democratic student on the basis of political affiliation? In other words, would these exchanges, part of the “marketplace of ideas” that makes university life so unique, be prohibited conduct at East Carolina? Under the language of East Carolina’s policy, they could be. And as a result, students who don’t want to risk punishment might censor themselves from engaging in these types of discussions and debates, which should form the heart of university life.

### **Nondiscrimination Policies**

At East Carolina, a registered student organization must have a statement in its constitution and by-laws to the effect that “there shall be no discrimination of race, religion, creed, color, national origin, sex, age, sexual preference, veteran status, or disability with regards to the purpose of the club.” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students’ right to freedom of association.

## **Elizabeth City State University**

### **Speech Codes**

Our research indicates that Elizabeth City State University’s speech-related policies are consistent with the First Amendment. Elizabeth City’s Sexual Harassment Policy provides that to constitute sexual harassment, conduct must be “so extreme or constant that a reasonable person would find that it...creates a hostile or abusive working or educational environment.” This policy is consistent with the Supreme Court’s harassment jurisprudence: it requires both that the conduct be severe or pervasive, and that the conduct be objectively offensive.

Elizabeth City also maintains a Computer Use Policy providing that students’ computer use must “not violate state or federal laws or University policies against race or sex discrimination, including sexual harassment.” Since Elizabeth City’s sexual harassment policy does not

restrict protected speech, this related policy is also constitutionally acceptable.

### **Nondiscrimination Policies**

Unfortunately, Elizabeth City does maintain an unconstitutional nondiscrimination requirement as applied to religious student groups, requiring that “all clubs and organizations must be open to all Elizabeth City State University students. Clubs may not discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, or any other factors.” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students’ right to freedom of association.

## **Fayetteville State University**

### **Speech Codes**

Fayetteville State University maintains one explicitly unconstitutional policy as well as several policies that could too easily be used to ban or excessively regulate protected speech.

Fayetteville State’s Code of Student Conduct defines “racial harassment” as

verbal or physical behavior that stigmatizes or victimizes an individual on the basis of race and involves an express or implied threat to another person’s academic pursuits or participation in activities sponsored by the University or organizations or groups related to the University. Such behavior may also create an intimidating, hostile or demeaning environment for such academic pursuits or participation.

A federal court in Michigan held that a virtually identical policy at the University of Michigan was unconstitutionally vague. *Doe v. Michigan*, 721 F. Supp. 852 (E.D. Mich. 1989). The court first held that the words “stigmatize” and “victimize” “are general and elude precise definition.” *Doe*, 721 F. Supp. at 867. The court also held that the phrase “involve an express or implied threat to an individual’s academic efforts” was vague because “it is not clear what kind of conduct would constitute a

‘threat’ to an individual’s academic efforts.” *Id.* Although the *Doe* decision is not binding on North Carolina, it was a highly publicized decision, and it is surprising that Fayetteville State would continue to maintain such a publicly discredited policy.

Fayetteville State’s Code of Student Conduct defines “harassment” as “any act that is abusive or threatening to another by means other than the use or threatened use of physical force.” This policy is defective because it does not require that the act be threatening to a *reasonable* person in order to constitute harassment. Instead, it conditions the permissibility of speech on the subjective reaction of the listener.

FIRE handled a case at William Paterson University of New Jersey (WPUNJ) that illustrates how conditioning speech on subjective listener reaction can lead to the suppression of constitutionally protected speech. In March 2005, a women’s studies professor at WPUNJ sent out a campus-wide e-mail about an upcoming showing of a film described as a “lesbian relationship story.” The e-mail contained a “reply to” address. In response to this unsolicited e-mail, a religious Muslim student at the university replied to the professor as follows:

Do not send me any mail about “Connie and Sally” and “Adam and Steve.” These are perversions. The absence of God in higher education brings on confusion. That is why in these classes the Creator of the heavens and the earth is never mentioned.

*William Paterson University: Punishment on Harassment Charges for Response to Mass E-mail, at <http://www.thefire.org/index.php/case/682.html>.*

This student’s e-mail is absolutely constitutionally protected speech. However, the professor complained to the university about the e-mail. She stated that the “message to me sounds threatening” and that “I don’t want to feel threatened at my place of work....” As a result of the professor’s complaint, the student was found guilty of

violating New Jersey’s policy against discrimination and harassment.

As this case demonstrates, prohibiting conduct that is “threatening to another” without reference to a reasonable person could easily be used to suppress protected speech as well as genuinely unprotected threats.

Fayetteville State also prohibits, as disorderly conduct, “using abusive and/or vulgar language....” As discussed earlier, however, most “vulgar language” is constitutionally protected.

Additionally, Fayetteville State maintains a housing policy that prohibits “any form of violence, threats, fighting, wrestling, or verbal confrontations.” The term “verbal confrontations” is vague and overbroad. As discussed in detail earlier, a regulation is unconstitutionally vague if people of ordinary intelligence are left to guess at its meaning. What is a “verbal confrontation”? If two students are arguing loudly in the hallway about a controversial topic they discussed earlier in class, is that a verbal confrontation? When people are forced to guess at the meaning of a regulation, they censor themselves in order to avoid punishment. This leads to an impermissible “chilling effect” on constitutionally protected speech.

## **Nondiscrimination Policies**

At Fayetteville State, in order to become a recognized student organization, the organization’s president must sign a statement affirming that “[t]his organization will not practice nor condone discrimination, in any form against university or community members on the grounds of race, nationality, religion, sex, or handicapping conditions.” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students’ right to freedom of association.

## **North Carolina A&T State University**

### **Speech Codes**

As does Fayetteville State, North Carolina A&T State University prohibits “using language that is abusive

*It is surprising that Fayetteville State would continue to maintain such a publicly discredited policy.*

and/or vulgar.” It also prohibits “[a]ny vulgarity, obscenity, harassment or threats through E-mail.” As discussed in detail above, a state actor such as North Carolina A&T State University cannot constitutionally prohibit vulgar language.

### **Nondiscrimination Policies**

North Carolina A&T State’s Student Handbook provides that “[r]egistered and approved student organizations do not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, religious affiliation, sex, national origin, age or handicap in any aspect of their functions and operations.” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students’ right to freedom of association.

## **North Carolina Central University**

### **Speech Codes**

North Carolina Central University’s Guide to On-Campus Living provides that “[s]tatements of intolerance and/or harassment due to race, ethnicity, sex, religion, disability, or sexual preference may be subject to disciplinary action.” This policy is unconstitutionally overbroad because it prohibits a great deal of constitutionally protected speech. In fact, a federal court in Pennsylvania recently struck down a university policy prohibiting “acts of intolerance” on overbreadth grounds, holding that it prohibited speech protected by

the First Amendment. *Bair v. Shippensburg Univ.*, 280 F. Supp. 2d 357, 370 (M.D. Pa. 2003).

A prohibition on “statements of intolerance” is also unduly vague since the university does not define what constitutes a “statement of intolerance.” Would a student’s vocal opposition to proselytizing on campus be a “statement of intolerance” due to religion since some religions require their members to proselytize? This student’s opinion is unquestionably protected speech. However, because it is difficult to know what is prohibited by this policy, students and faculty will likely censor protected speech themselves in order to avoid punishment.

North Carolina Central prohibits “public profanity,” in direct violation of established Supreme Court precedent. In *Cohen v. California*, 403 U.S. 15 (1971), discussed in detail above, the Supreme Court held that the state could not lawfully make the “public display” of a “four-letter expletive” a punishable offense. *Cohen*, 403 U.S. at 26. North Carolina Central’s “public profanity” policy directly contravenes this holding and is therefore unconstitutional.

North Carolina Central also prohibits employees and students from using the university computer network to “download offensive or derogatory material from the Internet.” This is unconstitutionally overbroad. Although this policy clearly covers hardcore pornography, which the university can legitimately regulate, it also bans a great deal of constitutionally protected speech. As courts have held in cases too numerous to list, the state cannot ban communication simply because someone finds it offensive or derogatory. Rather, it must fall within one of the very narrow categories of speech that the Supreme Court has held are outside the protections of the First Amendment: obscenity (as legally defined), fighting words, or actual harassment.

## **North Carolina School of the Arts**

### **Speech Codes**

North Carolina School of the Arts maintains a harassment policy that could be used to suppress protected speech. Although it defines harassment as “behavior based on another person’s status that creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or educational envi-

*Public institutions such as North Carolina School of the Arts and many others persist in attempting to ban “offensive” speech. It is unlikely, if not impossible, however, that a policy such as this could survive a constitutional challenge.*

ronment,” it goes on to provide examples of harassment that could have a serious chilling effect on campus speech. It provides that “behaviors that may constitute discriminatory harassment include,” among other things, “stereotyping the experiences, background, and skills of individual groups,” making “inconsiderate or mean-spirited jokes,” and, most disturbingly, “attributing objections to any of the above to ‘hypersensitivity’ of the targeted individual or group.” This policy is probably saved from illegality by the fact that it says these behaviors “may” constitute harassment rather than that they *do* constitute harassment. Indeed, almost any behavior “may” constitute harassment if it is severe, persistent, and pervasive enough to effectively prevent an individual from obtaining an education.

These examples are misleading enough, however, that they are likely to have a chilling effect on students’ constitutionally protected speech. For example, nearly all speech that “stereotypes the experiences” of others, and nearly all “mean-spirited jokes” are constitutionally protected. Most distressing is the suggestion that attributing objections to speech to “hypersensitivity” is prohibited. In fact, alleged harassment *must* be evaluated from the perspective of a reasonable person, and an argument that the alleged victim is not reasonable but rather has unreasonable sensitivities is an entirely legitimate defense to a claim of harassment.

North Carolina School of the Arts also prohibits “disorderly conduct including, but not limited to, verbally abusive or inappropriate behavior. For example: discrimination against another student by using offensive speech or behavior of a biased or prejudiced nature related to one’s personal characteristics, including race, color, national origin, gender, religion, disability, age or sexual orientation.

The Supreme Court has held on numerous occasions that speech cannot be restricted simply because it offends people. In *Street v. New York*, 394 U.S. 576, 592 (1969), the Court held that “[i]t is firmly settled that under our Constitution the public expression of ideas may not be prohibited merely because the ideas are themselves offensive to some of their hearers.” In *Papish v. Board of Curators of the University of Missouri*, 410 U.S. 667, 670, the Court held that “the mere dissemination of ideas—no matter how offensive to good taste—on a state university campus may not be shut off in the name alone of

conventions of decency.” Federal courts across the country have echoed this. See *Saxe v. State College Area School District*, 240 F.3d 200, 206 (3d Cir. 2001) (there is “no question that the free speech clause protects a wide variety of speech that listeners may consider deeply offensive....”); *Doe v. University of Michigan*, 721 F. Supp. 852, 863 (E.D. Mich. 1989) (the university could not “proscribe speech simply because it was found to be offensive, even gravely so, by large numbers of people”).

The Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights, whose regulations govern harassment in the educational setting, has also made clear that merely offensive communications do not constitute unprotected harassment. See *First Amendment: Dear Colleague Letter*.

This policy is not saved by the fact that the prohibition is couched in terms of discrimination, since while actual discrimination can—indeed, must—be prohibited, “using offensive speech” is not a form of discrimination. Discrimination can occur in the form of actual (*i.e.* severe, persistent, pervasive) harassment or in the form of denial of equal opportunity. North Carolina School of the Arts cannot get around the First Amendment by redefining “discrimination” to include offensive speech. Nonetheless, public institutions such as North Carolina School of the Arts and many others persist in attempting to ban “offensive” speech. It is unlikely, if not impossible, however, that a policy such as this could survive a constitutional challenge.

## North Carolina State University

### Speech Codes

North Carolina State’s policies are, for the most part, consistent with federal anti-harassment law and thus the First Amendment. It maintains one policy, however, that could too easily be used to restrict protected speech. North Carolina State’s racial harassment policy provides that “[r]acial bias or harassment is a form of race discrimination in violation of federal and state law and North Carolina State University policy, and it will not be tolerated.” The university’s definition of racial harassment is acceptable; it provides that racial and other harassment “consists of unwelcome conduct when: 1. such conduct has the effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work or academic performance, or 2. such conduct has the effect of creating an intimidating, hostile or

offensive working or learning environment.” On the other hand, the prohibition on “racial bias” could be used to suppress protected speech if the university applied it to expression as well as to discriminatory actions. Leaving this term undefined makes this policy too susceptible to abuse by overzealous administrators.

## Nondiscrimination Policies

North Carolina State maintains a constitutionally appropriate policy that provides only that student organizations may “[n]ot practice illegal discrimination.” This policy, which tells students only that they may not violate applicable law, is unobjectionable.

## UNC Asheville

### Speech Codes

UNC Asheville defines harassment as, among other things, “taunting, challenging or provoking any student or university official....” This is wholly unconstitutional, bearing little or no relationship to federal anti-harassment law. It prohibits certain types of speech outright, without reference to whether that speech is objectively—or even subjectively—offensive, and without reference to whether that speech is severe and persistent enough to create the necessary hostile environment.

UNC Asheville also violates its students’ right to freedom of conscience by forcing them to “commit to a code of Civilized behavior” in the form of a Student Creed that provides, among other things, that “in joining this learning community,” “I will respect the dignity of all persons...I will not condone bigotry...I will strive for the openness to learn from differences in people....” The final sentence of this Student Creed indicates that it is more than merely aspirational: “If you feel that you have experienced actions on campus which are not in accordance with the Student Creed, please contact the Academic and Student Affairs Office.”

The U.S. Supreme Court has stated that “[i]f there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein.” *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 642 (1943). In its Student

Creed, UNC Asheville is actually forcing students to profess their belief in an officially approved ideology. This is a brazen intrusion into students’ freedom of conscience.

## Nondiscrimination Policies

UNC Asheville also maintains a nondiscrimination requirement for student organizations, which provides that “[f]ull membership and participation must be available to all UNCA Students without regard to race, religion, national origin, disability, age, veteran status, sexual orientation, or gender.” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students’ right to freedom of association.

## UNC Chapel Hill

### Speech Codes

At first blush, UNC Chapel Hill appears to maintain a permissible sexual harassment policy, which provides that sexual conduct constitutes sexual harassment when “such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.”

Yet, UNC Chapel Hill goes on to provide “examples of sexual harassment” that include, among other things, “sexually explicit statements or questions”; “sexually explicit jokes or anecdotes”; “remarks about sexual activ-

*In its Student Creed, UNC Asheville is actually forcing students to profess their belief in an officially approved ideology. This is a brazen intrusion into students’ freedom of conscience.*

ity”; and “sexually explicit emails, away messages, voice mails.” This policy is unconstitutionally overbroad. By stating that these examples are sexual harassment, UNC Chapel Hill explicitly bans constitutionally protected speech, since the state cannot ban sexually explicit expression unless it meets the legal definition of obscenity or harassment. While these examples could constitute harassment if they were part of a course of conduct so severe, persistent and pervasive that it prevented someone from obtaining an education, they *are not*, standing alone, “examples of sexual harassment.”

UNC Chapel Hill’s network acceptable use policy provides that “users shall not harass or stalk others, post, transmit, or originate any unlawful, threatening, abusive, fraudulent, hateful, defamatory, obscene, or pornographic communication” over UNC computers. This is a textbook example of overbreadth. The policy legitimately regulates a number of types of communication, including harassment, fraud and other illegal activities, defamation, and obscenity. But mixed in with these legitimate regulations are unconstitutional prohibitions on “abusive” and “hateful” communications.

“Abusive” or “hateful” communications cannot be regulated unless they rise to the level of physical threats, fighting words, or actual harassment. These provisions are plainly unconstitutional.

## **Nondiscrimination Policies**

UNC Chapel Hill has twice engaged in religious discrimination against student organizations, with the most recent instance resulting in a federal judge’s issuing a preliminary injunction against the university.

In December 2002, UNC Chapel Hill attempted to force the InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, a campus student group, to remove a provision of its constitution that required that the officers of that Christian group be Christian. After FIRE publicized UNC Chapel Hill’s unconstitutional and illiberal actions, the university quickly relented.

In the fall of 2003, UNC Chapel Hill derecognized a Christian fraternity that refused to sign the university’s nondiscrimination statement for student organizations. The fraternity filed suit in federal district court in North Carolina, and in March 2005, the judge preliminarily enjoined UNC Chapel Hill from enforcing its student

organization nondiscrimination clause. Although UNC Chapel Hill has not admitted any wrongdoing in its derecognition of the fraternity, it has changed its nondiscrimination policy since the case began.

As of August 2004, the student organization nondiscrimination policy provided that:

In keeping with applicable law and University policy, membership and participation in your organization must be open without regard to age, race, color, national origin, religion, disability, veteran status, or sexual orientation. Membership and participation in your organization must also be open without regard to gender, unless exempt under Title IX.

Since that time, UNC Chapel Hill has added the following text to its policy:

Student organizations that select their members on the basis of commitment to a set of beliefs (e.g., religious or political beliefs) may limit membership and participation in the organization to students who, upon individual inquiry, affirm that they support the organization’s goals and agree with its beliefs, so long as no student is excluded from membership or participation on the basis of his or her age, race, color, national origin, disability, religious status or historic religious affiliation, veteran status, sexual orientation, or, unless exempt under Title IX, gender.

## **UNC Charlotte**

### **Speech Codes**

UNC Charlotte’s Racial Harassment Policy prohibits “any verbal or physical behavior...that stigmatizes or victimizes an individual on the basis of race, ethnicity, or ancestry, and that involves an express or implied threat to or interference with any facet of an individual’s University life or creates an intimidating, hostile or demeaning environment for that individual in the University community.” This policy is unconstitutionally vague, leaving individuals to guess at what it prohibits and leading to a chilling effect on protected speech. As discussed earlier (see entry for Fayetteville State), this policy has already been held unconstitutional by a federal court in Michigan, and is unlikely to survive a constitutional challenge in North Carolina.



UNC Charlotte maintains a “sexual harassment prevention brochure” that provides examples of “verbal offensive behavior.” These include “sexual innuendos and comments” and “jokes about sex or gender in general.” This interpretive guide to UNC Charlotte’s otherwise appropriate sexual harassment policy renders the policy unconstitutional, as it prohibits protected speech such as sexual innuendos, sexual comments, and jokes about sex or gender. Again, while these types of communication could theoretically be part of a course of conduct that constitutes harassment, the state cannot ban these types of communications outright in an effort to avoid harassment.

### **Nondiscrimination Policies**

At UNC Charlotte, each registered student organization is required to include a clause in its constitution providing that it will not “discriminate in its membership policies or otherwise, against any person on the basis of race, gender, national origin, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or disability....” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students’ right to freedom of association.

## **UNC Greensboro**

### **Speech Codes**

UNC Greensboro’s Policy on Discriminatory Conduct provides that “UNCG will not tolerate any harassment of, discrimination against, or *disrespect for persons*.” (Emphasis added.) This is overbroad. The university can legitimately prohibit harassment (consistent with the First Amendment, as defined by federal law) and discrimination. The university cannot, however, prohibit “disrespect”—as members of a free society, students at UNC Greensboro are free to express their respect or disrespect for other members of the community so long as they do so in a way that does not fall within the very narrow areas of speech not protected by the First Amendment (physical threats, harassment, fighting words). The university can advocate for respect and encourage all members of the community to treat one another with respect. It cannot, however, prohibit con-

stitutionally protected speech in the name of this otherwise worthy goal.

### **Nondiscrimination Policies**

At UNC Greensboro, all registered student organizations must include an “Anti-Discrimination statement” in their constitutions: “The Anti-Discrimination statement must include that student organizations may not discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, gender, age, national origin, disability, military, veteran status, *political affiliation* or sexual orientation.” (Emphasis added.) In other words, to receive recognition, the College Democrats must open the membership of their group to staunch Republicans. That is both unconstitutional and absurd.

## **UNC Pembroke**

### **Speech Codes**

UNC Pembroke prohibits “discriminating against another student by using offensive speech or behavior of a biased or prejudiced nature related to one’s personal characteristics, such as race, color, national origin, sex, religion, handicap, age, or sexual orientation.” As discussed earlier (see entry for North Carolina School of the Arts), this is unconstitutionally overbroad.

UNC Pembroke also prohibits “[u]sing obscene, vulgar, loud, or disruptive language or conduct directed toward and offensive to a member or visitor of the University community.” As discussed above (see entry for East Carolina University), this infringes on constitutionally protected speech.

### **Nondiscrimination Policies**

UNC Pembroke maintains a policy that prohibits student groups from engaging in

[d]iscrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, creed, age, disability, or honorable service in the armed services of the United States that impairs or may impair an individual’s...participation in University-sponsored extracurricular activities....

This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious require-

*Unprotected harassment is more than simply embarrassing or humiliating conduct.*

ments for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students' right to freedom of association.

## UNC Wilmington

### Speech Codes

Until very recently, UNC Wilmington—like several other schools in the UNC System—unlawfully prohibited “[d]iscriminat[ing] against another student by using offensive speech or behavior of a biased or prejudiced nature related to one’s personal characteristics.” The university recently revised this policy to instead prohibit only “behavior of a biased or prejudiced nature related to one’s personal characteristics, such as race, color national origin, sex, religion, handicap, age or sexual orientation.” This policy is still dangerously ambiguous, as it is unclear whether “behavior” includes expressive activity. But it is certainly an improvement over the explicit prohibition on “offensive speech.”

UNC Wilmington also maintains an overbroad definition of sexual harassment in its code of student conduct, which prohibits “displaying offensive visual materials which interfere or are intended to interfere with another person’s work or study.”

### Nondiscrimination Policies

To become a registered student organization at UNC Wilmington, an organization must include the following “non-exclusionary membership clause” verbatim in its constitution: “This organization does not discriminate against any student, faculty, or staff based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, handicap, or sexual orientation.” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is

their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students' right to freedom of association.

## Western Carolina University

### Speech Codes

Western Carolina University maintains a policy on “Discriminatory Personal Conduct” that provides as follows:

It is the policy of Western Carolina University that speech or action by a university employee, occurring in the scope and course of university business, that gives offense by its clear expression of bias or prejudice toward an individual because of that person’s or group’s race, age, color, creed, national origin, religion, sex, disability, or political affiliation is subject to review on a case-by-case basis and may subject the offender to appropriate discipline if warranted by the entire record and totality of the circumstances.

This policy likely has a powerful chilling effect on faculty speech at Western Carolina. Although the policy states that in considering whether discipline is warranted, the severity and pervasiveness of the alleged harassment will be considered, the policy threatens “review” of *any* conduct that gives offense, without reference to whether the conduct was objectively offensive or whether it created a hostile and abusive working environment (since, as discussed earlier, mere “offense” cannot constitute harassment).

Western Carolina’s sexual harassment policy prohibits “a pattern of conduct which embarrasses and/or humiliates and which includes one or more of the following: (i) comments of a sexual nature; or (ii) sexually explicit statements, questions, jokes, or anecdotes.” Although this policy does properly require a “pattern of conduct,” unprotected harassment is more than simply embarrassing or humiliating conduct. Rather, the conduct must be severe and pervasive enough to create an environment that a reasonable person would find hostile and abusive.

### Nondiscrimination Policies

Western Carolina maintains a nondiscrimination requirement for student organizations that provides that

“[c]ampus organizations shall be open to all students without respect to race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, handicap, or sexual orientation.” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students’ right to freedom of association.

ual merit, free from discrimination because of race, creed, national origin, or handicap.” This policy is overbroad because it prohibits religious student organizations from having religious requirements for leadership and membership, as is their right under the First Amendment. As discussed earlier, a federal court in North Carolina recently held that these nondiscrimination requirements probably violate students’ right to freedom of association.

## Winston Salem State University

### Speech Codes

Winston Salem State University maintains several unconstitutional speech codes. Its racial harassment policy provides that “racial harassment is any behavior that would verbally or physically threaten, torment, badger, heckle, or persecute an individual because of his or her race.” This policy is a textbook example of overbreadth: in addition to prohibiting unprotected conduct (physical torment), it also prohibits constitutionally protected speech. Again, the Supreme Court has held that for student-on-student conduct to constitute unprotected harassment, that conduct must be “so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it can be said to deprive the victims of access to the educational opportunities or benefits provided by the school.” *Davis v. Monroe County Bd. of Educ.*, 526 U.S. 629, 650 (1999).

By contrast, Winston Salem State’s racial harassment policy has no requirement of severity or pervasiveness; it does not even require that the conduct be repeated. Nor does it require that the conduct be “objectively offensive”; if an individual feels “badgered” or “persecuted” by the speech, that is enough to establish harassment.

Winston Salem State also maintains an e-mail policy providing that “[t]he use of profanity or offensive language is prohibited.” As discussed earlier, this is entirely unconstitutional.

### Nondiscrimination Policies

At Winston Salem State, “to be recognized on campus a student organization must [s]ubmit a statement signed by the organization president and faculty advisor that specifies that membership will be on the basis of individ-