



Counsel so she could pass on the response of the Counsel concerning my requests. When I arrived at the office, she greeted me and proceeded to cite several reasons why a sexual orientation harassment notice would not be sent out to students. It would also not be sent in the future alongside racial and sexual harassment policies.

The reasons for this decision ranged from absurd to unreasonable. One particularly absurd reason Counsel refused to send out this notice was that it claimed that students do not read their e-mail. Attempting to publicize this particular University policy in this manner, it was argued, would only be met by student apathy and a general lack of interest in the matter.

Even if students eventually *do* check their e-mail, University Counsel suggested that there were logistical problems with e-mailing students notice of the University anti-harassment policy on sexual orientation. It argued that there are far too many policies about which to notify students. A "slippery slope" was being risked here by notifying students of the HABS0 policy. If this particular anti-harassment policy is sent to students by e-mail, it was argued, there will be little keeping the University from having to notify students of all policies by e-mail.

The final reason Counsel gave just seemed to intimate that it did not fully grasp the situation. It suggested that it was already sufficiently notifying students about the sexual orientation harassment policy. This sufficient notification was supposedly accomplished by the Chancellor's initial memo from September 6, 2001 sent to Deans, Directors and Department Chairs concerning "Policy Statements on Non-Discrimination."

Why It Doesn't Add Up

Counsel's concerns about a lack of e-mail use by students and a "slippery slope" of policy publicity are so unfounded that it seems almost ridiculous

to respond to them. Nevertheless, an analysis of the above response by University Counsel is necessary. Suffice it to say, the University e-mail system is widely used by thousands of students everyday (compulsively by many). Its widespread daily use is easily demonstrated by an increasing need for additional campus Internet and e-mail stations. E-mailing notice of three anti-harassment policies (sexual orientation, sexual and racial) in one e-mail rather than simply notice of two anti-harassment policies (sexual and racial), as is currently done, is not the first step down a slippery slope. Even if they choose to send out notice of the HABS0 policy, the University is still perfectly justified in not advertising to students dated and non-essential policies like those concerning, for instance, "Faculty and Staff Travel to SARS Areas."

The University Counsel's response is clearly a refusal to adequately address the seriousness of the University's poor policy publicity. Reference to the September 6 memorandum from Chancellor Moeser as a tool of Counsel's notification to students about anti-harassment policies does not make sense. This memo did not even concern the anti-harassment policy on sexual orientation. This memo on the whole concerned itself solely with "Policy Statement on Non-Discrimination" - as its title reflects. The policy on nondiscrimination is different from the HABS0 policy. In addition, this memo was not sent to students, but only to "Deans, Directors and Department Chairs" - and sent almost three years ago! There seems then to be no good reason for the University to continue to avoid publication of its own sexual orientation harassment policy. What is behind this lack of adequate policy publicity?

Existing University Publicity Efforts

A quick look at current University publicity of the anti-harassment and non-discrimination policies reveals general administrative apathy and irrational resistance to change. From the UNC homepage, any user can "easily" find the University's policies on harassment and discrimination by clicking on the link for "Administration," then "UNC-CH Policies," then "Nondiscrimination." Once there, they are confronted with the following links: AIDS: University Memo on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, Nondiscrimination: Policy Statements on Nondiscrimination, Protection for Reporting Improper Government Activities, Racial Harassment Policy and Procedures and continued on page 14

