



"Policy" from page 13

Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures.

The webpage still refers to the AIDS memo, but oddly enough it contains no link to it. The rest of the links are all to existing documents. The first concerns non-discrimination policies, the second concerns reporting government improprieties, and the third and fourth concern racial and sexual harassment policies.

First, why are these harassment notices found under "Nondiscrimination"? Discrimination and harassment policies are clearly different, and yet they are all lumped into this same general category. The University Counsel points to this webpage when it says it is adequately advertising the sexual orientation harassment policy. A link entitled "Nondiscrimination: Policy Statements on Nondiscrimination" (www.unc.edu/campus/policies/nondiscrim.html) to the Chancellor's memorandum on September 6 is here. But if students would come here to find information on the sexual orientation harassment policy then why not simply place a link here to this policy alongside the racial and sexual harassment "policies and procedures"? The Chancellor's memo here does not even concern harassment.

One reason might be the general lack of understanding in the University community about these policies. The University Counsel advertises longstanding policies on sexual and racial harassment but seems to annually forget to advertise similar policies on sexual orientation harassment. Few people know the difference between the non-discrimination policies and the anti-harassment policies. Even Chancellor Moeser seems to confuse the two in his memo when he says, "Any employee of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill having a complaint of *discrimination* should notify the immediate supervisor (excluding the alleged *harasser*)" (The emphasis is mine). Is he talking about discrimination or harassment? Are those who discriminate also harassing and vice versa?

Another reason might be that while the Office of the Dean of Students (in conjunction with several other University offices) did develop an anti-harassment policy, that policy has not been widely advertised or adopted by the University community as a whole. It seems that this so-called "Resource and Action Plan for Sexual Orientation" is only for *students* who are experiencing "harassment or assault based on sexual orientation." But the problems do not end here. How does a student know if s/he has experienced HABSOS? While the plan discusses HABSOS at length, it never defines what HABSOS is or might be. Similar policies about

sexual and racial harassment carefully define what constitutes the practice. No such clear definition exists in the current HABSOS policy.

Are Only Students Protected from Harassment?

It seems then that while the Office of the Dean of Students has developed its own plan for dealing with harassment and assault of students based on sexual orientation, the University as a whole has no similar plan of action in regards to faculty, administrators or staff. There is no recourse for the professor who told me he heard the words "faggot" ring across the quad at his passing on two occasions when he began teaching at UNC-CH just a few years ago. There is no system in place for administrators who are treated similarly or staff members who are specifically harassed by co-workers because they are or are thought to be gay, lesbian or bisexual.

As I reviewed UNC policy, I came across this statement about harassment: "The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill recognizes the rights of all members of the University community to learn and work in an environment free from unlawful harassment and/or retaliation based upon age, sex, color, national origin, religion, creed, or handicapping condition." However, if a faculty member, administrator or staff member at the University is harassed because of their sexual orientation, there seems to be no "legal" recourse for them. Their harassment is lawful.

Recent Developments

Recently, I heard good news that someone in the University administration (the details are vague so far) has decided to send out notice of the full non-discrimination policy to students along with the racial and sexual harassment policies. While this is not sending out the HABSOS policy and thus not exactly what I was attempting to accomplish, it is definitely a step in the right direction. Stephanie Chang of the LGBTQ Office is also spearheading efforts to update the HABSOS policy this summer by adding a clear definition of what exactly constitutes "harassment and assault based on sexual orientation." While the LGBTQ Office (as a division of Student Affairs) does not seem to be the most appropriate office to lead any efforts to urge adoption of the policy by the *entire* University community and its extension to faculty, administrators and staff, they nevertheless are tirelessly working to make progress on this issue. I hope that each member of the University community will help them make progress in whatever way s/he can.

All of these recent developments bring me back to the fundamental goal in this area. The mission of the University is to serve *all* the people of the State. The University exists "to improve the condition of human life through service and publication; and to enrich our culture." Is the apparent lack of understanding by the Office of the University Counsel enriching the lives of UNC students, faculty, administrators and staff when it fails to enforce and advertise the University's HABSOS policy? It is no doubt a difficult step to publicize such controversial policies while being held hostage fiscally by a conservative legislature. But what message does the University send to gay, lesbian, bisexual and queer students, faculty, administrators and staff when it does not even have the courage to send out a simple e-mail? λ

Co-Editor in Chief and senior Douglas Dukeman, a religious studies and philosophy double major from Norton, Ohio, can be contacted at lambda@unc.edu.