

Foundation for Individual Rights in Education

601 Walnut Street, Suite 510 • Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106 T 215-717-3473 • F 215-717-3440 • fire@thefire.org • www.thefire.org

Greg Lukianoff
President

Robert L. Shibley
Senior Vice President

William Creeley
DIRECTOR OF LEGAL AND
PUBLIC ADVOCACY

Adam Kissel Vice President of Programs

Alan Charles Kors CO-FOUNDER AND CHAIRMAN EMERITUS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Harvey A. Silverglate Co-founder and Chairman

Barbara Bishop William J. Hume Richard Losick Joseph M. Maline Marlene Mieske Daphne Patai Virginia Postrel Daniel Shuchman

BOARD OF ADVISORS

Lloyd Buchanan T. Kenneth Cribb, Jr. Candace de Russy William A. Dunn Benjamin F. Hammond Nat Hentoff **Roy Innis** Wendy Kaminer Woody Kaplan Leonard Liggio Herbert London Peter L. Malkin Muriel Morisey Steven Pinker Milton Rosenberg John R. Searle **Christina Hoff Sommers** December 22, 2011

President Dana L. Gibson Sam Houston State University The Office of the President Box 2027 Huntsville, Texas 77341

ent n F cs e 4 4

Dear President Gibson:

I write today because FIRE is concerned about a policy in force at Sam Houston State University (SHSU) that unconstitutionally restricts the speech rights of SHSU students.

Specifically, SHSU's Code of Student Conduct defines disorderly conduct, in relevant part, as the use of "abusive, indecent, profane or vulgar language." This impermissibly broad definition restricts a staggering amount of constitutionally protected expression and fundamentally violates the First Amendment rights of all SHSU students. Continued maintenance of this policy chills expression on campus and betrays freedoms that SHSU, a public university, is legally bound to protect. Moreover, the policy undermines the mission of an institution presumptively committed to intellectual rigor, robust debate, and a free and vibrant community. For these reasons, FIRE named this policy our "Speech Code of the Month" for October 2011.

SHSU's policy prohibits "abusive, indecent, profane or vulgar language." Yet most speech that may be characterized as "abusive," "indecent," "profane," or "vulgar"—however one chooses to define these amorphous terms—is

after all, can be singularly effective in disseminating a particular message, and the same holds true for the type of expression prohibited by SHSU's policy.

Please be advised that federal and state courts across the country have consistently struck down unconstitutional speech codes, often masquerading as harassment or civility policies, at colleges and universities over the past twenty years. In addition to Ree, see $CCue^{-1}$ the rg n s n s, 618 F.3d 232 (3d Cir. 2010) (invalidating university speech policies, including harassment policy, on First Amendment grounds); DeJohn F.3d 301 (3d Cir. 2008) (striking down unconstitutional sexual harassment policy); D ch g n n ers t, 55 F.3d 1177 (6th Cir. 1995) (declaring university discriminatory Centr harassment policy facially unconstitutional); rr nt Count Co ege D str ct, 694 F. th Supp. 2d 610 (N.D. Tex. 2010) (invalidating "cosponsorship" policy due to overbreadth); Roberts H r g n, 346 F. Supp. 2d 853 (N.D. Tex. 2004) (finding university sexual harassment policy unconstitutionally overbroad); B r h ppensburg n ers t, 280 F. Supp. 2d 357 (M.D. Pa. 2003) (enjoining enforcement of university harassment policy due to overbreadth); Booher Bo r of Regents, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11404 (E.D. Ky. Jul. 21, 1998) (finding university sexual harassment policy void for vagueness and overbreadth); *Corr e n t nfor Jun or n ers t*, No. 740309 (Cal. Super. Ct. Feb. 27, 1995) (slip op.) (declaring "harassment by personal vilification" policy unconstitutional);n ng. LEXIS 114fiC3.15789()-10.4986(c)3.15789

