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REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE UNDERGRADUATE EXPERIENCE--PART I

The University of Rhode Island
March 30, 1993

There can be no question by any American with open eyes, open ears, or an open mind that we live in a sexist, racist, classist, agist, homophobic, intolerant, and violent society. It should come as no surprise, then, that college campuses across the nation reflect these attitudes and issues. The University of Rhode Island is no exception.

As a direct result of a campus charge of sexual assault, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee established the ad hoc Commission on the Undergraduate Experience in January, 1991. The Commission was reconstituted with a new Chair in late Spring of 1992. This Report represents the beginning of the research required to study issues involved in being an undergraduate on the URI campus. It is not intended to be complete on any subject or even in the list of subjects included.

CHARGE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The Commission was asked to investigate the interpersonal climate for undergraduates at the University of Rhode Island with the following specific charges:

1. to review and analyze evidence of underage drinking, alcohol abuse, sexual harassment, gay and lesbian bashing, other forms of harassment, assault, rape, and other illegal activities involving undergraduates that occur on campus.

2. to review all related reports over the past five years from the Sexual and Racial Harassment Committees, police statistics on crimes, judicial system complaints, and related materials from the units of Student Development.

3. to review resolutions of reported complaints in the judicial and criminal justice system.

4. to consult with officials from the Rape Crisis Center and review Freshman Orientation and other orientation programs to examine the messages that URI sends to incoming students.

5. to meet with various constituencies.

6. to review relevant research literature and conduct formal hearings.

7. to identify activities and programs outside the classroom that improve the interpersonal climate on campus.
From September, 1992, to March, 1993, the Commission 1) collected research from published books and articles on harassment of all kinds in the society and at colleges around the country in order to establish a cultural context for our campus; 2) examined handouts, published articles, and surveys related to the URI campus; 3) attended many meetings and conferences on campus at which students shared their experiences with regard to both peers and faculty; and 4) interviewed many students, faculty, staff, and administrators on the topics studied, with the focus on student perceptions, experiences, and attitudes.

The Commission has been frustrated in its attempts to gather "hard" data for this study for several reasons:

1) issues involving confidentiality;
2) the lack of institutional commitment to developing a data base on a wide range of social issues in past years;
3) the scarcity of systematic studies on even the most sensitive campus issues;
4) the lack of financial resources for developing and analyzing data at this time;
5) the absence of a central agency to process the reports scattered throughout the campus;
6) student fears about reporting harassment, intolerance, and sexual assaults such as rapes;
7) the climate of hostility and exclusion generated against racial, sexual, and other minorities on this campus, thereby making the open forum less than desirable.

Consequently, the Commission has had to rely on a) national studies of our society in general and various colleges in particular that corroborated our findings on this campus; b) the few studies done at URI; c) anecdotal material when similar anecdotes were heard repeatedly—at different times and from different sources; d) interviews with students, faculty, and staff; and e) student discussions at various meetings held by the Women's Center, the Instructional Development Program, Uhuru Sasa, the Southern New England Conference on Race and Ethnicity, and other meetings during the Fall, 1992, and Spring, 1993, semesters. It should be noted that most students and staff (and sometimes faculty) asked that their names be kept confidential because they were concerned about reactions and reprisal. Therefore, no respondents' names have been used in this study.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE

The "1987-1988 Alcohol Task Force: Report #1" (February 29, 1988), chaired by Theodora A. Zubrinski, provided a 56-page study of alcohol use on campus. By order of the administration in 1988, this report was labeled and kept confidential. The following information is taken from that report:
Data Pertaining to Alcohol Use and Abuse at URI. The following data was compiled by Alpha Research Associates, an off-campus group, which surveyed over 500 randomly selected members of the URI campus community by telephone. The findings indicate that:

-Slightly over half [50+\%] of the members of the campus community see alcohol or drugs as a "serious" or "very serious" problem.
-Although 40\% report that they neither know nor suspect anyone at URI of having a problem with drugs or alcohol, one in five [20\%] say that they know or suspect more than 50 persons to be abusers.
-One in three [33\%] respondents report they have a friend or loved one whom they know or suspect has a problem (Dougan, 1987, p. 8).

Data based on surveys administered by the same research group and completed by 730 undergraduate students, indicates that:
-43\% of the respondents reported having six or more drinks per week;
-12\% of the respondents reported feeling that they have a drinking problem;
-26\% of off-campus residents reported that they drink and drive;
-33\% of off-campus residents reported that they rode with a driver who has been drinking;
-23\% of those living in Greek houses reported drinking three or more days per week; and
-22\% of those living in Greek houses reported drinking thirteen or more drinks per week (O'Donnell & Dewey, 1987, p. 1).

Additional data from the URI student judicial system, from Health Services' surveys and patient records, from client data at the Counseling Center and from incident reports to the Sexual Harassment Subcommittee support the findings of this survey. Sixty percent of all student judicial cases which were handled during the 1986-1987 academic year by the Office of Student Life, for example, were alcohol-related (Dougan, 1987, p. 8). Similarly, statistics from the University Judicial System for the eight-month period from March 1987 through November 1987 indicate that forty-six percent of the cases that received formal disciplinary action involved the use of alcohol (The Good Five Cent Cigar, 1987, p. 8); twenty-nine percent of the cases handled by the Judicial Advisory System within the Office of Residential Life during the 1986-1987 academic year were alcohol-related (Stephens, 1987). Thirty-eight percent of the students who completed a health-risk questionnaire administered during Fall 1987 by URI Health Services reported 'excessive drinking habits,' the majority in that group of 'heavy drinkers' acknowledging that they
drink and drive or had ridden with 'a driver who had been drinking.' Fifty-eight percent of the patients seeking treatment at URI Health Services during the six-week period from September 9, 1987 through October 30, 1987 and designated 'High Risk Monitoring' were under the age of 21 and were treated for alcohol intoxication or alcohol-related conditions such as skin lacerations, gastroenteritis, and fractured vertebrae (Durant, 1987). Twenty-two percent of the students who sought counseling at the URI Counseling Center responded yes to the following question about the causes of the problem that prompted them to seek counseling: 'Do you feel that the causes [of your problem] ... may have been influenced by your or someone else's use of alcohol or [other] drugs?' (Annual Harassment Subcommittee of the Affirmative Action Committee indicates that alcohol was a factor in ninety-five percent of the rape and first-degree sexual assault incidents that were reported to the subcommittee during the 1986-1987 academic year (Reilly & Zubrinski, 1987).

However great our fascination with statistics and however similar local data may be to national statistics, they offer little comfort to the individuals whom they represent and do not tell the human story of personal loss, pain and tragedy or physical discomfort and disfigurement that may be associated with alcohol-related problems. Students who face disciplinary action before the university's judicial system, who experience health-related problems, or who seek to address the effects of their own alcohol abuse or that of their parents, relatives, or friends, often suffer the immediate consequence of missed classes, incomplete academic work and even interrupted study. Over the long-term alcohol abuse is linked to serious relationship, financial, physical, emotional and cognitive problems (Willoughby, 1979, pp. 65-127; Heaton, 1987, pp. 283-340)." (ATF 1987-88)

Though the above report was written five years ago, the findings are still relevant since campus violence and harassment are still linked to alcohol and other drug abuse. For that reason, the ATF report should no longer be kept "Confidential" and the recommendations made by that Task Force should be made public and implemented by both the University administration and the Office of Student Life. (See pages 6-18 of the ATF Report.)

Though students now report seeing hard drugs on campus, particularly in fraternities, some students suggest that the drugs of choice at URI seem to be alcohol and marijuana. Fraternities were singled out by students, who are both pro- and anti-Greek, as the single most disruptive element in their first semester at URI. The first-semester Rush--with the parties offering alcohol, marijuana, and food that is better than dorm fare--creates an atmosphere of conflict to students who are just beginning to learn the academic expectations and work load at a
university and are making choices between the parties and studies. Even upperclass students have expressed difficulty balancing their responsibilities effectively during Rush, and for freshmen the Greek presence can be devastating. Since Rush parties are on weeknights as well as weekends, the effect on academic achievement is serious. On the self-assessment form completed by students who are on academic probation, pledging and socializing are often mentioned as the single most significant reason for their failure. Some students complain that the Greek way of life spills over into the dorms when students at Greek parties return to the dorms rowdy and drunk. Even students who want to be pledged often disapprove of the excessive alcohol and drugs that make up fraternity life.

Thus, whether students choose to pledge to a Greek house or not, the Greek system encouraging alcohol and drug consumption and week-night parties is a major presence on campus. This system creates an environment of anxiety, fear of violence, and other psychological issues that arise in an atmosphere of alcohol abuse and social control by one group over all others on campus. Little wonder that at Parent Orientation, there is considerable anti-Greek sentiment voiced by many parents.

Fraternities also remain a serious problem because of their institutionalized concepts of "male bonding" and the need to be accepted by and belong to the group, attitudes which are too often related to abuse of alcohol and of women. The role of alcohol and drugs in abuse of women was addressed by the Association of American Colleges in 1988 in a Project on the Status and Education of Women report entitled, "Peer Harassment: Hassles for Women on Campus":

Alcohol and drugs are common to some incidents of peer harassment. By reducing people's inhibitions and creating an atmosphere where even hurtful or violent behavior is considered amusing, alcohol can make otherwise unacceptable behavior seem acceptable. This is especially true when men are in groups. A single man drinking too much can be hurtful; a group of men who have been drinking can be even more so. A crowd mentality combines with the lack of inhibition caused by alcohol to create a potentially explosive situation. Unfortunately, many fraternities encourage heavy drinking among their members; at some fraternity parties, the only drinks available are alcoholic beverages. Sexual abuse, including gang rape, is often linked to alcohol. (p. 7)

There is also drinking in the dorms, despite the rules against this behavior. Students report that the Alcohol Control Policy is weakened because an R.A. cannot report a student drunk unless that student is caught with a drink in his/her hand. A student returning drunk from a party and disrupting the hall, then, may not be subject to severe disciplinary action or counselling, according to at least some students' understanding
of the situation. Substance abuse at parties "down the line" is also related to incidents involving students and local police.

Despite new campus policies since the 1988 report, stricter enforcement of some rules, a desire of some students to live in "Health Dorms," and social concern about drinking and driving, problems with alcohol both on campus and "down the line" continue. As long as substance consumption is treated by students as the norm throughout the four years at URI, strategies are limited for improving the social life for undergraduates. But there are changes being made: in 1992, one Freshman Orientation leader told the incoming class that the first thing they needed in order to be students here was a false I.D. so they could drink; the staff in charge of the 1993 Orientation has instituted new strategies for educating its leaders in order to present a different attitude to the incoming class. In addition, alcohol was banned from Orientation as a symbolic and educational gesture for new students.

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SEXISM**

In "A Fact Sheet for Students," which is distributed by the URI Office of Student Life, sexual harassment is defined as "Unwanted Sexual Attention." The sheet goes on,

You may have been a victim of SEXUAL HARASSMENT and not even know it. It most often happens between a male (as the aggressor) and a female (as the victim), although the roles can be reversed. Estimates are that 20-30% of all women college students will experience some form of sexual harassment. Each year approximately 125,000 college women receive direct threats or bribes for sexual favors. Black women, gay and lesbian students, and women in traditionally male fields are also likely targets of sexual harassment. .. Sexual harassment is not sexually motivated. It is an ISSUE OF POWER, where the aggressor is trying to embarrass, anger or control. The harassment incident occurs without the consent of the victim, and has nothing to do with how s/he is dressed, where s/he is, or what s/he is doing.

Unfortunately, though this "Fact Sheet" offers examples, outlines the effects of sexual harassment, and lists seven campus offices where complaints can be recorded and resolved with an assurance of confidentiality, many incidents of harassment and even rape go unrecorded, according to students and authorities on the subject.

**Peer Harassment**

While some men are victims of sexual and gender harassment, the overwhelming majority of victims are women. In a study by Jean O'Gorman Hughes and Bernice R. Sandler entitled "Peer Harassment: Hassles for Women on Campus," for the Association of American Colleges, the situation is stated clearly:
6) "A desire to be 'one of the boys' and be accepted can explain some men's behavior, especially in groups. Participating in harassing activities becomes a way to bond with other men, a way to prove oneself." Social immaturity is often used to explain--then excuse--harassing behaviors. (p. 7)

The above study concludes that emotional, psychological, and physical harassment is often a kind of "male bonding at the expense of women's worth and safety." Moreover, whether we are talking about "jokes" designed to denigrate women, sexual comments to embarrass women, harassment on the street or in dining halls, attitudes in class to keep women silent, or unwanted physical touching or intimidation, "Harassment often escalates when it is tolerated, encouraged, or ignored" ("Peer Haras." p. 6).

Studies from university campuses support the findings of Hughes and Sandler. For example, a 1986 Cornell University survey reports that

- 78% of female respondents experienced "sexist comments"
- 68% "received unwelcome attention from their male peers"
- 89% "involved individual males"
- 11% "involved groups of males" (p. 2)

The above reports confirm what researchers on our campus have found: that the incidence of sexism and sexual harassment directed at women is disturbingly high. A University of Rhode Island study published in Gender and Society in 1992 and authored by Mary Ellen Reilly, Bernice Lott, Donna Caldwell, and Luisa DeLuca reinforces the above conclusions. Their paper, entitled "Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Related to Self-Reported Sexual Victimization," examines males' self-reported attitudes toward women and the relationship of those attitudes to harassing and violent behaviors:

The present findings for men support the proposition that there is a continuum of misogyny that includes sexually harassing behaviors (e.g., sexist jokes and put-downs), intimidation, coercion, and sexual assault. Significant positive correlations were predicted and found among self-reported tolerance for sexual harassment, adversarial sexual beliefs, rape-myth acceptance, likelihood to sexually assault, and experience as a sexual victimizer. Both likelihood to sexually assault and victimizing experience were well predicted by tolerance for sexual harassment and by each other. (p. 133)

The researchers were able to draw a "portrait" of "the college man who admits to having behaved toward women in a coercive, abusive, or assaultive manner": "Our data suggest that there is a clear relationship between self-reported beliefs, attitudes, and overt behavior. The sexually aggressive college man is
Harassment "makes coeducation less than equal for both men and women" (p. 2). For people who are not certain about the difference, this study distinguishes between attention and harassment: "All sexual attention is not sexual harassment... Unwanted sexual attention is experienced by women as harassment when personal boundaries are crossed" (p. 4). The report defined harassing behaviors: when a group of men "rate" females' physical attributes in cafeterias, at parties, or in classes so that the women avoid those places by skipping meals and classes and restricting their social life; when a man focuses his attention on a woman's sexual parts in order to embarrass her; when a woman is singled out to be touched or fondled; when "teasing," sexual innuendos, and bullying of a sexist nature, both physical and verbal, make a woman feel humiliated, inferior, and powerless; when a man will not take "no" for an answer. Harassment is when "women experience hostility, anger, and sometimes even violence from male students" just for being female (p. 1).

The report cites the reasons for peer harassment as "a complicated interaction that varies with individuals and situations" (p. 7), but there are several reasons that seem to underlie such male behavior:

1) "Their actions are often based on stereotyped views."

2) "Men are generally socialized to be dominant. They may be uncomfortable dealing with strong women and their discomfort may translate into anger. For some men, lashing out at these and other women by harassing them is a way to alleviate their discomfort. For some, harassment is anger against feminism--a way to strike back at women."

3) "Clearly, anger against women (whether conscious or not) is one of the underlying motives for much harassment--especially in situations where women are physically injured. . . . In many ways, women may become scapegoats for men's problems."

4) "Peer harassment may also involve issues of power and control. By hurting someone or making other people feel weak, some men feel stronger. This is reminiscent of the "bully" syndrome in which the smaller, weaker person is attacked by the stronger one."

5) "Many men feel they are more powerful than women. Because their sense of well-being depends on being stronger, smarter, and more assertive than women, men may belittle and otherwise devalue women as a way of confirming their superiority."
likely to be tolerant of sexual harassment and to say that he might sexually assault if assured of not being punished" (p. 135). He is also more likely "to believe in myths about rape and to see heterosexual relations as adversarial" (p. 135). This study found that "there is a clear relationship between what [men] believe about women and about gender relationships and how they behave in a variety of settings" (p. 136).

The same study examined the characteristics of college women who have been sexually victimized: "No attitude or belief measure was found to predict whether or not a woman had experienced coercive, abusive, or assaultive sex" (p. 135). The researchers found "that personal beliefs are irrelevant to college women’s victimization experiences" (p. 135). However, "those who were more tolerant of sexual harassment were also more likely to believe in adversarial sexual relations and to subscribe to myths about rape" (p. 136). Their findings suggest "that educational efforts must be directed toward increasing women’s awareness of the potential for victimization in intimate situations with acquaintances and dates... in order to learn to label forced sexual acts as rape or assault... [and thereby] increase the likelihood that victimization experiences will be reported to authorities, friends, or support service providers" (p. 136). Both published research and CUE interviews show clearly the effect of female socialization to accept oppressive and dangerous male behavior as the "norm" and to try to ignore, avoid, or dismiss such behaviors at their own psychological and physical expense.

The December, 1991, "Sexual Harassment Subcommittee of the Affirmative Action Committee Annual Report to the Faculty Senate" once again supports corroborating data that of the cases reported to the Affirmative Action Office from June 1, 1990 to May 31, 1991, 49% of the complainants were female (85% were individual complaints, 4% were groups) and 96% of the accused were men (85% were individuals; 11% were groups of males). There were 28 cases of sexual harassment; 19 cases of unwanted physical contact, including 9 cases of 1st degree sexual assault (penetration) and 4 cases of 2nd degree sexual assault (touching of intimate body parts). (See Appendix A1-A2).

Researchers, staff, and faculty working closely with students know that many of the cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault go unreported. In fact, interviews with female students by CUE made clear the women’s reluctance (and often their inability) to recognize and report sexist behavior by both peers and faculty. Yet, with further questions, the students would begin to open up and admit that in certain classes or situations they are uncomfortable and even angry.

Anecdotes shared by female students with the CUE members include
1) "jokes" such as the one told by a Freshman Orientation Leader (When was the last time the cannon on the green went off? Answer: the last time a virgin walked in front of it). This "joke" was imprinted on senior T-shirts in 1992.

2) concern about the male students' attitudes in some of the classes, especially in some of the professional schools. The Business College was mentioned repeatedly.

3) refusal of male students to participate on committees chaired by women or to be active in clubs chaired by women.

4) the willingness of men to use women's ideas for homework but then to act superior in class in front of the professor who, himself, behaves in sexist ways.

5) endless stories about the fraternities. Women may refuse to go into fraternities to try to avoid being treated in such demeaning ways (whether subtle or overt), but the misogynist attitudes and behavior pervade both classrooms and the rest of the campus. Example: fraternity "little sisters" are sometimes referred to as "fresh meat." Example: a questionnaire by a fraternity rated new pledges not only by the number of girls they had had sex with, but by whether they had ever had anal sex with a girl, the latter experience having a higher value. [The language has been changed considerably here.] Ironically, fraternities seem to be hotbeds of homophobia, yet the brothers rate each other higher for the same sexual activities for which they denigrate gay men. Example: women going to a frat party are rated, as they walk toward the door, according to the size of their breasts and other aspects of their anatomy; some women were turned away for not "measuring up." Example: women who were part of the Greek social scene in their first years on campus but broke away from that social environment report the difference in their self-images and self-respect after their "liberation" and find that it took them some time before they realized the effects of their treatment in the Greek houses. Some women expressed sorrow that other women never break away.

Why do so many women tolerate and even participate in their own victimization? The "Peer Harassment" study offers several reasons:

Some young women may mistake some forms of harassment for flattery. For example, when men yell obscenities at them or tell them sexist jokes, women may feel more desirable and complimented because they become the center of attention. Some women may disagree with or rebel against feminist ideals. They want to go back to a more 'romantic' time when men 'took care of' women and women could enjoy being sex objects. Others want to be considered 'good sports' and able to 'take a joke.' Some women, like some men, believe that this is the way of men, that the behavior is normal—that this is the way to have a 'good time' and be accepted by the group.
that underneath the smile and presumed warmth is hostility toward women that creates an atmosphere of discomfort for all women, but especially for those who have been sensitized to recognizing the cues. **Example:** One science professor consistently uses the pronoun "he" even when "she" would be more appropriate. He often uses birds as examples for his point, and his dismissal of the female gender goes so far as his reference to the bird that was making "his" nest and laying "his" eggs. This anecdote brought hilarity to a group of women discussing sexism, but the women did not laugh when they realized how it represents the professor’s attitude toward women and how he treats them in his class—according to the women, he was saying that they are not only irrelevant but invisible, and should stay that way. **Example:** Though there are numerous incidents cited throughout the campus, the examples reported about many science, engineering, business, and pharmacy classes are endless, from ignoring the women who raise their hands and praising men’s answers even when they are wrong, to subtle put-downs by their comments and jokes, to overtly hostile treatment of women in contrast to their treatment of men. One woman, whose professor told her that she should have no problem getting a job with her "looks," began the interview by saying that she had seen no prejudice by male instructors in her college which is often cited for sexism and having very few female faculty; then as she began to talk, she realized the significance of her experiences and ended by saying that at least half of her professors have evidenced sexist attitudes that made her feel less than the men. This woman does not have the positive self-image that her intelligence and the difficulty of her major in a competitive professional school should have developed.

It is time for faculty self-examination, for too many of our faculty (both male and female) are "dissipating" our female students and their intellectual capacities (F. Scott Fitzgerald defined "dissipate" as "making nothing out of something.") Of course, if we make enough women believe they are nothing, we certainly cut down on the competition in all aspects of life.

The consequences of such treatment are staggering for female students. As noted earlier, their self-image declines if they have been in contact with harassing situations both in and out of class. Women have to endure enough social degradation (whether they consciously recognize it or not), but when their professors tell them in numerous forms of verbal and body language that they are inferior to men, the women internalize those attitudes and, in addition to other reactions, begin to believe it. This is yet another form of male power and control being exercised at the expense of women who feel powerless to change the situation and indeed usually are. Women say that they do not report this kind of harassment because they don’t want to suffer retaliation, they may have to take this professor’s courses again, every woman does not see what is happening so cannot define the source of her discomfort or feelings of inadequacy in a particular class, they have no way of proving "subtle" misogyny, and people may tell
them that they are being overly "sensitive" (as so many women are accused of being when men do not want to address their real concerns), and so on. A professor's choice of language tells a great deal about his/her attitudes, and his way of "looking down" at a female shouts loudly his open disdain. One alumna tells about trying to get into a history class: The tall professor "looked down on her" in a very condescending way and kept repeating how difficult the course would be, how much reading there would be, and how much work would be involved even when she said that those requirements would not bother her. Finally, his attitude was so offensive and insulting that she said she turned away from him resolving never to take one of his courses if it were the last course on campus. She felt that he took one look at her and treated her as though she did not have a brain in her head. This young woman was a Phi Beta Kappa who graduated with high honors and now holds a responsible professional position.

The pervasiveness of these male attitudes on the part of some faculty and teaching assistants does little to enhance their own professional images, leaves very negative feelings on the part of female alumnae (which may translate into fundraising issues), and tells the male students consciously or unconsciously that women deserve to be treated as inferiors because they are. If their professors think so, it must be true. The consequence of such attitudes has been termed "contra power" (Benson, Signs), a situation evident on our campus in reports by female teaching assistants and instructors teaching WRt 227 (Business Writing) in the College of Business: the insulting and disdainful treatment by male students toward women instructors is presently being considered seriously in the reassessment of the English Department's obligations to teach WRt 227 for that college.

At a Breakfast for Leaders last year, students talked about the sexual harassment on campus and targeted the Greek system (i.e., fraternities) with its parties. It was noted that women are afraid to do anything about it, that the Greeks must be held accountable for their behavior, that there should be a comfortable enough environment on campus for women to speak out, that the Greeks who act macho seem to be the immature ones, that the attitudes between the Greeks vs. Non-Greeks do nothing to bring people together, that there should be leadership training for all Greeks, and that in sororities there are education and support, but it does not offset the influence of the fraternities.

The female students at the Breakfast voiced even more resentment toward male faculty for sexism than toward their peers: for example, the profs who refer constantly to "he" (this complaint was heard frequently), the engineering faculty who don't expect women to be in that field and question whether they are capable of doing the work even when the women are getting good grades, the fact that Marine Affairs has only one female faculty, the complaint of being "belittled" by TA's in a science department, the experience of being talked down to by a male Dean.
Some women, especially those involved in sororities, may feel that they will be ostracized if they do not go along with demeaning fraternity/sorority activities. They want to be liked by men and other women and are afraid to antagonize them by disagreeing or withdrawing from the activity. Furthermore, some are afraid to report these activities because they fear retaliation. Indeed, these fears are often justified.

Sometimes women who go along with a little harassment may find that the harassment increases. Initially they like the behavior, but then it escalates to a point where they become uncomfortable.

Some women do not collude in the sense of actively going along with harassment but instead do nothing about it. They may feel helpless or not know how to say that they do not like the behavior. (p. 6)

We found that women are often not aware that they are being degraded by behavior that is defined as harassment. "Jokes" are a case in point—the "JAP" jokes designed to diminish Jewish women, the "blond" jokes about women's intellectual inferiority, the "virgin" or "slut" jokes that turn women into objects to be used then thrown away. Some of the notable cases of sexist behavior that have been brought before the Board of Student Conduct, for instance, clearly reveal that when such attitudes of disdain toward females are manifested in behavior the consequences to women are frightening. Sometimes women are even victimized by an insensitive Board. Women who are publicly humiliated and violated are doubly victimized when they then become targets of further degradation and harassment by both men and other women, they suffer from depression, they start to miss classes, their grades suffer, and often they leave the university. The men doing the harassing stay on to get their degree. In spite of this injustice, other women often support the men, as when women blame the victim of rape. It seems to be easier to believe that only women who "are looking for it" or "deserve it" get raped than to confront the fact that abuse and rape can happen to any woman at any time. Thus, both men and women tend to blame the victim and exonerate the perpetrator, for, after all, "boys will be boys."

Yet, even women who are frightened and angry by such harassment do not report their experiences. One woman was threatened by a group of men outside a Greek house one night when she was walking to meet her boyfriend. Their remarks were not only insulting but frightening, and she began to run when she believed that she might be attacked. Yet, though her boyfriend wanted to get some friends to take on the offenders, neither she nor her friend wanted to report the incident or make trouble for the "house." Women are afraid to go to the library or anywhere else alone after dark, and they are told repeatedly to walk only with friends. Indeed, even the library is not "safe," for the
library has had its own problems with exhibitionists and sexually explicit letters in books.

Women on this campus as well as in the society at large are prisoners to the hostile men who are aggressors. Though many men of course do not fall into the category of harassers or assaulters, there are enough of the latter to make women's lives unpleasant, uncertain, frightening, and dangerous.

**Faculty Harassment of Students**

Faculty attitudes are crucial barometers of the climate on any campus, and studies across the nation indicate the pervasive sexism that poisons the college experience for many women. It is significant, for instance, that women generally enroll in college with a higher self-image as a competent student than men, but during their four years women's self-esteem diminishes markedly while male self-esteem rises significantly. The study on "Peer Harassment" frames the situation clearly:

Consciously or not, male faculty members, including teaching assistants, are models for male students. When they treat women with respect, they are teaching appropriate behavior to their students. However, some male faculty members do not treat women well, for example, by using sexist humor to "spice up a dull subject," or by making disparaging comments about women. They are thus demonstrating behavior that will encourage male students to disparage and possibly harass women. Some faculty members support male students who harass women in class by ignoring or refusing to discourage harassing behavior. At other times, faculty members may laugh along with male students at the expense of women. By treating women with respect and discouraging harassment of any sort, male faculty members may not only influence what happens in a classroom, but may provide examples of good behavior that can be used outside the classroom as well. (n.20, p.14)

Faculty members may not always realize how they are perceived by the women and men on campus. **Example:** A couple of women complained several years ago about a group of male faculty who had coffee together in the Memorial Union and looked at various parts of the female students' bodies, made comments, and laughed as the women in their classes walked by. What seemed to bother the females, besides their own embarrassment, is that they liked the faculty in question and didn't want to see them behaving in such an unseemly way. **Example:** One faculty member is so consistently sexist in his attitudes and remarks that some women refuse to major in that subject when they realize that they will have to take that professor's courses again in order to get a degree. **Example:** Some women avoid other professors who have reputations for making sexist remarks in class, focusing on sexuality as examples, touching outside of class, and generally behaving in ways that make women uncomfortable when they realize
who was condescending, the female students with excellent grades who are not offered the same interview opportunities for the top jobs as male students with lesser grades and less experience in the Business clubs on campus. The Business College came under particular fire for the different treatment to men and women, the concern that helping a female will be interpreted as having a "special" relationship with her, and the fear of making complaints about the sexism.

A published study entitled "Sexual Harassment of University Students" (1986) by Mary Ellen Reilly, Bernice Lott, and Sheila M. Gallogly at the University of Rhode Island confirms the conclusions of the Association of American Colleges and our own anecdotal experience. This study was based on "personal experiences of both women and men"--393 juniors, seniors, and graduate students who filled out the questionnaire and 47% of these students who described specific incidents which happened to them on campus. According to this study, sexual harassment is a "major educational equity issue" (p. 333) with men more tolerant of harassment and with younger students more accepting of harassment. Reilly et al. quotes an earlier study at URI which reported similar findings with respect to female and male tolerance of harassment: "Although there was variation among women and men, their average responses were reliably different in every case. A glance at the statements and the mean scores of the women and men indicates that men consider sexually related behavior on the job and at school more natural, more to be expected, and less problematic and serious than do women" (Lott et al., 1982) (p. 350). It appears that little has changed in the last ten years.

The research by Reilly, Lott, and Gallogly focused on male and female harassment by professors, graduate students, and staff [See tables on pages 16a and 16b]:

While female professors and graduate assistants were sometimes reported by male students as initiators of sexually harassing behaviors, the more common occurrence reported by students of both sexes was that male professors and graduate assistants were the harassers. Almost one-quarter of our women respondents reported having personally received sexually suggestive looks or gestures from male instructors outside the classroom, while almost one-fifth reported experiencing unwanted sexual teasing, jokes, comments, or questions from male professors. Similar findings have come from studies of women at other universities.

More than 8% of our women respondents reported experiencing unwanted, deliberate touching from male professors... Among our respondents, about 4% of women reported touching from male staff in nonjob settings while over 11% reported such behavior on the job... The present study found the percentages of males reporting sexual harassment experiences to be low, except for sexually
Table VII. Students' Responses* to Experienced Sexual Harassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored the behavior or did nothing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made sure that I was never alone with that person again</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped attending class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped the course</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change adviser, major professor, or committee member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed my major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw from the university</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked or told the person to stop</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told other students or friends</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported the behavior to a counselor, chaplain, health professional, or other staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported the behavior to person's supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported the behavior to my adviser, another professor, or my employer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported the behavior to my family, lover, or spouse</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a joke of the behavior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted and went along with the behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V. Percent of Students* Who Personally Experienced Sexually Harassing Behavior by Staff Members in Job-Related Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior reported</th>
<th>Male professor</th>
<th>Female professor</th>
<th>Male graduate assistant</th>
<th>Female graduate assistant</th>
<th>Male staff</th>
<th>Female staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually suggestive looks/gestures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual teasing, jokes, etc.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted deliberate touching</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted pressure for social contact</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted attempts to kiss/fondle</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositioned to participate in sexual acts</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in sexual acts because flattered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of students responding ranged from 173 to 182; 83-91 women and 85-94 men.

Only those behaviors reported by 3% or more of respondents are included.

M and F designate sex of respondent.
Table IV. Percent of Students* Who Personally Experienced Sexually Harassing Behaviorb by Staff Members Outside the Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior reported</th>
<th>Male professor</th>
<th>Female professor</th>
<th>Male graduate assistant</th>
<th>Female graduate assistant</th>
<th>Male staff</th>
<th>Female staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually suggestive looks/gestures</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual teasing, jokes, etc.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted deliberate touching</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted pressure for social contact</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted attempts to kiss/fondle</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositioned to participate in sexual acts</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in sexual acts because flattered</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of students responding ranged from 376 to 391 persons; 208-218 women and 168-173 men.

Table III. Percent of Students* Who Observed Any Sexually Harassing Behavior by Instructors in Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior observed</th>
<th>Male professor</th>
<th>Female professor</th>
<th>Male graduate assistant</th>
<th>Female graduate assistant</th>
<th>Male staff</th>
<th>Female staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually obscene language</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually explicit materials</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually explicit jokes, etc.</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually suggestive comments</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put-downs of women as a group</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put-downs of men as a group</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors dating classmates</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of students responding to these items ranged from 372 to 392 persons.

*M and F designate sex of respondents.
suggestive looks and gestures and unwanted sexual teasing from female staff in job-related settings. It should also be noted that while few, if any, women students reported sexual harassment from other women, male students cited experiences with other males for a number of the behaviors described.

Our women students were more likely to receive unwanted pressure for social contact (for coffee, drinks, dates, etc.) than the male students, and male professors are the biggest source of these pressures. In job-related settings, most pressure for women came from male staff. For male students the largest number of reports outside class involved female graduate assistants, and in job-related situations, female staff.

The promiscuity myth described by Dzech and Weiner (1984, p. 67), which holds that "college women are sexually promiscuous, unfettered voluptuaries with hedonistic philosophies," certainly does not appear to be substantiated by this research. The picture that emerges suggests that men are more apt to use their sexuality for personal gain than are women and that the former feel more comfortable initiating sexual behaviors.

Women students in our sample tended to respond to sexual harassment in the same ways described by Benson and Thomson (1982). Women believe they must "manage the trouble" and use "the tactic of selective avoidance." Among the women who described incidents of sexual harassment, 17 students made sure never to be alone with the harasser. They attempted to manage a difficult situation by avoiding the cause of the discomfort. In essence, they were being victimized again. None of the seven men who responded to this item indicated that he had subsequently avoided being alone with the harasser.

The picture that emerged from this study allows several interpretations. On the one hand, sexual harassment of students at the university is not the norm in classrooms, in advising, and on the job. Most professors, graduate assistants, and staff members conduct themselves professionally and seem to respect the students with whom they interact. They do not appear to abuse their position of power and status by using sex as a weapon.

Not all staff members are professional, however, and many students, both women and men, are subjected to sexually harassing behaviors from persons in positions of trust. Women students are, far more often than men students, the targets of sexual harassment and are less tolerant of it, but are unable to effect change. (pp. 352-355)

While CUE experience interviewing students supports these conclusions about the professionalism of the vast majority of faculty, incidents of faculty harassment have gone unreported, and the seriousness of the encounters that the students do have should not be underestimated. Moreover, with the extensive public discussion of these issues of harassment (especially as a
that the Student Entertainment Committee was all white and wanted to remain so.

7) that we need more black students not just to teach white students about who they are, but to learn from each other.

The speaker expressed resentment toward this University for its policies which he felt reflects racist attitudes. The white students at that meeting were silent about the issues he raised, and the Asian student never said one word throughout the entire meeting. (He left Cuddy a note saying he would be willing to speak with her privately, but he never returned the phone calls and notes that she left for him.)

At another meeting in February 1993, an African-American student who has been a campus leader said he was sorry he came to URI. He said it has been "very rough" here as a black student because the institution has been "unsupportive" and he has felt "like a rat in a cage." Teachers speak in a "condescending" way and treat him and other students of color as though they should consider it a privilege to be in that faculty member's class--yet they don't have the same attitude toward white students. He said that people should be judged on who they are and what they can do, not on the color of their skin. This student's comments reflect everything that CUE found out from other students of color and from groups of students at other meetings.

Because the institutions of higher education in this country are overwhelmingly white-centered--run by whites, for white students, and with curricula that focus predominantly on white authors, scientists, history, etc.--most students of color feel as marginalized and alienated on campus as they do in the society at large. For the two years after Prof. Badejo left URI and before the present African/African-American Studies Director came in the Fall of 1992, students in that program seemed to lose the cohesiveness and feeling of value that that program and its activities had offered. As the 1992-93 year passed and students began to know the new Director, positive comments were heard and a new energy and optimism seemed to emerge. However, the campus as a whole remained either indifferent or hostile to minority concerns. At a Women's Center conference, "Educated Women of the 90's--Leading the Future," one session on "Multicultural Issues" was led by two female students from different cultures who talked about some of the problems of being in a minority:

1) There is a lack of representation of themselves and their cultures in history books, in lectures that do not relate to their experiences, on TV, in newspapers, etc. It is as though they and their people do not exist.

2) There are few role models, from elementary school to college, and on this campus that fact is evident.

3) The curriculum is almost entirely white, Eurocentric, and there is little attempt in the great majority of classes to integrate minority contributions into the subject matter in those classes.
result of the Anita Hill/Clarence Thomas hearings), faculty and staff may be more aware of the definition and consequence of sexual harassment so that the behaviors may now have gone underground. However, the misogyny that underlies sexual harassment of women by men is as present as ever in attitudes, body language, and verbal language. As more women become educated to the cues and profiles of sexism designed to elevate men and denigrate women and as women who are aware of demeaning treatment by faculty and graduate assistants feel that they can trust the University to support and protect them, the incidence of reporting unequitable, unprofessional, and psychologically damaging behavior should increase proportionally. Whether a female student is diminished by male faculty or a male student is diminished by female faculty, such behavior is intolerable.

MINORITY ISSUES

Racism and Cultural Bigotry

Racism and intolerance are alive and well on the URI campus. Last Spring at a Breakfast for Leaders, we asked the students to assess the racial climate here at URI. One student reminded us that the percentage of our students who are African-American is considerably lower than in the society at large, and that reflects the lack of importance of people of color at this institution. The only black student present said

1) that there is no commitment to diversity here;
2) that we need to improve relations by making the campus reflect society, and, therefore, we must have more staff, faculty, and students of color;
3) that 3 out of 4 incoming freshmen (1992-93) had never spoken to a black person, so they arrive on campus with all of the stereotypes, bigotry, and fears generated by their families, communities, and media;
4) that there are not nearly enough faculty sensitive to issues of diversity [Note: At several meetings English teachers were cited as being sensitive to racial issues and including readings from cultures beyond white Euro-American literature. The English Department may well have been cited because Cuddy was present, so the English professors whom students admired came readily to mind. It should be noted that while many people in that department have expanded their offerings beyond the canon, not everyone has done so. Furthermore, many other faculty in other departments have also been concerned about diversity issues, as the Women’s Studies courses, the African/African-American Studies courses, some courses in other departments, the URI centennial lecture series and conferences by the IDP, James Findlay in History, etc. indicate. This is simply a report of what students said.]
5) that there is very little black entertainment on this campus.
4) They must contend constantly with stereotypes from both students and faculty. Some faculty expect less of minority students, which is both condescending and destructive to the student's self-image and self-worth.
5) There is a lack of appropriate services for minority students.
6) Racism is pervasive on campus in the discriminating way they are treated. They feel ignored and invisible. They sometimes feel that the white majority feels that the minority should just go away, and everything will be better and easier.
7) "Multicultural" means more than black and white.

These two students posed some solutions to these conditions: People should learn to look for substance instead of just surface; we should build respect for everyone; a sense of empowerment should be given to everyone; there should be joint ventures between, for example, sororities and Uhuru Sasa so that people learn about each other.

At every meeting and with each individual from a minority—whether racial, cultural, disabled, or sexual minority—ignorance and lack of respect were cited as the most significant and pervasive reasons for prejudice and for destructive behavior. One student noted the reaction to her hair being styled in dreadlocks. She was deeply hurt by students staring at her but, even more, by the remarks she overheard about her "dirty" hair. She told about washing her hair several times a day in order to get her hair in this style and commented that her hair was probably cleaner than the hair of any student calling her dirty. The same student said that when she went to the computer lab, the person in charge ignored her then would not give her a computer to use. She did not know why but assumed the reason was her color. She also lamented that this campus does not recognize her culture, and she feels lonely here. [It should be noted that a course on her culture was offered the semester after she voiced these opinions.]

Other students from cultures outside the U.S. borders repeated those attitudes and feel ostracized because of their accent and because they are often treated as though they are invisible. Students point out that faculty and students should realize that an accent is not a sign of intellectual deficiency, but rather shows that they can speak at least two languages while American students usually can speak only one language. Yet they are often treated as though they are stupid.

Students often point to the fraternities and sororities as racist institutions. There are few students of color pledged to those bastions of white supremacy. When white students supporting the Greek system were asked how many minorities were in their houses, they sheepishly admitted that there were no students of color in those particular houses—but the reason was that no students of color wanted to be in their house. When
asked what they did during Rush to welcome minorities and encourage them to pledge to their houses, white students answered that they had done nothing. Minority students confirmed this at a couple of meetings CUE attended. Thus, the Greek attitudes are perceived as representative of the institution's racist attitudes since Student Life and the administration have been ineffective in making changes in the Greek system which fosters and perpetuates intolerance of all kinds.

Minority women have problems even beyond the sexism and harassment suffered by all women. Often the women from other cultures have been socialized to be quiet and subservient and their subdued personalities intensify their isolation. On the other hand, some African-American women feel they are punished by African-American men for being who they are because 1) the females are strong and outspoken and the men want white women because they are more submissive and deferential, and 2) some white women go after the black athletes who respond because it is prestigious to go out with white women. Therefore, these African-American women feel rejected by their own "brothers," as well as by society. Women from other cultures with whom we spoke both admire the ability of African-American women to speak up for themselves but also resent being overwhelmed and silenced by other women as well as men. It often seems when these young people talk about their experiences they seem to be caught between the Skylla and Charybdis of cultural mores and expectations and therefore are "damned if they do and damned if they don't." It is a lonely and terrifying experience to be in a minority that is not valued—which pretty much defines the position of minorities in this country, as well as on campus.

While there are many faculty who have long been committed to re-educating themselves and challenging their own "isms" and there are programs like AAF and WMS which help students question traditional assumptions and absolutes, the institution has not done enough in the past to alter the negative experiences of minorities. And though there are academic programs, individual faculty, and programs in Student Affairs responding to those needs, minority students still encounter too many models for attitudes and behavior that are negative or perceived as negative. Example: When a faculty member does not allow the minority student to pick her own project topic, but automatically assigns her the topic related to the black community, that faculty member is considered racist, however well-meaning the professor is. White students are empowered with choice but the black student, it is assumed, would be interested only in black issues so she is denied the same freedom of choice given to white students. Example: When white faculty turn to the only black student in class and ask what "your people" would think about the issue being discussed, that question assumes that all people of color must think, feel, and act alike and therefore denies these students the same individuality and respect accorded to white students. For this, and other, reasons students of color are often reluctant to stay in classes where there is a minority of
one, according to the minority students reporting. **Example:** A student who was of Portuguese and Native-American descent was delighted to take a course on Native-Americans at a junior college she attended before matriculating at URI. She dropped the course when the instructor started referring to the "Redskins." **Example:** Hispanic and Asian students find little in the coursework at URI to reflect or validate their backgrounds and the richness of their many cultures. Assumptions and differentiated treatment are part of racism that may be subtle to many white faculty but are anything but subtle to the minority students. The examples are endless.

Though the present University administration has made a commitment to diversifying the campus and has made significant changes to that end (e.g., the new Director of African and African/American Studies, the promise of a new house for the program, a new Director of Security, support for the Safe Zone program, etc.), many minority students see the changes as too slow in coming. And the reality is that some minority faculty and staff have left and are leaving URI because of the lack of support for them as individuals or for their programs and because they are offered higher-paying jobs elsewhere. As we hire new minority faculty and staff, we have lost some excellent people in the last several years and will continue to do so. Moreover, qualified minority faculty, especially African-Americans and Hispanics, are scarce and the numbers of African-American Ph.D.'s has decreased markedly (African-Americans earned "23% fewer doctorates in 1989 than they did in 1979"—Indiana Alumni, Sept/Oct 1990, p. 15). The models that students need and want, then, are going to be even more difficult to find in the future, and the changes required to diversify the campus while educating students and faculty about prejudice will require additional funding at the very time when our university is in the worst financial difficulty.

Unfortunately, one of the most successful academic programs at URI in the past in offering admirable models and in supporting and encouraging students to reach their intellectual and emotional potential now has its own internal problems. Some students report that the Program for Talent Development, long hailed by its students and by many faculty across campus, has itself caused a divisiveness among minority students that has intensified minority isolation and uncertainty. Despite some superior advising by a couple of overworked people, one of whom just left the program, and a director who remains committed to the students and the program he has dedicated many years to developing and expanding, some staff members are perceived as having begun to use the program as a platform for personal agendas that are less than constructive. Some students and members of the campus community have been dismayed by the unprofessional environment, language, and behavior in the TD office. Some TD students have felt more shut out of the system than ever because the program that promised them a support system and a feeling of community is now being run on a day-to-day basis.
by people who need to reassess their role, behavior, and obligation to the students. The African-American activist campaign out of TD last year is a case in point. Though TD during November 1992 suggested concrete changes with regard to racism on campus, it also divided its constituency and alienated many students. If students feel ostracized and "used" in a program like Talent Development, we are indeed in trouble.

One of the biggest problems is with the faculty members who are in denial and refuse to believe that they are part of the sexism and racism problems on campus. In fact, some deny that there is sexism or racism on campus. Simply put, there are faculty who do not want change (See Appendix B1-B2). Yet, if changes are not made out of a sense of justice and caring, we should at least realize that too many of our students will continue to graduate unprepared for what is coming. By the year 2020, the present minority population, all together, will make up the majority in this country (Erickson and Strommer). Studies across the country tell us that we cannot continue to "educate" students into the traditional, white, European, patriarchal, heterosexual system that marginalizes and denies the rights of "others." Yet, there can be no changes until people are willing to think in new ways. It has been frequently noted that meetings for faculty to study diversity, harassment, etc. have very poor attendance by faculty, and the people who do attend are often those who are already sensitive to those issues.

Students see only what is done or not done and therefore perceive that many of us talk a big talk but we don't really care. Such conclusions result in demoralizing even the most dynamic, active, and committed young people who will continue to leave our campus with rage and resentment instead of gratification and feelings of success.

A great deal more than this study is required to understand and respond to the experiences of racial and cultural minorities on this campus, but we would like to mention one other group that suffers not from faculty assumptions of their inferiority, but from assumptions of their superiority—the Asian students. There is a stereotype in this country that all Asian and Asian-American students are exceptionally smart and excel in math and science. Consequently, some Asian-American students reported that too many teachers take their intelligence for granted and ignore and overlook them, do not give them the same attention that other students get, and make the same assumptions about them that the society does. They want faculty to know that they also need help, that they are not all geniuses in math and science (or any other subject), and that they should be seen as individuals with individual differences. They say that faculty should see someone as a student first, not as a stereotype. Their situation is intensified because other students often make the same assumptions also and therefore feel competitive, resentful, or hostile to the Asian students for their presumed intellectual superiority. As a result of the stereotyping, many Asian and
Asian-American students feel isolated, invisible, and silenced because of the way they are treated in classes as well as by other students.

In addition, open prejudice and hostility toward Asians and Asian-Americans have spilled over into classes where the instructor is of Asian descent. One non-Asian student reported that (white) students have been so rude and disdainful to one Asian professor in a professional school that another (white) professor was called in to arbitrate.

Finally, prejudice cannot be attributed to just one group of students (the white students). White students, therefore, also reported being harassed and abused by minority students. One student in athletics reported the hostility between black and white team members, and he felt that there was equal responsibility for the situation. Other students felt mistreated and fearful in dorms because of minority hostility. Inter-racial conflict does not seem to be diminishing though students taking courses focused on cultural diversity are more knowledgeable and sophisticated. Perhaps we should be examining how much a college education can overcome the stereotypes, insecurities, and hatreds built up by many students over a lifetime before they get to campus.

Students with Disabilities

This is another group with such diversity that our comments in a short report cannot hope to explain their problems or difficulties on campus. Categorization is limiting, at best, in describing or explaining the experiences of individuals in any group. Students with disabilities, then, come from diverse backgrounds and cultures, and their disabilities range from vision and hearing impairments to blindness and deafness, from partial physical mobility to wheelchair requirements, from learning disabilities from birth to learning disabilities acquired as a result of illness or accident. Comments repeated by students in this group are that most of their peers avoid them, that they have almost no one to talk to on campus, that they are lonely, and that other students seem to feel uncomfortable when around students with physical disabilities. Even for the outgoing students who have made friends, romantic relationships are not easy to find. Problems with self-image are compounded when faculty also treat them as though their physical condition results in intellectual impairment, and as though the extra time required to accommodate their needs is an annoyance. Students express special regard for those faculty who do take extra time to help them.

According to one blind student who is working on a public relations program to educate the campus, the common denominator for the problems of every minority group is ignorance and therefore a lack of understanding of those who are different from
the majority. He noted that students with disabilities are not "on a level playing field" with other students. Not until everybody on campus can go into every building unimpeded will the playing field be leveled. He was quick to note that such a remark may seem to express an adversarial attitude, for it is true that the disabled often feel they must be on the attack to get what they need; however, he does not feel that way. In response to a question about how he thinks he is treated by peers, he responded that much that goes on is visual and people probably move away when they see him coming. He assumes that people are curious about him because there is an inherent curiosity about differentness, but this curiosity is countered by people's fears about disability and coming face to face with one's own mortality and vulnerability.

This student lives off campus in his own apartment by himself. He has several female friends who assist him with his various chores. One friend gets him back and forth to school, he goes grocery shopping with another, and so on. He tries not to impose too much on any one friend because they are all busy too. While he is very independent, he is also sensitive to how much he needs other people and to the special assistance required from faculty. He also understands that some faculty may not want to give extra attention, extra time for exams, etc., to particular students because this might cause resentment and hostility in abled students who cannot comprehend special needs. He feels that educating both faculty and students will help to eliminate such problems.

Another student with a learning disability had the same conclusion about the need for educating the faculty. His experience was that he had been an excellent student and then had an illness that affected his memory and cognitive functions. Consequently, he knows the difference between his present difficulties and the ease with which he functioned before his illness. He can also see the difference in the ways he is now treated. In his address to a meeting of faculty, he admitted that since his disability friendships do not come easy. He said that at URI there isn't the room to be different, that in his experience, teachers don't allow student-teacher interaction or differences of opinion, and that it is difficult to educate faculty to special needs of students who do not fall comfortably into the majority. He felt that special accommodations to learning-disabled students do not make a course "easier," just possible. He is at such a disadvantage in every situation that accommodation to his disability may simply be like giving a handicap in golf—it doesn't help someone win, it just gives people an even start. He also wanted faculty to know that sometimes because of medication or emotional problems resulting from their condition, students with learning disabilities may not be able to meet course requirements at the time set by the professor; e.g., the student may turn in a paper late. He was not asking that the course be made easier or that the requirements be different for people with disabilities, only that
they be given opportunities to find ways to accommodate their special needs so that they also can achieve at their highest level.

Homophobia and Heterosexism

In a Ph.D. proposal at URI entitled "Mediators of aggression against lesbians and gay men: A laboratory experiment," Jennifer Fernald uses Herek’s definition of heterosexism to discuss negative attitudes and violent behavior toward gays and lesbians:

Aggression against lesbians and gay men occurs within the cultural context of pervasive ‘heterosexism’ (Herek, 1990). Gregory Herek (1990, p. 316) defines heterosexism as an ‘...ideological system that denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes any nonheterosexual form of behavior, relationship, or community...’ and which, like other ideologies of oppression, ‘...is manifested both in societal customs and institutions...and in individual behaviors.’ Herek (1990, p.316) has argued that heterosexism not only provides the backdrop against which anti-gay aggression is enacted, but further, that ‘anti-gay violence is a logical, albeit extreme, extension of the heterosexism that pervades American society. (8)

Fernald notes that the "term 'homophobia,' which has gained the most currency in the popular vernacular, is rooted in Churchill’s (1967) study of attitudes toward homosexuality, in which he coined the term 'homoerotophobia' to refer to a pervasive cultural fear of homosexual eroticism or acts" (9). However, this term is no longer adequate to describe the hatred and hostility toward homosexuals found in our culture: "Whereas a phobia refers to an intense, irrational and persistent fear, except in a minority of cases, the affect most closely associated with anti-gay attitudes is not fear but anger and disgust (Ernulf & Innala, 1987: Haaga, 1991). Furthermore, expression of anti-gay attitudes in a culture in which homosexuality is condemned and/or ignored is not only not irrational, but in fact in some situations actually confers benefits to the individual who expresses them (Herek, (1986b)" (Fernald, 9). This is the climate of "'cultural heterosexism'" and "'psychological heterosexusm'" (Herek; Fernald, 10) within which our gay, lesbian, and bisexual students must live in our society and on our campus.

In 1989, Herek published an article entitled "Hate Crimes Against Lesbians and Gay Men" in American Psychologist. In that study, he states:

Antigay hate crimes (words or actions that are intended to harm or intimidate individuals because they are lesbian or gay) constitute a serious national problem. In recent surveys, as many as 92% of lesbians and gay men report that they have been the targets of antigay verbal abuse or
threats, and as many as 24% report physical attacks because of their sexual orientation. Assaults may have increased in frequency during the last few years, with many incidents now including spoken references to the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome by the assailants. Trends cannot be assessed, however, because most antigay hate crimes are never reported and no comprehensive national surveys of antigay victimization have been conducted. (948)

Herek points out that the abuse from peers is made even more intolerable because students often can't count on parents, faculty, administrators, or law enforcement personnel to protect them. Indeed, some of the verbal and physical harassment has been by police, according to CUAV [Community United Against Violence, San Francisco] (952). The extent of antigay violence is presented in the following table (Herek, 950).

Table 1
Combined Data for Antigay Violence (Survey Studies) in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Incident</th>
<th>PLGTF* (1986-1987)</th>
<th>NGLTF* (1986)</th>
<th><em>Sex</em></th>
<th>Penn*</th>
<th>Rutgers*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal threats</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects thrown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chased or followed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spat upon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit, kicked, or beaten</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault with a weapon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism or arson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault/harassment</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police victimization</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School victimization</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PLGTF = Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force (Gross et al., 1988). The figures reported in column 1 are incidents for male and female Philadelphia residents that occurred in the year prior to the survey; figures in column 2 are lifetime totals. Total sample size for the PLGTF studies = 437 with 146 female respondents (33%) and 291 male respondents (67%).

† NGLTF = National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (Berill, 1986). N = 2,074, including 654 female respondents (32%) and 1,420 male respondents (68%).

‡ YLS = Yale Sexual Orientation Survey (Herek, 1986a). N = 215, including 53 female respondents (43%) and 117 male respondents (54%). Gender was not specified by 5 respondents; percentages were reported only for gay or bisexual members of the sample (n = 166).

* Penn = Pennsylvania State University (O'Augelli, 1988). N = 132, including 49 female respondents (37%) and 83 male respondents (63%).

It should be no surprise, then, that the heterosexist and homophobic attitudes in the society at large are brought by students to campuses across the country. Fernald cites some statistics that are disturbing, to say the least:

Aggression against gays is usually thought of in terms of street violence, however it is also pervasive on college campuses (Berrill, 1990; Herek, 1989). One-thousand-four-hundred-and-eleven anti-gay incidents on 34 college campuses were reported by lesbian and gay student groups to NGLTF [National Gay and Lesbian Task Force] in 1988 alone. On
every college campus where a study has been conducted, pervasive anti-gay physical and verbal abuse has been documented (Herek, 1989). In one such study conducted at Pennsylvania State University (D’Augelli, 1989), questionnaires were distributed at lectures, films, social events and organizational meetings of gay and lesbian groups on campus. Of the 125 self-identified gay men, lesbians and bisexuals (mostly gay/lesbian) who responded: 76% had been verbally harassed at least once; 26% had been threatened with physical violence at least once; 22% had been chased or followed; 5% had been spat upon; and 4% had been punched because of their known or perceived sexual orientation at some point during their college careers. Similar rates of victimization have been documented at Rutgers University (Cavin, 1987 cited in Berrill 1990), Yale University (Herek, 1986a), the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (Yeskel, 1985), and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (O'Shaugnessey, 1987 cited in Berrill, 1990), suggesting that anti-gay violence and harassment permeate college life. (Fernald 4)

In Felice Yeskel's report on gay and lesbian harassment at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, the data speak for the fearful and unsafe environment which so many gay, lesbian, and bisexual students encounter on campuses:

**General Harassment and Discrimination**

"When I lived on campus, I had grafitti written on my door and memo-board and posters and stuff torn down or defaced. I also got harassing phone calls and my door knocked on in the middle of the night and morning." (This comment is from the Comprehensive Survey.)

"I have received life-threatening calls saying, 'I'm going to kill you, faggot.'" (Comprehensive Survey)

"Coming out for me meant the whole decision to take on that challenge of being beaten up, or doing things that were gonna cause trouble." (Speak Out)

"When these incidents of violence and homophobia occur, it doesn’t just hurt the victim, it sends a clear message to the whole social community of what’s acceptable or unacceptable behavior, what are attitudes we stand behind and what aren’t, and really creates a social climate that impinges upon everybody’s freedom." (Speak Out)

Harassment and discrimination take a number of different forms. Gay, lesbian and bisexual students responding to the comprehensive survey indicated the forms they commonly experience.
Classroom

6% believe they were penalized in a class by receiving a lower grade or less attention due to their sexual orientation.

Employment

21.3% report that they believe they have been penalized in a work situation (fired, not re-hired, negative treatment from supervisor or co-workers) because of their sexual orientation.

Knowledge of UMass Anti-Discrimination Policies

77.1% of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals responding to this question on the survey indicate they knew that harassment and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation are prohibited at UMass/Amherst.

The results of the Project PULSE Heterosexism Survey March, '85, show that in general only 59.3% of students know that lesbian and gay harassment is prohibited by the Code of Student Conduct.

The UMass gay and lesbian students "were asked whether they would make use of a number of campus agencies if they were the victims of harassment or discrimination": "68.9% of respondents report they would not go or would not go again to the Campus Police"; "70.1% of the respondents state they would not or would not again go to the Amherst Police"; 62.2% would not go to the Dean of Students Office, 63.6% would not go to the Ombuds Office, 62.9% would not go to faculty (7-8).

Gay, lesbian, and bisexual students at the University of Rhode Island echo the issues and problems reported by the UMass report. Their experiences are so frightening that most gays, lesbians, and bisexuals will not come out of the closet out of fear for the consequences—constant harassment and even physical assault. The situation is so serious that these students live literally in terror that someone might find out about their sexuality. Two gay men admitted knowing only 5 gay and lesbian students, including themselves, on the campus because they did not want people to know their sexuality. Example: One very active, respected student said that she would never "come out" on this campus because of the way she would be ostracized or otherwise mistreated while she was here. Example: A gay student, who was a member of a fraternity, was assaulted when two heterosexual brothers drunk from their frat party got a passkey, went into the young man's room, and tried to force him to perform oral sex. He refused and managed to get them out of his room, then early in the morning he packed and left the fraternity. He suffered, literally, an attempted rape and the emotional consequences of such an experience. Example: In spite of the
Verbal Harassment

30.5% of the students report they have been verbally harassed or threatened over the phone. The March '85 Project Pulse Survey indicates 43.2% of students in general believe that lesbians and gays receive threatening or derogatory phone calls.

44.6% of the students report they have been the victims of verbal threats or harassment on the UMass campus. This is in striking contrast to the general student population in which only 19.2% of students have been the victims of this abuse. (Project PULSE, Nov. '84). 72.2% of students in general believe lesbians and gays are victims of verbal harassment. (Project PULSE, March '85).

Physical Harassment

21.1% of respondents indicate that they have been the victims of physical confrontation or assault. 5.0% of students in general report that they have been physically attacked. (Project PULSE, Nov. '84).

Sexual Harassment

21.1% of respondents say they have been sexually threatened or harassed.

Grafitti

85.9% of those responding say that they have been subjected to viewing anti-lesbian or gay grafitti. The Project PULSE results, March '85, confirm this finding. 80.4% of students in general have seen anti-lesbian or gay grafitti.

Jokes or Slurs

87% of the students report that they have heard anti-lesbian or gay jokes or slurs. 92.3% of students in general report that they at least occasionally hear other students making anti-lesbian or gay jokes or remarks. (Project PULSE, March '85).

Threatened With "Exposure"

29.3% of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals reporting say they have been threatened with "exposure" of their sexual orientation to someone who didn't know.

Housing

13.3% think they have been asked to leave or pressured into leaving housing because of their sexual orientation.
reality of gay and lesbian harassment and violence by heterosexuals in our society, the male students who would discuss the issue in one English class last semester insisted that the heterosexual men will be in danger if President Clinton allows gays to remain in the military. Example: When the student Gay and Lesbian Alliance was meeting at the Women's Center, male students watched the house to see who was entering and leaving in order to follow, harass, and threaten the gay students with violence. The students stopped meeting at the Center. Example: A talented young man, who authored plays and other pieces of literature while he was a student at URI, remained very much in the closet. He even wrote for the Great Swamp Gazette under a pseudonym because he did not want his identity known. Example: Male students who belong to a fraternity were concerned about attending a program about gays and lesbians as part of their class work because of what the brothers would say or think about them. Example: Though the gay students interviewed lamented how few programs there were at URI for them, they admitted that they are afraid to attend the lectures and films that are offered because if they are recognized going to the programs, they will be presumed gay/lesbian, their sexuality may be disclosed, and their lives will be hell (several heterosexual students who were asked to attend a program about homosexuality for a class expressed the same fears). Example: One student whose sexuality was disclosed in the dorm started to receive obscene remarks and hate mail at his door. Example: One activist student who had the courage to come out was called names loudly by groups of men when she entered the dining hall. Example: One student in an Honors course came into class one day with his face and body severely bruised. He began to tremble and cry when he told the professor after class that he "came out" to his parents the night before, his father beat him up, and he was thrown out of the house without money or clothes. He said he did not know how long he could stay in college without some support at this point of the semester. He left school within a week of that incident. Example: Several years ago one of the fraternities hung a banner saying "Sigma Chi Hates Homos." A history professor complained to the house and the students took it down. Then with a vote of the brothers, the banner was immediately put up again. No disciplinary action was taken against the house. Example: One professor, who was taken for a student, was at an information table in the Memorial Union during Gay Awareness/Pride Week. Two male students took pens and defaced the literature on the table, then verbally harassed and threatened him. Finally, when he couldn't take any more of their crude remarks, he told them he was a faculty member and they would be in serious trouble if they did not leave. They left the vicinity of the table very quickly. Example: When the Rhode Island Gay and Lesbian Youth organization came to our campus for a meeting, they were treated so badly and made so unwelcome that they left. The examples go on.

Some gay men reported that they would not feel safe with the police or most faculty and are resentful of religious judgments
on campus. Except for one chaplain, students feel no support from the religious leaders. They say they have seen nothing on the campus that makes them feel welcome. One out-of-state freshman said at the end of last year that he was leaving URI because he saw no reason to pay high tuition at a hostile campus when he can get the same education for less money at his own state university. A sophomore said he would remain at URI only because of the in-state tuition, though there was no social life for him here. The same student laughed wryly about the stereotypes regarding promiscuity among gay men, said he is celibate, and said that of course no one would believe that. These students only talked to the CUE member because their close friend, who was a student in the faculty member's class, assured them they would remain anonymous and safe—the friend even accompanied them to the interview.

An alumna who recently spoke to a group of faculty shared her experiences as "the resident lesbian on campus." She said that jokingly, but the point was that she was the student who spoke for gay and lesbian experience on campus—and still does—because undergraduates now on the campus do not dare to be public about their sexuality. She said that she didn't make any friends because as soon as students knew she was lesbian she was either tolerated or outright avoided. While her teachers never ridiculed homosexuality and nothing derogatory was said by her instructors, she always felt that the faculty saw and felt differently from her. Her teachers framed all issues from a heterosexual center and made assumptions based on stereotypes and heterosexual constructions. For example, all couples were "he" and "she"; all students were inevitably going to get married and have children; gayness was mentioned, if at all, only as an afterthought, and so on. Their experiences were not hers, and her teachers did nothing to make their views of the world inclusive. Consequently, she never felt that she was totally accepted and never felt safe to be herself, and with few exceptions teachers did not make her feel "safe." She asked the faculty to educate ourselves and be models for "safe behavior." She also asked us to encourage discussion so that all students (and faculty) can be educated about differences.

Presumably the above alumna did not take the courses that do discuss these issues, but her experiences are echoed by many other students as well. Example: One senior last Spring mentioned to her professor that that class was the only one she had taken at URI that included discussion of gays and lesbians. She said she was grateful because her father was gay and had come out when she was about twelve years old. She said that he is a wonderful person and a great father, that anyone would be lucky to have a relationship like the one she and her brother have with their father, and that the attitudes and stereotypes about gays upset her because they do not relate to her father's character or life. She talked for some time.
While the climate on campus in the mid-80's is reported to have been relatively more open, attitudes are now so hostile that the student organization of The Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Alliance has not been holding meetings. No gay or lesbian students seemed to be willing to be public enough to use the funds approved by the Student Senate. Consequently, unless the faculty or Student Life arranges programs and speakers of interest to the homosexual constituency on campus—and they are often afraid to attend and be seen at such lectures—there is absolutely nothing offered to these students. Students said repeatedly that programming, readings, and assumptions about human nature are hetero-centered in and out of most classes. More than one heterosexual student also noted that there seems to be an attempt on the part of the institution in general to make gay and lesbian students an invisible and silenced group. Yet, a substantial number of students in one class expressed anger about the violation of civil rights and human dignity based on sexuality.

Because of the fear generated by this hostility, there is no undergraduate willing to serve on (or be seen at the meetings of) the "Committee to Eliminate Homophobia and Heterosexism." This committee is made up of a group of faculty, administrators, staff, and graduate students who are concerned about the intolerance on this campus. The Committee has developed a program with an emblem to designate the "Safe Zones" for gay, lesbian, and bisexual students on campus. (See Appendix C1-C3). Any faculty or staff person who wishes to serve as a resource where students being harassed can go for protection may put up a Safe Zone emblem on his/her door. No one is required to participate and no judgment is made about faculty who do or do not participate. The fact that such an emblem—with its program to reach out to the entire campus for help—is necessary to publicize the need to protect any of our students is shocking. And the fact that a few other campuses in the country have made similar initiatives—and those that have not begun such programs have already heard about the URI emblem and are watching our campus to see the response and to see if it "works"—is clear indication that our campus is not isolated in its inherent heterosexism and the sense of imminent danger on the part of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals.

The Safe Zone program has generated varied responses. The Chronicle of Higher Education carried a story about the Safe Zone program (See Appendix D). One faculty member at URI sent a letter expressing disgust and anger to the Committee to Eliminate Homophobia and Heterosexism and accused the Committee of motives and intentions that are not part of their agenda (See Appendix E). The emblems put up on several doors in Independence were defaced (See Appendix F). It became clear to the Committee intent only on making a safer campus that the environment at URI is still not hospitable.
Again, ignorance and fear of "differentness" seem to be at the heart of the problems. Heterosexual students are shocked to learn that, based on a conservative estimate, at least 10% of our nation's population are gay and lesbian. If we include bisexuals and men who have some kind of homosexual experience in their lives, the estimate jumps to 50%. Yet, student attitudes are still based on misinformation, stereotyping, and intolerance. They come to campus with those beliefs, and our institution has not managed to enlighten most students or alter their behavior. The focus in our society on AIDS, which students want to believe is a disease of gays, and the conflict over gays in the military have increased the visibility of all issues related to sexuality. Unfortunately, the result has not been greater education and tolerance, but just the opposite. It has brought homophobia and heterosexism to the surface with new rationalizations for oppression.

RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

While there are no data and therefore no way of knowing how pervasive the subtle and overt religious prejudices are, the Jewish "jokes" and the general stereotyping of all "Others" are clear indications that intolerance at URI extends to religions as well as to race, cultures, sexuality, and other differences. There was no time to explore the issues of religion this year, but comments by students suggest that it is of a serious enough nature that studies should be done and data collected in the near future.

The absence of an extensive section on religious attitudes should in no way be construed as indifference to this problem on the part of CUE. In fact, it is such a complicated issue precisely because religious prejudice does not seem to be a majority/minority issue; religious intolerance is not limited to any single group or religion but seems to include all "others" who are different from oneself. In-depth analysis of power relations, class relations, issues of control, considerations of God and Truth, and so on, are part of this controversial subject and could not begin to be handled in a seven-month study.

CLASS CONFLICTS

This is another area requiring study and analysis that could not be addressed in this report. However, the subject should be examined in the near future, for it has great significance for the identity of this institution, as well as for the identities of our students. The issues of class elitism, hierarchy, and power are also inextricably linked to the existence of the Greek system on our campus.

THE GREEK SYSTEM

Throughout the research for this report, the Greek system was mentioned repeatedly in relation to just about every negative
aspect of campus life across this country. Research in higher education confirms the correlation between the attitudes and practices in the Greek system and issues of alcohol and drug abuse, anti-intellectualism, sexism, female abuse and rape, anti-gay activities, racism, classism, violence, and so on. Yet, its financial and social impact on campuses and among alumnae/i are so great that it remains entrenched in college life. Only a few institutions have recently eliminated Greek life from their campuses. This is not to say that those offenses are not committed elsewhere on campuses or that there are not admirable students who are members of fraternities and sororities; it simply means that the Greek system institutionalizes and codifies offensive attitudes and inappropriate behaviors that are accepted as the norm. Any positive aspects of Greek life, or the existence of a "good" house here and there, does not mitigate their overwhelmingly negative legacy.

On the URI campus, fraternities are lumped together and labeled "The Greek Mafia" by many students who admitted privately that they feared reprisals and ostracism if they reported activities that violated the University's written codes of conduct. Even some men and women who belong to the Greek system and support its existence admit that after taking courses that raised their consciousness about treatment of women, etc., they are uncomfortable with the activities and how they are run—but they can do little about it. It is difficult for men who are sensitive to inequality and abusive behaviors to remain silent; yet, silence is required as a test of loyalty and of being a "man" in an organization perpetuating male bonding at the expense of individual morality and ethics. Simply by belonging to the Greek program or attending Greek functions and remaining silent about inappropriate and destructive behavior, students condone and perpetuate Greek attitudes and practices that are psychologically destructive and often physically dangerous.

A recent case in point was cited in an article in The Good Five Cent Cigar (March 30, 1993) in which a Sigma Pi fraternity brother was severely intoxicated and "wrapped onto a picnic bench with plastic wrap" so that he had difficulty breathing and was hospitalized only after a sorority called the police. According to the article, one brother admitted to the police that he had videotaped the incident "but that he erased the tape. The report said that other brothers denied the taping altogether" (1). The point is that a life was in jeopardy, yet the brothers would not come forward with charges against specific perpetrators. That silence seems too often to describe a major part of the Greek "honor" code.

The Greek system is a patriarchal, hierarchical, exclusive, sexist, chauvinist, racist institution that no longer represents the values that universities articulate publicly. The rest of this report has cited numerous consequences of the Greek system to women's physical safety and psychological well-being, to the ostracism of minorities, to the fear by gays, and so on. Yet,
some people high in the ranks of Student Life defend Greek life by pointing to the house that has a higher-than-average GPA (though most fraternities are notorious for their anti-intellectualism, for their attitudes that Rush and other social activities come first even if it means lower grades for the brothers, and for their lower-than-average GPA's) and talk about leadership skills, charities, etc.

It seems ironic that Student Life staff have worked so hard to change anti-social attitudes and behavior in the past several years while supporting the very system that perpetuates those attitudes and the resulting violations. One joke wryly reported by more than a few students goes this way: staff or faculty members will meet with Greek students to present a program on date rape, drug and alcohol abuse, etc. etc.; the brothers listen with respectful interest and even sometimes ask the "right" questions and make the "right" responses; then when the adult who has been working very long hours to bring this educational experience to the house leaves, the brothers breathe a sigh of relief, break out the beer, and put on the porn video. In fact, it was reported that some houses regularly run porn videos while they are setting up for parties. Despite the well-intentioned programs, then, misogynist attitudes and remarks are rampant, and drugs of all kinds are readily available, according to reports.

And while sorority values may seem to be less pernicious because women do not act out in the same ways, sororities reinforce habits and expectations that enable fraternities to exist as they are and that make most women less than they can be. Sororities are intimidated into silence and submission and therefore too often comply and protect—and that is just a different kind of social and moral malignancy.

Thus, allowing Greek life to exist on campus while designing programs to try to change the attitudes and behaviors inherent in that system—attitudes that are required for the Greek male bonding and pride in being "men" that justify the system’s existence for many people—is not only ludicrous, but a waste of time and money. It is like the U.S. Government passing anti-smoking laws, using taxpayer money to run anti-smoking messages on TV, and designing educational programs for schools while taxpayer money is simultaneously used for subsidies to help support the tobacco industry. We tell people to stop killing themselves with cancer and other ailments caused by the cigarettes that we help the industry produce. What we are doing with the Greek system on campus is just as hypocritical and futile in terms of changing values and behavior.

The fact that the Greek system is primarily for white students is also hypocritical when much of the administration, Student Life, Office of Residential Life, and faculty are supposed to be committed to diversity and multi-culturalism. In a class discussing this issue, the students in the Greek system denied their own racism and prejudice; when asked by the
that there are things being done and issues being studied to make the campus safer for everyone.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS TO CHANGE THE CLIMATE ON CAMPUS

Despite the negative tone and content of this report, there are numerous members of the campus community—in programs, individual classes, and extra-curricular activities—working very hard to change the attitudes and climate of oppression. The following is a brief list of some programs and activities committed to diversity and expanding educational opportunities for all students:

Academic Programs

The African/African-American Studies Program (AAF) is active in providing programs, courses, lectures, theater, etc. to students.

The Honors Program offers courses and supports speakers and other programs. The 1994 Colloquium will be on Race, Class, and Gender in American Society and will be offered by faculty from AAF and Women's Studies. Last year the Colloquium was on Poverty in the United States. These are just two examples, in addition to the courses offered by individual faculty.

The Women's Studies Program has long provided leadership in expanding campus course offerings in terms of diversity and inclusion. The annual lecture series, film series, the Conference on Gays in the Military, etc. are a few of its activities.

The staff in the Office of Student Life and the Women's Center offer courses in various colleges, direct student internships, and offer programs related to the academic sector of the University.

The Program for Talent Development offers academic advising, tutoring, and a program of summer courses designed for incoming students who are academically disadvantaged.

Individual courses in various departments across campus meet the goals of expanding the canon in many subjects and making students aware of their own biases and the concept of "Otherness," among other cultural issues. A committee in the Department of Education at URI compiled an extensive list of such courses now being offered.

Extra-curricular Programs

1. Enforcement of alcohol policy:
   A. Approximately 300 citations per semester are given with
formal judicial action and monetary fines imposed. 

B. The fines (approximately $7,000/semester) are used for alternative weekend program grants, educational prog., and facilitators for alcohol education groups. 

C. Twenty students per semester referred to mandatory 5-hour education groups. 

2. Greek houses are required to sponsor alcohol education workshops as well as health education workshops. 

3. C.A.R.E. (Committee Against Rape and Exploitation) trains 15-120 students per year to do workshops for students. 

4. The Women’s Center staff do workshops on sexual harassment and assault in classes and living units. 

5. A mock date rape trial presentation with an educational panel is presented every 2-3 years. Fraternities and Sororities are often mandated to attend. In addition, a theater piece on date rape is presented every 2-3 years. 

6. The Office of Student Life presents workshops in classrooms on sexual and racial harassment. 

7. There is an annual celebration of diversity. 

8. The Students Organized Against Racism (SOAR) has offered lecture series by faculty on different issues. 

9. The University presents two Chautauquas on diversity. One focuses on Native Americans and one on People of Color. 

10. Women’s Center presents self-defense lectures, demos, and classes. 

11. African-American History month activities are programmed. Latino Awareness Month activities are programmed. Women’s History Month activities are programmed. 

12. Tapestry of Voices, a summer multi-cultural arts festival, is sponsored by many departments on the campus. 

13. Disabled Student Services sponsors symposia, panels, and workshops about ADA, 504, and discrimination based on disability. The National Theater for the Deaf performances occur every 2-3 years on campus. A Mentor program is in place for students with disabilities. 

14. The Office of Student Life offers human relations education and training for students, staff, and faculty, as well as dialogue groups for students. 

15. During orientation, programs on relationships, diversity, date rape, and alcohol/drug abuse are now mandatory for new
instructor if there were any students of color in their fraternities and sororities, the answer was "no." One student said (and others agreed) that if minority students wanted to belong to Greek houses, they could start their own. After all, they have Uhuru Sasa, etc. The professor was reminded of the fact that in the 1950's Jewish students at Brown University were still barred from joining the fraternities. Though Jewish students at Brown opened their own house during that decade, that solution stemming from such blatant anti-Semitism would hardly be acceptable on most campuses today. Why some URI students feel that such a divisive and discriminating solution is acceptable for other minorities in today's world is troubling.

Greek attitudes were also reported to be rampantly hostile to gays. When two gay students were asked if they ever go to the Greek activities, they laughed and asked, "Are you crazy?" They said that they stay as far away from Greeks as possible. A speaker from the Rhode Island Gay and Lesbian Task Force, who was invited to campus last year to discuss gay issues, spoke of his own experiences as a member of a fraternity at URI: he remembers voting with the rest of his fraternity to banish a brother whom they just learned was gay. The speaker shared his feelings about his participation in that shameful incident and about how he dated and worked hard to show he was one of the guys. He said that the spirit of fraternity life for him and other gay members who are hiding reinforces feelings of isolation and depression.

The Greek system, by its nature, is incompatible with the mission of higher (or any) education. Despite widespread criticism of its codes and conduct, despite parents' concerns and criticisms at orientations and at other meetings, the national organizations have refused to change enough to educate its members better or demand higher standards of conduct from its members. And our campus has had no more success despite an excellent staff and extensive resources used toward that end. As a public university, we have to go on record to state that the Greeks' class system of white, male dominance, control, and intimidation is unacceptable. And no excuses or rationalizations based on individuals' promises of reform can change a system that is inherently divisive and destructive—a system that supports and perpetuates the values that have always been violations of human rights. The system is founded on corrupt assumptions and codes. As long as the Greek system exists on our campus, we—as administrators, faculty, and staff—tell the students that we condone what the Greek system stands for and what it does to denigrate human beings. That kind of hypocrisy and insensitivity to the needs and feelings of our student population should not continue.

CAMPUS SECURITY

Campus security has been another serious part of the climate that has created insecurity and fear among various groups of students. The problem was considered to be so serious that
President Carothers hired a new Director of Campus Security in order to make substantive changes which seem to be making a difference. However, it will take time to reverse student distrust and make students feel that the police will protect them when they need help. Reports from both white and black students indicate that some members of the campus police have been responsible for racist remarks, differentiated treatment of blacks and whites, and even harassment of black students. Example: A black student went into the Police Station to speak to an officer who was overheard to say that he didn’t want to speak to that "nigger." Example: Some students reported that a black student was stopped in his car over and over just for driving on the campus "because he was black." Students reported that the police have treated minorities differently from the way they have responded to white students. Some students noted that staying in groups was a kind of protection for minorities who feel unsafe because of their small numbers, the hostility of the majority, and what the minority students perceive as prejudice among many police.

Some women also feel less protected by the police. One has to question the significance of the fact that only 2 rapes were reported in 1990 and no rapes were reported to the campus police in 1991 and up to 7/92 (See Appendix ). Yet, according to the Sexual Harassment Subcommittee Annual Report, 9 rapes were reported to other official sources between June, 1990, and May, 1991; that approximate number has been reported each year since, with 11 rapes reported unofficially this year. It was noted that perhaps some of the reason that women don’t go to the police is that they are not encouraged to by ORL, Student Life, etc. This issue needs examination. While new police policies have been implemented regarding sexual assault, women’s feelings of being unprotected are still widespread. This is especially so with regard to fraternity parties: women mentioned that since the officers are paid by fraternities to provide security, the officers are more concerned about protecting their "meal ticket" than protecting the women. The fact that there are "After Party Parties" is also indication to some students that the campus police are in collusion with the fraternities, and this feeling intensifies women’s distrust and fear.

If you can’t go to the campus police for help, where can you get certain protection, students in racial, cultural, and sexual minorities ask. Gay and lesbian students interviewed have little confidence that the police can--or would--keep them from being harmed on campus. Thus, many women and minorities, responding to a history of institutional indifference, experience fear and insecurity on our campus.

The "Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act" (Appendix G1-G4), which was distributed in 1992-93, is a valuable document for all members of the campus. If the campus community becomes familiar with this document, students may come to realize
students.

16. The Committee to Eliminate Heterosexism and Homophobia provides programs, brochures, and other literature, and lobbies for safety and other equal rights.

17. Judicial action is taken against those who harass, abuse, or assault others. Sanctions may range from "no contact," to mandatory education on the topic, to dismissal.

18. "Women's Center" and "Rapport" are newsletters containing resources for women and multicultural students/staff.

19. Student groups dealing with these issues include: POWER (People Organized for Women's Equality and Rights), URISSC (URI Students for Social Change), SOAR, LASA (Latin American Student Association), NASA (Native American Student Assoc.), Uhuru Sasa (the African American Association).

20. Policy for reporting and reviewing sexual harassment cases is currently under review.

21. Campus Escort service is in place so students will not have to walk alone at night.

22. A number of audio and video resources are available in the Office of Student Life.

CONCLUSIONS

If we, as faculty, administrators, and staff, are to bring out the best from our students and ourselves, we had better rethink our views and assumptions about the world and our campus. We should start by demanding more and having the highest standards for our students and ourselves so that we can all have more self-respect. We should prove that our priorities are changed by taking the money earmarked for sports scholarships and offering those grants for academics. We should begin to listen to what our students have to say about their lives and experiences, and we should let them know that when they are on our campus we will do everything we can to protect them from the dangers and intolerance that have become prevalent in our society. We should make it clear from Orientation to their graduation that we will not allow disrespect or abuse of anyone on campus, that we expect those standards from the students who attend URI, and that the person who breaks the rules will suffer severe consequences. We should require that each student take courses on gender, culture, and class issues in order to teach everyone how to see from other people's point of view. And we should abolish the Greek system which is, itself, a discriminatory one that frustrates all attempts at reform and that now has too much control over the social and interpersonal climate and values of the entire campus. And we should reassess
a market-driven admissions policy if we want to reach and maintain the standards that we say we want. We should, in effect, take a long, painful look at ourselves in order to understand how we affect the undergraduate experience on this campus.

We also have to admit that though faculty should be role models for attitudes and behavior, we are not the center of student life on campus; rather, their world of dorms and fraternities and down-the-line living, of alcohol and jobs and families in strife, of intolerance and rejection, often makes life for our students a time of anxiety, grief, depression, and longing for what they dreamed college would be. While many students love college life, many others find the undergraduate experience an unpleasant one that may affect their memories of this institution for the rest of their lives. We can do better.

RECOMMENDATIONS

#1: The Commission on the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) should be a permanent committee of the Faculty Senate. Each year CUE should study one issue in depth, should conduct surveys and collect data related to that issue, and should keep files up to date as more topics are covered.

#2: As numerous other reports have suggested over the last few years, one administrator with a faculty committee should be in charge of designing a data base and collecting data and reports each year so that an historical context can be determined and information will be kept up to date in one central repository on all social and academic issues. This data base will save enormous energy and time for each committee and researcher in the future.

#3: The Greek system should be discontinued at URI.

- President Carothers should constitute a committee immediately to study the feasibility and time frame within which this can be accomplished. Gradual phasing out with a target date of 1998 for total disbanding of the system should be encouraged.

- Because of the heavy financial investment by the national fraternities and sororities and because of the state burden involved in this enterprise, the Governor, Board of Governors, and the Commissioner for Higher Education should be apprised of the situation on campus and should be encouraged to work with the President to make this possible.

- The lands and buildings now occupied by fraternities and sororities should be converted gradually into offices, dorms, meeting centers, coffee houses, etc.
- In the meantime, stricter policies and enforcement, closer monitoring, hiring of mature house people (by the national organizations) who will be held responsible for infractions of the rules, and so on, should be implemented immediately.

- The URI plan and its implementation could be a model for campuses across the country that are held hostage by financial exigencies and that lack the political and moral courage to end a system that is long out of date.

#4: A committee of the Faculty Senate should begin immediately to study making a statement of commitment, along the lines of the University of South Carolina's "Carolinian's Creed" which is included as Appendix H, a requirement for matriculation at URI.

#5: A long-term study should be undertaken to determine, if possible, whether and how much prejudice and attitudes of intolerance can be changed by the college experience.

#6: Recommendations of previous reports like "The 1987-88 Alcohol Task Force: Report #1," Talent Development suggestions regarding racism, reports on women's issues and harassment, and so on, should be centralized, studied, and implemented, when appropriate. CUE might be mandated to collect this material.

Respectfully,

Prof. Lois A. Cuddy, Chair
Prof. Judith Anderson
Prof. Stephen Grubman-Black
Prof. Chet Hickox
Dean Jean Miller
Ms. Lori Andreozzi, Student Consultant

Note: Three members of the Commission disagree with some of the recommendations and therefore have not signed this Report.
### Complainants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Other (URI related)</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accused:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>Other (URI related)</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nature of Harassment/Assault Incident:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Harassment/Assault Incident</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted Physical contact</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal (including phone call)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal (w. physical assault)</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display of Offensive Material</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted Sexual Advances</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyeurism</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene Behavior</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sex</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of Sexual Assault Incidents Only:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No action requested at time of report</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Action/Judicial Board</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil/Criminal Court (including grand jury)</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint dropped</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where Incident Occurred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on-campus Residential Unit</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls to Residence</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Building</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Department</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Building</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus (outside, unnamed build.)</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Site</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Publication (e.g. student newspaper)</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolution of Cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action Requested by Complainant</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., advice only; filed for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possible future action; etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved Informally</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., meeting with accused with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complainant; apology; educational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshop; etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved Formally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral/Written Reprimand</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Faculty/Staff only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Judicial Action</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Students only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil/criminal Court</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including grand jury)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Dropped</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(by victim, police or Attorney General's Office)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The academic community is alarmed by reports of intergroup tension at many colleges, including those long committed to equal opportunity. Unfortunately, educators have failed to reassess some recent policies and practices that, far from promoting tolerance and fairness, are undermining them. Worse yet, many have seized upon incidents of conflict to call for the extension of these policies and practices. They include:

- A willingness to admit students widely disparate in their level of preparation in order to make the campus demographically representative
- Preferential hiring for faculty and staff positions determined by race, ethnicity, and gender
- Racially or ethnically exclusive financial aid and academic counseling programs, as well as special administrators, ombudsmen, and resource centers assigned to serve as the putative representatives of selected student groups
- Punitive codes restricting "insensitive" speech
- Mandatory "sensitivity training" for incoming freshmen and sometimes for all students, faculty, and staff
- Requirements that students take tendentious courses dealing with groups regarded as victimized
- A failure to enforce campus rules when violated by those promoting these policies or other "politically correct" causes

The National Association of Scholars believes that these policies and practices involve either the application of a double standard or the repudiation of appropriate intellectual criteria. Consequently, they undercut the academy’s special sense of common purpose and prompt divisive calculations of group interest. Specifically, we believe that:

The admission of seriously underprepared students creates unrealistic expectations and frequently leads to frustration and resentment. Moreover, policies that target specific minority groups unfairly stigmatize all students in such groups, reinforcing negative stereotypes.

Two-track hiring threatens to produce a two-tiered faculty instead of a genuinely integrated one. While such hiring may well create "role models," they will be the wrong kind, encouraging the belief that it is the assertion of group power instead of the pursuit of individual achievement that reaps the most abundant rewards.

Disadvantaged students deserve ample assistance, yet disadvantage need not coincide with race or ethnicity. Those excluded are often frustrated by seeing individuals who may be no worse off than themselves receiving special treatment solely because of ancestry. Furthermore, bureaucracies created to serve or champion particular groups tend to have vested interests in emphasizing differences, fostering complaints, and maintaining the separation of those groups.

Safeguarding intellectual freedom is of critical importance to the academy. Thus, it is deeply disturbing to see
the concept of "discriminatory harassment" stretched to cover the expression of unapproved thoughts about selected groups or criticism of policies assumed to benefit them. Higher education should prepare students to grapple with contrary or unpleasant ideas, not shield them from their content. What is more, if a highly permissive attitude toward the excoriation of the "privileged" accompanies the censorship of critical views about other groups, a backlash is predictable.

Tolerance is a core value of academic life, as is civility. College authorities should ensure that these values prevail. But tolerance involves a willingness, not to suppress, but to allow divergent opinions. Thus, "sensitivity training" programs designed to cultivate "correct thought" about complicated normative, social, and political issues do not teach tolerance but impose orthodoxy. And when these programs favor manipulative psychological techniques over honest discussion, they also undermine the intellectual purposes of higher education and anger those subjected to them.

If entire programs of study or required courses relentlessly pursue issues of "race, gender, and class" in preference to all other approaches to assessing the human condition, one can expect the increasing division of the campus along similar lines.

The discriminatory enforcement of campus regulations can only sap the legitimacy of academic authority and create a pervasive sense of mistrust. Indeed, should students feel that repeated violations not only go unpunished, but are actually appeased, the reckless may be tempted to take matters into their own hands. The final stage of discredit will be reached when students and faculty see in such appeasement attempts by administrators to justify their own programs of campus "reform."

The policies just described are generally well-intentioned. Nonetheless, if the goal were deliberately to aggravate campus tensions, the same policies might well be adopted. On the premise that the fair treatment of individuals can do as much to correct the current situation as the doctrine of collective guilt has done to create it, the National Association of Scholars urges the following:

♦ admitting inadequately prepared students only when realistic provision can be made for remediation
♦ maintaining nondiscriminatory hiring policies
♦ eliminating all forms of institutional segregation and preferential treatment determined by race and ethnicity, together with administrative positions that foster ethnic dissension
♦ protecting the expression of diverse opinion
♦ avoiding programs that attempt to impose "politically correct" thinking
♦ adding or retaining ethnic or gender studies courses only when they have genuine scholarly content and are not vehicles for political harangue or recruitment
♦ enforcing campus rules, even with respect to those who feel they are violating them in a good cause

The National Association of Scholars believes that the surest way to achieve educational opportunity for all and maintain a genuine sense of academic community is to evaluate each individual on the basis of personal achievement and promise. It is only as individuals united in the pursuit of knowledge that we can realize the ideal of a common intellectual life.

For copies of this or other NAS statements, or for additional information about the National Association of Scholars and its activities, including its fellows program, research center, speakers bureau, search service, newsletter, state and regional affiliates, conferences, local events, and the quarterly Academic Questions, write to the National Association of Scholars, 575 Ewing Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, or call 609-683-7878.

For Reasoned Scholarship in a Free Society
Dear University Member,

Thank you for requesting a Safe Zone sticker and showing your support for lesbians, gays and bisexuals at the University. The intended message of the symbol is that the person displaying this symbol is one who will be non-judgmental, understanding and trustworthy should anyone need help, advice, or just someone to talk to.

The pink triangle was used by the Nazis to label gay men and the black triangle was used to label lesbians (and others deemed antisocial). These symbols have been adopted as a symbol of gay and lesbian identity and self-esteem. The green circle, the opposite of the familiar red circle with a slash, signifies that it is okay for these issues to be discussed in the area where the symbol is displayed.

Please let us know the kind of responses you get to the sticker, positive and negative. We are particularly concerned with stickers being defaced or removed. Your feedback is welcomed, and can be sent to the Committee to Eliminate Heterosexism and Homophobia, c/o Affirmative Action Office, 80 Lower College Road.

Again, thanks for your support as we try to make this campus a welcoming place for all members of the University community.

Sincerely,

Committee to Eliminate Heterosexism and Homophobia
A VISION OF OUR CAMPUS COMMUNITY

RESPECTING DIVERSITY OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION

1. All policy statements of the University would include sexual preference as a non-discriminatory class.

2. Language of announcements and other public documents mentioning couples and families would use terminology that was inclusive, i.e. partners, co-habitants, parents as opposed to mother, husband.

3. Same sex couples and families and non-married heterosexual partners would receive the same benefits as heterosexual couples and families, i.e. health care, memberships in gym, etc.

4. University members would support state legislation to eliminate discrimination against lesbian, gay and bisexual individuals.

5. An on-going series of programs on lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues would be publicized throughout the state to show active support.

6. Education positively reflecting diversity would be an emphasis across the curriculum. Course content would include the lifestyles, concerns and contributions of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people whenever applicable.

7. Lesbian and gay groups would receive funding and recognition at the same level as other groups of similar purpose, i.e. gay, lesbian and bisexual organizations, gay fraternity, if desired, etc.

8. Campus entertainment would include programming of openly gay speakers, musicians, comedians and others of value to the university community.

9. Women or men holding hands, walking with an arm around each other, or otherwise showing affectionate regard for each other would be just as ordinary and acceptable as it is now for heterosexual couples on campus.

10. Just as a person is not identified as being heterosexual, no individual would be identified as lesbian, gay or bisexual in an article or written material unless that information was pertinent to the purpose of the writing and such identification was agree to by the individual.

11. Freshman orientation would include information on lesbian, gay, and bisexual groups and activities as well as those for other minorities. This information would be embedded in all material printed or reported on campus to assure the normalness of these endeavors as a part of any campus community.

   Non-discriminatory policies would be emphasized at the point in orientation when all other issues of law and order are discussed (drinking on campus, rape issues, etc.)

12. Any discriminatory behavior on campus including harassment would be vigorously addressed.

COMMITTEE TO ELIMINATE HOMOPHOBIA AND HETEROSEXISM
Homophobia

is the irrational fear of homosexuality and the hatred, disgust, and prejudice that fear brings. Oppression of lesbians and gay men, as well as bisexual women and men, is based on homophobia.

Heterosexism

is homophobia that has been institutionalized. The assumption that being heterosexual is inherently better or more moral than being lesbian, gay, or bisexual is, like racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression, based on false assumptions.

Heterosexism awards power to members of the dominant group (heterosexuals) and denies privilege to members of the subordinate group (lesbians, gay men, and bisexual women and men).

Homophobia and heterosexism

clearly oppress lesbians, gay men, and bisexual individuals through acts of verbal and physical harassment and collective actions which result in invisibility, invalidation, and discrimination.

But homophobia and heterosexism also hurt heterosexuals by helping maintain rigid definitions of "appropriate" sex-role behavior and gender relationships. In the same way that racism is a white person's problem and sexism is a man's problem, homophobia and heterosexism are a heterosexual's problem.

University of Rhode Island
Anti-discrimination policy:

"The University of Rhode Island prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, age, color, creed, national origin, handicap, or sexual orientation, and discrimination against disabled and Vietnam era veterans in the recruitment, admission or treatment of students; the recruitment, hiring or treatment of faculty and staff; and the operation of its activities and programs."

The Committee to Eliminate Homophobia and Heterosexism was formed in 1991.

This group of students, staff and faculty, of all sexual orientations, are working together to address the concerns of lesbian, gay and bisexual people at the University.

Everyone is welcome and encouraged to attend the meetings of this group.

For more information contact:

Diane Goodman, Coordinator of Human Relations Education, 792-2101 or

Wally Sillanpoa, faculty, Department of Languages, 792-4705.

The Committee thanks Gwenneth Rae for her time and energy preparing this brochure.

AFFIRMS

President Carothers
STATEMENT,

"Our goal within this community, however, is not merely to avoid discrimination.

Rather, it is our goal to respect the dignity of each individual and to affirm the right of each member of this community to lead his or her life free of fear or harassment.

Sexual differences, like other differences, are important aspects of URI's rich cultural heritage."

(Memorandum, March 2, 1992)
U. of R.I. promises 'safe zone' for gays

KINGSTON, R.I.—"Safe Zone" stickers (below) are appearing on doors and desks at the University of Rhode Island's campus here to let gays and bisexuals know they are safe and welcome.

The stickers bear the pink and black triangles that have become symbols for the gay-rights movement. The sticker campaign was organized by the university's Committee to Eliminate Homophobia and Heterosexism.

Diana Goodman, interim head of URI's affirmative-action office and a member of the panel, said that displaying the sticker signifies that a person "will be non-judgmental, understanding, and trustworthy" towards gays and bisexuals. She added that the campaign is a response to "a sense of gay invisibility" on the campus.
TO: The Committee to Eliminate Homophobia and Heterosexism
FROM: Dr. George deLodzia, Management Department
DATE: April 5, 1993
SUBJECT: Your Memo to "Eliminate"

Many colleagues on campus recommended I not write this letter for fear of retaliation. Their fear attests to the reputation many of you "divisive" folks have intimidated. I will never forget the verbal and physical castigation a handful of us received during the ROTC debate in the Senate. Reasoning with you is out of the question.

I was particularly disgusted at your recent memo calling for "elimination of ..." The last time I heard this threat was in Europe during World War II when another self-appointed cell was "eliminating" ideas, children, religious opponents, Jews, and countries. The first step of most reactionary groups like yours is to attack, label, then disrupt. Your group-thinking has put you outside of the basic mission of a university.

I abhor any radical movement, right or left that seeks to impose "right thinking" on anyone. You and others have hyped this gay and diversity issue to such an extent that your threats have diverted attention from other critical problems facing the campus, and, the education of students in the new economy. Why not show evidence of wrong doing to gays and lesbians, individually and as a group to the proper judicial channels? Your rantings might be totally acceptable at a private university such as Brown or Brandeis where there is enough fat in the budget to accommodate the idleness of professors and students. Our students are not so lucky. Many of our students work; most have parents who can barely afford to send them to learn the skills and competencies to critically think and survive in a troubled market place.
I don't think the legislature, the governor and URI parents are prepared to fund the use of the state supported Affirmative Action office for the advancement of special interest groups that want to "eliminate" free speech and beliefs on campus. We are in the business of equal opportunity education at URI not social activism. Hence, I suggest you conduct your personal business outside of the official university channels and state supported offices. Governor Sundlum's message on ethics applies here. Reimburse the university for the time you spend and the office space, mail, and phones you are misusing for other than official business. Don't bother those of us who are educating students.
Damage to stickers violates Safe Zones

By Rob Borkowski
Assistant News Editor

Sometime between Sunday and Monday the gay and lesbian Safe Zone stickers posted at 10 offices in Independence Hall were defaced, causing faculty and staff to cry out in protest.

According to English Professor John Leo, the stickers were put up by the Committee Against Heterosexism and Homophobia to promote an atmosphere where a person could talk about gay and lesbian issues without being worried about harassment.

The logos on the stickers featured a pink triangle, the same symbol used by Hitler in World War Two in order to identify and imprison homosexuals. Between 60,000 and 600,000 homosexuals were rounded up and put in concentration camps under this symbol, which is now being used to symbolize safety instead of persecution.

Leo said that the defacing of the stickers is a frontal assault on the whole idea of teaching, study and tolerance of different sexual orientations. “Students and faculty in my department are pissed off that the Neanderthals at this university have jeopardized it (the program),” he said.

Leo compared the attitude towards gays at Brown to the atmosphere at URI. “The student body at Brown has become more progressive in their understanding of homosexuals than students at URI,” he said. He described lectures on homosexual issues that attracted packed crowds of up to 300 people.

Professor of English Louise Cuddy said that large numbers of people don’t show up to conferences on homosexual issues because of fear. Heterosexuals are afraid that they will be branded as homosexuals and be harassed. Homosexuals are afraid of the same thing. “They don’t want anyone to know, because then their life would be hell.” The situation, says Cuddy, is one in which the homosexual community is so afraid of becoming targets that they are not even aware of each others a group. Many homosexuals, says Cuddy, would rather hide and pretend that they are heterosexual than take the chance of reaching out to someone.

Mary Capello, an English professor whose office was de-stickered, said that she would rather have someone talk to her about removing the stickers than have them rip them off. She was not surprised, however. “Frankly I think that its’ somewhat expected. I think a worse reaction could have occurred,” she said.

Leo posed a question to the university regarding the issue. “What kind of university do you want? One where a bunch of fly-by-night marauding assholes go through a department defacing a logo that says its OK to be different, or do they want a university where difference is an occasion for pleasure; whether in classrooms, social life, or at work?”
STUDENT RIGHT TO KNOW AND CAMPUS SECURITY ACT

"TOGETHER WE CAN MAKE OUR CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY SAFER."

INTRODUCTION

At the University of Rhode Island, the safety and well being of our students, faculty, and staff is vitally important. With the support of several University departments we have numerous people involved in keeping this campus safe and secure.

However, a truly safe campus can only be achieved through the cooperation of all students, faculty, and staff. This publication is a part of our effort to ensure that this collaborative endeavor is effective. We hope that you will read it carefully and use the information to help foster a safe environment for yourself and others on the University campus.

1. CAMPUS SECURITY

   Kingston Campus - The main campus has a fully empowered police department, and each campus police officer is a graduate of the Rhode Island Municipal Police Academy. The Department calls upon the State Police and South Kingstown Police to assist as needed. All crimes on the Kingston Campus should be reported directly to the Campus Police at 792-2121. This office is staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

   In addition to the Campus Police, there is an evening security force in the Residential Life area. These individuals are responsible for the overall security of the residence halls. They do not have any arrest or detention powers. All crimes in the Residential Life area should be reported to the Campus Police at 792-2121.

   Narragansett Bay Campus - The Narragansett Bay Campus has a security department consisting of public property patrolpersons who have the responsibility to patrol and maintain the building security on the campus. The Narragansett Police Department is the local jurisdiction responsible for investigating crimes on the campus. All crimes should be reported to the Campus Security Department who will notify the Narragansett Police. The Security Department number is 792-6262. This office is staffed 24 hours.

   College of Continuing Education - Providence Campus - The security at the CCE Campus is handled by an outside contractor who is responsible for the building and parking lot. All crimes on this campus must be reported to the Providence Police who do all investigations. The police number is 272-1111.

   W. Alton Jones Campus - West Greenwich - The campus has one public property patrolperson that works various shifts as required. All crimes must be reported to the West Greenwich Police Department at 397-7191. All crimes should also be reported directly to the management staff on the campus.

2. ACCESS TO FACILITIES (ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE)

   In general, all administrative offices are locked between the hours of 4:30 p.m. and 8:30 a.m. Since the normal operating hours are 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., these buildings are monitored by building checkers and/or the police who make rounds to ensure that the buildings are secured.

   Time of year and individual building usage dictates the security in the academic buildings. These buildings are secured during non-use hours by the building checkers; however, special consideration is given to individuals who have a need to be in a building performing research or other University work.
3. **ACCESS TO RESIDENCE HALLS**

Each residence hall is staffed with a hall coordinator, an evening security staff member, and several residence assistants. All residence halls have front door key access only, from 8:00 p.m. to 7:30 a.m.

4. **CRIME STATISTICS**

The following statistics (crime) are those reported to the Campus Police. Judicial statistics are the result of both Campus Police reports and community member complaints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kingston Campus</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>8/91-7/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Arrests, As Follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Law Violations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse Violations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Possession</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narragansett Bay Campus: No crimes reported for period shown.

W Alton Jones Campus: No crimes reported for period shown.

College of Continuing Education: One motor vehicle theft 8/91-7/92.

No other crimes reported for periods shown.

5. **JUDICIAL STATISTICS - 1991-92 Academic Year**

This chart does not include: incidents investigated with no charges resulting, charges dropped, informal action (letters of reprimand). Last year's statistics are in parenthesis for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Integrity Cases (AA/AH/UBSC)</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic infractions reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not all academic cases are reported to Student Life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Academic Allegations (may include more than one allegation per case)</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related to People and Property</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50(61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, misuse, theft of other's property</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfering with functioning of University or staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal or written or physical harassment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse/assault</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial or religious harassment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangering oneself or others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging violations of community standards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Victimless"

Failure to provide correct information/identification to staff 27 29 56 (56)
Failure to meet with University staff 23 43 66 (45)
Failure to comply with instructions of staff 19 25 44 (42)
Failure to comply with judicial sanctions 4 2 6 (5)
Trespass/unauthorized occupancy 9 3 12 (9)
Failure to vacate during fire alarm 6 3 9 (4)
Possession or use of fireworks/explosives 1 8 9 (21)
Improperly registered social events 13 13 26 (44)
"Penning" (preventing exit) 0 1 1 (1)
Computer Misuse 0 2 2 (0)
Failure to preserve documents 1 2 3 (0)

Residence Hall policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallway athletics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>144 (128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash, condition of room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire safety</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room furnishings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence on roof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related to Alcohol and Other Drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possession/use of marijuana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage or public consumption/possession of alcohol</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>667 (220*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of a keg or beer ball</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging, serving, allowing underage consumption</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol event violations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total "simple" alcohol violations (incident had only one violation, that of a single alcohol policy): 485 (70*)

Total "compound" alcohol violations (besides the alcohol violation, incident included other violations of community standards): 85 (155)

Case Disposition: Individual students' sanctions may include more than one of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 day deferral</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78 (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence probation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>142 (199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal from residence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation of residence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary censure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary probation (includes citations)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>623 (37*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, education, counseling</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72 (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass or limited dorm access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restitution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other: apologies, written assignments, no contact, meetings with staff, etc.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine (formal cases)</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social suspension (Greek Chapter)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter probation (Greek Chapter)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade sanction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that last year's statistics do not include citations.

The above crime and judicial statistics indicate reported offenses only.

6. **OFF-CAMPUS JURISDICTION**

   Off-campus student events and residences are, in general, not under the jurisdiction of the University. Exceptions to this policy are outlined in Section 31 of the Student Handbook.

7. **ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG POLICIES**

   Policies on possession, use, and sale of alcohol or illegal drugs, and the enforcement of underage drinking, controlled substance laws, and a description of alcohol and drug abuse education programs provided by the institution are found in the University's Drug and Alcohol Free Campus Statement distributed to the University community annually.

4. **STUDENT PROGRAMS**

   The Campus Escort Service (Kingston Campus only) (792-RIDE) Operates daily from 5 p.m. to 1 a.m.

   Campus Emergency Phone (Kingston Campus only) - Throughout the campus are several emergency telephones providing immediate access to the Campus Police.

   Lighting/Landscaping - The University reviews lighting and landscaping on a regular basis. If you see an area that needs improvement, call the Campus Police at 792-2121.

9. **STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY**

   "Together we can make our campus community safer"

   1. Use the escort service.
   2. Immediately report all crime to the Campus Police, your residence hall director, evening security staff, or RA.
   3. Never prop open an exterior residence hall door.
   4. Lock your room even if you're leaving for a short period of time.
   5. Ask visitors to identify themselves before allowing them access to the building or your room.
   6. Carry your keys at all times and never lend them to others.
   7. Park cars in lighted areas and keep them locked at all times. Conceal valuables.
   8. Report suspicious looking individuals to the Campus Police or a staff member.

Dr. Lois Cuddy
Professor
English
Independence Hall
"Joint Faculty Senate-Administration Committee on Equity for Women and Minorities in the Tenure and Promotion Process Report to the Faculty Senate" (January 1992).


Auster, Lawrence. "'America: Multiethnic, Not Multicultural.' Academic Questions: A Publication of the National Association of Scholars. 4:4 (Fall 1991).

Babcock, Judith A. Chair. Task Force on Sexual Assault on Campus. The Rhode Island Commission on Women (April, 1992).


The Carolinian's Creed

The community of scholars at the University of South Carolina is dedicated to personal and academic excellence. Choosing to join the community obligates each member to a code of civilized behavior. As a Carolinian...

this introduction submits that membership in the Carolina Community is not without its obligations. It is assumed or understood that joining is evidence of a subscription to certain ideals and an agreement to strive for the level of achievement and virtue suggested by the following.

I will practice personal and academic integrity.

...a commitment to this ideal is inconsistent with cheating, in classes, in games, or in sports, it should eliminate the practice of plagiarism or borrowing another student's homework, lying, deceit, excuse making, and infidelity or disloyalty in personal relationships.

I will respect the dignity of all persons.

...a commitment to this ideal is inconsistent with behaviors which compromise or demean the dignity of individuals or groups, including hazing, most forms of intimidating, taunting, teasing, baiting, ridiculing, insulting, harassing, and discrimination.

I will respect the rights and property of others.

...a commitment to this ideal is inconsistent with all forms of theft, vandalism, arson, misappropriation, malicious damage to, and desecration or destruction of property. Respect for another's personal rights is inconsistent with any behavior which violates persons' right to move about freely, express themselves appropriately, and to enjoy privacy.

I will discourage bigotry, striving to learn from differences in people, ideas, and opinions;

...a commitment to this ideal pledges affirmative support for equal rights and opportunities for all students regardless of their age, sex, race, religion, disability, ethnic heritage, socioeconomic status, political, social or other affiliation or disaffiliation, affectional preference.

I will demonstrate concern for others, their feelings and their need for conditions which support their work and development.

...a commitment to this ideal is a pledge to be compassionate and considerate, to avoid behaviors which are insensitive, inhospitable, or inciteful, or which unjustly or arbitrarily inhibit another's ability to feel safe or welcomed in their pursuit of appropriate academic goals.

Allegiance to these ideals obligates each student to refrain from and discourage behaviors which threaten the freedom and respect all USC community members deserve.

...this last clause reminds community members that they are not only obliged to avoid these behaviors, but that they also have an affirmative obligation to confront and challenge, and respond to, or report the behaviors whenever or wherever they're encountered.