

UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON SYSTEM

Dona Hamilton Cornell

Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs, University of Houston System

Vice President for Legal Affairs, University of Houston

General Counsel, University of Houston System, University of Houston

May 31, 2019

Zach Greenberg
Foundation for Individual Rights in Education
510 Walnut Street, Suite 1250
Philadelphia, PA 19106

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Re: Your letter dated May 16, 2019

Dear Mr. Greenberg:

Thank you for bringing this important matter to our attention. Please know that the University of Houston (UH) is committed to fostering a culture of inclusion, where individuals of all backgrounds and beliefs can express themselves and where everyone on campus feels safe and a valued part of the University community. UH takes justifiable pride in its history of diversity and inclusion. Our Mission Statement depicts our allegiance to these values, specifically pledging to “anticipate and respond to changing demographics in an increasingly diverse and globally independent world.” The UH Diversity and Inclusion Statement (below) reinforces our continuing support of those standards and is intended to advance dialogue and to facilitate appropriate actions related to issues of diversity at our campus:

The University of Houston embraces diversity and recognizes our responsibility to foster an open, welcoming environment where students, faculty and staff of all backgrounds can collaboratively learn, work and serve. We value the academic, social, and broader community benefits that arise from a diverse campus and are committed to equity, inclusion and accountability. Diversity enriches our university community and is a driving force instrumental to our institutional success and fulfillment of the university’s mission. We commit to engaging in an ongoing dialogue to thoughtfully respond to the changing realities of our increasingly interconnected world. We will continually strive to work together to address the challenges of the future in a way that removes barriers to success and promotes a culture of inclusivity, compassion and mutual respect. The competencies gained through diverse experiences across campus prepare all of our students, staff and faculty to thrive personally and professionally in a global society.

The University expects that individuals engaging in expressive activities, will remember our collective values as members of the UH community, which include respect and civility. As I believe you would agree, the best way to respond to speech that we do not agree with is with more speech. Feeling safe and comfortable to do so is crucial.

The University has developed reasonable time, place and manner restrictions to provide an orderly forum for expressive activities. Those restrictions and requirements are set forth in the University's Freedom of Expression Policy (MAPP 13.01.01, <http://www.uh.edu/af/universityservices/policies/mapp/13/130101.pdf>). The Freedom of Expression Policy allows, *but does not require*, University faculty, staff, students and members of registered student organizations to reserve certain outdoor areas, including Butler Plaza, in advance:

Individuals or groups must request the use of outdoor space through the Conference and Reservation Services Office. Reservations are accepted on a first-come first-served basis. Each outdoor space for any single event can be reserved for a total of three days in any two-week period, but overnight reservation of outdoor space is not allowed. The requesting group or individual seeking to reserve outdoor space pursuant to this section must submit a completed Expressive Activity Description Form ("Form") to the Dean of Students at least seven business days in advance of the proposed expressive activity. [Section IV].

Section V of the Freedom of Expression Policy provides that "The areas marked A, B, C, D, E, and F on the campus map (Addendum A) and provided below are the six (6) outdoor expressive activity areas that may be reserved in advance. These six areas may also be used for expressive activity **without a reservation**; however, an individual or group with a reservation will have exclusive use and priority over other individuals or groups." The area "D" is Butler Plaza. Most groups that are going to set up tables or structures/displays and/or want the reassurance of a reservation when they are going to publicize an expressive activity, utilize the reservation system. A reservation does not preclude another group from engaging in expressive activity such as handing out flyers.

That said, thank you for bringing the Freedom of Expression/Organized Activity Form to our attention. I agree that the third paragraph incorrectly states that a reservation is required in the "five outdoor organized expressive activity areas." That language will be corrected right away.

With regard to the events that you referred to in your letter, based on information provided to me, as you acknowledge, UH police officers were present in Butler Plaza on April 2nd and 3rd, interacted in a positive manner with members of the Coogs for Israel group and stepped in to address an individual who was acting in a disruptive manner. The police officers did subsequently inform the Coogs for Israel group that they could not continue to table in Butler Plaza that day, but it was because another group had a reservation for Butler Plaza and not because anyone had complained about the content of their expressive activity. The Baptist Student Ministry had a reservation for Butler Plaza on April 2nd, 3rd and 4th. In order to help members of the Coogs for Israel group understand the situation and the application of the Freedom of Expression Policy, the officers accompanied the students to the Dean of Students Office.

Associate Dean of Students Kamran Riaz spoke with students in the Coogs for Israel group. He informed them that another group had reserved Butler Plaza, giving the other group the exclusive use of the area. In other words, the Coogs for Israel group could not set up tables in Butler Plaza and conduct that kind of organized expressive activity because the space was already reserved. He reminded them of the process to reserve space and gave them his business card. He did not tell the students that they had to cease their expressive activities because someone opposed their views.

Mr. Zach Greenberg
May 31, 2019
Page 3 of 3

Going forward, we will have a conversation with members of UH police leadership to ensure that the message officers convey in situations where another group has an area reserved for expressive activity is clearly related to the time, place and manner restrictions and not to the content of the expressive activity. We will also correct the language on the Freedom of Expression/Organized Activity Form and review the Freedom of Expression Policy with Student Affairs leadership to ensure that the policy is clearly conveying reasonable time, place and manner restrictions.

Again, thank you for bringing this timely and important matter to our attention. If you want to discuss this further or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dona H. Cornell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Dona" being more prominent.

Dona H. Cornell

cc: Dan Maxwell
Kamran Riz



CHANCELLOR/PRESIDENT'S
OFFICE

19 MAY 22 AM 10: 04

May 16, 2019

President Renu Khator
Office of the President
212 E. Cullen Building
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77204-2018

Sent via U.S. Mail and Electronic Mail (president@uh.edu)

Dear President Khator,

The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to defending liberty, freedom of speech, due process, academic freedom, legal equality, and freedom of conscience on America's college campuses.

FIRE is writing to the University of Houston (UH) to share our concern about the threat to free speech posed by your institution's act of shutting down the Coogs for Israel student group event in Butler Plaza. UH's misapplication of its policy on student free speech violates the group's First Amendment rights. We call upon UH to respect its students' free speech rights by clarifying its free speech policy.

I. FACTS

The following is our understanding of the pertinent facts, based on our discussions with involved students and review of applicable documents and video recordings. We appreciate that you may have additional information to offer and invite you to share it with us.

On the morning of April 2, 2019, UH student organization Coogs for Israel hosted an event on Butler Plaza, an open outdoor space traditionally used for student expression on UH's campus. The event featured a small table, a canvas, and an easel, which the group used to pass out white T-shirts to students who could draw on the shirts. Their goal was to start a dialogue with the campus community about Israel.

UT's Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures (MAPP) 13.01.01(V) governs students' expressive activity in Butler Plaza. Under this policy, Butler Plaza is designated as an area students can use **without a reservation**, although "an individual or group with a reservation will have exclusive use and priority over other individuals or groups."¹ (emphasis added). However, on UH's website, it claims that MAPP 13.01.01(V) designates Butler Plaza as one of five "outdoor free expression areas that **require a reservation**" for expressive activity.² (emphasis added).³

Coogs for Israel did not have a reservation for Butler Plaza that day. Two other student groups were engaged in expressive activity in Butler Plaza at the time, one with a reservation and the other without a reservation. Neither of these groups disrupted each other's activities, as the area was large enough to accommodate all three groups.

At the beginning of the event, two campus police officers approached the Coogs for Israel table and amicably chatted with the students about their event. The officers did not indicate to the students that their activities presented a problem or conflicted with UH policy in any way. The police remained nearby throughout the event, which continued without incident for about two hours.

After two hours, however, members of another student organization, Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP), started talking to Coogs for Israel. After SJP members began yelling at Coogs for Israel members, the officers again approached the table and the SJP students left the area.

Shortly thereafter, the officers asked Coogs for Israel to take down their table, citing the group's lack of a reservation for the space. The event continued for around ten minutes without a table. The officers then directed the group to end the event, asserting that Associate Vice President for Student Affairs Daniel Maxwell received complaints about the group violating UH policy on free expression in Butler Plaza. The officers said they were directed by Associate Dean of Students Kamran Riaz to stop the event because another group had reserved Butler Plaza, and Coogs for Israel did not have a reservation.

According to Coogs for Israel, as the group was being escorted off Butler Plaza, a police officer told the group: "We were getting a lot of calls. I'm almost 100 percent sure that it was the same

¹ UNIV. OF HOUSTON, MANUAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION (rev. Dec. 8, 2015), *available at* <http://www.uh.edu/af/universityservices/policies/mapp/13/130101.pdf>.

² UNIV. OF HOUSTON (2019), FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION POLICY, <https://www.uh.edu/dos/resources/freedom-of-expression>.

³ UNIV. OF HOUSTON (2019), FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION POLICY, <https://www.uh.edu/dos/resources/freedom-of-expression>.

students that were yelling at you guys.” The officers also said they had received calls from students stating that the group made them feel “unsafe.”

After the event, the officers escorted several Coogs for Israel members to meet with Riaz in his office. Riaz explained to the group that they could not table, distribute literature, or conduct any expressive activity in Butler Plaza because they did not have a reservation. The group asked Riaz if he received any complaints about the event, to which he responded that he did not know and that this was the first time he had heard about it.⁴ When the group mentioned that the officers told them that students complained about the group’s event, Riaz responded that he had “no knowledge” of any complaints about the group.⁵ Coogs for Israel later inquired with Maxwell about this issue, and he told the group that he was unaware of any complaints concerning the group.⁶

II. ANALYSIS

A. UH is bound by the First Amendment.

It has long been settled law that the First Amendment is binding on public universities, including the University of Houston. *Healy v. James*, 408 U.S. 169, 180 (1972) (“[T]he precedents of this Court leave no room for the view that, because of the acknowledged need for order, First Amendment protections should apply with less force on college campuses than in the community at large. Quite to the contrary, ‘the vigilant protection of constitutional freedoms is nowhere more vital than in the community of American schools.’”) (internal citation omitted); *see also DeJohn v. Temple Univ.*, 537 F.3d 301, 314 (3d Cir. 2008) (on public campuses, “free speech is of critical importance because it is the lifeblood of academic freedom”); *Pro-Life Cougars v. Univ. of Houston*, 259 F.Supp.2d 575, 582–85 (S.D.Tex. 2003) (applying strict scrutiny to strike down UH policy requiring reservations for expressive activity in Butler Plaza).

B. UH’s erroneous application of MAPP 13.01.01(V) creates an unconstitutionally vague restriction on UH student expression.

Under MAPP 13.01.01(V), Coogs for Israel did not need a reservation to engage in expressive activity in Butler Plaza. However, the UH police officers cited this policy in shutting down

⁴ Audio recording: Coogs for Israel meeting with Associate Dean of Students Kamran Riaz (Apr. 2, 2019) (on file with author).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Letter from StandWithUs Chief Executive Officer Roz Rothstein to UH President Renu Khator and UH Vice President Richard Walker (Apr. 5, 2019) (on file with author).

their event, and Riaz explained to the group that this policy requires groups to have a reservation to hold an event in Butler Plaza. These misapplications of this policy, together with the conflicting online description of this policy, obstruct students' ability to ascertain whether their expression in Butler Plaza will require advance approval. This confusion will have a chilling effect. The potential consequences that await a student who mistakenly believes the less-restrictive policy to apply would cause a reasonably cautious student to rely, instead, on the more restrictive description and enforcement of the policy. These university discrepancies render its free speech policy unconstitutionally vague.

A policy is unconstitutionally vague when it does not "give a person of ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is prohibited, so that he may act accordingly." *Grayned v. City of Rockford*, 408 U.S. 104, 108 (1972). As a federal judge wrote in striking down a university's speech code:

We must assess regulatory language in the real world context in which the persons being regulated will encounter that language. The persons being regulated here are college students, not scholars of First Amendment law.... What path is a college student who faces this regulatory situation most likely to follow? Is she more likely to feel that she should heed the relatively specific proscriptions of the Code that are set forth in words she thinks she understands, or is she more likely to feel that she can engage in conduct that violates those proscriptions (and thus is risky and likely controversial) in the hope that the powers-that-be will agree, after the fact, that the course of action she chose was protected by the First Amendment?

Coll. Republicans v. Reed, 523 F. Supp. 2d 1005 (N.D. Cal. 2007).

Based on UH's application of MAPP 13.01.01(V) to Coogs for Israel, and its erroneous description of the policy on its website, students cannot reasonably ascertain whether a reservation is required to use Butler Plaza for expressive activity. Further, the maintenance of conflicting interpretations of university policy grants administrators the unfettered choice to enforce one or the other at will, introducing the possibility of discriminatory or arbitrary enforcement. *See FCC v. Fox TV Stations, Inc.*, 567 U.S. 239, 253 (2012) (those subject to regulation "should know what is required of them so they may act accordingly," and "precision and guidance are necessary so that those enforcing" regulations "do not act in an arbitrary or discriminatory way").

This confusion was on full display during Coogs for Israel's conversations with campus police officers and Riaz, where the students believed they could use Butler Plaza without a

reservation, only to be told the complete opposite by Riaz. Even if this policy is not intended to restrict expressive activity in this manner, it has a chilling effect on campus expression—an unacceptable result at an institution bound by the First Amendment.

C. UH’s apparent requirement that students register in advance to use Butler Plaza for expressive activity fails strict scrutiny.

If the interpretation of MAPP 13.01.01(V) asserted by Riaz and UH’s website governs expressive activity in Butler Plaza, the reservation requirement cannot survive a strict scrutiny analysis, which a federal court has already determined applies to restrictions on student expression in Butler Plaza. *Pro-Life Cougars*, 259 F.Supp.2d at 582.

According to UH’s website and Riaz, UH designates five open, outdoor areas that can only be used with a reservation from the UH administration.⁷ In order to engage in expressive activity in these areas, students must submit a request to the UH administration at least five business days in advance of the activity.⁸ Students must also receive approval from the Dean of Students Office, which requires the students to submit a completed “Expressive Activity Description Form” to the Dean at least seven business days in advance of the proposed activity.⁹

The requirements that students reserve Butler Plaza at least five days in advance, and submit a completed “Expressive Activity Description Form” to the Dean at least seven business days in advance, violate the First Amendment rights of UH students.

Administrative procedures requiring a speaker to obtain a license, permit, or to register before engaging in expression are highly disfavored under long-established law and difficult to justify. *See N.Y. Times v. United States*, 403 U.S. 713, 714 (1971) (“Any system of prior restraints of expression comes to this Court bearing a heavy presumption against its constitutional validity.”) (internal quotation marks omitted). The First Amendment does not allow—and courts will not uphold—broad permitting schemes that place a significant burden on speech and are not sufficiently tailored to serve an important government interest. The United States District Court Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, has already decided that this standard applies to UH’s Butler Plaza, stating:

This uncontroverted evidence compels the conclusion that both the University, and in particular Butler Plaza, are public fora designated for student speech. . . .

⁷ *Freedom of Expression Policy*, *supra* note 1.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Id.*; *Freedom of Expression Expressive Activity Description Form*, UNIV. OF HOUSTON (2015), https://www.uh.edu/dos/_files/freedom-of-expression-form.pdf.

Any restriction imposed by the University on student expressive activity on Butler Plaza must therefore be analyzed under the strict scrutiny standard as opposed to the reasonableness standard suggested by Defendants.

Pro-Life Cougars, 259 F.Supp.2d at 582.

A federal district court has already declared that UT may not require its students to register in advance to use Butler Plaza for expressive activity. *Pro-Life Cougars*, 259 F.Supp.2d at 283 (striking down UT registration requirement as an unconstitutional prior restraint under the First Amendment); *see also Shaw v. Burke*, No. 2:17-CV-02386-ODW, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7584, at 19-20* (C.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 2018) (striking down university permit requirement for student expression because it “impermissibly restricts speech” and is “not legitimately tied to the government’s interests.”); *Univ. of Cin. Chapter of Young Americans for Liberty v. Williams*, No. 1:12-cv-155, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80967, at *20 (S.D. Ohio June 12, 2012) (declaring that similar policy “violates the First Amendment and cannot stand” and noting that “the mere fact that the notice requirement applies to all student speech raises constitutional concerns”);¹⁰ *Roberts v. Haragan*, 346 F. Supp. 2d 853, 861 (N.D. Tex. 2004) (holding Texas Tech University’s “park areas, sidewalks, streets, or other similar common areas” are public forums for students and university’s requirement that students obtain permission before conducting expressive activities outside designated free speech areas was not narrowly tailored).

Furthermore, courts have consistently invalidated permitting requirements that are not appropriately tailored to an important government interest. In *Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. v. Village of Stratton*, 536 U.S. 150 (2002), the Court struck down a village ordinance prohibiting all door-to-door canvassing without a permit, reasoning that the ordinance was not sufficiently tailored to meet the government’s interests in preventing fraud and crime and protecting privacy. *Id.* at 168–69; *see also Weinberg v. City of Chi.*, 310 F.3d 1029, 1039–40 (7th Cir. 2002) (citing *Watchtower* and finding that permit requirement for peddling on public sidewalk did not further significant government interest). At the same time, the village’s permitting scheme placed a substantial burden on citizens’ First Amendment rights by entirely preventing anonymous and spontaneous speech and by deterring speakers who do not wish to seek a license. *Watchtower*, 536 U.S. at 166–68. As the *Watchtower* Court observed:

¹⁰ In *Williams*, the court rejected the university’s asserted interest in preventing disruption of its operations, stating that “[m]ere speculation that speech would disrupt campus activities is insufficient because ‘undifferentiated fear or apprehension of a disturbance is not enough to overcome the right to freedom of expression on a college campus.’” 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80967, at *19–25 (quoting *Healy*, 408 U.S. at 191).

It is offensive—not only to the values protected by the First Amendment, but to the very notion of a free society—that in the context of everyday public discourse a citizen must first inform the government of her desire to speak to her neighbors and then obtain a permit to do so.

Id. at 165–66.

Moreover, courts will strike down permitting systems “without narrow, objective, and definite standards to guide the licensing authority.” *Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham*, 394 U.S. 147, 151 (1969); *see also City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publ’g Co.*, 486 U.S. 750, 770 (1988) (permit requirements must have clearly delineated standards). The *Shuttlesworth* Court struck down an ordinance requiring a permit for parades and demonstrations where it vested “virtually unbridled” authority on government actors to decide what permits to grant or deny. 394 U.S. at 150; *see also Weinberg*, 310 F.3d at 1045–46 (peddling permit requirement granting unbridled discretions held to be unconstitutional prior restraint).

UH’s practice of restricting expressive activity in Butler Plaza is an unconstitutional prior restraint on speech. Like Texas Tech’s requirement that students obtain permission before conducting expressive activities in the open, outdoors areas of its campus, UH’s imposed restriction is similarly constitutionally deficient, as such a broad restriction on student expression is not narrowly tailored to serve the university’s interests. Like the *Watchtower* ordinance, UH’s restriction prevents students from engaging in spontaneous speech on campus, and as the *Watchtower* court noted, “[t]he mere fact that the [government rule] covers so much speech raises constitutional concerns.” 536 U.S. at 165. Moreover, UH’s restriction contains no “narrow, objective, and definite standards” to guide the Dean of Students in his decision-making authority. *See Shuttlesworth*, 394 U.S. at 150. Instead, it permits students to exercise their First Amendment rights only at the discretion of an administrator possessing broad discretion, not guided by narrow and objective criteria, to authorize or refuse student expression in a designated public forum. The maintenance of this prior restraint violates not only the rights of Coogs for Israel, but all UH students who wish to engage in expressive activity.

III. Conclusion

UH cannot, consistent with its moral and legal obligations under the First Amendment, continue imposing contradictory rules regarding students’ expressive rights. FIRE asks that UH clarify its policy in order to bring it in compliance with the First Amendment and applicable legal precedent. UH must also clarify that will not restrict the ability of Coogs for

Israel or other UH student groups to engage in expressive activities in open, outdoor areas of UH's campus.

We request receipt of a response to this letter by the close of business on May 30, 2019.

Sincerely,



Zach Greenberg
Program Officer, Individual Rights Defense Program

cc:

Kamran Riaz, Associate Dean of Students

Daniel Maxwell, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs