September 22, 1987

Dr. Louise Douce
Counseling and Consultation Services
Fourth Floor, Ohio Union
1739 North High Street
CAMPUS

Dear Louise:

After reviewing the proposal which you and Keith Oliver brought to me last May, I am writing to ask you to convene and chair a planning committee for gay programming at Ohio State. This committee should be able to represent all the constituencies in the gay and lesbian community at the University.

The initial charge to this committee will be to develop a specific proposal for establishing an office of gay and lesbian programming. This proposal should include specification of the mission, the organizational placement and arrangement of an office, and recommendations for staffing, budget, and physical location.

This initial work of this advisory committee should be completed by November 30, 1987, and forwarded to me for review.

In advance let me thank you for your hard work on this matter of concern to our University community.

Sincerely,

Edward H. Jennings

EHJ/dr

cc: Russell J. Spillman
A SAFE SPACE

PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE FOR GAY, LESBIAN AND BISEXUAL PROGRAMMING

Advisory Committee to Dr. Edward Jennings:

Louise Douce, Chair; Acting Director, Counseling and Consultation Services
C. Grey Austin, OSU Ombudsman
Franklin R. Banks, Associate Professor, Preventive Medicine
William H. Hall, Director, Residence and Dining Halls
Richard H. Hollingsworth, Acting Dean of Students
Randy McGee, Student; Gay and Lesbian Alliance
Marianne Neal, Student, College of Law
Keith Oliver, Research Associate, Affirmative Action Grant, Counseling and Consultation Services
Dorothy S. Painter, Academic Advisor, ASC
Mariangeli Santana, Student, Gay and Lesbian Alliance

Consultants:

Sue A. Blanshan, Executive Officer for Human Relations
Barbara M. Newman, Associate Provost, Academic Affairs
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposal:

That an Office of Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual Programming be established at The Ohio State University to provide education, programming and appropriate referral for OSU faculty, staff and students. That this office be administratively housed within the Division of Student Affairs and have clear responsibility, funding, and a safe accessible space for the OSU gay, lesbian and bisexual community. That a parallel referral Advocacy function be established within the Employee Assistant Program for gay, lesbian and bisexual faculty and staff. That a Coordinating Council be established to address OSU policies and procedures impacting this population.

OSU Policy:

OSU is one of 47 universities that specifically bar discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (OSU Operating Manual, Number 1.10, definition of Affirmative Action).

The 1982 establishment of Affirmative Action Grants continue OSU commitment to cultural pluralism. Dr. Jennings' 1982 remarks affirmed OSU's commitment to the 'potential of persons who have not been the beneficiaries of all of society's privileges and opportunities' and 'to fulfill our inherent obligation to do all we can to seek the real goals of equal opportunity for all people.'

OSU currently has no formal or visible mechanism for addressing issues of gay, lesbian and bisexual faculty, staff and students.

The Problem:

Based upon the common estimate that 10% of all people are gay or lesbian, OSU has 6,900 lesbian and gay people: 5400 students, 1100 staff, 400 faculty. This is the second largest minority at OSU.

A large portion of the University community remains ignorant of the occurrence and effects of gay oppression. The political, cultural, and medical events of the past decade have made lesbians, gay men and bisexuals an unpopular minority group.

There is growing evidence that lesbians, gay men and bisexuals are at risk for impaired physical, social and emotional health in an oppressive and often hostile society.

The effects of environmental homophobia (attitudes of prejudice and acts of hostility against gay people) on gay, lesbian and bisexual people is to inhibit their maximum performance on the job and in school and encourage their retreat and attrition to a safer, more affirming place.

Retention and affirmation for more productive careers as faculty, staff and students is the key concept upon which to build the proposed office.
The Documentation:

A 1986-87 Affirmative Action grant funded two studies of the OSU environment. The first was a telephone poll of 200 faculty and 400 students selected at random. The second was an environmental assessment completed by 180 people in the gay, lesbian and bisexual community.

Results of the OSU Poll:

30% of the students and 57% of the faculty knew a gay or lesbian person at OSU. Based on a Homophobic Scale embedded in the questions, 77% of the responding students and 54% of the responding faculty would be classified as homophobic.

55% of the students and 48% of the faculty felt some form of formal support for this population is warranted. Of a given list of possibilities, a permanent office, workshops and programs, speakers and academic classes were the most frequently endorsed choices.

Results of the self-identified survey:

Perception of respondents was that OSU does not promote an environment or promote an attitude of support, safeness, or sensitivity to the gay, lesbian and bisexual community.

Even non-gay people who support and affirm gay lifestyles are reluctant to be openly identified fearing harassment, discrimination and stereotyping.

Research at other Universities:

University of Michigan has had an office for gay, lesbian advocacy since 1971. The University of Pennsylvania recently established one.

University of Massachusetts at Amherst, University of California at Santa Cruz, Yale University and the University of California at Los Angeles have all conducted studies and made recommendations.

The Solution and Specific Recommendations:

A Coordinating Council be established of representatives from the Employee Assistance Program, Office of Human Relations, Counseling and Consultation Services, Residence and Dining Halls and the Office of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Programming. This Council will review issues of OSU policy and procedure and make programming recommendations to the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Office.
An Office of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Programming be established in the Division of Student Life under the Vice Provost of Student Affairs. This office will have specific space, be staffed by a minimum of two people gender balanced, and have a sufficient programming budget.

The scope of the Employee Assistance Program be expanded specifically to respond to and provide referrals for gay, lesbian and bisexual faculty and staff.

**Purpose and Functions of the Office:**

1. Provide referral and advocacy for various gay, lesbian and bisexual specific concerns.

2. Provide gay affirmative programming for the gay, lesbian and bisexual OSU community.

3. Provide education to the OSU community at large.

4. Provide AIDS Education and Prevention programs for the lesbian, gay and bisexual populations.

**Summary:**

To borrow from the Santa Cruz proposal, 'The University must make it clear that sexual diversity is honored as is all other diversity, and that homophobia will not be tolerated; it must institutionalize support services for this population; it must commit itself to continued education of faculty, staff, and students; and it must encourage academic acceptance of diversity in sexual orientation.'
Proposal:

That an Office of Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual Programming be established at The Ohio State University to provide education, programming and appropriate referral for OSU faculty, staff and students. That this office be administratively housed within the Division of Student Affairs and have clear responsibility, funding, and a safe accessible space for the OSU gay, lesbian and bisexual community. That a parallel referral advocacy function be established within the Employee Assistant Program for gay, lesbian and bisexual faculty and staff. That a Coordinating Council be established to address OSU policies and procedures impacting this population.

OSU Policy:

The Ohio State University is to be commended as one of 47 universities that specifically bar discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (based on Campus Voice, August-September 1986). OSU has recognized the legitimacy of gay, lesbian and bisexual lifestyles as demonstrated in the Affirmative Action anti-discrimination policy which includes sexual orientation (OSU Operating Manual, Number 1.10, definition of Affirmative Action). The Affirmative Action policy is implemented by the Office of Human Relations and their focus on affirmative action for all people and celebration of diversity within the OSU community is clear and evident.

OSU's commitment to cultural pluralism has been further demonstrated with the establishment of Affirmative Action Grants in 1982 and the recent proposals for recruitment and retention of minority students. In Dr. Jennings' remark to the Board of Trustees in 1982, he further defined the OSU Affirmative Action Goals to 'develop all of society's human resources to the fullest extent possible', to be concerned with the 'potential of persons who have not been the beneficiaries of all of society's privileges and opportunities' and 'to fulfill our inherent obligation to do all we can to seek the real goals of equal opportunity for all people'.

However, the University currently does not have a formal or visible mechanism to address issues of concern nor to demonstrate support for the gay, lesbian and bisexual population nor to provide an environment which enhances and challenges its non-gay people to examine their values, attitudes, or beliefs. This proposal provides such a formal, visible and accessible mechanism to achieve these goals.

The Problem:

Estimates of how many people are gay or lesbian vary from study to study and opinion to opinion. However, the basic standard is that approximately 10 percent of all people, all cultures, and across history are gay or lesbian. Based upon the Kinsey studies from 1950 to the present it is further estimated that another 40 percent of all people are to some extent bisexual.
Based on this estimate of 10 percent (Kinsey 1953, American Psychological Association Committee on Gay Concerns), OSU has approximately 6,900 gay and lesbian people. This breaks down to 5400 students, 1100 staff, and 400 faculty. The addition of bisexual persons for which no standard percentage is widely accepted makes the target population of this proposal the second largest minority at OSU.

Yet, a large portion of the University community remains ignorant of the occurrence and effects of gay oppression. Racial slurs, ethnic slurs and disparaging religious terms have largely disappeared from the vocabularies of educated people - yet the words 'faggot, queer, and dyke' persist and are even reinforced by many members of the University community. Posters publicizing gay-related events are frequently ripped from campus bulletin boards, and obscene or harassing phone calls to the student Gay and Lesbian Alliance are a daily occurrence. One AIDS joke told by a professor can have a profound impact on gay or lesbian students.

The political, cultural, and medical events of the past decade have made lesbians, gay men and bisexuals an unpopular minority group. A current resurgence of fundamentalist religious activities exhorts the homosexual to repress, alter, or otherwise 'mend' his/her sexuality. The political return to 'family values' has left gays and lesbians largely disenfranchised. The fear of homosexual people resulting from the AIDS epidemic has had a devastating effect on gay men. The psychological and social impact of such repressive and regressive attitudes severely limits the positive productivity and scholarly endeavors of this minority group.

There is a growing evidence that lesbians, gay men and bisexuals are at great risk for impaired physical, social and emotional health in an oppressive and often hostile society. Homosexual persons experience or fear rejection from all directions: friends, parents, roommates, professors, colleagues and even self. Internalization of the norms and values of the non-gay or dominant culture contributes to self-denigration and guilt when the individual realizes his/her sexual orientation (Altman, 1971). Most university students are at a time in their lives when they are recognizing their sexual preference and attempting to deal with that orientation in various ways. Many gay, lesbian and bisexual students attempt to ignore their sexuality, hoping that it will go away. Further, misinformation among gay and lesbian students impedes development of a positive self-concept. Positive role models who could counter these stereotypes are largely invisible in the University community. Few gay and lesbian professors or administrators are willing to risk the social and professional ostracism that often follows acknowledgment of their sexual orientation. Many gay, lesbian and bisexual faculty and staff attempt to fit into the dominant heterosexual culture and live in fear that their orientation will somehow become public knowledge. They fear loss of promotion, ostracism from their colleagues and students, and discrimination in tenure and salary decision.
Dr. George Weinberg, a psychologist and author, is credited with coining the word 'homophobia' in the book *Society and the Healthy Homosexual*. In strictest terms it refers to the intense and debilitating fear of homosexuality. In common terms it refers to an attitude of prejudice and hostility against gay, lesbian and bisexual persons. It can range from silence and feigned ignorance in the face of others' discriminatory practices to outright harassment and violence.

The effects of environmental homophobia on gay, lesbian and bisexual people are to inhibit their maximum performance on the job and in school and encourage their retreat and attrition to a safer and more productive careers as faculty, staff and students is the key concept upon which to build the proposed office.

The Documentation:

A 1986-87 Affirmative Action Grant entitled 'A needs assessment and the development, implementation and evaluation of a program for the academic, personal and social support of gay and lesbian students, faculty and staff' was awarded to the OSU community along with several programming and educational activities. The first study, conducted by the OSU poll, surveyed 400 OSU students and 200 OSU faculty. The 30 survey questions included 10 items assessing the OSU environment and suggestions for formal support and 20 items from the 'Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals'. (refined by Hudson and Ricketts, 1980). The second study was an environmental assessment survey completed by self-identified gay, lesbian, bisexual people and other persons supportive of those lifestyles.

Results of the OSU Poll:

Four hundred students and 200 faculty were randomly surveyed. The first 10 items asked about individual perception and experience concerning gay and lesbian people at OSU. Thirty percent of the students and 57% of the faculty stated that they knew a gay or lesbian person at OSU. Only 15% of the faculty and 11% of the students surveyed felt that the general attitude of people at OSU toward lesbian and gay persons was somewhat positive or positive. When asked if OSU should provide formal support to gay and lesbian people, 45% of the students and 52% of the faculty responded that no formal support was necessary. However, about half of both groups did feel formal support was warranted. Those people were offered a list of possibilities and selected first, second and third choices. A permanent office, workshops and programs, speakers and academic classes were the most frequently endorsed choices.
TABLE I
OSU POLL RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviated Item</th>
<th>% Endorsing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know someone who is gay/lesbian</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think that the general attitude toward gay/lesbian is somewhat positive</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe that no formal support is necessary</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe that formal support is necessary</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First choice for support:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Office</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/programs</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Class</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second choice:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/programs</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Office</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Classes</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Second Choice</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second part of the survey was the Homophobic Scale. Seventy-seven percent of the responding students and 54% of the responding faculty were classified as homophobic on the basis of their responses. Of these, 29.4% or nearly one-third of the students, and 11.4% or a little over one-tenth of the faculty were classified as high grade homophobics. For the purpose of this survey, homophobia is defined as the response of fear, disgust, anger, discomfort and aversion when dealing with gay or lesbian people. Comparative data among other university populations are not available. However, the student response is significantly more homophobic than the University of Hawaii psychology students on which the instrument was developed.
TABLE II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homophobia Scale Scores</th>
<th>% in Category</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homophobic Total</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-grade homophobic</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo-grade homophobic</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Homophobic Total</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-grade non-homophobic</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo-grade non-homophobic</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDENT N = 400
FACULTY N = 200

Survey for self-identified gay, lesbian, bisexual and supportive people:

The survey used was developed by the 1986-87 Affirmative Action Grant recipients, and was targeted toward gay, lesbian, bisexual and supportive faculty, staff and students at The Ohio State University. The information desired from the survey were data about perceptions of the environment and attitudes toward gay, lesbian and bisexual people at OSU.

The survey was designed so that all individuals completing the survey would respond to the demographic questions (questions 1-8) and the next 18 questions (questions 9-26), dealing with: support, safeness, services, sensitivity, and visibility. The next sets of questions were to be completed by specific segments of the University community, i.e. students (questions 27-32), faculty (questions 33-39), staff (questions 40-45), and residence hall students and staff (questions 46-50). Each section addressed issues of support from various facets of the University community that the specific group interacts with. The 'final questions', in Part I of the survey, asked about the individual's awareness concerning The Ohio State University's Affirmative Action anti-discrimination policy, which includes sexual orientation.
TABLE III
SELF-IDENTIFIED SURVEY RESULTS

N = 180

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 1-8:</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions 9-26:</td>
<td>Perceptions concerning the actual environment and the preferred environment on issues of support, safeness, services, sensitivity, and visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS:</td>
<td>A significant difference was found on all questions indicating that the actual environment is less than that which is preferred. Each question requires individual examination beyond this summary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Questions 27-50: | Perception concerning the actual environment and the preferred environment on issues of support for specific populations: 27-32, students; 33-39, faculty; 40-45, staff; 46-50, residence hall students and staff. |
| RESULTS: | A significant difference was found on all questions indicating the actual environment as less than the preferred. Each question requires individual examination beyond this summary. |

| Questions 51-61: | Experience with and awareness of the experience of others. |
| RESULTS: | | Experience | Aware of others Experiencing |
| 51) harassment | 26% | 90% |
| 52) discrimination | 35% | 87% |
| 53) feelings of exclusion from University functions | 58% | 77% |
| 54) feelings that my future may be negatively affected | 55% | 89% |
| 55) feelings of isolation | 53% | 90% |
| 56) feelings of frustration in meeting other people who identify themselves as I do | 50% | 78% |
| 57) positive social opportunities | 68% | 65% |
| 58) support for my lifestyle | 71% | 59% |
| 59) support for me academically/professionally | 70% | 63% |
| 60) the feeling that my lifestyle is recognized as valid | 62% | 52% |
| 61) the feeling that I would like to leave OSU for a more supportive environment | 38% | 72% |
Part II of the survey was subjective, asking the individual to choose three items (minimum) from part one of the survey for which a relatively large discrepancy exists between the actual and preferred environment. The individual was then instructed to indicate the number of the question and to explain what exists or has happened to make the individual feel this way. And finally, respondents were asked to explain what they feel could be done to improve the situation.

One hundred–eighty (180) usable surveys were returned. Results indicate that there is a shared discrepancy between the 'actual' and 'preferred' environment and attitudes at OSU toward gay, lesbian and bisexual people. Analysis of the responses demonstrates that this discrepancy is statistically significant, with the 'actual' environment and attitudes being less positive or supportive than were the 'preferred' environments and attitudes. It is the perception of the respondents that OSU does not provide an environment or promote an attitude of support, safeness, sensitivity, or offer services at an adequate level for the gay, lesbian and bisexual community. Further, the current environment is not one which sufficiently encourages or supports people who are gay, lesbian or bisexual. In addition, it appears that people who identify themselves as both non-gay and gay affirmative are reluctant to become openly identified as such. Fears of harassment, discrimination and loss could account for this phenomenon.

Clearly, the results of both studies indicate that the current OSU environment is one in which gay, lesbian and bisexual people are not accepted, supported or encouraged as individuals or as a group because of their self identity. This overt and covert oppression negatively affects their productivity as students, scholars, researchers and employees. Further, OSU's failure to affirmatively address homophobia fosters an environment where homophobic attitudes and responses are consequently stunted in their personal growth, development and capacity to live effectively in a world of cultural pluralism.

Research at Other Universities:

Concerns about formal University support for this population are being expressed at several universities. The University of Michigan has had an office since 1971. Members of this advisory committee visited that office in December 1986. The University of Pennsylvania and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst have also recently established offices. The University of California at Santa Cruz also studied their environment and submitted a set of recommendations similar to these to their Chancellor. According to the 'Campus Voice' article cited earlier, 47 universities have specific antidiscrimination policies on the basis of sexual orientation, 30 schools have academic curricula in gay and lesbian studies, and 300 have lesbian and gay student organizations.
The Santa Cruz Task Force interviewed faculty, staff and students across the university community. Despite the university's specific policy, they found the atmosphere on campus at best unsupportive and 'in an appalling number of instances, hostile.' Students and staff reported incidents of harassment ranging from disparaging remarks, anonymous notes, and graffiti to destruction of property and physical threats.

Dr. Gregory Herek, a psychology professor at the City University of New York, conducted a study at Yale University in the spring of 1986. Of the 200 gay and lesbian students in his survey, 90, or nearly 50%, of them, reported experiencing some kind of anti-gay harassment. A majority stated they feared for their safety on campus because of the threat of violence.

The Santa Cruz proposal cites a recent study at UCLA by the American Council on Education which found that 52.2% of college freshmen supported laws banning homosexuality.

The University of Massachusetts surveyed student perceptions and anti-gay prejudice. Of the 250 respondents, about half felt anti-lesbian/gay attitudes existed on their campus, about one-fourth said they occasionally hear instructors or staff members making negative remarks or telling jokes that put down lesbians or gays.

This brief summary suggests that The Ohio State University environment may not be more homophobic than other universities around the country, yet the level of negative attitudes, beliefs and behavior is intolerable. All the campuses cited are moving to positively address this climate. The Ohio State University in the spirit of enhancing human potential and celebrating human diversity must also act.

The Solution and Specific Recommendations:

Administrative Structure:

1. We propose some form of structural responsibility at the highest possible level. As the functions will serve faculty, staff and students, we suggest a five person coordinating council composed of a representative from the Employee Assistance Program, the Office of Human Relations (preferably someone involved in Affirmative Action grievances), the Counseling and Consultation Services, Residence and Dining Halls, and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Programming Office.

2. We propose that an office for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Programming be established within the Division of Student Life under the Vice Provost for Student Affairs. This office must carry a guaranteed charter to serve faculty and staff as well as students.
3. We propose that this Office be staffed by at least two people. We recommend a coordinator full-time and a graduate assistant possibly from the Student Personnel Assistant Program. For both initial start-up and continuing operation, a gender balanced team is crucial to meet the goal of serving the entire gay and lesbian population.

At least one full-time professional staff person is vital to effectively serve faculty and staff.

Additional staffing needs could be accomplished with work studies, volunteers, field work and returning students.

4. We propose expanding the scope of the Employee Assistance Program to specifically respond to and provide referrals for gay, lesbian and bisexual faculty and staff.

Space:

1. An actual office space is absolutely necessary for the effective function of this office. This space should be accessible and the entrance should not be through some other public space that would 'spotlight' one's entry to this office.

2. The advisory committee visited one potential space and discussed several others. Renovation of one of the houses on 16th Avenue presently managed by Residence and Dining Halls is recommended. These houses no longer meet building code standards for housing but could easily be renovated to house several campus offices including this one.

Additional Administrative Support:

Several offices and administrative units presently provide some programming and support for the gay, lesbian and bisexual community. The Counseling and Consultation Services provides counseling support groups, gay affirmative therapy and outreach, staff training and consultation. Women's Services provides programming for the full diversity of women student populations and programs focusing on the issues of lesbian women are publicized in the Women's Calendar. Residence and Dining Halls, as part of their Minority Affairs Committee, arrange staff training and have co-sponsored several programs with the Affirmative Action Grant. Women's Studies offers lesbian feminist perspectives in the OSU curriculum winter quarter.

GALA; the Gay and Lesbian Alliance, is an active student organization. They operate a telephone information and referral service, a speaker's bureau and provide programming. They are a very successful student organization with a primary focus on the undergraduate student. The typical age range at their functions is 18-25 years of age. The needs of graduate and professional students are not currently being well met by this organization.
1. We recommend the establishment of a broad based advisory committee to this office, especially in the initial phases. This should be composed of representatives from all segments of the lesbian, gay and bisexual populations as well as representatives from offices presently providing services. Some focus on educating the non-gay community should also be represented in this advisory committee.

2. Of special concern are Black, Hispanic and Asian gay, lesbian and bisexual people who often live under 'double shadows'. Many struggle with double and triple oppression. Strong liaison relationships and joint programming should be established between this office and existing offices serving the larger minority populations.
### Budget:

1. We recommend fully funding the office as follows:

   **A. Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator (62 pay range)</td>
<td>$20,280</td>
<td>$31,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5% - 88/89 Guidelines</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% Benefits</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>6,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary 1 - Secretary 2</td>
<td>$15,163</td>
<td>$16,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5% - 88/89 Guidelines</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Benefits</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAA - MA/Ph.D.</td>
<td>$ 8,064</td>
<td>$ 9,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$53,884</td>
<td>$70,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating**

Phones, supplies, routine mail, etc. $4,500 $7,000

**Programming**

Honorariums (speaker and workshop fees), facility rental, advertising, mailings, brochures, workshops, seminars, travel, other $12,000 $28,000

**Total Continuing Funds:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$70,384</td>
<td>$105,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. We are extremely cautious about recommending a Phased program. Although we support the concept of allowing this office to build over a period of three to four years and we remain quite conscious of fiscal realities, we are deeply concerned that funding for Phases II and III may not be guaranteed. In addition, the initial image and reflection of University commitment will affect the effectiveness of this office.
Purpose and Functions:

A. Provide referral and advocacy for various gay/lesbian/bisexual specific concerns.

1. Maintain a list of appropriate health providers (appropriate refers to non-homophobic and educated for special concerns).

2. Provide referral to various OSU offices and units.

3. With GALA, coordinate and provide the hotline staffed with trained peer counselors.

4. Work with the Office of Human Relations on harassment concerns.

B. Provide gay affirmative programming for the gay, lesbian and bisexual OSU community.

1. Arrange major speakers once or twice a year.

2. Arrange and conduct brown bag and/or film series.

3. Coordinate and publish a Calendar of Events.

4. Program with a multicultural emphasis specifically focused on those subject to double or triple oppression.

5. Work with OSU Alumni Association and Development Fund to encourage and earmark specific gifts to the University.

C. Provide education to the OSU community at large.

1. With GALA, provide a speakers bureau for classroom and staff training panels.

2. Monitor, suggest purchases, and advertise gay affirmative resources, films, video training tapes, etc., for inclusion in present curricula.

3. Coordinate and/or provide training for OSU staff and faculty.

4. Coordinate efforts with OSU libraries to create a gay and lesbian archives.

5. Investigate establishing a Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies.

D. Provide AIDS Education and Prevention Programs for the gay, lesbian and bisexual populations.

1. Work with the OSU AIDS Task Force in AIDS education, prevention, and policy formation.
Summary:

The University is to be commended in establishing an anti-discrimination policy and in establishing the Office of Human Relations to enforce these policies. Anti-discrimination is not affirmative action, however. Affirmative action involves more than policies. It involves deliberate interventions and funded programs to promote an create opportunities where oppression of all forms have denied them. The University has relied primarily upon GALA, a student organization that until this year was unfunded, to provide support, advocacy and programming for the entire University's gay, lesbian and bisexual community. No other student organization has such expectations. No student organization should.

Two Affirmative Action Grants have provided the impetus, the data and the support base for these recommendations. The University is to be applauded for establishing the Affirmative Action Grant program. It was designed to provide seed money and initial support for innovative programs. These recommendations may be seen as clear evidence of the success of that programming. Affirmative Action Grants, however, cannot and should not be used for continued support. It is important that the research and programming impetus of these two years not be lost.

To borrow from the Santa Cruz proposal, 'The University must make it clear that sexual diversity is honored as is all other diversity, and that homophobia will not be tolerated; it must institutionalize support services for this population; it must commit itself to continued education of faculty, staff, and students; and it must encourage academic acceptance of diversity in sexual orientation.' We absolutely agree.

Respectfully Submitted,

Louise A. Douce, Ph.D.