

THE STATE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
SYSTEM IN TENNESSEE  
BOARD OF REGENTS

IN RE: APPEAL FROM THE DENIAL OF RECOGNITION BY AUSTIN  
PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY OF THE PROPOSED ORGANIZATION,  
STUDENT COALITION FOR GAY RIGHTS

---

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT

---

Attached hereto are the findings of fact proposed on behalf of the Student Coalition for Gay Rights in connection with the appeal by the Coalition from the refusal of Austin Peay State University President Robert O. Riggs to recognize it as a student organization. These proposed findings are based on the record in this case developed at the hearing held on May 9th and 10th, 1979 before Dr. David F. Adkisson, Hearing Officer.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary E. Crawford  
26th Floor, Life & Casualty Tower  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Attorney for the Student Coalition  
for Gay Rights

IN RE:

APPEAL FROM THE DENIAL OF RECOGNITION BY  
AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY OF THE  
PROPOSED ORGANIZATION, STUDENT COALITION FOR GAY RIGHTS

---

FINDINGS OF FACT

---

This is an appeal by the Student Coalition for Gay Rights ("the Coalition") from the refusal of Austin Peay State University ("APSU") President Robert O. Riggs to extend recognition to it as a student organization. The appeal is to the Chancellor of the Board of Regents, who appointed the undersigned as the Hearing Officer for a hearing conducted on May 9 and 10, 1979. The hearing was held in accordance with the hearing procedures set forth in Attachment A, and both the University and the Coalition were represented by counsel.

The following witnesses were called by the parties:

For the University:

1. Dr. Harvey Reese, a licensed medical doctor engaged in the private practice of psychiatry. Dr. Reese is not board-certified. He has taught at the University of Tennessee Medical School. He has not specialized in issues related to homosexuality.
2. Dr. Garland Blair, Chairman of the Psychology Department, Austin Peay State University. Dr. Blair's Ph. D. degree is in counseling and he has conducted no special study of homosexuality.

3. Dr. Charles N. Boehms, Vice-President for Student Affairs, Austin Peay State University. His degree is in zoology.

For the Coalition:

1. Mr. Richard Lewis, a senior student at Austin Peay State University and the first President of the Coalition.

2. Mr. Glenn Carter, Assistant Professor of Social Work at Austin Peay State University and a faculty advisor to the Coalition.

3. Dr. Thomas Pinckney, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Political Science at Austin Peay State University.

4. Dr. Embry A. McKee, Associate Professor of Psychiatry at Vanderbilt University Medical School, and Director of the Vanderbilt Adult Psychiatric Outpatient Clinic. Dr. McKee is a licensed medical doctor and is a board-certified psychiatrist. Dr. McKee's research specialty is human sexuality, including homosexuality, and he has written extensively on the subject.

5. Dr. Howard B. Roback, Professor of Psychiatry at the Vanderbilt University Medical School and Associate Professor of Psychology at Vanderbilt University. Dr. Roback is a Ph. D. level psychologist and practices in the Vanderbilt Adult Psychiatric Outpatient Clinic. Dr. Roback has been involved in research on homosexuality and has written several articles on the subject.

6. William Riley, Director of Student Life at the University of Missouri - Columbia (by affidavit).

7. Dr. Judd Marmor, Franz Alexander Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Southern California School of Medicine (by stipulated testimony). Dr. Marmor is a former

President of the American Psychiatric Association and is considered one of the country's leading authorities on homosexuality.

The transcript of the Hearing and the exhibits introduced at the Hearing are attached hereto.

From the entire record, I find as follows:

#### BACKGROUND TO APPEAL

1. The requirements for recognition of student organizations are set out in the Austin Peay State University Student Handbook (Exhibit 4) and Board of Regents Policy 3:01:01:00 (Exhibit 15).

2. Following proper approval by the Austin Peay State University Student Government Association, the application for recognition of the Coalition was submitted to Dr. Charles N. Boehms. The Coalition had complied with all procedural and technical requirements of the University and the Board of Regents for recognition of student organizations and Dr. Boehms declined to recognize the organization solely for the substantive reasons contained in his letter of January 31, 1979 to Student Government President David Mason (Attachment 2 to Exhibit 17) and explained in his testimony. These reasons were as follows:

a. Recognition would give credibility to homosexual behavior and tend to expand violations of state law prohibiting homosexual behavior.

b. Recognition may lead to increased personal and psychological stress for persons who may be troubled about their sexual identity.

c. Recognition would not be consistent with the educational goals of the University.

d. Concern for how the community outside the University might react if the Coalition were recognized.

Exhibit 17, Attachment 2  
Vol. I, p. 86, line 24 - p. 88, line 16 (Boehms)  
Vol. I, p. 66, lines 6-25 (Boehms)

3. On February 6, 1979, Mr. Richard Lewis, President of the Coalition, appealed Dr. Boehms' decision to President Robert O. Riggs. On February 8, 1979, President Riggs refused to extend recognition to the Coalition. His reasons are stated in his letters of that date to Mr. Richard Lewis (Exhibit 17, Attachment 5) and to Mr. David Mason (Exhibit 17, Attachment 4). The following statement from the letter to Mr. Lewis summarizes his reasoning:

It is my judgment that the Student Coalition for Gay Rights implicitly endorses homosexuality. Sexual activity with another of the same sex is unlawful in the State of Tennessee; moreover, such activity is contrary to the Judeo-Christian ethic which undergirds our community, our State, and our nation.

There are ample opportunities for students and faculty in the classroom and through independent inquiry to examine freely the social and psychological structures and nuances of our society....

The Student Coalition for Gay Rights has no place at Austin Peay State University. The purposes of this group are contrary to the mission of this institution.

## SCIENTIFIC BACKGROUND

4. Homosexuals as a group exhibit as wide a variety of personality types and patterns of behavior as heterosexuals. Homosexuals may be as mentally healthy as healthy heterosexuals and some can accurately be described as models of social comportment and psychological maturity. On the other hand, other homosexuals may be as ill as sick heterosexuals or as irresponsible as untrustworthy heterosexuals. Numerous psychological tests of various groups of non-patient homosexuals demonstrate that they are indistinguishable from heterosexuals on psychological measures of adjustment. These studies show that there is no higher incidence of psychopathology among groups of non-patient homosexuals than there is among groups of non-patient heterosexuals.

Vol. II, p. 37, lines 1-7 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 38, lines 7-18 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 47, lines 9-21 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 77, line 8 - p. 79, line 4 (Roback)  
Substitute Exhibit 6, pp. 15-16 (Marmor)

5. With respect to their sexual conduct, the majority of homosexuals are no more promiscuous than the majority of heterosexuals. Homosexuality per se is not compulsive. While some homosexuals, like some heterosexuals, may limit their sexual conduct to brief encounters with numerous individuals, many homosexuals form long-term, monogamous relationships. Homosexuals are no more likely than heterosexuals to make objectional sexual advances.

Vol. II, p. 41, line 16 - p. 42, line 9 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 46, lines 4-20 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 79, lines 11-20 (Roback)  
Substitute Exhibit 6, pp. 8-11 (Marmor)

6. Popular stereotypes about the way homosexuals look and behave are false. There is no reliable correlation between physical appearance, social mannerisms, and preferred sexual practices.

Vol. II, p. 40, line 7 - p. 42, line 9 (McKee)  
Substitute Exhibit 6, p. 8 (Marmor)

7. The extent of social acceptance of homosexuality has not been demonstrated to affect significantly the incidence of homosexual behavior. Cross-cultural studies that have been conducted on the subject show that homosexual behavior occurs in roughly the same proportion in societies that condone it and in societies that disapprove of it. Although American society on the whole is quite hostile to homosexual behavior it nevertheless occurs in this country with significant frequency. As much as ten per cent of the population may be predominantly homosexual.

Vol. II, p. 49, lines 19-25 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 51, line 4 - p. 52, line 4 (McKee)  
Substitute Exhibit 6, pp. 4-5 (Marmor)

8. Cross-cultural studies have shown that the attitudes of different societies toward homosexual conduct vary widely. Many societies strongly condemn such behavior but a majority of those studied have considered it to be normal and socially acceptable.

Vol. II, p. 49, lines 12-21 (McKee)  
Substitute Exhibit 6, p. 3 (Marmor)

9. There is substantial scientific uncertainty on the causes of homosexuality and disagreement within the psychiatric profession on how homosexuality should be classified. As psychiatry has learned more about homosexuality, each succeeding

formal medical classification of it has been less severe. In 1974 the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality per se from its list of mental disorders by a vote of 5,854 to 3,810. A new category was created for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders that applies only to certain types of homosexuals. This category -- "Sexual Orientation Disturbance" -- is described as follows:

This category is for individuals whose sexual interests are directed primarily toward people of the same sex and who are either disturbed by, in conflict with, or wish to change their sexual orientation. This diagnostic category is distinguished from homosexuality, which by itself does not necessarily constitute a psychiatric disorder. Homosexuality per se is one form of sexual behavior and, like other forms of sexual behavior which are not by themselves psychiatric disorders, is not listed in this nomenclature of mental disorders.

While some psychiatrists continue to regard all homosexuals as being mentally ill this is now a minority view. There is, in fact, a large and respectable body of scientific opinion, including many psychiatrists, that homosexuality per se not only is not a mental disorder but can even be a normal psychobiological variant of the human potential for sexual response.

Vol. II, p. 35, line 8 - p. 36, line 15 (McKee)  
Vol II, p. 47, line 22 - p. 48, line 23 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 56, line 3 - p. 59, line 16 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 60, lines 5-13 (McKee)  
Substitute Exhibit 6, pp. 1-2 (Testimony of  
of Dr. Judd Marmor)



## THE COALITION

10. The Coalition's membership is composed primarily of persons whose sexual orientation is homosexual but some heterosexual students and faculty are also members.

Vol. I, p. 143, lines 5-7 (Lewis)  
Vol. I, p. 146, lines 2-4 (Carter)

11. The statement of purpose contained in Article II of the Coalition's constitution is as follows:

This organization shall work to promote human rights and to encourage a better understanding of alternative lifestyles.

The phrase "alternative lifestyles" refers to the lifestyles of homosexual persons.

Exhibit 17, Attachment 1

12. Restricting the statement of purpose contained in the organization constitution to a broadly worded, general statement is not unusual and is common practice among student organizations at APSU.

Vol. II, p. 4, line 23 - p. 6, line 21

13. An official, detailed statement of organizational purpose was adopted by the general membership of the Coalition on April 11, 1979 as an internal document designed for the guidance of the membership, and as an elaboration on the general statement of purpose contained in Article II of the Constitution. This statement, which is Exhibit 8 to the record, is an accurate reflection of the purposes of the organization. Although worded differently than earlier detailed expressions of organizational purpose (which were drafts or informal statements contained in press releases), the April 11, 1979 statement in basic substance is not inconsistent with the previous expressions. It does not

represent any change in the organizational purposes perceived by participants at the time the Coalition was founded.

Vol. I, p. 115, line 7 - p. 18, line 2 (Lewis)  
Vol. I, p. 133, line 35 - p. 136, line 23 (Lewis)  
Vol. I, p. 149, line 20 - p. 150, line 10 (Carter)  
Exhibit 8

14. The April 11, 1979 statement is as follows:

The Student Coalition for Gay Rights is open to all students of Austin Peay State University, whether gay or non-gay, who share its goals. The Coalition's purposes are as follows:

1. To encourage communication between gay and non-gay members of the University community.
2. To educate the University and the surrounding community on the meaning of being gay and to dispel the false stereotypes of gay people that now exist.
3. To organize effective political action in support of legislation protecting the civil rights of gay people, including equal opportunity to jobs and housing.
4. To engender a rational debate concerning sodomy laws and other statutes that proscribe private sexual conduct between consenting adults without ethical, social or political justification, and to urge their repeal.

As an educational and political action organization, the Coalition does not advocate or promote violation of state statutes. Our goal is not to promote homosexuality or any other kind of sexual behavior but to promote understanding and equality for all people without regard to their sexual orientation. We seek to effect our goals through compliance with the Constitution of the United States and the State of Tennessee, Tennessee statutory law and the rules and regulations of the University.

\* 15. The Coalition is willing to accept recognition by the University that is contingent upon the April 11, 1979 Statement

of purpose (Exhibit 8 to the record) remaining in effect and that is contingent upon continued compliance by the Coalition with that statement.

Vol. I, p. 135, lines 5-17 (Coalition's attorney)

16. Organizers of the Coalition are truthful when they state that the organizational purpose is not to promote homosexual behavior, but rather to promote a better understanding of homosexuals and homosexual lifestyles.

Vol. I, p. 98, line 5 - p. 99, line 17 (Boehms)  
Vol. I, p. 95, lines 9-23 (Boehms)

17. Meetings of the Coalition have been conducted in a business-like manner, comparable to that of other student organizations.

Vol. I, p. 146, lines 5-19 (Carter)

18. There is no indication that the Coalition has been used by its homosexual members as a method of locating sexual contacts and the Coalition does not function as a dating service.

Vol. I, p. 146, line 20 - p. 147, line 5 (Carter)  
Vol. I, p. 127, lines 1-21 (Lewis)

19. There is no evidence in the record that an organizational purpose or activity is to advocate imminent violations of law by any person. There is no evidence in the record that persons who are members of the Coalition have solicited any individuals on campus to engage in homosexual behavior or that the organization itself has urged or caused persons to engage in homosexual conduct.

Vol. I, p. 49, line 25 - p. 50, line 2 (Blair)  
Vol. I, p. 77, lines 14-18 (Counsel for APSU)  
Vol. I, p. 77, lines 22-23 (Boehms)  
Vol. I, p. 103, lines 12-16 (Boehms)

[ 20. It is the Coalition's policy and practice to refer any students who come to it indicating emotional or psychological problems to persons with professional expertise in counseling. The Coalition refers persons to the University psychologist or to a psychologist in private practice in Clarksville who was formerly employed with the Tennessee Department of Mental Health. Representatives of the Department have expressed an interest in the possibility of the Coalition completing a study of the needs of homosexual persons in the community that could be met by the Department. There is no evidence that the Coalition is engaged in any improper counseling.

Vol. I, p. 127, line 22 - p. 132, line 9 (Lewis)  
Vol. I, p. 137, lines 5-20 (Lewis)

## ISSUES INVOLVING RECOGNITION

21. The contention in this record that recognition of student "gay rights" organizations will cause an increase in homosexual conduct on campuses is quite speculative in nature. There does not appear to be any empirical or historical basis in the scientific literature for such a contention, and certainly no such basis has been shown in this record. The Director of Student Life at the University of Missouri - Columbia, has been unable to find any indication that formal recognition of two "gay rights" groups on that campus has resulted in increased or expanded homosexual conduct among students or that it has caused violations of Missouri law. The psychiatrist called by the University, who has not specialized in issues related to homosexuality, testified that although over the long term "gay rights" groups will, in his opinion, affect public views on homosexuality and create a more permissive attitude on homosexual behavior, it would be impossible to prove that there will be more homosexual conduct on the campus as an immediate effect of such an organization. The psychiatrist and psychologist called by the Coalition, both of whom have done extensive work on issues of human sexuality in general and homosexuality in particular, testified that neither the University's position on recognition nor the functioning of the Coalition in accordance with its purposes will increase the amount of homosexual conduct.

This record does not support a finding that recognition of the Coalition will increase the amount of homosexual conduct

taking place among the University's students in comparison with the amount that will take place in any event.

Vol. I, p. 102, line 23 - p. 105, line 5 (Boehms)  
Vol. II, p. 59, lines 17-24 (McKee)  
Exhibit 5, p. 2 (Riley)  
Vol. I, p. 13, line 16 - p. 14, Line 7 (Reese)  
Vol. I, p. 16, lines 4-6 (Reese)  
Vol. II, p. 42, lines 10-14 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 51, lines 4-8 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 52, lines 12-20 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 81, lines 1-6 (Roback)  
Vol. I, p. 147, lines 12-18 (Carter)

*Boehms repeat*  
2

22. The only activities that the Coalition will be able to engage in as a result of recognition that it cannot engage in without such recognition are 1) using campus facilities on a scheduled (as opposed to non-reserved) basis; 2) lease of a campus post office in the name of the organization and distribution of notices through the campus mail; 3) obtaining a listing in the Student Handbook and the yearbook; and 4) posting notices of meetings and activities on University bulletin boards.

It is difficult to see ~~and~~ how extending these benefits of recognition can materially increase the incidence of homosexual behavior.

Vol. II, p. 26, line 18 - p. 27, line 19 (Boehms)  
Exhibit 14

23. Fear was expressed by the University's witnesses that notwithstanding the fact that the organizational purpose of the Coalition is not to advocate or promote homosexual behavior, some individual homosexuals who might be members of the Coalition might have that purpose or may solicit or encourage students to practice homosexuality. Witnesses expressing this view admitted that it was not based on any specific knowledge of, or discussion with,

the Coalition or with the actual members of the Coalition, but on their beliefs about general human nature. Dr. Reese conceded that his view that such may occur applies only to some, and not all, homosexuals.

The University administration acknowledges that no student organization can absolutely control the conduct of all its members. As a consequence, the University holds individuals individually responsible for their conduct. It disciplines individual students who violate the law or University policy and disciplines as well the organizations to which such students may belong only if the individuals, in engaging in the violative conduct, were acting under the auspices of or in connection with that organization. As previously noted, there is no evidence in this record, or even any contention, that any activity conducted under the auspices of, or in connection with, the Coalition has involved homosexual conduct or sexual solicitation. In the view of Dr. Boehms, its denial that it intends to promote homosexual conduct is honestly made. I find nothing in this record to indicate that Dr. Boehms is wrong in this regard. Indeed, the Coalition appears to be sensitive to this issue and has taken steps to prevent even the appearance of impropriety.

Solicitation of sexual partners by individual homosexuals, to the extent that such will occur on campus, will not be materially impeded by refusal to grant recognition to an organization whose organizational purposes and activities do not include such solicitation or promotion and which is designed to meet educational and political action objectives. This is true for

two additional reasons. The Coalition will probably continue to exist as a functioning group even if not recognized; and homosexuals who are members (as well as those who are not) will continue to be University students despite such non-recognition, and will continue to carry out whatever their patterns of behavior may be.

This record demonstrates that issues involving recognition are needlessly confused by failure to distinguish carefully between organizational purposes and activities on the one hand and the purposes and activities of individuals (who may or may not be members) on the other. The fears and concerns expressed by the University's witnesses involving possible conduct by individual students are with respect to patterns of behavior that they have not tied to the actual and proposed activities of the Coalition or to the organizational purposes.

Vol. I, p. 23, lines 5-9 (Reese)  
Vol. I, p. 38, line 19 - p. 39, line 7 (Reese)  
Vol. I, p. 32, line 9 - p. 33, line 16 (Reese)  
Vol. I, p. 40, lines 7-12 (Reese)  
Vol. I, p. 92, line 13 - p. 93, line 25 (Boehms)  
Vol. I, p. 99, line 3 - p. 102, line 22 (Boehms)  
Vol. I, p. 96, lines 6-13 (Boehms)  
Citations to record in support of findings  
18 and 19 above  
Vol. I, p. 127, lines 1-19 (Lewis)  
Vol. I, p. 146, line 20 - p. 147, line 11 (Carter)

24. In connection with the previous finding the following excerpt from Dr. Boehms' testimony is illuminating:

Q. You stated that you were concerned about students with what you refer to as gender or sexual identity problems seeking guidance from their peers. I believe you said that's one way, one of many ways in which students seek guidance now.

Regardless of whether the Student Coalition for Gay Rights is recognized on campus, you recognize the fact that there are going to be homosexual students on campus, do you not?



A. I recognize that fact.

Q. And that such guidance as people may get from them may take place whether or not there is any organization that exists.

A. I recognize that fact.

Q. All right. Now, I thought I understood you to say that the implied purpose of the group is to encourage acts in violation of state law. Is that your testimony?

A. No. I did not relate at all to the purpose of the organization. I was asked why I denied recognition and --

Q. You aren't contending then that the organization is designed for the purpose of trying to promote people to violate state law?

A. I am saying that one of the stated purposes of the organization is not as you say, it is not within their stated purposes to encourage people to violate the law.

Q. Okay. And you aren't suggesting they are lying about that purpose, are you?

A. Not as an organization as the structure of the organization would be presented. What I am saying is that official recognition of an organization whose members may or may not practice something which is illegal within the state can cause an increase, in my opinion, of the student who is in question about entering into this practice, having a greater freedom to if the organization is recognized.

Q. Entering into specific sexual practices?

A. Yes. Homosexual practices.

Q. So it's the act of recognition rather than the existence of the group that you believe will promote that result.

A. Yes. I do not deny that the group exists. I --

Q. It will probably exist in practice whether or not you recognize them.

A. It will probably exist and practice whether I recognize them.

Q. So it's the act of recognition that you fear?

A. The officialdom of recognition that I would say can have some inference.

25. The University's students generally do not appear to regard recognition of the Coalition as constituting a sanctioning of homosexuality. Students generally disapprove of homosexuality but the 25 - 1 vote of the Student Government Association in favor of recognition and the testimony of the faculty members who testified on the subject indicate that most of the students support recognition of the Coalition as a student organization. They appear generally able to distinguish between approval or disapproval of homosexuality on the one hand and what they perceive to be requirements of freedom of association, assembly, and expression on the other.

Vol. II, p. 6, line 22 - p. 9, line 19 (Pinckney)  
Exhibit 3 attached to Exhibit 17 (Letter  
of SGA President David Mason to University  
President Robert D. Riggs, dated February  
8, 1979.)

Vol. I, p. 141, lines 8-10 (Lewis)

Vol. I, p. 147, line 19 - p. 148, line 9 (Carter)

26. The possibility that some members of the public or student body may erroneously conclude that recognition of the Coalition constitutes approval or condonation of homosexuality by the University, which possibility would be undesirable, can be prevented or largely mitigated by a clearly worded statement accompanying recognition, if such is extended, that the University strongly disapproves of homosexual conduct. The University can

make clear that there are constitutional limits on the University's ability to deny recognition and that recognition can and will be revoked in the event the Coalition engages in, or advocates, imminent illegal activity. Such a statement can be sent as well to members of the public corresponding with the University administration on the subject. University publications listing recognized student organizations can, and should, contain a disclaimer such as the following:

Certain constitutional limitations exist with respect to the University's ability to approve or deny recognition to student organizations. The significance of recognition is primarily limited to permission to use certain campus facilities and services under appropriate circumstances. Recognition does not necessarily imply University approval of specific viewpoints expressed by recognized student groups.

27. Increased information about homosexuality, which will result from the educational activities of the Coalition proposed in this record and from the ensuing debate and dialogue on the subject that is to be expected within the academic community, is healthy for the community and will be beneficial to persons who may feel anxiety or stress concerning the subject as a result of inadequate or incorrect information.

Vol. II, p. 54, line 54 - p. 55, line 22 (McKee)  
Vol. II, p. 81, line 10 - p. 82, line 7 (Roback)

28. Specific evidence on the nature and extent of likely reaction to recognition of the Coalition by the outside community was not presented at the hearing. Testimony of general societal disapproval of homosexuality in the United States was presented. A legal opinion on whether the anticipated unpopularity of

University recognition can provide a constitutional justification for refusal to recognize the Coalition would be helpful in the decision-making process. The Coalition contends that such a consideration may not lawfully influence the decision on whether to recognize it.

Vol. II, p. 51, lines 9-11 (McKee)

Vol. II, p. 94, lines 10-17 (Counsel for the Coalition)

29. To the extent that a student organization seeks to disseminate knowledge about homosexuality and seeks to engender rational discussion of the issue, it is consistent with the educational purposes of the University. An examination of the materials in the record that the Coalition has thus far distributed and that the Coalition proposes to distribute in furtherance of its stated purposes show that they have obvious educational value. Judged by its stated purposes, its actual activities conducted thus far, and its proposed activities as reflected in this record, the Coalition as an organization is consistent with the educational objectives of the University.

Vol. I, p. 91, lines 14-20 (Boehms)

Exhibits 9-13

Vol. II, p. 15, line 2 - p. 16, line 6 (Pinckney)

Vol. I, p. 148, lines 10-25 (Carter)

Vol. II, p. 81, line 6 - p. 83, line 16 (Roback)

Vol. I, p. 117, line 19 - p. 118, line 2 (Lewis)

Vol. I, p. 118, line 15 - p. 123, line 6 and p. 124, line 3 - p. 126, line 25 (Lewis)

Exhibit 8


30. The APSU Student Handbook requires that student organizations that have been recognized register the names of their officers after each election and submit "changes in name, purpose,

constitution, or otherwise" that occur during subsequent quarters to the student senate for approval. This is a condition for retention of recognition, as is the requirement that the groups make annual reports of their activities in writing to the Vice-President of Student Affairs and SGA Secretary of Communications. Not being a recognized student organization, the Coalition at present is not required to make such reports or obtain such approvals. Recognition would have the beneficial effect of providing these mechanisms for University monitoring and supervision of the organization.

Exhibit 4 (p. 54 of APSU Student Handbook)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing "Proposed Findings of Fact" has been mailed, postage prepaid, to the attorney for Austin Peay State University, David C. Porteous, The State University and Community College System of Tennessee, 1161 Murfreesboro Road, Nashville, Tennessee 37217 this the 8th day of June, 1979.

  
Gary E. Crawford