Report by the
Committee on Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Issues
Executive Summary

The Faculty Senate established the Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues in May, 1994 for the purpose of fostering lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) scholarship and considering concerns about services for and equity toward LGB students, faculty, and staff. The Committee conducted independent research on campus, reviewed published data, and collected relevant information about LGB programs and services in other colleges and universities in preparation for writing this report. The Committee’s analysis and recommendations concern (1) scholarship, (2) the curriculum, (3) issues of campus life for LGB students, and (4) issues for LGB faculty and staff.

Scholarship: The broad field of LGB studies has produced a rich body of scholarship, the influence of which is felt throughout the academy. LGB scholarship is increasingly influential, both within established disciplines and in interdisciplinary thought. Research in psychology and the biological sciences continues to elucidate the fundamental elements and determinants of sexual orientation. Sociologists have studied sexual identity, LGB families, and the politics of LGB groups and movements. In philosophy, history, literature and the arts, LGB scholars strive to define and describe sexual identity in multiple contexts and to explicate the importance and contributions of LGB authors, artists, and events. Legal scholarship brings many of the concerns of these other fields into the discourse on public policy and supports the development of new doctrines and theories in the law. In addition to a solid library of published works, there are now good professional journals that focus on LGB studies and individual articles on LGB topics in other well established academic publications.

The curriculum: While more than 100 courses currently taught at this university include LGB content, our curriculum does not contain a specific introductory course in LGB studies and has no regular course in LGB theory. Lesbian and gay studies programs are in place or in development at more than twenty institutions (including the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee); at least 40 colleges and universities have developed specific courses in lesbian and gay studies. The Committee recommends that UW-Madison establish an LGB studies program (initially, as a certificate) in order to support and strengthen LGB scholarship, foster interdisciplinary study and teaching, reduce isolation among LGB scholars and students, and stimulate the development of new courses that would be of broad interest. The new resources required for a certificate program will be modest in comparison to the benefit produced.

Campus life – students: While LGB students acknowledge that UW-Madison attempts to provide an inclusive, equitable climate, they emphasize the presence of a substantial gap between these positive processes (or good intentions) and actual outcomes. LGB students continue to experience a continuum of violence, from “benign” neglect to physical assault. Our LGB students consistently express the need for visible, accessible support services, especially to prevent or respond to harassment in residence halls. They want a curriculum richer in LGB topics, and seek benefits for their domestic partners. Although a variety of student-run groups and services attempt to meet social, cultural, and political needs for LGB students, many of those groups are poorly funded and have little year-to-year stability. This Committee recommends a number of important efforts to improve support and services for LGB students – including strategies to make the housing environment safe and free of harassment; health insurance and other benefits for students’ domestic partners; improved funding and a better location for the LGB campus center; a full-time liaison to the LGB student community; and a variety of program enhancements to give greater support to LGB students from orientation through graduation.

Campus life – faculty and staff: The most important issues identified by LGB faculty and staff are the existence of a pervasive, subtle climate of discrimination (characterized by the dominance of the “heterosexual assumption” and social pressure to remain silent and apart) and the absence of adequate support services, including especially health insurance and other benefits for domestic partners. The experience of LGB employees varies extensively, and is stratified by the influences of gender and social class; nonetheless, most LGB faculty and staff described a sense of neglect and discussed “guarding” themselves and their ideas against prejudice. The absence of domestic partner
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benefits is a serious deficiency that threatens the welfare of LGB employees and their partners and families. Responding to these concerns, the Committee recommends improved training for faculty members, and especially for department chairs and deans, regarding LGB issues as they pertain to equity and fairness for both employees and students. The Committee also recommends that the university work diligently to rewrite, as necessary, all of its procedures and policies concerning benefits — most importantly, health insurance — for spouses and dependents in order to provide the same benefits to the domestic partners of its employees.

The Committee concludes that the university can — but does not yet — provide and environment that is safe, equitable, inclusive, and free from harassment and discrimination for LGB students, faculty, and staff. It finds that the contributions that LGB people might make to the civic, academic, residential, and social life of our campus community are too often blunted or delayed by prejudice or fear. The Committee emphasizes that, by improving the climate for LGB students, faculty, and staff, and by supporting LGB scholarship, research, and teaching, UW-Madison nurtures and advances new ideas. Those ideas, and the humane environment that supports the students and scholars who explore them, will become another priceless contribution from this university to its State. With both people and ideas at stake, the Committee encourages the university to take this opportunity for leadership very seriously.

Summary of Recommendations

The Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues recommends that:

1. the university establish and fund a program in lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies. Initially, this program should grant a certificate in LGB studies, but not provide a dedicated major. After five years, the certificate program should be evaluated, and, if it is successful, the university should expand and enhance it so LGB studies can be a major field of undergraduate study.

2. the Division of University Housing increase efforts to provide a housing environment that is safe and free of harassment for all students. In particular, it is essential to add more training for house fellows about how to create and implement a safe and inclusive environment, and how to respond quickly and effectively to harassment of LGB or transgender students. Housing should provide fast, predictable, effective systems of making and responding to complaints about harassment in any form.

3. the university support University Health Services’ efforts to secure the availability of health insurance that covers domestic partners for students within the framework of the Student Health Insurance Plan (SHIP).

4. the university work diligently and quickly to obtain coverage for domestic partners in the health insurance plans it provides to every category of its employees.

5. the university examine all of its policies and procedures for providing benefits of other kinds to spouses and dependents and re-write them as necessary to provide the same benefits to the domestic partners of its faculty, staff, and students.

6. the Equity and Diversity Resource Center and the Professional Development and Training Office work together to organize a focused, coherent strategy for effective orientation and continuing training of faculty and staff to promote sensitivity to LGB issues and to reduce the frequency of harassment and discrimination against LGB employees.

7. the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs include in the required training of department chairs and deans (a) particular attention to lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues as they affect equity and fairness in employee hiring and evaluation, determining salaries, and promotion and tenure; (b) encouragement of institutional or community service by faculty and staff concerning lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues; and (c) recognition of the value and importance of lesbian, gay, and bisexual scholarship.
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8. the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs also include in the required training for deans and department chairs (a) particular attention to lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues as they affect equity and fairness in the recruiting, admission, evaluation, retention, and rewarding of students; (b) encouragement of students' contributions in campus or community service concerning lesbian, gay, or bisexual concerns; and (c) recognition of student research and scholarship in lesbian, gay, and bisexual topics.

9. all faculty and instructional staff re-examine their courses and syllabi to determine where they could be enriched by including lesbian, gay, and bisexual content or perspectives.

10. all faculty and instructional staff also consider how the climate in their classrooms might be negative for LGB students, and use that assessment in fostering a more inclusive, affirming environment.

11. all faculty and staff examine in their work, programs, services, and social interactions the presence of the assumption of heterosexuality and make efforts to overcome this narrow assumption.

12. the university fund the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Campus Center (LGBCC) with stable moneys and provide it with visible, accessible space in a central campus location.

13. the university create a full-time position for a university liaison to the LGB and transgender student community. The person in this position should be highly visible as a resource and support person for wide-ranging matters of LGBT student life.

14. the Summer Orientation, Advising, and Registration (SOAR) Leadership Team greatly expand the attention given to LGB and transgender issues in SOAR. The Office of the Dean of Students should make it as easy as possible, and as safe as possible, for new or transferring students (both undergraduate and graduate/professional) to obtain information about the university and city LGB communities and to access LGB resources and services.

15. the Office of the Dean of Students develop an LGB mentoring program, providing a connection between LGB students (of any level) and university LGB faculty and staff.

16. the Office of the Dean of Students develops referral information that faculty and staff can use to provide assistance to students with questions or concerns.

17. every three to five years, the faculty senate's Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues reassess the effectiveness of processes to provide a campus environment that is safe, equitable, and free from harassment and discrimination for LGB students, staff, and faculty.

18. the Chancellor charge one of the Associate Vice Chancellors with the responsibility of implementing the preceding recommendations.
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Chapter One - Background and Introduction

Perspective
This Committee has determined that the University of Wisconsin-Madison can -- but does not yet -- provide an environment that is safe, equitable, inclusive, and free from harassment and discrimination for lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) students, faculty, and staff. Our community is impoverished by its inadequate attention to lesbian, gay, and bisexual scholarship, though there are serious, effective LGB scholars among us. The curriculum suffers because of the absence of a commitment to lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies, and many of our courses neglect the richness of lesbian, gay, and bisexual experience, history, and art. The university misses opportunities to serve and support LGB students, faculty, and staff, and, as a consequence, it neither assists in their development nor realizes from them the full benefit of their presence here. The contributions that LGB students, faculty, and staff might make to the life of our campus community are too often blunted or delayed by fear or prejudice. Subsequent chapters in this report document these findings and explain their importance.

These are not matters of “political correctness,” nor of identity politics. Rather, they concern the most basic principles of humane and equitable treatment of all persons, the strength of a diverse community, and the finest traditions of open inquiry, academic freedom, and excellence in scholarship. LGB students and employees are citizens who deserve equal protection and fair treatment; lives lived in fear are lived incompletely. When LGB students feel unsafe in residence halls and neglected or shunned in classrooms, they lose opportunities to learn and to develop as whole human beings. We cannot any longer overlook the damage done – to themselves and our whole community -- when LGB students, faculty, and staff must, in consideration of their own personal or professional safety, attempt to obscure their sexuality. This distinguished institution of higher learning should work diligently and courageously toward sustaining an environment of full inclusion, absolute equity, and freedom from harassment, harm, and discrimination for all of its LGB members.

An improved institutional climate will bring greater peace and fulfillment for LGB faculty, staff, and students – but will also release their ideas, creativity, and spirit from the restraints inevitably felt by an endangered minority. And the university, as a whole, will only benefit from hearing their voices more clearly. LGB scholarship is rigorous and diverse; it challenges all of us to think differently and critically about some of the most basic questions of human nature, relationships, and society. An LGB perspective will enrich many of our existing courses; the influence of LGB thought, criticism, research, and art will broaden and deepen the relevance, coherence, and credibility of our curriculum. LGB studies and courses are pertinent for any student today – both because a complex understanding of the varieties of human experience strengthens general education, and because our students become global citizens who will certainly need to think through questions of sexuality, discrimination, equity, and diversity in the future.

This university, finally, has an enormous responsibility to Wisconsin, our nation, and the world. The “Wisconsin Idea” embodies both our commitment to service and our belief that great universities have something very important to offer their constituencies. By improving the climate for LGB students, faculty, and staff, and by developing and supporting LGB scholarship, research, and teaching, UW-Madison nurtures and advances new ideas. Those ideas -- and the humane environment that supports the students and scholars who explore them -- will become another priceless contribution from this institution to its state. Of course there may be controversy, as people and interests on and off campus struggle to understand what this Committee feels is most important: that LGB students, scholars, and scholarship matter a great deal to the whole community. But both ideas and people are at stake here, and the Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues encourages the university to take this opportunity for leadership very seriously.

Historical Background
The University of Wisconsin-Madison's support of equal rights for gay men, lesbians, and bisexual people has had a checkered history. Between October, 1962 and February, 1963 the campus reached a low point during what has subsequently been called the “Madison Gay Purge.” Gay men (and men suspected or accused of being gay) were contacted by the Department of Protection and Security and/or the Dean of Men, charged with homosexual "misconduct," and threatened in a variety of ways if they did not provide information about other men who engaged in homosexual "misconduct." As the phone calls, investigations, and threats from Protection and Security and the Dean of Men continued, resistance began to build. There were promises of lawsuits against the University if it
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applied sanctions against students charged with homosexuality, and the Department of Psychiatry appealed to end these threats to the mental health of students on the Madison campus. Eventually President Harrington ordered the Department of Protection and Security to cease their investigations and the purge ended, but not without leaving unpleasant memories among its survivors.

Since 1979, official policies of the University of Wisconsin-Madison have prohibited discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. On May 7, 1979, the Faculty Senate resolved that "It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that our policies on nondiscrimination at UW-Madison should include sexual preference as the basis on which discrimination is prohibited."

In 1982, Wisconsin Assembly Bill 70 amended the State of Wisconsin's non-discrimination laws to include sexual orientation as a basis for which discrimination is prohibited on the part of the state, state agencies (such as UW-Madison), or state contractors.

On April 10, 1987, the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents, in its Resolution 3757, acknowledged its commitment to maintaining students' rights to be free from discrimination in an academic setting. In that resolution, the Regents also declared that "the citizens of the State of Wisconsin, through their Legislature, have stated that discrimination based on sexual preference is not to be tolerated or allowed in Wisconsin."

On February 1, 1988, the UW-Madison Faculty Senate adopted a resolution stating that discrimination in the UW-Madison Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) programs "violates fundamental notions of equal opportunity and privacy, as well as violating University of Wisconsin-Madison policy and the intent of state law." On December 4, 1989, at an especially-called meeting, the UW-Madison faculty voted (386-248) to request the UW Board of Regents to terminate the university's contracts with the Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC programs if those programs did not end discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation by May of 1993. In its meetings in 1990 the Board of Regents voted not to implement the faculty request. But the Board of Regents did vote to instruct UW officials to work through elected political representatives in Washington to change the anti-homosexual policies practiced in the United States armed forces, of which the campus ROTC units were a subordinate part.

In August 1989, the Dean of Students, Mary Rouse, established a Gay and Lesbian Issues Committee. She charged the committee with the responsibility to examine "those aspects of the UW-Madison academic and social life which contribute positively to the experience of gay and lesbian students as well as the problems which negatively affect the recruitment and retention of gay and lesbian students." The Committee's report, issued on January 23, 1992, made a wide range of recommendations to a variety of campus agencies, services, and programs, including the Dean of Students Office, University Housing, and the University Health Service. One of its recommendations, addressed to the Chancellor's Office, proposed the establishment of a Task Force "composed of interested faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students to explore models for incorporating gay and lesbian studies" in the university's curriculum.

In the Spring of 1992, the University of Wisconsin Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Alumni Council was established. The Council's purpose was "to cooperate with the Wisconsin Alumni Association in promoting the best interests of the University of Wisconsin, to provide a recognized forum that facilitates dialogue and relationships between the university and its Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual alumni and to support and encourage a positive social and academic environment throughout the university community for its Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual students, faculty and staff." The Alumni Council formally affiliated with the Wisconsin Alumni Association in 1994. Since its founding, the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Alumni Council has hosted a series of alumni reunion events as well as an annual formal awards ceremony honoring distinguished alumni.

In each of these recorded events, votes were taken or policies were adopted to bring an end to discrimination based on sexual orientation. Each instance represented an attempt to create a climate in which all members of the community, including gay, lesbian and bisexual members, are able to participate and develop intellectually and emotionally, free from fear, violence and harassment. Five years ago, a previous committee endorsed the concept of a lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies program. It is in the context of this history that the current Committee has done its work.
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Establishment of, and Charge to, the Faculty Senate Committee on Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Issues
On March 4, 1994, James Steakley, Associate Professor of German, and Janice Sheppard, Assistant to the Dean of Students, joined by 40 faculty and staff co-signers, sent a letter to the University Committee requesting that it establish a committee "to address lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues." On May 2, 1994, the Faculty Senate moved to establish the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Issues Committee as a standing faculty committee.

The Faculty Senate assigned the following tasks to the Committee:
- to foster relevant teaching and research
- to coordinate interdisciplinary and interdepartmental efforts
- to convene scholarly conferences and symposia
- to consider concerns about discrimination and career advancement
- to act as a resource on such matters as benefits for domestic partners

Activities of the Faculty Senate Committee on Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Issues
During the 1994-95 academic year, the committee, chaired by James Steakley, reviewed its charge and task assignments and decided to focus initially on fostering relevant teaching and research. In consultation with the Secretary of the Faculty, the Committee prepared a survey form to be sent to all UW-Madison faculty members asking if they were engaged in any teaching or research that dealt with lesbian, gay, or bisexual topics.

In September 1995, the Committee dispatched a mailing to all faculty members. The mailing included a letter introducing the Committee and requesting that the respondent fill out the survey form and return it to the Secretary of the Faculty. The survey form asked if the respondent offered any courses dealing primarily or partially with lesbian, gay, or bisexual topics; occasionally referred to such topics in lectures or discussions; had conducted research on such topics; etc. The survey form also asked if the respondent knew of any situations on the UW-Madison campus where there was overt discrimination based on sexual orientation. Two-hundred and eighty copies of the survey form were returned and analyzed.

During the 1995-96 academic year, members of the Committee interviewed a convenience sample of LGB faculty and staff and conducted focus groups among LGB students, in order to gain a better understanding of their experiences on campus, the issues in their lives, and their views on key issues. Members of the Committee gathered information from several dozen respondents.

In addition, the Committee sponsored several lunches and presentations. It also acquired several lists, to supplement its research about courses with lesbian, gay, bisexual content at UW-Madison. Those lists included rosters of LGB groups on the UW campus and in the city of Madison and the names of relevant LGB films and documentaries. The Committee also obtained a gay and lesbian studies bibliography and information about the Certificate Program in Gay and Lesbian Studies at UW-Milwaukee.

At the end of the summer of 1996, the Committee, with Richard Keeling as Chair, began drafting and reviewing sections of this report. The Committee also acquired lists of programs in gender and LGB studies at universities in the USA and Canada; LGB libraries, archives, and virtual research collections; and companies, municipalities, and universities with domestic partner plans. In early 1997, the Committee carefully verified the accuracy of all the information it had collected about courses on our campus, courses and LGB studies programs elsewhere, and LGB archives.

Members of the Faculty Senate Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues included:
Michele Besant, Graduate Student, School of Library and Information Studies (1994-1997)
Jason Best, Undergraduate Student (1996-1997)
Jeanne Boydston, Associate Professor of History (1994-1997)
Ken Chraca, Program Manager Arts Outreach and Arts Consortium (1994-1997)
Joe Elder, Professor of Sociology and South Asian Studies (1994-1997)
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Membership, continued:
  Elizabeth Ellsworth, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction (1994-1996)
  Janet Hyde, Professor of Psychology and Women's Studies (1994-1997)
  Richard Keeling, Director, University Health Services and Professor of Medicine (Chair, 1996-1997)
  Peggy Lewis, Assistant Dean of Students (1996-1997)
  Chad Moffett, Undergraduate Student, History (1994-1995)
  Harold Scheub, Professor of African Languages and Literatures (1994-1995)
  Jan Sheppard, Director, Student Organization Office (1994-1996)
  James Steakley, Professor of German (Chair, 1994-1996)

Chapter Two - Scholarship

Introduction
The broad field of LGB studies has expanded beyond anyone's expectations over the last two decades. Books, major
critical anthologies, special issues of journals, academic conferences, graduate examination fields, dissertations, articles,
and newly established archives and research centers all attest to the growing significance of this area of study. Even a
very selective review of this research demonstrates that LGB studies has already produced a rich body of scholarship, the
influence of which is felt throughout the academy.

The roots of that scholarship are deep. Although it is impossible fully to detach the history of LGB scholarship from the
politics of the gay liberation movement, the sources of LGB studies extend far back beyond the Stonewall Rebellion of
1969 -- to Freud, and, before him, to late nineteenth-century medical researchers in Europe and the United States. It was,
however, at the mid-point of the twentieth century, during and after World War II, that a broad scholarly interest in
questions of sexuality began to take shape. This interest was first evident in official attention to issues of sexual
"normalcy" in the mobilization for war, but it persisted after World War II in the extensive inquiry into ethics and the
"authentic self" to which the war and the Holocaust gave rise. By the 1960s, research on sexuality focused on the
construction and implications of socially produced "roles," the "selves" that were presumably demanded and labeled by
society's institutions. Two approaches proved particularly significant for later gay and lesbian studies: examinations of
the social role of "deviance," including sexual deviance, and -- spurred by growing feminist movements -- examinations
of gender as social role and of lesbianism as a personal and political identity.

Over the course of the 1970s, "role" theory fostered a new interest in the broad social construction of "identity." In "The
Homosexual Role," British sociologist Mary McIntosh speculated that homosexuality itself was a social role, not an
innate self. Meanwhile, women's historians like Carroll Smith Rosenberg ("The Female World of Love and Ritual")
documented the existence of romantic female friendships in Victorian America. The immediate institutional beneficiary
of this line of inquiry was women's studies: by the late 1970s women's studies programs at colleges and universities
around the country provided an interdisciplinary base for an exploding scholarship on gender. LGB studies profited from
that presence, and from the (often heated) intellectual debates about gender and sexuality generated in women's studies
work (see, for example, Snitow, Stansell, and Thompson, 1983).

By the 1980s, however, in the wake of a decade of gay and lesbian political activism, LGB studies had begun to assume
its own independent scholarly footing, related to women's studies and yet separately situated. Early LGB research
reflected the identity politics of the 1970s, focusing on the social experience and sources of distinct "gay" and "lesbian"
identities. But the new field soon began to incorporate the methodologies of postmodern theory. Michel Foucault's
History of Sexuality argued that the very category "sexuality" was socially constructed, and of relatively recent vintage.
Drawing on feminist theory, Judith Butler examined sexuality as a performed identity. These and other studies gave rise
to the critical approach known as "Queer Theory," which is less interested in questions of specific interior identity than in
larger questions about the historical construction of sexuality, its lived contingency, and the uses of sexuality as a vehicle
of social regulation (including the constitutive role of sexuality in racial and gendered identities). Queer studies
emphasizes the diversity and flexibility, or unfixedness, of sexual identity, and investigates sexuality as a process of
representation (see, for an example, Beemyn and Eliason, 1996).

As the following discussions of selected fields indicate, over the last several decades, the older LGB studies and the
newer Queer studies have begun to generate a complex, nuanced, and widely influential scholarship of their own, both
within established disciplines and in interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary connections. Research into the
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constitutive processes and character of specific identities—heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual and, recently, transgendered—has continued, but it has been joined, in almost all of the fields surveyed, by a larger and more theoretical interest in understanding the character and deployments of sexuality itself.

**Psychological Research**

Although much of the early research would not be considered admirable by today's standards, psychology claims pride of place in research on homosexuality.

Stimulated by the early work of Sigmund Freud (1910) and extending through the 1960s, two questions (both reflective of the world within which they were posed) dominated the field: are homosexuals as well-adjusted as heterosexuals; and, what disturbances in development cause people to become homosexual? Efforts to address the first question have produced a series of different methodologies which have led to changing conclusions. The earliest studies used a sampling method that involved studying gay men and lesbians who were patients in psychotherapy (reviewed by Rosen, 1974). Not surprisingly, researchers found disturbances in adjustment of the gays and lesbians studied. A modified design, which compared the adjustment of gays and lesbians recruited through psychotherapists with community samples of heterosexuals not in therapy, produced similar results. Not until the 1970s were these studies repeated using more fully comparable groups (gays and lesbians recruited from the community and heterosexuals recruited from the community, often matched on factors such as age and education). This methodology has generally found no significant differences in adjustment between the two groups (Bell and Weinberg, 1978; Rosen, 1974).

Paralleling this line of research was another strain of inquiry which assumed that gays and lesbians did show disturbances in adjustment and was intended to elucidate developmental disturbances that caused people to become homosexual. Researchers hypothesized the significance of many factors, ranging from endocrine problems to disturbance of the parent-child relationship, to rejection by peers. In a massive interview study designed to test all the environmental hypotheses that had been proposed, Bell, Weinberg, and Hammersmith (1981) found that there was no solid evidence for any of the theories. Most experts in the field agree that the cause—or, more likely, causes—of sexual orientation have not yet been determined.

Current psychological research on sexual orientation has moved beyond these questions, to address issues that seem more central to the lives of LGB people today. For example, one strand of research has examined gay and lesbian relationships, on questions such as relationship satisfaction, communication patterns, power, and decision-making (e.g., McWhirter and Mattison, 1984; Peplau and Amaro, 1982). Other research focuses on the consequences for children of growing up in a lesbian or gay household, generally finding that there are not serious adverse consequences (e.g., Patterson, 1992).

Research on LGB people and on the question of sexual orientation remains one of the hot topics in psychology, however, and is generating interesting new questions and innovative methods for answering those questions.

**Research in the Biological Sciences**

Research in the biological sciences has focused mainly on attempts to discover and characterize a biological basis for sexual orientation. Scientists have considered three general categories of factors: genetics, brain factors, and endocrine influences.

Efforts to document a possible link between the endocrine system and sexual orientation have been underway since at least the 1940s. Early studies hypothesized deficiencies in testosterone levels in male homosexuals and deficiencies in estrogen levels in lesbians. Rendered more reliable by the development of highly precise hormone assays, current endocrine research indicates that, on average, there are no significant differences between gay men and heterosexual men, nor between lesbians and heterosexual women, on levels of sex hormones (Gartrell and Banks, 1995).

A recent interest in possible genetic factors has produced intriguing results. Bailey and Pillard (1991) found a 52% concordance rate for gay men participants who had an identical twin brother, compared with a concordance rate of 22% for fraternal twins and 11% for adoptive brothers. Nearly identical statistics were obtained for lesbians in a parallel study by the same research group (Bailey et al. 1993). Both studies suggest a possible significant, but by no means determinative, genetic influence on sexual orientation.
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Research on differences between homosexuals and heterosexuals in brain anatomy or physiology is at an earlier stage--and conclusions are even less certain. In a representative and much publicized study, neuroscientist Simon LeVay (1991) claimed that certain cells in the hypothalamus differed significantly between gay men and heterosexual men and, moreover, that the cells of the gay men resembled more closely those of heterosexual women than they did heterosexual men. Serious methodological flaws in the study have rendered its conclusions quite controversial.

Doubtless this search for biological influences on sexual orientation will continue, aided by advances in biological methods and research designs. To date, however, no certain relationships have been documented.

**Literature**

The fields of LGB literary history and cultural studies have shared in the recent explosion of work on sexuality. While any summary of this research will inevitably be reductive, the field can be broadly divided into two approaches.

The first approach focuses specifically on homoerotic acts and desires, reading these as markers of a relatively fixed identity group long-neglected in scholarly research and deserving of preservation. In terms of literary study, this theoretical leap from sexual acts (and desires) to sexual identity provides a justification for the retrieval of writings by either self-identified or historically-identifiable lesbian and gay authors. This approach has enabled the rediscovery of authors and texts neglected within the mainstream literary canon and to a re-reading of already canonical writers (Walt Whitman is one prominent example) whose "sexuality" had been either ignored or misrepresented by more traditional criticism. Designated by Eve Sedgwick (*Epistemology of the Closet*) as a "minoritizing" logic, the approach sometimes treats sexuality as a historical constant, in which case the term "lesbian" can align a classical writer like Sappho with a modern poet like Adrienne Rich; at other times, the same logic is applied only within the historical context of the twentieth century, the century which made the category of the "homosexual" available as a mean of identification.

The second approach follows a "universalizing" logic by insisting that homoerotic acts and desires are not isolated within a "minority" population. Sometimes referred to as "queer studies" and often associated with the writings of Michel Foucault and Judith Butler (among others), this perspective can be traced to early twentieth-century medical researchers (*Freud's Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*), through the gay liberation movement of the early 1970s, and up to radical forms of political activism and sexual dissidence today. This approach begins by emphasizing the historical specificity of the very idea of sexual identity (homosexual or heterosexual), and then proceeds both by investigating the origins of the idea and by searching for alternative conceptions of bodies and pleasure. Though still committed to the study of "lesbian," "gay" and "bisexual" authors, queer research tends to bracket those terms in order to open the topic of sexuality into larger frames of reference: the historical construction of "heterosexuality," as a "majority" sexuality; the regulation of colonial sexual relations; the impact of sexuality and sexual (sub)cultures on social and political theory; the intersections between sexual and other forms of "minority" identification.

These two overlapping approaches obviously have different research and political agendas. What they share, however, is a commitment to the project of culture-preservation and culture-building common to virtually all humanist enterprise.

**The Arts**

The growing importance of LGB studies in the arts is evident in at least three (relatively distinct) categories of research materials. The first is located within the disciplinary and institutional confines of traditional arts studies--for example, in thematic readings of dramatic texts and music works and in biographical works on particular artists and arts practitioners. Among the most influential works in this area are Claude Sommers' *Wilde to Stonewall: Studies in a Male Homosexual Literary Tradition*, Edmund White's *Jean Genet*, and Maynard Solomon's essays on Franz Shubert's homoeroticism. Broader thematic studies include Kaier Curtin's *We Can Always Call Them Bulgarians: The Emergence of Lesbians and Gay Men on the American Stage* and Kate Chedgzoys's *Shakespeare's Queer Children*. By the 1990s, these biographical and thematic studies had given rise to a broader critical interest in the relevance of sexuality to artistic creation itself. This new area of research manifested itself as early as 1991, with Susan McClary's *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality* and Wayne Koestenbaum's *The Queen's Throat: Opera, Homosexuality, and the Mystery of Desire*.

(continued)
Studies of artists who were or may have been homosexual and of homoerotic themes in performance have recently given rise to the study of sexuality itself as a social performance. Arguably the key analytical metaphor for work in queer studies generally, important work in "performance studies" has evolved particularly from the critical study of lesbian theatre. This work ranges across feminist theory, materialist cultural studies, and queer theory and makes for a heady mix of positions and fractures within lesbian identity. Jill Dolan's Presence and Desire nicely distinguishes between earlier, radical feminist formulations of lesbian issues (as questions of rather fixed identity) and more recent "queer" formulations of sexuality as a conditional enactment of social relations. Lynda Hart and Peggy Phelan's Acting Out: Feminist Performances includes essays on specific lesbian theatre groups and lesbian performers who blur the lines between formal theatre performance and the daily performance of identity and resistance.

Sociology

One area of particular sociological research has concerned the sociology of the family. As gay and lesbian couples have established autonomous households, some of them involving childrearing, sociologists of the family have been interested in analyzing the bases, strengths, and weaknesses of such "alternative" family forms. One path-breaking book was by P. Blumstein and P. Schwartz, American Couples: Money, Work, Sex (1983) that analyzed same-sex couples as well as heterosexual couples. J. Stacey in Brave New Families (1991) and K. Weston in Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, and Kinship (1991) described homosexual units as "families" and traced their efforts to incorporate friends, kin, and children into their lives (even if they were surrogate kin and children) in forms paralleling those of more "typical" families. Blumstein and Schwartz observed that since homosexual couples are sometimes rejected by their blood kin, homosexual couples often carry out "family building" among those acquaintances (whether related or not) who are willing to accept their homosexuality and affirm their relationships. K.M. Baber and K.R. Allen, in their Women and Families: Feminist Reconstructions (1992) presented well-documented materials on lesbians and their families. And in 1995 K. Allen and D. Demo published an article titled "The Families of Lesbians and Gay Men: A New Frontier in Family Research" in the Journal of Marriage and the Family. In a series of studies (one of them published in 1989) L. Kurdek studied the social support systems and cohesive aspects of same-sex couples. One of his preliminary findings was that lesbian couples appeared to have a stronger relationship quality than did gay couples.


(continued)
Recently a number of sociologists have studied the ways in which the field of sociology has dealt with LGB sociologists and their concerns. In 1994, *Sociological Theory* published two such articles: A. Stein's and K. Plummer's "I Can't Even Think Straight: Queer Theory and the Missing Sexual Revolution in Sociology," and S. Epstein's "A Queer Encounter: Sociology and the Study of Sexuality." In the same year, *Critical Sociology* published an article by S. Seidman: "Queer Pedagogy: Queer-in-Sociology." In 1995 V. Taylor and N. Raeburn published, in *Social Problems*, "Identity Politics as High-Risk Activism: Career Consequences for Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Sociologists." In this article they identified some of the choices LGB sociologists may have to make regarding their own career plans. In 1996 S. Seidman edited and published a collection of sociologically-relevant articles under the title *Queer Theory/Sociology*, presenting the current status of gay and lesbian issues in the field of Sociology.

As far as family sociology and other fields of sociology are concerned, serious research has already begun. In the years ahead, as the visibility of lesbian, gays, and bisexuals increases, one can expect the tempo of sociological research to increase as well.

**Philosophy**

Important recent contributions to LGB studies in the field of philosophy have come from three groups of philosophers: lesbian feminists (emphasizing common concerns between lesbian and other females), gay theorists (tending to focus on men, but also meaning to address common concerns between lesbians and gay men), and queer theorists (including feminist-socialist contributors, addressing common concerns among lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and transgendered folk). In the first group, the most influential contributors have been Marilyn Frye, who wrote *Politics of Reality* (1983) and *Willful Virgin* (1992), and Sarah Lucia Houland, who published *Lesbian Ethics: Toward New Values* (1988). Also significant are books by Jeffner Allen and Joyce Trebiloc and essays by Maria Lugones. Most of this work has background in the Midwest Society of Women in Philosophy, which has been active with a strong lesbian presence since 1971.


In queer scholarship, the most influential contributor is Judith Butler, author of four books, the best known of which is *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (1990). Other significant scholars include Jackie Zita, who has contributed many essays and written the forthcoming book, *Body Talk*, and Jacob Hale, who writes essays on transgender issues.

Wisconsin's Claudia Card has explored ways of bridging some of these divisions. Her work constitutes something of a hybrid, especially between lesbian feminist and gay scholarship (with some influence of queer scholarship as well). Her recent publications include *Lesbian Choices* (1995) and *Adventures in Lesbian Philosophy* (1994).

**History**

LGB history has its roots in the so-called "new histories" of the 1970s (of which African American history, women's history, and the history of the working-classes are additional examples). Like those other areas, early LGB historians had a double purpose. First, they sought to recover the histories of persons and groups identified as homosexual usually omitted from academic teaching and scholarship. This goal produced a focus on the discovery of evidence long ignored or lost and on the re-reading of known evidence for its ability to disclose information about neglected groups. Jonathan Katz's two documentary collections -- *Gay American History* and *Gay American Almanac* -- have proved foundational for the field, and comparable anthologies have appeared for LGB European history. Important work focused on the struggles of early homosexual movements (for example, influential early studies by James Steaksley and John D'Emilio) and the identification of famous individuals treated in traditional scholarship as heterosexual (for example, Walt Whitman and Eleanor Roosevelt). From early on, LGB historians also strove, not simply to place gays and lesbians in the existing historical narrative, but to alter the story itself -- to revise the traditional historical emphasis on politics, wars, and statecraft, by insisting on the pertinence of a broader cast of historical actors and questions. This focus soon evolved into an interest in the historical character of sexual identity itself and in the importance of sexuality as a vehicle of state-building. John Boswell's prize-winning
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Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality (1980) argued that attitudes about sexuality were not transhistorical, but altered markedly even within the Western European tradition. George Mosse examined attitudes toward sexuality as an expression of specific nationalisms (Mosse, 1984).

An early inclination to essentialism (that is, to the assumption that sexual identity is innate) has more recently been replaced by the effort to understand the sexual subject as constructed and specific to particular communities, spiritualities, and economies. Like researchers in other field, LGB historians now emphasize the dynamics of historical "performativity" -- that is, of sexual identity as a historically specific, enacted constellation of attitudes and relations. For example, George Chauncey's celebrated Gay New York (1994) traces the consolidation of a wide diversity of enacted, non-heterosexual identities toward a single "gay male" identity experienced individually and socially as oppositional to heterosexuality. With a few notable exceptions (for example, Elizabeth Kennedy and Madaline Davis, 1993), this work has not problematized intersections of race and sexual identity and has focused on white communities.

Legal Research
Legal scholarship on questions of sexual orientation and the law is quite recent. As late as the early 1980s, legal scholars had paid little attention to this field -- a notable exception being Rhonda Rivera's 1970s breakthrough overview (Rivera, 1979). The Supreme Court's landmark 1986 decision in Bowers v. Hardwick (in which the Court upheld the constitutionality of a Georgia sodomy law as applied to a gay man) proved the watershed event. The decision generated extensive scholarly attention, most of it critical of the court's reasoning and its result. Since Hardwick, the legal literature on sexual orientation questions has mushroomed, and several trends are apparent.

First, as public policy debates on LGB issues have proliferated, so has the work of legal scholars. Questions about same sex marriage, gays in the military and anti-gay rights initiatives and referenda, for example, are arising with increasing frequency in the legislative and judicial arenas. (See Rubenstein 1996). A growing body of scholarship addresses the constitutional and other legal issues implicated in these controversies and proposes new approaches and solutions. The Supreme Court's first genuine gay rights decision, rendered in the spring of 1996 (Romer v. Evans -- in which the Court invalidated a Colorado antigay rights initiative) should accelerate the growth of LGB scholarship focused on the development of new legal doctrines and theories.

In addition, many legal scholars writing on LGB questions have been influenced by larger trends in academia (especially critical legal theory and LGB studies) and have taken a more theoretical turn. The post-Hardwick scholarship has reflected a strong interest in interrogating the very concept of homosexuality and, in particular, the stability and coherence of sexual categories. Explorations of the links between sexual acts and the more complex constellation of social factors that comprise identity, have been particularly central in this growing literature. This line of inquiry, which produces a critique of laws that assume fixed homosexual and heterosexual identities, is typified in the work of Janet Halley (1993, 1994). The increasing skepticism of many scholars toward conventional identity categories (sexual and otherwise) has also helped to generate a new scholarly interest in intersectional issues (such as the overlap of race, gender, and sexuality; for example, Valdes, 1995).

Finally, like legal scholars in many other areas, LGB scholars have shown increasing interest in drawing on disciplines outside of the law to assess the nature of rights claims. In exploring LGB legal questions, this interdisciplinary work has incorporated, for example, perspectives from biology (Halley 1994), economics (Brown 1995) and history (Eskridge 1993).

Conclusion
Whether understood as a subject matter or as a category of critical analysis, as an inquiry into a fixed identity or as an examination of socially constituted positions, as LGB studies or as queer theory, research on sexuality is a provocative and prolific field. In the tradition of American universities, committed to the development of intellectually active and engaged young adults, LGB studies retains its original focus on personal identity and individual experience. At the same time, in the questions it asks, the material it explores, and the methodologies it incorporates, LGB studies has long since transcended purely personal interests to assume an important and influential role both in the academy and in public policy-making.

(Note: References, a list of journals and a list of academic publications included in the full text of the report are available through the Faculty Senate materials on-line and in the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty.)
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Chapter Three - The Curriculum

Current Courses with Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Content
In September, 1995, this Committee distributed a survey to all University faculty and instructional staff, seeking information about lesbian, gay, and bisexual scholarship and teaching. Specifically, the survey inquired about:

[] courses dealing primarily or partially with LGB topics
[] references to LGB issues in lectures or discussions
[] research about LGB issues and concerns

Two hundred and eighty completed surveys were returned and analyzed; the results demonstrated that more than 100 courses then taught at UW-Madison contained lesbian, gay, and bisexual content.

In the late fall of 1996, the Committee contacted the faculty members who had responded affirmatively to any of the original survey questions, to guarantee that the information provided remained current, and to ask for any additional courses, references, or research. The surveys disclosed that at least five current courses focus exclusively on these issues (Women's Studies 442, Lesbian Culture; Comparative Literature 368, Literature and Ideas: Special Topics: Alternative Sexualities; History 600, Advanced Seminar, Sexual Identities in American History; German 711, Cultural History of Homosexuality in Germany; and Law 940, Special Topics: Sexual Orientation and the Law). The faculty responsible for another 10-15 courses reported that more than 10 percent of the content relates to LGB people, history, literature, or social concerns. In most other courses identified by respondents to the survey, five to 10 percent of the material covered is specifically relevant to LGB issues. In those courses, attention given to LGB concerns varies from discussions of the life or work of a certain artist, writer, historical figure, or filmmaker to analyses of the construction of gender and sexuality in various cultures. Much of the content reported in the survey deals directly with discrimination or prejudice against lesbian, gay, or bisexual people.

The curriculum does not currently include an introductory course in LGB studies. There is no regular course in LGB theory.

A list of the courses reported in the 1995 survey as verified and augmented in 1996 is included as an attachment to this report.

Lezian, Gay, and Bisexual Courses and Programs in other Colleges and Universities
The Committee has gathered information about lesbian, gay, and bisexual courses, curricula, and programs at other institutions of higher education. In January, 1997, the Committee made direct contact with representatives of each of the institutions listed below to validate the information provided in a variety of lists maintained on world wide web sites.

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee established a certificate program in gay and lesbian studies in 1994, based on the recommendations of an ad hoc study committee and their Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Faculty/Staff Caucus. Having surveyed department chairs about lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues in courses in 1993, the Caucus compiled a list of about 35 existing courses that formed the core of the subsequent certificate program. Their program requires 18 credits, with a minimum grade point average of 2.5. All students must complete an introductory course (three credit hours) plus 9 credits in courses that focus primarily on gay and lesbian issues and 6 credits in courses that "include a substantial amount of material about gay and lesbian issues." No more than 9 credits from any single department can apply to the requirements for the certificate. These requirements are quite similar to those established for LGB certificate programs in other institutions.

Lesbian and gay studies programs are also in place or in development in at least these institutions:

American University
Brown University
Cornell University
City University of New York (Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies)
Duke University
Rutgers University
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San Francisco City College
San Francisco State University
Stanford University
Towson State University
University of Arizona
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside
University of Chicago
University of Colorado, Boulder
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Minnesota
University of Montreal
University of Southern California
Wesleyan University

A larger number of institutions are currently developing specific courses in lesbian and gay studies. Among them are:
Antioch College
Brandeis University
California Polytechnic Institute, Pomona
California State University, Chico
California State University, Fresno
California State University, Northridge
College of William and Mary
East Carolina University
Florida Atlantic University
George Mason University
George Washington University
Harvard University
Humboldt State University
Hunter College
Illinois State University
Indiana University
Miami University of Ohio
New York University
Northern Illinois University
Pennsylvania State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Southern Illinois University
Tufts University
University of California, Davis
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of California, Santa Cruz
University of Maine, Orono
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Michigan
University of Utah
University of Washington
Western Washington University
Yale University

Proposed Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Studies Program
This Committee proposes that the University establish a program in lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies. Initially, this
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program should grant a certificate in LGB studies, but not provide a dedicated major. After five years, the certificate program should be evaluated, and, if it is successful, the University should expand and enhance it so LGB studies can be a major field of undergraduate study.

The proposed certificate program would require 15 credit hours (typically five courses), to include an introduction to gay, lesbian, and bisexual studies and a capstone course. The Committee estimates that two faculty members would need to devote about 0.5 FTE each to the program; one of those professors would serve as chair (an activity requiring about half of that faculty member's time in the program1), and the other would teach the introductory and capstone courses. A part-time program assistant would support the work of the program, and space would be required for support staff and faculty.

To establish the certificate program, the faculty in the program will need to develop a new, introductory level lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies course and a capstone seminar, both to be taught by the program faculty. The program faculty may be newly hired scholars, professors transferring from other departments or programs on our campus, or a combination of both. As the results of the Committee's surveys demonstrate, there are a number of other existing courses which can satisfy some of the requirements of the certificate program.

Our rationale for this recommendation is as follows:

[1] Over the past 20 to 25 years, lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies courses, programs, and Centers have been established on more than 50 campuses in the United States and on many in Europe as well. The study of LGB experience constitutes a distinct, interdisciplinary field of inquiry, teaching, and scholarship that incorporates a diversity of literary, cultural, and scientific materials and methods. Simply including LGB content in otherwise unconnected courses fails to account for the scholarship emerging in this broader field. A lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies program would support and strengthen this rich scholarship. In establishing a LGB studies program, the University would participate in an important academic endeavor that unites many institutions of higher education in formalizing gender and sexuality studies. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has established a certificate program in gay and lesbian studies. The University of Wisconsin-Madison should be a leader in developing such a program, as well.

[1] Lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies are interdisciplinary by their very nature. These programs bring together scholarship in a broad variety of fields; the new perspectives that lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies provide can enhance research and teaching in each of those disciplines. This University is strongly committed to interdisciplinary scholarship, and the program the Committee proposes would foster research and teaching across disciplinary boundaries among faculty interested in issues of sexual orientation.

[1] The development of a LGB studies program, by building these connections, would diminish the sense of isolation now experienced by faculty who are engaged in scholarship on lesbian, gay, and bisexual topics. The presence of such a program would attract new faculty with interests in these areas. A number of caucuses, study groups, and task forces concerned with LGB studies now thrive within scholarly professional organizations.

[1] The University disappoints and limits a substantial number of students by the absence of a formal LGB studies program. Several current lesbian, gay, and bisexual courses are repeatedly oversubscribed; students seeking to major in LGB studies are frustrated. A lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies program would provide opportunities for undergraduate or graduate students seeking to do research in the field.

[1] Establishing a certificate program, as opposed to a major, is a reasonable first step that builds upon existing University resources. The Committee's survey of 1995/96 demonstrated that a great many courses with substantial LGB content already are taught; with the addition of an introductory course at the 100 level and a capstone seminar, the foundation of a lesbian, gay, and bisexual curriculum would be established. Furthermore, the faculty now includes a number of professors in a variety of disciplines who teach courses with LGB content; these faculty members would bring strength to a developing program. Sharing their time between the lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies courses and their primary discipline would preserve the essential interdisciplinary character of LGB studies and avoid creating an isolated, disconnected new program.

1the chair's responsibilities may occupy 0.75 FTE during the first year.
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At the same time, it is important to dedicate faculty time to LGB studies in a formal way. The current informal arrangement does not provide consistency and does not nurture leadership. A LGB studies program would provide support for both new and current faculty who are doing research on related topics, writing for scholarly journals, or teaching courses with lesbian, gay, and bisexual content.

A lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies program would provide the framework for advancing scholarship not only through courses, but also through conferences, symposia, and invited speakers.

For both faculty and students, the presence of a lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies program would bring LGB issues and persons greater visibility.

The university would serve the entire undergraduate student body by maintaining an introductory course in lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies. Such a course would be of interest not only to students who intended to pursue a certificate, but also to other students who had personal or academic interest in the field.

Additional Recommendation
The richness of LGB experience, history, imagination, thought, and art can enhance the content of many courses, majors, and research projects. While a lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies program will bring strength and focus, it is also important to infuse LGB experience broadly in the curriculum. The Committee therefore encourages all faculty and instructional staff to re-examine their courses and syllabi to determine where they could be enriched by including lesbian, gay, and bisexual content or perspectives.

Chapter Four - Campus Life: Students

"I worked as a house fellow last year and had lots of guys coming to me with problems because I got a reputation as someone that would at least try and help. For instance, I had a guy who was not "out," but every weekend when other students on his floor were drunk, they would come and beat on his door and tell "the faggot to come out." He talked about being scared to even go to the bathroom on the weekend. Another gay resident had "faggot" written on his door repeatedly. One guy said that his roommate suspected he was gay and went through his desk and found a calendar from the LGBCC. The roommate proceeded to tell the whole floor. Yet another man told me that every time he went in the shower, people would make nasty remarks and leave. And yet another guy received harassing phone calls with people leaving messages on his machine: "We know where you live and we're going to kill you"; "You better watch your back"; "Do you wanna suck my dick? You will if I shove it in your face." Get the picture?"

"One thing that happened to me in the classroom. I didn't come out; I was just talking about issues - queer teachers specifically, that is about being a lesbian teacher and different kinds of identity markers there are and fear about being outed and losing your job. And in the class I was in, nothing I ever said any time after that could be heard. Everyone would jump on me whenever I opened my mouth. Somehow I had said something that positioned me so far away from everyone else in the class that the next time I spoke everyone said NO and the next time NO. I wondered what was going on? Do I have something on my shirt?? I was very confused. I don't think the professor even noticed because it wasn't like they were saying "lesbians are wrong." It was just that suddenly I couldn't bring anything up without someone finding a problem with it. It was like what I said was so disturbing that nothing else I said after that could be worthwhile. There was a brick wall in the classroom."

"I came here [for graduate school] with the understanding that this was a great place to be a lesbian, and I had a terrible, terrible time trying to find the community. I am out and resourceful, and I called every number in the directory and group after group was defunct.... I called the student center and heard "open at these times." I called at the "open" times and got the answering machine. It was very, very frustrating. I'd heard all these great things and I couldn't find any. Obviously, I did finally. But it took a long time. If I had not been really comfortable with who I am and truly invested in seeking out places, I would not have found the community."

"People told me I should be careful about being 'out' as a medical student, because medicine is such a homophobic profession. I haven't advertised it, but I don't hide it, either. Most of the people in my class who (continued)
know have been pretty cool about it. If I'm around and people know about me, no one tells 'faggot jokes' or says anti-gay stuff. But when people don't know, I hear it all the time. Like on rounds in the hospital; on some services, the residents and even the attendings say these subtle anti-gay things, and they lower their voices because they know they shouldn't be saying them. I don't feel like having to confront people every single time; I'd be confronting a couple of times a day. And besides, sometimes the people who make insensitive remarks are the ones who will be evaluating me. You have to be careful."

"If the other guys knew I was queer, I'd be run right out of the training room. Nobody can deal with it in sports. With all the shared bathrooms and showers, nudity, and butt-slapping. So I keep real quiet. But I ran into another guy on a different team in one of the bars in Milwaukee one night -- I wouldn't ever go near one of the Madison bars -- and we were both, like, really terrified. Like he knows something about me and I know something about him. It's not a good way to live, it isn't. But what else can I do? I don't want to give up my sport."

**Introduction**

Although the LGB students with whom we talked wanted to point to positive things about their experience at UW-Madison, as well as the problems they've encountered, the difficult things they had faced were more on their minds. And while they acknowledge that many things are being done to try and improve the campus climate for LGB students, as some of the opening quotations suggest, there is a large gap between positive process and actual outcomes for many students. LGB students are an extremely diverse group—a fact that both complicates their lives and makes it impossible to summarize a singular LGB experience. However, what is clear is that there continues to be a continuum of violence, from benign neglect and invisibility in the classroom to physical assault, experienced by many, many LGB students on this campus. This is difficult to hear -- especially if one has worked hard to improve the campus climate and provide better services for LGB students. Students acknowledge our efforts and, at the same time, articulate many continuing challenges. This difference between the *efforts* of dedicated, caring people, on the one hand, and the *lived experience* of LGB students, on the other hand, does not suggest that either is invalid, nor does it imply that some further argument should determine which is true. The Committee believes that both are true and that the difference simply suggests the magnitude of the work remaining to be done.

In January of 1992, the Gay and Lesbian Issues Committee (GLIC), under the auspices of the Dean of Students Office, issued a report, "Issues of Concern to Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Students on Our Campus," which comprehensively reported on campus life for LGB students. It contained more than 30 recommendations for administrative units providing student services, as well as a number of suggestions directed towards "overall campus effort." Some of the recommendations were taken seriously and resulted in action. This chapter will provide information about the current efforts of various administrative units with regards to services for LGB students and discuss the status of LGB student-run groups and services. However, the primary purpose of our information gathering for this chapter was to update the earlier GLIC report in terms of investigating what are seen as the most pressing issues from LGB students' points of view. The initial focus of this chapter is a discussion of three wide areas students see as currently most important: invisibility and the violence it fosters, domestic partner benefits, and curricular issues.

**LGB Students Speak**

To assess the current campus climate and issues of concern for LGB students, five group interviews were conducted during the 95-96 academic year, involving thirty LGB participants. Information was also collected with a questionnaire at a Ten Percent Society dance, in discussion at Out is In Advisory Board [to the Dean of Students] meetings, and by comparing notes with University Health Service (UHS) staff from their interviewing process involving LGB students and health issues. In presenting the student voices we do not pretend that we heard from everyone. In particular, undergraduate students of color were under-represented, and no one we spoke with self-identified as transgendered.

Most students we interviewed stated that gender was a factor that heavily influenced their experience. In fact, when we asked about this, the common response was: "Well, yeah, like duh." The elaborations of this, however, suggest that male privilege extends through the campus LGB communities -- and, at the same time, that "obviously queer" men are the most likely to experience physical attack.
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The general picture that emerged is one of a "good news, bad news" story. Overall, the interviews suggest that UW-Madison is a good place for LGB students, but:

we don't really know how it is for transgender students;
"good" is relative—compared to many places (other colleges and universities, and other cities), it's great—but things here could be improved;
the University "talks a better line" than what it actually provides in terms of making LGB students truly equal members of the campus community.

Issues that surfaced also fall into three main areas:

the need for visible and accessible student support services to counter invisibility generally and violence in the residence halls, specifically.
the need for domestic partner benefits that include health insurance.
- the need for more, varied, and visible LGB-related courses.

There is an important division between the undergraduate and graduate/professional student concerns in that the undergraduates feel safe housing is a major issue for them, while the graduate and professional students most frequently talk about wanting domestic partner benefits that include health insurance. Because safe housing is seen as necessary for everyone, graduate students agree that this is the number one issue that should be addressed. Similarly, while students want to see the issue of curricular addressed, making sure everyone has safe housing remains a priority. Students suggest none of these issues is truly separate, however: offering domestic partner health insurance and LGB studies courses could be part of a clear, consistent message that LGB people are valued at the UW-Madison, and this message, in turn, could help reduce incidents of harassment of LGB students.

**In/Visibility and the Day to Day: Housing, the Classroom, Getting Connected**

While not all students who had experienced university residence hall life found it bad, most students seem to agree that university housing is not a good, or even safe, place for LGB students to live. Students reported numerous incidents of vandalism (posters being ripped off residence hall room doors, graffiti scribbled on their walls). Many described the common experience of roommates' requesting a room change upon finding out the interviewed student was gay. One lesbian student reported that a gay friend was physically assaulted in his residence hall the week before. Almost more disturbing to students than the incidents themselves, however, is the feeling that one is on his/her own. Students acknowledge that "(The Division of University) Housing tries." However, house fellows are seen as poorly trained to handle homophobic situations. And there is a reluctance by many residents to draw further attention to themselves by reporting incidents -- especially since they feel little will be done.

Students also reported an in/visibility issue in the classroom. While race, class and gender are validated as important perspectives or standpoints for critique and analysis, sexual orientation is seldom addressed. And often if an LGB student raises LGB issues s/he must be prepared to work alone for the rest of the semester. Several students reported difficulty getting copies of notes or in joining study groups after inadvertently coming out in class. One lesbian senior commented, "I don't think professors see it, but many times in undergraduate classes LGB students are separated out." And graduate students are not immune: research group opportunities suddenly shrunk for one student; another said, "Some professors seem to cringe when I suggest I want to do a gay/lesbian related paper...and I plan to do research that will be focused on the GLB community." A medical student described being "dropped" from scheduled meetings of a small group working on a research project once the other students, and the supervising professor, found out she was lesbian.

Students feel strongly about more visibility being an important piece to lessen day-to-day struggles in several ways. First of all, there is a need for more visible support. Students asked about having an "official" LGB housing liaison. One even suggested having a contact for each academic department. There were several discussions questioning the effectiveness of the current LGB position in the Dean of Students Office. And while student counseling services seem to try to have LGB staff, students wondered why this also has not become officially institutionalized. Individuals can only accomplish so much, but having units hire and advertise LGB support positions is seen as part of the larger message that needs to get out: LGB and transgender students are here, belong here, and should be, and feel, welcome here.

(continued)
Students also wished that more visibility be created at Summer Orientation, Advising, and Registration (SOAR) programs. Entering LGB students may well just be coming out, and finding information without having to ask for it, or do a lot of hunting, can make a tremendous difference. Making LGB students, services, and issues visible at SOAR would provide initial reassurance that new LGB students belong here. Despite the many student groups and LGB resources in the wider Madison community, if one is not resourceful and extremely persistent, it can be hard to find LGB communities here. "Isolation" during freshman year was a leitmotif in the interviews. And even graduate students tell tales of difficulties in finding "community." Certainly this concern interacts with the housing issues LGB students face: new students, if they are fearful of the consequences of asking questions about LGB resources or having materials about LGB organizations and services around their rooms, are less likely to find support.

Students arrive at the UW-Madison from many different places -- literally and figuratively. LGB and transgender students bring yet another dimension of diversity. Too often, they feel, being LGB or transgender is an unacknowledged existence, while at the same time it is "used against us." At the very least, they would like to feel safe where they have to live. And they come here expecting, or at least hoping for, a lot more: "The University shouldn't be a source of problems-it should be the place that the students can turn to for help and support!"

**Domestic Partner Health Insurance**

Domestic partner benefits that include health insurance was the most common issue raised by graduate students. While it became possible in the fall of 1996 to get a student health insurance policy through the Ten Percent Society that will cover domestic partners, that policy provides far less coverage than the insurance offered teaching assistants, program assistants, and fellows as employees of the University, and so remains an insufficient solution. The health insurance provided as an employee fringe benefit does not include coverage for domestic partners. Similarly, the Student Health Insurance Plan (SHIP) sponsored by the university excludes coverage for domestic partners. Students then have to make an unacceptable choice between (1) adequate and/or employer-provided coverage and (2) insurance that covers a domestic partner. While some students have a pragmatic need for such insurance, many more expressed their concern as (1) an equal rights issue and (2) a matter of the University’s acting in good faith: "It would show the University is putting their money where their mouth is."

Though University Health Services attempted to secure coverage for domestic partners in SHIP in 1994, the effort failed. Graduate students repeatedly expressed the view that the university’s failure to continue to fight on this issue was illogical and a disillusionment. They found it illogical because the problem of uninsured and underinsured people in Wisconsin is well documented, and a less restrictive policy could help get more people insured. Further, they found it illogical because the UW needs to remain competitive, and more and more universities are offering domestic partner health insurance. As one student wrote: "My main concern is that the U. remembers the benefits they reap from a significant gay student population! I would hate for the U. to ignore this population and cause both gays and the U. to lose." Several graduate students stated that they almost enrolled somewhere else due to the lack of partnership medical benefits. Students believe that it is has been well demonstrated at other institutions that the actual fiscal cost is small compared to the benefit, both pragmatic and symbolic, for an institution which affirms among its premises equal opportunity, intellectual freedom, and the building of community.

Most upsetting for some was the message they felt the UW sent to LGB and transgendered students about the disparity between words and action. One person commented: "... I still feel that the University doesn't care about me having a level field to succeed on either." If the University would work on extending health insurance benefits, just the opposite message would be broadcast: "It's more than just having health insurance, it shows the University thinks that my family is important." Students are not naive about wider political reality (they realize that the university’s advocacy for domestic partners benefits could be costly in some ways), but they ask that the Chancellor’s Office support renewed effort to make changes in policy sooner rather than later.

**Curricular Issues**

In discussions of whether there is an interest in a LGB Studies program, there was a consistently positive response from LGB students. Students felt that establishing a LGB Studies program is a good idea for several reasons. There is a wealth of research currently being done in this area and the UW-Madison does not offer sufficient opportunity for students and faculty to participate in the field. Furthermore, students who do venture to work in LGB research on their own are rather isolated and sometimes stigmatized. And finally, the validation of scholarship in this field would have the added benefit of increasing positive visibility of LGB and transgender issues that would help the overall campus climate.

(continued)
Students find it somewhat ironic that, as a leading research institution, the UW-Madison has fallen behind in establishing an LGB Studies program. "If UW-Milwaukee can have a program, why can’t we?" was a common sentiment. Besides general scholarly interest, it was suggested that there would be interest from some in professional service fields: "LGB Studies should be available because of the lack of training to help LGB’s in society." In other words, beyond their personal interest, students suggest a LGB Studies program is necessary both to keep the UW-Madison "cutting-edge" and to support its mission in training professionals fully competent to deal with current societal and cultural issues.

The absence of an LGB Studies program makes academic life difficult for students wishing to take classes in this area. Access to the current LGB studies–related courses and especially the larger number of current courses with LGB content is made difficult by the absence of well-coordinated information about such offerings: "Just listing courses separately in the timetable would help in locating classes." Expression of more deeply felt concern centers on the perception students have that there is little support from faculty and other instructional staff to pursue work related to LGB Studies. One student felt that, "Race, class and gender are being seen as critical factors that affect society, but sexuality is consistently swept under the rug." Another student commented, "If it were my major it would receive validation similar to issues related to race, class, and gender."

Since LGB studies is interdisciplinary by definition, students felt it important that support for it be universal in the university community. This concept was repeated by many students, who felt that an excellent way to show support and facilitate LGB focused research without compartmentalizing it would be to structure an LGB Studies Program as explicitly interdisciplinary. Some students made analogies to Women’s Studies as a model. They commented that in Women’s Studies, students have a focal point through which knowledge and research focused on women and gender can be centered; the department’s existence also validates research and knowledge about women in disciplines and classes that are not explicitly women focused. This has had an impact in many departments, validating women-related papers and research in courses that are not specifically related to gender. Students felt that an LGB Studies Program could accomplish the same thing for LGB-related work.

Again, there was somewhat of a division between undergraduate and graduate students with regards to their priorities. More undergraduates expressed excitement and interest in a major and taking LGB Studies courses generally. Many of the graduate students suggested their "academic path was already planned" and a new program would not so strongly affect academic choice. However, graduate students were supportive and suggested if they could find time they would certainly be interested. And those graduate students pursuing research projects with an LGB or transgender focus felt an LGB Studies program would certainly help them get the background they were currently putting together on their own.

All students interviewed seemed in agreement that a LGB studies program would create visibility for LGB and transgender concerns that could help the UW-Madison be a better place for students as a whole. One person commented that having a program would "...validate that this is a legitimate area of study. It would show that LGBT’s exist and have a history and culture." A LGB Studies program offers another way for everyone to be gain knowledge about "difference," become more comfortable with each other, and potentially work and live together more successfully. This point, emphasized by the students, is key: that developing a lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies program is in the best interest of the entire campus community -- not just of LGB students.

**LGB Student-Run Groups and Services**

Seven LGB and transgender groups are currently registered student organizations, including: Bi?Shy?Why?; Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Grad Students; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Law Student Union; LGB Catholic Students & Friends; Students of All Preferences (SOAP); Shake It Up!; and the Ten Percent Society. A number of other groups, such as the Lesbian Avengers, LGBT’s of Color, and Parents and Friends of Lesbians & Gays (PFLAG) have an active campus presence, but are not formally registered.

These groups offer a wide range of social, cultural, and political activities. For example, many hold regular meetings that offer opportunity for socializing and participating in work groups to make things happen on campus, such as "Coming Out Week" (around October 11, National Coming Out Day), film series and speak outs. Particularly visible because of its longevity, popular dances, and being a site of controversy, the Ten Percent Society offers an example of students’ taking matters into their own hands. In this last year they have maintained an active
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listserv, produced a twenty page brochure that provides information about LGB campus resources, offered their own student orientation program for incoming LGB students, and brought a student insurance plan to campus which includes domestic partner benefits.

The Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Campus Center (LGBCC) is another well-established student organization and is unique among LGB groups in having paid staff and maintaining a space large enough to be both office and drop-in center, as well as a social activity spot. The LGBCC is of particular importance because it houses the student LGB resources library, publishes a LGB campus newsletter, serves a clearing-house function for other LGB groups, and offers peer support services. This last year the LGBCC has worked hard to increase coordination and communication between LGB groups both on campus and in the larger community. Unfortunately, this critical organization is in danger of losing its funding because of the recent court ruling that using student segregated fees to fund the LGBCC, among 16 other student organizations, is a violation of the constitutional freedoms of speech and association for those students who are ideologically opposed to these organizations.

Although the potential threat to the LGBCC was not an issue during our interviews, after the ruling a member of the board of directors was contacted to describe the long term ramifications of this decision on student services. Because the LGBCC offers a diverse array of social and support services run by students themselves, it is sometimes the only place in which students feel comfortable discussing their issues and problems. Since the entire budget of the center is in jeopardy, they may have to close. This would make an already difficult situation for LGB students much worse.

LGB students are active in trying to create a campus they can safely and proudly call "ours." However, as the current situation with the LGBCC suggests in a very dramatic way, the foundation that exists for their efforts is precarious. Even without the pending budget loss, groups must constantly deal with the facts that the LGB student population is very diverse; many student groups form in crisis times and disband as need dissipates or leaders graduate. While inevitable, and a good thing in many ways, the ebb and flow of activity does underscore the need for student groups to have the support of structures that offer "institutional memory," mentoring, and stability beyond the typical student's year or two of involvement. And given the possibility of loss of a way to fund the LGBCC with student fee moneys, more, and more secure, funding becomes increasingly important.

**University Support and Outreach to LGB Students**

*Dean of Students Office*

On the UW-Madison campus, the Office of the Dean of Students has for a number of years taken a leadership role in bringing attention to addressing the needs and concerns of LGB students. In 1989, the Dean of Students, Mary K. Rouse, initiated the campus' first major effort to look systematically at these concerns by establishing the Gay and Lesbian Issues Committee (GLIC). This committee was composed of faculty, staff, and students, and was charged with investigating "those aspects of UW-Madison academic and social life which contribute positively to the experience of gay and lesbian students as well as the problems which negatively affect the recruitment and retention of gay and lesbian students." As mentioned in Chapter One and the introduction to this chapter, GLIC issued its report containing over 30 recommendations in January of 1992.

Partly because of the findings of this report, Dean Rouse worked to establish a .2 FTE staff position in the Office that was designated for work as liaison to the LGB campus community. Through the liaison, communication between students, faculty, staff and community groups was fostered, student groups were assisted in forming, and individual students welcomed and assisted. A number of campus and campus/community ad hoc committees were organized to deal with specific issues of concern to students and staff. The initial staff member holding this appointment, Jan Sheppard, also made an important contribution by working with other campus departments and programs to include LGB-friendly material. In the fall of 1995, this position was eliminated as part of a required budget reduction, and a designated LGB contact person, Peggy Lewis, was named to help continue the Office's activities and resource sharing.

Encouraging students to report instances of harassment and discriminatory experiences has been and is a high priority of the office. Currently, the SPEAK-UP program serves as a phone or email connection to report such incidents. In addition, staff of the Office of the Dean of Students, including the LGB contact person, are always
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available to talk with students about their experiences and take action with offenders if appropriate (either through the student disciplinary code or by referral to the Office of Equity and Diversity if the offending party is a faculty or staff member).

The Dean of Students Office has also: (1) worked to increase LGB visibility in SOAR, (2) co-sponsored LGB welcome receptions and graduation receptions, (3) put on programs and organized a lunch hour brown-bag speaker series, (4) published a newsletter, “We’re Everywhere.” And the office continues to have close contact with students and student groups through the LGBT Student Advisory Board and in the contact person’s attendance at student group meetings.

University Health Services
University Health Services (UHS) provides clinical, counseling, and prevention services to all UW-Madison students. For more than a decade, UHS has offered special clinical and outreach services to gay and bisexual men on campus (especially the Blue Bus Clinic’s sexually transmitted disease evaluation and treatment services, HIV antibody counseling and testing program, safer sex/condom use presentations, and outreach services at Ten Percent dances and in gay bars). More recently, UHS’ health promotion program began conducting focus groups and structured interviews with LGB and transgender students in order to better assess and respond to their health and counseling concerns and needs. At least five new LGBT staff have joined UHS in the past three years; LGB people are now strongly represented in UHS administration, clinical services, counseling and consultation services, and prevention programs.

To improve services for LGBT students and the climate within which those services are provided, UHS has also: (1) added magazines of LGBT interest to its waiting room periodicals, (2) increased the number of LGBT health promotion materials available, (3) invited LGBT students to address members of the clinical and counseling professional staff, (4) focused on LGBT issues as a component of its emphasis on responding to the needs of a diverse student body, (5) participated actively in a liaison project with University Housing to improve the climate for LGBT students in residence halls, (6) hired LGBT undergraduate and graduate students to work in health promotion and outreach programs, (7) begun designing new, LGBT-specific health promotion materials that respond to needs identified by our own LGBT students, (8) developed a series of workshops on relationship building for gay men, (9) advocated strongly and effectively on behalf of including domestic partners in the student health insurance plan -- the failure of which did not occur because of any lack of UHS support, and (10) increased the availability of “coming out” groups in Counseling and Consultation Services. The director of UHS, Richard Keeling, serves as Chair of this Committee.

At the same time, UHS believes there is much more to do both to improve the climate and to enhance clinical, counseling, and prevention services for LGBT students. Domestic partners coverage in health insurance remains a pressing, unmet need; UHS is committed to taking whatever steps it can to make it a reality (and has organized an on-campus and statewide working group to prompt faster action). Many important health and counseling concerns for LGBT students (such as violence in relationships, binge drinking, and depression) remain inadequately addressed because of the more general problems in the campus climate; although UHS cannot solve those problems by itself, it seeks collaborators in finding solutions for the whole campus community.

Division of University Housing
University Housing has developed a number of programs and services for lesbian, gay, and bisexual students living in university residence halls:

Assessment: A standing committee, the LGBT Housing Assessment Committee, meets biweekly to evaluate the living environment for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students living in residence halls. Several professional staff members and a representative of University Health Services make up this committee. The committee discusses ways to reach out to lesbian, gay, and bisexual students; it conducts open meetings each semester for current students and staff to share concerns and help generate ideas to improve the residence hall communities. In the spring of 1997, the Committee will conduct written surveys with lesbian, gay, and bisexual students living in residence halls to better evaluate the residence hall environment.
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Training: Housing has developed an LGBT Handbook for student staff and leaders as a training tool to assist them in meeting the needs of LGBT students. The handbook includes a list of program ideas, films, and community resources, as well as suggestions for handling issues that might arise. All professional staff are required to attend a training session concerning difference and diversity within the first six months of their employment; the session, entitled "Race and Gender Sensitivity," also addresses issues of homophobia. Housing provided a training session for students in the fall of 1996 to increase students' sensitivity toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual students.

Other: Housing co-sponsors monthly socials for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students living in the residence halls. Housing has volunteered to be one of two offices on campus that will implement a Safe Zone project under the guidance of the Dean of Students LGBT Advisory Committee. Housing recruits and hires openly gay staff members (currently there are five professional staff members and four student staff members who are openly gay). Representatives of Housing have attended Ten Percent Society meetings to recruit students to join their staff. Posters on each bulletin board in the halls during the fall of 1996 acknowledged that lesbian, gay, and bisexual students live here and listed a variety of campus and community resources for students. Several professional staff members are listed as out professionals in the "LGBT Resources at UW-Madison" guide distributed by the Ten Percent Society. A student staff member has established a social group in Ogg Hall for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students living there.

Other Units
Other administrative units on campus that directly serve a wide student body and have consciously worked to increase their visibility for GLBT students include the Campus Assistance Center (CAC) and the University Police. Considering themselves "the index" to the campus community, CAC is a point of contact for anyone trying to find almost anything related to the campus community. CAC keeps the LGBCC Newsletter available in their entrance area brochure rack. It also provides listings to LGBT student groups in their database and includes information about other sources of assistance for LGBT students in their various publications.

The University Police have had official LGB liaison duty included as part of an officer's job since 1990 and the student Bascom Hall sit-ins related to ROTC. In the last year they have made a more serious outreach effort. Officers Anita Kichefski and Jerome Van Natta produced a brochure "What the UW Madison Police Department Can Do for You" to provide information about dealing with harassment based on sexual orientation. They have also made a point of attending student meetings and dances to introduce themselves and make it clear that the University Police Department is a resource for any student needing assistance. While there were some questions raised about intent when officers first appeared at a Ten Percent dance, an invitation to return suggests their presence is appreciated.

Summary Comments
Between January 1992 and January 1997, efforts have increased to address the issues and concerns of GLBT students at the UW-Madison campus. However, this work (1) has not produced results that make this a truly improved climate for most LGB and transgender students and (2) is too frequently carried out through ad hoc processes that lack solid support and commitment from faculty and staff. In response to the information gathered we make the following recommendations.

Recommendations
1. Increase efforts by the Division of University Housing to provide a housing environment that is safe and free of harassment for all students. In particular, add more training for house fellows about how to create and implement a safe and inclusive environment, and how to respond quickly and effectively to harassment of LGB or transgender students. Provide fast, predictable, effective systems of making and responding to complaints about harassment in any form.

2. Support University Health Services' efforts to secure the availability of health insurance that covers domestic partners for students within the framework of the Student Health Insurance Plan (SHIP). Support similar efforts to provide coverage for domestic partners in health insurance provided through employment fringe benefit plans to staff and faculty, including teaching assistants, program assistants, and fellows.
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3. The university should all of its policies and procedures for providing benefits of other kinds to spouses and dependents and re-write them as necessary to provide the same benefits to the domestic partners of its faculty, staff, and students.

4. Develop a Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Studies Program, using a model similar to Women’s Studies, Southeast Asian Studies, and other interdisciplinary fields.

5. Fund the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Campus Center (LGBCC) with stable moneys and provide visible, accessible space in a central campus location. Doing so would allow the LGBCC to become a more effective source of support and information for the multiple LGBT student communities.

6. Create a full-time position for a university liaison to the LGB and transgender student community. The person in this position should be highly visible as a resource and support person for wide-ranging matters of LGBT student life, including, but not limited to, being a contact for administrative service units, a point of referral for individual students and parents, an academic staff assistant to the LGBCC to help with year-to-year transitions, and the facilitator of regular evaluations of the campus climate for LGBT students. Creating such a position would not relieve other university departments, service agencies, and administrative offices of the responsibility to develop, implement, and monitor the effectiveness of programs and services for LGBT and transgender students; rather, this new position would focus the university’s efforts, coordinate programs and services, and continuously evaluate our success.

7. The SOAR Leadership Team should greatly expand the attention given to LGB and transgender issues in SOAR. The Office of the Dean of Students should make it as easy as possible, and as safe as possible, for new or transferring students (both undergraduate and graduate/professional) to obtain information about the university and city LGBT communities and to access LGBT resources and services.

8. The Office of the Dean of Students should develop an LGB mentoring program, providing a connection between lesbian, gay, and bisexual students (of any level) and university LGB faculty and staff.

9. The Office of the Dean of Students should develop referral information that instructors can use to provide assistance to students with questions or concerns.

10. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should include in the required training for deans and department chairs (a) particular attention to lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues as they affect equity and fairness in the recruiting, admission, evaluation, retention, and rewarding of students; (c) encouragement of students’ contributions in campus or community service concerning lesbian, gay, or bisexual concerns; and (c) recognition of student research and scholarship in lesbian, gay, and bisexual topics.

11. The Committee encourages faculty and instructional staff also to consider how the climate in their classrooms might be challenging for lesbian, gay, and bisexual students, and to use that assessment in fostering a more inclusive, affirming environment.

12. Every three to five years, the faculty senate’s Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues should reassess the effectiveness of processes to provide a campus environment that is safe, equitable, and free from harassment and discrimination for LGB students, staff, and faculty.

Chapter Five - Campus Life: Faculty and Staff

While I was chairing a university committee, a member of the committee made disparaging remarks during a meeting about a professor in one of the university schools who allegedly talked in class about being a lesbian, suggesting that this should raise some serious questions about her competence as a professor. I pointed out in response that she being a lesbian could easily have been relevant to the subject matter that she was teaching and that I often found it relevant to so identify myself in relation to the subject matters that I teach. As much as anything else, the scornful and ridiculing tone in which this complaint was made by my fellow committee member was distressing to me. It seemed to me, however, that it never crossed his mind that the committee might include a lesbian or gay member, until I spoke up. I don’t know whether he ever reconsidered his views, since he never said anything in response.
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I flew to Madison to be interviewed for a faculty position. Until the morning of my arrival, I had been given only very positive feedback about my credentials and experience; my research, publications, and clinical interests all fit closely with the department’s priorities. Having heard that Madison was a progressive place where gay people could be comfortable, I said something about my partner -- and used his first name -- to the faculty member who came to pick me up at the airport. We were waiting for my luggage to be delivered to baggage claim. He looked startled, asked me to repeat my partner’s name, and excused himself to make a hasty phone call! Thereafter, the tone of my visit changed completely; they hurried me through a couple of interviews, made some excuses about canceling a few meetings, and got me out of town.

Straight faculty don’t have to worry about how “out” they are in each context. It takes an enormous amount of energy, and a good memory. You can say that I should just be myself -- be “out” everywhere, and to everybody -- but you wouldn’t say that if you had lived through the surprised looks, awkward moments, and changed relationships I’ve seen. I think I lose graduate students -- not because they’re homophobic, but because they fear that I won’t be as credible and effective in advocating for them, finding them support, or getting them jobs later.

I finally got tired of pretending. But when I told one colleague that I was gay, he told me he didn’t think it was a good idea for me to be alone with male students any more, because people would talk. After a while, I didn’t get asked back to the department’s softball team, though I’m pretty good. At the holidays, I find out about parties I wasn’t invited to. But at least it feels honest now. I’d rather they know and dislike me than destroy my soul by pretending to be someone I’m not.

My being gay is a matter of public record. But each year the new students don’t know, which means I can never assume everyone in my classes knows. Rather than stating outright that I’m gay, I’ll say something like “my research interests are in gay areas.” A colleague once told me she didn’t want our department to be known as a “haven for homos.” I’m willing to put up with comments like that, since I feel I have a responsibility to provide students with a good role model.

After being hounded out of an off-campus job by the other workers when they learned I was gay, I was glad to get a custodial job with the University. I’m now trying hard to keep anyone on campus from finding out I’m gay -- at least till I pass my probationary period. I hope nobody asks too many questions off-campus, since then they’re likely to find out about me, and I might lose this job too.

It seems like being gay has become “interesting” to other people. So I get a lot of strange little questions -- things most people would not ask a straight person, like “Which one of you is the ‘woman’ in the relationship?” I bring my partner to departmental events, and nobody knows what to call him -- “my friend,” or whatever. I think a lot of people mean well, in a way, but just don’t know what to say. But then, too, I’ve seen my share of evil. Someone left a vicious homophobic tract on my desk once, and there have been hateful phone calls. It keeps me off base, most of the time.

Introduction
There is little published empirical research that describes or interprets the experience of LGB faculty and staff in institutions of higher education. Croteau and Lark reported on a survey of the experiences of LGB student affairs professionals in 1995; Hogan and Rentz investigated the LGB-related attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors of student affairs graduate students, faculty, and practitioners in 1996. An increasingly rich body of qualitative (primarily narrative and ethnographic) research emerged recently, beginning with Croteau and Lark’s exploration of biased and exemplary student affairs practices concerning LGB issues (1995) and continuing with the publication of two important books in 1997: Toni A. H. McNaron’s Poisoned Ivy: Lesbian and Gay Academics Confronting Homophobia and William G. Tierney’s Academic Outsiders: Queer Theory and Cultural Studies in the Academy. For reasons that must be painfully obvious, it has never been possible to conduct random sample studies of gay, lesbian, and bisexual faculty and staff; it is, therefore, uncertain, but very doubtful, whether the empirical or narrative studies available adequately portray the entire spectrum of the strengths, concerns, and problems of LGB employees. The themes described by the UW-Madison faculty and staff who made themselves available for the Committee’s interviews are, nonetheless, completely consistent with the reports in published papers and books.
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Major concerns of faculty and staff
In the 1995 survey commissioned by the Committee, faculty and instructional staff reported two foremost areas of concern: the existence of a subtle, but pervasive climate of discrimination produced by the heterosexual assumption, and the issue of domestic partner benefits. The first is an issue of institutional culture, with roots and connections far beyond this campus; the latter is a complex matter of state law, insurance regulation, and university policy. This committee's interviews and discussions with LGB faculty and staff demonstrated that there is no singular "LGB experience" for UW-Madison employees; the following paragraphs reflect the variations reported.

Social pressure to remain silent and apart
Although some faculty and staff report experiences which lead them to believe that certain departments, programs and individual colleagues are overtly antagonistic to gay men, lesbians, and bisexual or transgender people, most instead describe a strong, pervasive social pressure to remain silent and apart. They describe colleagues who are often reluctant and uneasy about discussing or including LGB topics in their teaching, scholarship, and research, and who become uncomfortable with LGB issues are raised. Departmental social interaction, whether formal or informal, is more often structured for and directed toward traditionally married couples (and their children), ignoring "other" families. Invitations to events usually mention "spouses" only. Many gay men tell of being asked to "bring your wife" to functions. Several faculty members, like the one quoted at the beginning of this chapter, noted that they were simply not included in events, social occasions, or informal gatherings once others knew of their sexual orientation.

Although many colleagues may want to be supportive, the assumption of heterosexuality puts pressure on LGB faculty and staff to either stay in the closet or continuously state and re-state their orientation. Many LGB faculty complain that they bear the sole responsibility for educating others in their departments about LGB issues and concerns, or that they are asked to comment on LGB-related news and questions as though they somehow represented all LGB people. Some LGB faculty and staff observed that, while other people are unlikely to tell homophobic jokes or make crude comments in their presence, they are aware that those jokes and comments are made behind their backs. One professor said that Oscar Wilde's observation sardonic observation, "A faggot is a homosexual who just left the room" aptly summarizes his experience at UW-Madison.

Many resort to layering, or "compartmentalizing" their lives, as one senior official noted; he lives at several different levels, "rating" events in order to decide which ones he could attend with his partner and which ones might put his boss in an awkward situation. Another professor described "straightening" her office at certain times by removing her partner's photograph and other "evidence of lesbianism" to prevent embarrassment to her colleagues. Having to remember "who knows what" is a common theme -- as is the sense of a loss of control about the flow of information and gossip. "I've been surprised both ways," says one member of the academic staff; "I was trying not to reveal anything to one particular person, only to discover that she had already heard about me from somebody else -- but I've also wrongly assumed that someone had figured it out, and therefore shocked him by making a comment about going to a gay bar." The result of these uncertainties, fears, and anxieties is a kind of continual vigilance; some LGB faculty and staff described "scanning" all the time to determine who, in a group or a classroom, knows -- and what it is safe to say, or do.

The spectrum of experiences for LGB faculty and staff in multiple environments
It is clear that the university is composed of multiple environments and micro-environments that affect LGB faculty and staff in very different ways. Respondents described diverse experiences on campus from extremely positive to extremely negative, sometimes within the same department or administrative unit. A few (such as the custodian quoted earlier) expressed serious concern for their job security, promotion, tenure, or continued funding of their projects if they came out. Many LGB faculty feel, though, that "pushing the limits" would be dangerous to them in less dramatic ways: that bringing a partner to events, confronting homophobic jokes, insisting on inclusive language in departmental communications, or demanding attention to LGB issues in courses would result in their being somehow ostracized, marginalized, or punished. "The more out you are, the more it costs you," a professor in the medical school wrote; "You lose collaborators, priority for a better office, the good computer, the time of a secretary, and even opportunities for research that might get you promoted." A key theme is power, and
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powerlessness; some currently closeted LGB faculty members are certain that coming out would undermine their power and make them “less than” other (straight) colleagues. “Come out? No way!” said one assistant professor; “Not ‘til I get tenure.”

It is also clear that the experience of LGB faculty and staff is stratified by the influence of gender and social class. Lesbian and bisexual female faculty and staff live the double challenge of surviving in a male-dominated, and straight-dominated, culture -- on a campus where most administrators, deans, department chairs, and tenured faculty are male and (apparently) heterosexual. “On any given day, I don’t know which outrage is foremost,” a lesbian instructor wrote; “They (her colleagues) don’t like that I’m a woman, and they don’t respect feminist pedagogical practices, and they don’t want me talking about being lesbian all the time.” Another respondent, who describes herself as a “kind of out lesbian” writes that “I can’t live on the edge with these guys every day. One day I’ll roll my eyes too many times and then they’ll roll my head.” “I don’t know whether it was being a woman or being a dyke,” said another; “All I can tell you is that they (the other members of her department, who include some women) seem to forget to tell me stuff I need to know, don’t remember to include me on group emails, aren’t available to “sub” for me if I have to be out of town, and fail to refer students to me, or my courses. But” -- and here she identifies a more serious issue -- “the big problem is that they disparage my research, and even my thinking.” Several other women made similar comments; the most striking was a new lecturer’s complaint that “...Once they knew I had a female partner, they started questioning every comment I made during a discussion. I felt like they were thinking it was just the lesbian talking, so nobody needed to take it seriously.”

Several faculty lamented the insensitive, ignorant, and sometimes hostile reactions of some undergraduate students to LGB faculty, class materials and fellow students. Believing that these behaviors demonstrate a lack of experience and perspective about what it means to be a gay, lesbian, or bisexual, some teachers are able to use such situations as an opportunity to educate and develop students. At the same time, the presence of flagrant homophobic comments in a classroom frightens some instructors; one admitted that it impaired the quality of her teaching: “I feel that I’m more effective when I’m not so guarded – and last year, I felt so totally unsafe in my seminar that I avoided any reference to gay or lesbian topics. Unfortunately, that prevented me from sharing some of the best material I know with those students.”

Three students and three employees filed formal complaints with the university regarding sexual orientation discrimination or prohibited harassment in the past three years. It can be assumed that many other problems and situations were reviewed at the department/unit or school/college levels. Staff of the Equity and Diversity Resource Center report that they perceive a need for sensitivity training and that possible strategies for providing and reinforcing such training have been discussed in the past. Sexual orientation is part of the Center’s presentation on prohibited harassment; however, the institution depends on each university unit to provide appropriate orientation for new employees. The quality and extent of that orientation obviously varies enormously.

Absence of services and neglect of needs

Support services

Most LGB faculty and staff interviewed decrie the absence of any specific support services, structures, or programs for LGB employees. Although some faculty describe good experiences during their recruitment, most emphasize that they had difficulty getting information about LGB resources, finding access to LGB networks, or learning what the university might offer to a domestic partner. Several recently hired members of the academic staff noticed the absence of any reference to lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender persons in the formal materials they were provided when they accepted employment; one, who came from another Big Ten institution where a vigorous office of LGB services exists, spoke of feeling “lost” for the first few months in Madison. Although some faculty and staff had been able to make individual, special arrangements to accommodate their need to be absent for important events in a partner’s life, others recounted stories of frustration when trying to get a supervisor to permit time off (for example: (continued)
"When my partner had a kidney stone, I had to claim to be ill myself to be able to get the day off to stay with him"). Most of all, there is a common sense of neglect: it just does not seem as though LGB faculty and staff matter much to the institution. "I guess you could call it 'benign neglect,' " a scientist wrote; "in a lot of ways, it could be worse — but when you think about it, the university does little to make us feel welcome or valued; it's as if the university community does not recognize how hard it is to be gay in this culture."

Benefits for Domestic Partners

Increasing numbers of institutions of higher education are extending certain student status-derived, or employment-related, benefits (such as health insurance, access to campus recreational facilities, athletic tickets, and campus housing) to the domestic partners (same sex or opposite sex) of their faculty, staff, or students. At the end of this report is an attachment listing corporations, government agencies, and colleges and universities which currently offer health insurance to the domestic partners of employees or students.

While UW-Madison permits domestic partners access to university housing, tickets, and facilities, health insurance benefits are not currently available to the domestic partners (of either sex) of employees (faculty, academic and classified staff, teaching assistants, program assistants, and fellows). Although a voluntary health insurance plan sponsored by a student group, the Ten Percent Society, offered benefits to enrollees' domestic partners (of either sex) during the 1996/97 academic year, the university-sponsored health insurance plan (Student Health Insurance Plan, or "SHIP") does not.

Overwhelmingly, the critical issue for faculty and staff is these domestic partner benefits. "The absence of domestic partner benefits is appalling." One faculty member reports that she pays $1,700 annually to provide health insurance for her partner, a benefit which married colleagues receive at minimal expense. Employment-derived benefits for family members, and especially for a spouse, are important support structures for traditional marriages; their absence for LGB persons contributes to our society's neglect of the importance and sustenance of same-sex relationships. "Not having benefits — and especially health insurance — for my partner makes the university's position on my life pretty clear," one faculty member said. This is not simply a theoretical or philosophical concern for many faculty and staff; the cost of private health insurance for an individual partner is so high in some circumstances that the partner remains uninsured, or severely under-insured, for financial reasons. The absence of adequate insurance restricts access to needed medical services and delays care.

In 1994, University Health Services successfully persuaded Physicians Plus, the contracted provider of SHIP, to include benefits for domestic partners in their renewal of the insurance plan. Physicians Plus planned, in fact, to add coverage for domestic partners to several other group insurance plans, as well. The Office of the Insurance Commissioner, on reviewing this revision to SHIP, raised several objections (most notably to the definition of "domestic partner," and the uncertain status of such a person as a dependent, spouse, or plan member) and insisted that whatever Physicians Plus did to answer their objections would constitute a precedent that would bind all subsequent similar plans. Physicians Plus made a business decision to withdraw their plan. During this series of negotiations and meetings, the university experienced significant pressure from conservative state legislators who opposed extending health benefits to domestic partners, and especially to same sex partners. Since then, the university has not raised the issue again in any official sense. As is also true of many LGB students, some LGB faculty and staff feel that the university failed to try hard enough to overcome the objections of the insurance commissioner — though several of the faculty interviewed for this report recognized that the university would have "drawn fire" for taking a more firm position.

The absence of domestic partner benefits — and especially health insurance — is a serious deficiency that affects the lives and welfare of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students, faculty, and staff. Though efforts to correct this deficiency will certainly be controversial, the university has a responsibility to respond equally to the needs of the gay, lesbian, and bisexual members of its community.

(continued)
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Key steps required to make health insurance (and other) benefits available in the future would include:

[] identifying the statutory or regulatory changes necessary to make including domestic partners in a state-sponsored health insurance plan possible, and establishing the coalitions necessary to achieve them.

[] defining the circumstances required for domestic partner status; the university must decide (and be prepared to defend the decision) whether domestic partners means same sex couples, opposite sex couples, or both.

[] identifying the types of benefits to be offered and any restrictions on their use.

[] providing research data (and especially the experience of other comparable universities that offer such benefits) to address and disprove the myths associated with these benefits programs; this is particularly important in regard to health insurance coverage, because of concerns that extending health insurance to domestic partners would increase the university's risks or costs substantially.

[] formulating strategic plans for identifying allies, confronting barriers, reducing resistance, and building a foundation of support for the programs. Different benefit plans will have varying degrees and depth of support from groups on and off campus. Hastily established programs without the strength of careful design and good support are likely to fail if challenged.

**Recommendations**

1. The Equity and Diversity Resource Center and the Professional Development and Training Office should work together to organize a focused, coherent strategy for effective orientation and continuing training of faculty and staff to promote sensitivity to LGB issues and to reduce the frequency of harassment and discrimination against LGB employees.

2. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should include in the required training of department chairs and deans (a) particular attention to lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues as they affect equity and fairness in employee hiring and evaluation, determining salaries, promotion, and tenure; (b) encouragement of institutional or community service concerning lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues; and (c) recognition of the value and importance of lesbian, gay, and bisexual scholarship.

3. All faculty and staff should examine in their work, programs, services, and social interactions the presence of the assumption of heterosexuality and make efforts to overcome this narrow assumption.

4. The university should work diligently and quickly to obtain coverage for domestic partners in the health insurance plans it provides to every category of its employees. This action will have symbolic, philosophical, and financial importance to all LGB faculty and staff.

5. The university should examine all of its policies and procedures for providing benefits of other kinds to spouses and dependents and re-write them as necessary to provide the same benefits to the domestic partners of its students, faculty and staff.

6. Every three to five years, the faculty senate's Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues should reassess the effectiveness of processes to provide a campus environment that is safe, equitable, and free from harassment and discrimination for LGB students, staff, and faculty.
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