

**Final Report of
The President's Task Force on
Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian and Transgender Issues**

**Affirming Diversity:
Moving from Tolerance to Acceptance and
Beyond**

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

February 2001

**University of Washington
Presidential Task Force on GLBT Issues**

Final Report

**Affirming Diversity:
Moving from Tolerance to Acceptance and Beyond**

Table of Contents

Summary Recommendations	2
Introduction	3
Campus Life	14
Creating a Safe, Secure, and Comfortable Environment	21
Domestic Partnership Benefits	24
GLBT Academics	31
Appendices	34
Appendix A: University of Washington GLBT Resources	i
Appendix B: Summary of GLBT Resources at Selected Institutions	iii
Appendix C: GLBT Survey Results	iv
Suggestions for Task Force Foci	xii
Responses to Question #18: "I want the GLBT Task Force to work on the following issues:"	xvii

Summary Recommendations:

The University of Washington should:

Create an affirming and safe environment for gay, bisexual, lesbian and transgender students, faculty and staff, and, to reach this goal:

1. Appoint a standing President's Advisory Committee on Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian, and Transgender issues;
2. Establish a GLBT resource office, with paid staff position(s), that offers educational outreach, referral services, resources, advocacy, and programming;
3. Apply equivalent University policies, procedures, and benefits to employees with same-sex domestic partners as those assigned to employees with opposite-sex spouses;
4. Include GLBT concerns in all campus discourse and training sessions on "diversity," along with issues of race, ethnicity, gender and disability;
5. Sponsor an ongoing and inclusive campus dialogue on issues related to discrimination against GLBT individuals; and
6. Develop a GLBT Studies curriculum at both the graduate and undergraduate levels on the Bothell, Tacoma, and Seattle campuses.

Affirming Diversity: Moving from Tolerance to Acceptance and Beyond

Advocating the mere tolerance of difference. . . is the grossest reformism. Difference must be not merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic. Only then does the necessity for interdependence become unthreatening.

--Audre Lorde, poet

Our first president, George Washington, wrote to the tiny Jewish community in Rhode Island that in this new nation, we will no longer speak of mere "toleration," because toleration implies that minorities enjoy their inherent rights "by the indulgence" of the majority.

--Alan Dershowitz, law professor

INTRODUCTION

Given the size of the University of Washington (UW) community, there are likely to be thousands of gay, bisexual, lesbian, transgender people (GBLT) in our midst. However, unlike other minority groups, GBLT people are largely "invisible." This is due to both physical and social factors: sexual orientation essentially has no distinguishing physical characteristics, and discrimination (whether real or supposed) keeps many people from self-identifying or "coming out" to others. Many members of the university community may be surprised at this state of affairs; what could GBLT people possibly be worried about, especially on the Seattle campus in the midst of "super-liberal" Seattle?

In reality, a great many GBLT members of the community (students, staff, and faculty) may have come to campus from towns or other institutions where they could not be "out of the closet." Bothell and Tacoma may be less accepting communities than Seattle proper. Patterns of self-preservation can become internalized, into discretion or even forms of repression and homophobia itself. So, while there are some members of the sexual minority community at the University of Washington who are clearly "out," the concerns of the Task Force were directed to the whole range of GBLT experiences at UW. Our aims were to understand and document the realities of GBLT lives here and to provide a foundation for the development of policies, programs, and activities that would create campuses at which sexual minority people would not be merely tolerated, but in fact, validated, affirmed, and celebrated as a vital part of the mosaic of diversity.

There are, of course, instances of discrimination on these campuses which, while relatively enlightening, are not islands immune from the influences of the surrounding

sea, and there still is much work to do. The recent gradual extension of health benefits to state employees with same-sex domestic partners, for instance, is evidence that such discrimination was commonplace; and the remaining situations of unequal benefits are widely perceived by GBLT people as still discriminatory. In addition, the new health and dental benefits are somewhat precarious, as there have been---and continue to be--- efforts to reverse the administrative decision, including: a statewide initiative drive, a lawsuit (*Middleton v Public Employees Benefit Board*) and a bill introduced in the State Senate (SB 5232).

While it is common on campuses to see opposite-sex couples holding hands, hugging, and kissing, such behavior by same-sex couples is rare. It is widely known that such displays of affection could bring forth catcalls and other hostile reactions; thus invisibility and denial of the legitimacy of GBLT romantic feelings are perpetuated. This university is not a safe place for same sex couples to express even the most basic of affectionate actions.

In addition, GBLT people apparently do not experience a uniformly gracious reception if they “come out” to other members of the University community; this is particularly true when a GBLT person is dealing with someone who holds some sort of power over her/him; for example, students with faculty or staff, or staff with supervisors.

Finally, we explore the UW’s lack of academic curricula (courses and materials) dealing with aspects of GBLT existence. Insofar as a university serves a societal function of validating areas of knowledge, this “absent curriculum” perpetuates GBLT invisibility and marginalization.

Diversity and GBLT Concerns

The University Handbook covers policies on “non-discrimination and affirmative action” (Volume 4 Part I, Chapter 2). Language prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation was first added by Executive Order of the President on December 5, 1983. In the current version, Section 1 on non-discrimination states that “discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is also a violation of this policy.” Sexual orientation is defined in Section 3 as “heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender orientation, real or perceived.”

Over the past decade or more, many institutions have articulated a commitment to “diversity” as a fundamental societal objective. The rationale is that, in a highly heterogeneous civic reality, institutions must properly reflect the make-up of the social order if they are to be – and perceived to be – democratic. Academic institutions, in particular, have seen diversity as crucial to the mission of educating young adults to function successfully in our society. The GBLT Task Force believes that recent attacks on affirmative action dramatically highlight the importance of honoring our diversity.

Yet, the UW administration appears to conceptualize “diversity” narrowly, restricting it largely to concepts of race and ethnicity. Other disadvantaged groups, such as women and sexual minorities are rarely included in discussions of diversity. For example, in a July 11, 2000 letter to the “Campus Community,” President McCormick affirms: “The commitment of the University to diversity is stronger than ever, and our campus must reflect that commitment. We are determined to create a climate in which we can value the richness of our diversity and learn from one another.” These resolute sentiments were occasioned by the observation that “during the spring quarter several incidents at the University of Washington caused some members of our community to feel unwelcome and heightened concerns about our campus climate in general and *racial climate* in particular. “[emphasis added]”

The President followed up this message in the September 28, 2000 issue of *University Week* with a message so stirring it is worth repeating *in extenso*:

As we begin a new academic year, I want to speak to an issue that is of great importance to the University community and to each one of us. Our campus is not yet as welcoming to diversity as we want it to be. We must have a climate that allows each member of our community to achieve his or her highest goals. Great ideas and great discovery come from this. Our success – individually and collectively – depends upon it. Before enumerating some initial actions to improve our campus climate, it is important to underscore the value of diversity to our community.

At its core, the modern university is an affirmation of diversity – of the essential value of bringing different perspectives to the fundamental act of acquiring knowledge. Multiple perspectives and open discourse are central to the process of generating new knowledge. By definition, a university is the bringing together of multiple parts to make a greater whole.

Members of a university community learn from one another, in formal learning settings and informal interactions. Through their different perspectives, students, faculty and staff challenge each other’s assumptions, broaden their range of experience and learn to see the world from different viewpoints. In order to prepare students to contribute to an increasingly diverse society, the University must reflect that very diversity in its student body and among its faculty and staff. Different points of view from different cultures and lifestyles, different socio-economic conditions, different geographic regions, and different racial and ethnic heritages contribute to the vitality of the University’s learning environment. That is why the UW has placed such a high value on increasing the diversity of its students, faculty and staff.

But reflecting the diversity of the larger society is only half the challenge. The University must also be a community in which all members respect and value diversity. Each of us must come to understand that the rich tapestry of cultures, mores, beliefs and experiences represented in our community is to be honored, celebrated and nurtured. Diversity in its broadest sense lies at the center of the learning experience. It makes learning more meaningful and

profound. We must come to value our differences and to find in them our identity as an institution of higher learning.

During the next academic year, and in the years to come, we must work to cultivate an environment of appreciation and respect for diversity.

This important message focuses on “multicultural” (i.e., multi-ethnic) issues and activities, as if sexism were vanquished on campus and as if the President had not concurrently established this GBLT Task Force to deal with other actual threats to diversity.

The President’s announcement of an annual “Jeff and Susan Brotman Diversity Award” last December is an exciting example of UW’s deepening commitment to enhancing the multi-cultural atmosphere on campus. “This award is intended to recognize and reward outstanding UW programs that advance the diversity of our University community,” he said. This Task Force earnestly hopes that the activities we are recommending in the report will be received by the Brotman Committee as competitive candidates for support.

This Task Force – whose membership reflects diverse ethnicities, cultures, sexual orientations and gender identities – rejects any approaches to diversity enrichment that either privilege or neglect any of the aspects of variety within our human community. While we urge the University of Washington to broaden its operative concept of diversity, we urge it as well not to weaken its commitment to the activities it has already begun. Our operating premise is that *all* challenges to an open and welcoming campus *must* be confronted. Although the focus of our work and this report is on sexual orientation, individually and collectively we affirm our commitment to combating racism, sexism, “able-ism,” and other forms of discrimination at the University.

The Origins of the Task Force and Its Work Plan

In January 1999 four student government officials (from the Seattle campus Associated Students of the University of Washington [ASUW] and Graduate and Professional Student Senate [GPSS]) presented President McCormick with a report on the need for an advisory committee on gay, bisexual, lesbian, transgender concerns at the University of Washington, entitled “Continued Commitments: Diversity, Safety & Equality.” The present GBLT Task Force represents the President’s response to that report.

Methodically exploring the fact that “the University of Washington is perceived by the vast majority of GBLT community members as lacking in attention to their concerns,” the 1999 authors covered faculty and staff issues as well as student issues. They discussed GBLT invisibility, the scarcity of campus resources, bias-motivated incidents on the Seattle campus, the insufficiency of current policies, the national context of intolerance, and the activities at other universities to address these issues. Our Task Force supports that report and appreciates their efforts, which paved the way for our

current work. Its call for a permanent UW advisory committee on GLBT concerns is high among our own conclusions and recommendations.

We believe that the UW has turned its attention to these issues relatively “late in the game.” There is a substantial list of universities, including many UW peer institutions, which have permanent GLBT advisory committees, resource centers, academic activities and other affirming activities. The University of Washington lags substantially behind, and it should take decisive action promptly to rectify the situation.

Almost 10 years ago, the University of Michigan’s Affirmative Action Office and Study Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gay Men produced a major report, entitled “From Invisibility to Inclusion” (June 1991). Excerpts from its Executive Summary closely parallel where the UW is today, a decade later:

Despite the fact that lesbians and gay men constitute a valuable segment of the University community and are present in every classroom and every job classification, they are a largely invisible group. The invisibility results from and contributes to an unfortunate cycle: misconceptions about lesbians and gay men permit the development of a climate in which anti-lesbian and anti-gay harassment and discrimination are tolerated. As a result, many lesbians and gay men feel pressured to hide their sexual orientation and their colleagues and co-workers remain unaware of their presence. This invisibility allows misinformation and misconceptions to go unchallenged; in turn, these inaccuracies and the harassment and discrimination which they spawn encourage lesbians and gay men to remain hidden. We recommend a variety of widespread educational efforts to break this cycle of ignorance, invisibility, and intolerance.

The full integration of lesbians and gay men into the University community and the reduction of harassment and discrimination will not occur instantly. The recommendations contained in this report represent a significant beginning for an on-going process. To acknowledge past accomplishments, monitor progress in implementing recommendations, document continuing problems, and describe future strategies, we recommend that the Director of Affirmative Action provide annual progress reports to the University community.

The University is challenged to create an environment in which the contributions of lesbians and gay men are recognized, in which lesbians and gay men have equitable access to University services, and in which all students, faculty, and staff are free to study and work without fear of harassment and discrimination. The University of Michigan has established a position of national leadership in recognizing the value and necessity of creating a diverse, multicultural university environment; we must now extend our commitment to tolerance and respect to include members of the University community of all sexual orientations.

The full Michigan report can be found in the University of Washington Suzzallo Library.

Appointment of the Task Force.

In June 1999, after discussions with its putative chair, President Richard McCormick appointed the following people to serve on the Presidential Task Force on Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian, and Transgender Issues:

1. **Chair:** Philip Bereano, Professor, Technical Communication
2. Kelly Boyer, Assistant Director of Housing and Food Services for Residential Life; Representative from the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs
3. Mary Coney, Professor, Technical Communication (Chair of the Faculty Senate 2000-2001)
4. Katherine M. Cummings, Professor, Department of English
5. James A. Farrow, Professor, Medicine and Pediatrics; Director, Division of Adolescent Medicine
6. Larry D. Icard, Professor, School of Social Work
7. Leonard (Lee) James, Student, GPSS Representative
8. L. Lincoln Johnson, Director of Student Activities and Union Facilities; Representative from the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs
9. Akbar Mitchell, Facilities Manager, Housing and Food Services
10. Amanda Peachy, Student; ASUW Representative
11. Aaron Rabideau, Student; Residence Hall Student Association Representative
12. Sheryl Schwartz, Research Coordinator; Gay and Lesbian University Employees Representative
13. Richard Simkins, Director of Academic Counseling, Undergraduate Advising Center; Professional Staff Organizational Representative
14. Rusty Sweet-Sorgenfrei, Patient Care Coordinator, Epilepsy Center, Harborview Medical Center; Classified Staff Association Representative
15. Shawna Woodard, Police Officer; University Police Department Representative
16. Shirley J. Yee, Associate Professor, Women Studies

The Task Force resource people were:

1. Helen Remick, Assistant Provost, Equal Opportunity Office
2. Monica Banks, Administrative Assistant, Equal Opportunity Office
3. Scott Rutledge, Graduate Student, School of Social Work

The President charged the Task Force to:

- Collect and analyze information and serve as a forum for discussion of issues affecting GBLT students, staff and faculty;
- Develop ways to advise the campus community on GBLT issues;
- Create a comprehensive list of resources that serve the needs of GBLT students, staff, and faculty (e.g., counselors, etc.);
- Recommend ways to make the list of resources accessible to GBLT students, staff, and faculty;

- Review existing UW policies regarding GBLT issues and recommend any changes or new policies which, in your judgment, are needed;
- Compose a list of resources that are needed, especially by GBLT students, staff, and faculty, but which are not currently available.

President McCormick concluded by reminding us:

As you know, the University of Washington remains firmly committed to the goal that its students, staff, and faculty shall not be discriminated against on the basis of sexual orientation, and it is my hope that your service on this Task Force will enhance the understanding of GBLT issues by our campus community.

In the course of our deliberations, the following members resigned as the result of job change and the like: James A. Farrow, Larry D. Icard, Akbar Mitchell, Rusty Sweet-Sorgenfrei, and Amanda Peachy. We value their time on the Task Force. The Chair would like to extend his warmest appreciation to the Task Force members as well as to our staff resource persons, Assistant Provost Helen Remick and her administrative assistant Monica Banks, for their energy, dedication, and admirable collegial working relationships.

Areas of Inquiry

At its first meeting, with membership based on individual interests, experiences, knowledge and contacts, the Task Force began brainstorming possible issue areas to investigate. The Chair later sorted the list of possibilities into six categories for more direct review:

- Diversity/campus tone
- UW relations with outside agencies
- UW policies and procedures
- Public events
- People and resources within the UW community
- Academics

Based on responses to our winter 1999-2000 survey, feedback we received at six October 1999 open and publicized forums on all three UW campuses, a review of the 1991 University of Michigan report, and consultation with numerous people who have relevant expertise, we set forth four main areas of inquiry:

- Domestic partnership benefits
- Public safety
- Campus Life
- Academics

The Task Force created a subcommittee to focus on each topic area.

Availability of domestic partnership benefits was the most common concern, as “felt discrimination” among respondents to our survey and participants in the forums. The work of the Domestic Partnership Benefits Subcommittee also covered, as possible, other University policies and procedures regarding employment, admissions, and professional advancement. The Public Safety Subcommittee utilized a broad definition of “public safety,” including feelings of comfort and acceptance within the campus environment, “safe zones,” openness of the residential halls and the Hall Health Center, and speech codes. The work of the Campus Life Subcommittee aimed to assure that GBLT concerns are included in the larger discussions of diversity at the University, as well as campus celebrations, lectures, and cultural events, and to investigate the need for a permanent resource center and an Advisory Committee to carry forward the work we hoped to achieve. The work of the Academic Subcommittee was based on concerns that precious few UW courses had any relevant GBLT materials in them, as well as a desire to go well beyond that and establish a concentration, minor, or major in GBLT Studies (as many UW peer institutions have already done).

Within each of these four arenas, we looked at how to define the existing problem(s), the history of the issue at UW, creating a method of inquiry, and recommendations to make.

Overall Operations of the Task Force

The Task Force aimed for a work process, which was open and transparent. Although its meetings were not legally required to be open to the public, they were, and occasionally members of the public attended.

Survey: In order to ascertain campus attitudes regarding the Task Force’s four areas of inquiry, we developed a survey. Several Task Force members with expertise in such matters took the lead on this project: James Farrow, Larry Icard, Lee James, and Sheryl Schwartz. (See Appendix C for a copy of the survey and its findings). The survey was posted on the web and hard copies were available at our forums and through *University Week* and *The Daily*. We received approximately 200 responses, and while we are well aware that this is not a statistically valid sample of the University community, it has utility in being indicative of concerns and attitudes.

With the help of Helen Remick, Lee James did a first cut analysis to provide a basis for our initial discussions; eventually we hired a graduate student from the School of Social Work, Scott Rutledge, to do further analyses (also included in Appendix C). Almost a quarter of the respondents identified as heterosexual; this was a greater percentage than we had anticipated, and we took it as a positive sign that there was such interest in these issues among non-GBLT people. Of course, there were several hostile responses (all identifying as heterosexual males). Many GBLT people reported feeling lost and confused; the major issues were domestic partnership benefits and “safe zones.”

Forums: In mid-October 1999, two or three members presided at each of six forums, four on the Seattle campus and one each at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. These forums had been publicized through listserves, websites, flyers, and in campus newspapers (*The Daily* and *University Week*). Turnout was modest. Nonetheless, Task Force members were impressed by the depth of the “testimony” and people’s positive feelings about the appointment of the Task Force. The setting was intimate enough to elicit sincere discussions. These clearly helped shape our work; for example, the lack of domestic partnership benefits was forcefully conveyed as employment inequity, a form of discrimination.

Review of University of Washington Resources: The Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW) funds the Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian and Transgender Commission. The UW Libraries have a GLBT Studies Coordinator, Alvin Fritz, who has developed a wide range of resources regarding GLBT issues. He also works with individuals in person and by email. Other formal campus resources are available to GLBT persons but not focused exclusively on their needs. A summary of campus resources appears in Appendix A.

Review of Peer Institutions: While the 1991 publication from the University of Michigan was perhaps the most significant input from another school, we obtained and reviewed materials from many other institutions, in the PAC-10 and in our official “peer” list. A summary of this review is in Appendix B.

Review of Relevant UW Operations: Helen Remick and her staff efficiently obtained necessary documents for us to review and helped set up meetings with UW staff. The Task Force investigated the operations of Hall Health, the student counseling center, the campus police, the Benefits Office, the Intramural Athletics (IMA) program, and others. We gathered information on University-related institutions – most notably ROTC and the Greek system – so we could understand the larger picture.

People Consulted: Among the many people with whom we spoke to gather information, advice, and feedback were:

- State Representative Ed Murray
- Nicki McCraw, Manager, University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office
- Ryan Biava, President, ASUW (1999-2000)
- Betty Schmitz, Director, Curriculum Transformation Project
- Suzanne Manning, Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs, Greek Relations
- Katharine Sedgwick, Panhellenic Council Advisor
- Marsha Botzer, Ingersol Gender Center
- Alvin Fritz, UW Libraries GLBT Studies Coordinator

And in the Real World: During the life of the Task Force, the issues we were dealing with were continuing to undergo evolution beyond the walls of the campus. This was especially true with regard to domestic partnership benefits. In the US and abroad, private companies, governmental agencies, and institutions of higher education,

continued to expand the recognition and implementation of domestic partnership benefits. Most notably, perhaps, were: 1) the enactment of same-sex “civil union” legislation by the Vermont State Legislature, and 2) the action taken by the Washington State Public Employees Benefit Board (PEBB) to offer medical and dental benefits to same sex domestic partners of State employees (on the same terms they are offered to legal spouses of State employees). In regard to the latter, the Task Force helped obtain letters from President McCormick and the Faculty Senate to the PEBB supporting the change.

While these developments were positive, less encouraging events happened as well. The UW Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) program passed out materials at a basketball game encouraging Boy Scouts of America to apply for special recognition at a future game. Only after it received many complaints did ICA officials see it as inappropriate to give UW recognition to a group such as the Boy Scouts, which actively discriminates against GBLT persons.

Publicity: The work of the Task Force was publicized in the print media – *The Seattle Post Intelligencer*, *The University of Washington Daily*, *University Week*, *Seattle Gay News* and *Seattle Gay Standard* – and on campus listserves (e.g., “CampusQ” and “GLUE”).

Final public comment: A draft version of this report was widely disseminated during January 2001. The committee solicited email comments, and held four open hearings in Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma in order to gather comments. The draft was favorably received. People voiced concerns about whether the report would be shelved or would actually result in action and improvement in the environment for GBLT members of the University community. The work of the Task Force was featured in local media, on a radio call-in talk show, on the A.P. Wire Service and on Foxnews.com website, and was distributed nation-wide by the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Discrimination.

CAMPUS LIFE

Definition of the Problem

The University of Washington's role and mission statement declares that the University has the responsibility to "foster an environment in which its students can develop mature and independent judgment and an appreciation for the range and diversity of human achievement." The mission statement goes on to state that the University "cultivates in its students both critical thinking and the effective articulation of that thinking." The Task Force believes that in keeping with its role and mission, the University has an obligation to encourage students to examine perceived social attitudes and philosophies, including those related to human sexuality and discrimination against social groups.

The need to be responsive to all students has been well stated. Margaret J. Barr, Vice President for Student Affairs at Northwestern University and a nationally recognized expert in student affairs, wrote in *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration* (published in 1993 by Jossey-Bass Inc.):

Each of us is required to learn more about those who are different, to translate that learning into our daily lives, and to help our current students and our institutions prepare for the future challenges of diversity. Any tendency toward stereotyping and bigoted behavior must be confronted, both within ourselves and others, and it will not be easy. Support for diversity, which is demonstrated in large and small ways, is vital if we are going to serve today's and tomorrow's students.

Dr. Barr goes on to state a goal of the university "is to adapt facilities, programs, and services to meet the needs of the new students entering higher education." Dr. Barr includes sexual orientation in the list of characteristics for which services must be made.

The collegiate experience is a time for students to develop, or at least begin to form, a set of informed, rational, and thoughtful beliefs and opinions in light of which they can live meaningful and fulfilling lives. During this developmental process, our students should be able to turn to the University as a source of accurate and complete information. The following discussion focuses on the Seattle campus. We suggest that similar analyses and applications for Bothell and Tacoma campuses would be possible tasks for a permanent committee on GLBT issues.

History

The Seattle campus of the University of Washington has a history of experience with the gay, bisexual, lesbian and/or transgender campus community. From approximately 1972 until 1991, the Gay, Bisexual, and Lesbian Association (GBLA) was an active student organization on campus that provided support, education and resources to

students. In May 1991, GBLA was given commission status by the Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW); thus, GBLA became the Gay, Bisexual, and Lesbian Commission (GBLC). In 1997, ASUW voted to support GBLC's request to change its name to the Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian, and Transgender Commission (GBLTC). With the creation of the Commission, ASUW hired a student to serve as the Commission Director and allocated an annual budget for programming and services. For nearly thirty years, this student group has provided a wide spectrum of education, advocacy, programming, support, and resources for University of Washington students.

The University of Washington non-discrimination policy was amended in 1983 to include sexual orientation as a prohibited basis for discrimination. This was one of the first such policies in the nation.

In the early 1990's, a group of gay, bisexual and lesbian faculty and staff began meeting informally to discuss campus resources and "where we are as a community." The group formalized their structure during the 1991-1992 academic year and called themselves the Gay and Lesbian University Employees (GLUE). At the same time, the Seattle Pride Foundation, which was instrumental in forming GLUE, provided a small one-time grant to help GLUE get organized. During its early years, GLUE was an active organization. For several years, GLUE held regular meetings, but the main arena for involvement centered on email discussions. The GLUE email discussion list at one time included several hundred faculty and staff, and GLUE sponsored lunch discussions that focused on a variety of social and political issues. Several years later, interest in GLUE diminished.

Presently, several GLBT organizations are active on the Seattle campus, and they fulfill a variety of functions: social, political, advocacy, and programming. For many, these organizations are an important source of affirmation and support. Merely knowing that such organizations exist can be tremendously beneficial to individuals, whether or not they choose to participate in the groups. The Task Force is aware of these GLBT campus-affiliated organizations: Pride Dawgs, Coalition for Domestic Partnership Equality, Stonewall Medical Association, Lesbian and Gay Law Students (LEGAL), Bitter Old Hags and Grumpy Old Fags (BOHGOF, graduate student social group), Out for Business, Students Promoting Diversity, Campus Q (listserve), and Gay and Lesbian University Employees. See Appendix A for web addresses, where available.

The Office of Undergraduate Education trains all New Student Orientation leaders on diversity issues, including issues related to sexual orientation. The student orientation leaders are prepared to address GLBT issues during a workshop entitled "The Other 21 Hours." The workshop focuses on the time spent beyond the classroom; the presenters discuss many of the issues facing students during "the other 21 hours," outside of class. The workshop allows issues to be addressed in an informal, yet serious, setting, and it is followed by small group discussions where the students have an opportunity to delve further into the issues addressed. During these small group discussions, Orientation leaders have reference materials available to help answer as many questions as possible. The Student Resource Binder, given to all new students at Orientation,

includes information on the ASUW Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian and Transgender Commission. The materials in the Resource Binder are discussed during “The Big Picture,” a workshop that focuses on how to find community at the University of Washington. As this brief recital shows, whatever University resources are directed towards GBLT concerns are designed for students only; faculty and staff are largely left to fend for themselves.

Environment

In many ways, the environment at the University of Washington -- and the surrounding communities -- is positive and supportive for members of the GBLT community. We have not experienced the devastating effects of an incident like the murder of University of Wyoming student Matthew Shepherd. The absence of such a tragedy does not diminish the University’s responsibility to educate the University community about harassment and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity and to create an affirming atmosphere by dispelling negative assumptions and attitudes.

While we have few concrete examples of harassment, we cannot ignore some of the comments expressed in the Task Force Survey, such as: “the amount of time, manpower and money being spent on [this task force] is appalling - disband and stop wasting taxpayer money,” “stop being queer,” and “be tolerant of straight people.” These comments demonstrate that the University community is not yet as understanding, tolerant, nor affirming as it needs to be.

The GBLT community at the University of Washington desires the same rights and privileges as those routinely enjoyed by their fellow members of the University community. They desire, and have every right to expect, basic human rights such as equal treatment before the law and at the workplace, freedom of association, freedom to establish and sustain personal relationships, the ability to contribute to the community economically, politically, and socially, and the right to feel safe and secure. It is important to realize that self-identification or “coming out” as a GBLT individual is a process of self-discovery, which merits respect, sensitivity, and support. Therefore, it is crucial for the University to commit itself to maintaining a civil campus environment free of coercive, intimidating, and harassing actions. In order to further such an atmosphere, the University administration should explicitly include sexual orientation and gender identity in the University’s efforts to educate about diversity. GBLT issues should be included in employee training. In principle, the University includes the GBLT community in its diversity lexicon as demonstrated by the University’s nondiscrimination policy. However, in most other contexts the University limits its diversity statements to its strong support of ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity among students, faculty, and staff. The Task Force asserts that the discussion of diversity should be expanded to more thoroughly include sexual orientation and gender identity.

In addition, the UW should implement the concepts behind safe zone/safe space programs. A safe zone/safe space program provides a way for supportive faculty and staff to illustrate prominently and non-verbally that they are a safe contact for gay,

lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students and employees. The hallmark of these “Safe” programs is the public identification of allies by placing a “Safe” symbol, usually incorporating a pink triangle or rainbow, on office doors or within living spaces. Unlike more visible under-represented groups on campus, gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and questioning students and employees cannot be easily identified. Similarly, there is no easy method of identifying persons supportive and understanding of GBLT people and issues. Safe zone/safe space programs are sponsored on many campuses, including: Washington State University, University of Oregon, University of Colorado, University of Michigan, Texas A&M University, Florida International University, and University of North Texas. These programs have had a significant and positive impact on making the campus culture more tolerant and affirming towards GBLT individuals.

Registered student organizations at the University of Washington are governed by the University’s non-discrimination policy and social fraternities and sororities agree to abide with this policy in order to gain recognition by the University. However, many national charters do not include sexual orientation and gender identity in their non-discrimination policies. Two fraternities have non-discrimination clauses that include sexual orientation: Sigma Phi Epsilon and Zeta Beta Tau. They deserve special recognition and can be models for other fraternities and sororities.

Peer Information

Like the University of Washington, many of our peer institutions have formed university-wide committees to explore issues relevant to the GBLT community. These committees have provided a means to examine the campus climate and present recommendations for the senior leadership of the college or university. Those committee recommendations have generally highlighted environmental issues, campus challenges, GBLT resources, and university policies. A survey of the University of Washington’s peer institutions shows that a majority of them established committees with missions similar to that of this Presidential Task Force.

As a result of the work of the GBLT committees at UW peer institutions, nearly sixty percent of them have established GBLT resource centers. The following peer institutions currently have GBLT resource centers: Cornell University, Michigan State University, Ohio State University, Texas A & M University, the University of California system, and the Universities of Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin. PAC-10 peers, University of California at Berkeley, University of Oregon, and Washington State University, also have GBLT resource centers. A majority of these institutions have funded staff or are in the process of hiring additional staff. These Resource Centers provide support and education for individuals of all sexual orientations and improve the campus climate. (See Appendix B for a summary.)

While the programs at two institutions are geared directly for students (Ohio State University and Texas A & M University), the majority are designed for all members of the campus community. Most of the resource centers report to Student Affairs or Student Life. This approach is supported by the National Consortium of Directors of

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Resources in Higher Education, an organization committed to equity, improved campus climates, advocacy for policy change, program development, and establishment of GLBT offices/centers. The directors of GLBT resource centers agree that their work contributes to a more educated and affirming environment at their respective institutions.

There should be a GLBT Center established on the Seattle campus. The Task Force urges that the recommended permanent Advisory Committee look into the most appropriate structure for the Bothell and Tacoma campuses.

In our conversations with members of the campus community and from survey comments, many individuals identified the need for a GLBT Resource Center/Office. A resource center would provide valuable services in the following areas:

1. **Resources.** Currently there is no single location where resources related to gay, bisexual, lesbian, and transgender issues can be distributed. Many individuals report a dearth of information and an inability to locate campus and community resources. The resource center could house a dedicated library of materials for the campus community, including books and periodicals.
2. **Visibility.** Unlike many ethnic minorities, sexual minorities are often invisible. Visibility is an important part of making the campus a safe, supportive, and affirming environment. A resource center could lend increased positive visibility and assist in the overall climate at the University.
3. **Support of Campus Organizations.** Despite strong advocacy and representation by the ASUW Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Commission, GLBT organizations still struggle to maintain continuity. This has proven true at other campuses as well. A resource center – with its office space, staff, and informational materials – could provide this vital continuity. According to several GLBT Resource Center Directors, the variety of campus GLBT organizations are benefited by the establishment of a resource center.
4. **Programming.** A resource center could organize educational and social programming regarding sexual orientation and gender identity. Programming opportunities are numerous and could include speaker bureaus, educational panels, workshops, film series, lectures, talent shows, dances, and activity fairs. These programs and events would stimulate and enrich intellectual and social life on campus.
5. **Mentors.** As has been done at several UW peer institutions, a resource center could offer mentoring and support for students, faculty and staff. This collegial atmosphere would also enrich campus life.

Alumni Relations

The relationship between a university and its alumni can be significant. Many graduates have a strong need to keep up contacts with their alma mater. Alumni can be an important source of support to the institution as well. Special efforts to reach out to GBLT alumni like outreach to other alumni in demographic groups, which have been traditionally marginalized, need to be supported.

Recommendations

Create a safe and affirming environment at the University of Washington for gay, bisexual, lesbian and transgender students, faculty and staff. This goal can be reached through measures such as the following:

1. Establish a standing President's Advisory Committee on GBLT issues, which includes representatives from the Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses.
2. Establish a GBLT resource office on the Seattle campus, with paid staff positions, that offers educational outreach, referral services, resources, advocacy, and programming. Build such services into programs at Bothell and Tacoma, and create separate GBLT offices at such time as student and staff demand warrants it.

A **permanent committee** and a **GBLT resource office** could jointly or separately:
 - conduct a University-wide survey to gauge the campus climate about GBLT issues
 - encourage academic departments to actively promote and sponsor speakers and programs that address sexual orientation and gender identity
 - provide training in sexual orientation and gender identity for staff and faculty in University resource positions so that they might effectively respond to reports and complaints of harassment and discrimination
 - create a safe zone/safe space program at the University of Washington.
3. Bring GBLT issues into the mainstream of University life using language that is inclusive of gay, bisexual, lesbian, and transgender individuals when advocating for a diverse and pluralistic community, denouncing discrimination and harassment, and conducting educational programs on diversity.
4. Advocate for a change in the U.S. Department of Defense policy on gays in the military because of its impact on the University ROTC program and the effect of its recruiting activities.
5. Encourage full reporting of GBLT issues in University publications, such as *University Week* and *Columns*.

6. Encourage residence halls and student governments to continue and augment social and educational programs that increase understanding of GLBT issues and decrease harassment and discrimination.
7. Encourage fraternity and sorority chapters at the Seattle campus to sponsor workshops on GLBT issues and to work to have their national governing boards adopt non-discrimination statements that include sexual orientation.
8. Continue to address GLBT issues during New Student Orientations and adding GLBT issues to the topics discussed during Parent Orientations.
9. Encourage the Alumni Office to facilitate the formation of a GLBT alumni group, and to be sensitive to the existence and needs of GLBT alumni whether or not such a group is created.
10. Assure that GLBT issues are included in staff training programs.

CREATING A SAFE, SECURE AND COMFORTABLE COMMUNITY

Definition of the Problem

The University of Washington has a responsibility to students, faculty and staff to strive to create and maintain a safe, secure and comfortable community. For GBLT individuals, there is an added level of concern. As mentioned earlier, we are grateful not to have experienced a tragedy like the murder of Matthew Shepherd, a University of Wyoming student. However, the UW is not immune to such violence. Nor is the University free from lesser acts of hatred.

One way the University ensures public safety is by maintaining a Police Department on the Seattle campus. The UW Police Department (UWPD) is a fully accredited state police force. The Department employs 50 police officers who are fully commissioned by the State of Washington and have the same authority as other law enforcement officers. The UWPD has primary responsibility for law enforcement on the campus and works closely with the Seattle Police Department and other law enforcement agencies throughout Washington State. Commissioned officers patrol the campus on a 24-hour basis and staff a detective division, a traffic unit, the Residence Hall Patrol, and a Crime Prevention Unit. Bothell, Tacoma, and Harborview have security rather than police forces. They all share the goal of creating a safe environment by responding to all reported incidents in a sensitive and caring manner.

Overt acts of violence are rare at this University; however, covert incidents continue to create a hostile environment for GBLT individuals. For example, as mentioned earlier, persons involved in an opposite-sex relationship can walk freely on any campus holding hands or kissing without anyone giving him or her a second look. Same-sex couples do not have the same freedom. People often stare or make rude comments to same sex couples walking hand in hand or enjoying an intimate moment. A verbal reprimand for not “keeping it behind closed doors” is commonplace. This is a double standard that should not exist at our University.

Some GBLT individuals report not feeling “safe” in revealing their sexual orientation, in participating in GBLT sponsored activities, in responding to people who threaten them verbally, or in facing any number of similar situations. Because few overt incidents come to the public’s attention, the campus may seem “safe” to heterosexuals, but many GBLT people fear the underlying hostility that is known to exist. Intimidation is an aspect of safety and security that must be addressed. The UW community is made up of a diverse population, some of whom come from communities where there is little exposure to GBLT individuals, others from communities that are outrightly hostile towards GBLT individuals. In addition to the challenge of appropriately addressing violations of specific laws, the UW has a responsibility to create an overall environment of safety, security, and comfort for all UW community members.

For the most part, campus GBLT-related incidents described to the Task Force have involved verbal threats (e.g., disparaging remarks and threatening notes) or acts of

vandalism rather than physical actions against people. For example, approximately three years ago, several homophobic drawings were placed on walls and doors of Mercer Hall, one of the University of Washington's residence halls. Students and staff promptly addressed the incident and fortunately there was no recurrence; regardless, this created a hostile environment for those living in the community. Solutions invoking specific laws seem less urgently needed than tackling the more difficult task of changing individual behaviors. The desired outcome is to create campus environments responsive to the concerns of the GBLT community for comfortable acceptance.

History

A search of the records of the police department on the Seattle campus shows no record of hate crimes against GBLT individuals. The police are responsive to any incidents brought to their attention and, at least in recent times, such incidents seem to have been virtually non-existent. Campus crime statistics show no reported instances of physical harassment of a GBLT community member, or any other type of discrimination that would call for an immediate police response. A key word in the previous sentence is *reported*. It is impossible to know how many *unreported* incidents have occurred, but we do know that verbal harassment of GBLT people occurs at UW, as evidenced by responses to the Task Force's 1999 survey and forums, as well as hate-inspired graffiti which has been uncovered in recent years.

The UWPD has not had an opportunity to engage in preventive action, partly because of limited resources, and partly because it is difficult to identify actions that would contribute to a healthier campus atmosphere for GBLT individuals. The police receive periodic training to sensitize them to the nature of hate crimes, sexual harassment, and the like. But their primary focus is to respond to incidents, once they occur and are reported. The Task Force did not research training received by the security forces at Bothell, Tacoma, and Harborview Medical Center, but reaffirms the importance of such efforts for these groups.

The University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office (UCIRO) has received 13 inquiries regarding sexual orientation issues since 1994 (including two from straight males claiming that they were being harassed). Eleven evolved into actual complaints (four in 1996, five in 1997, none in 1998, and two in 1999; 2000 figures were not completed at the time of our research). Six were found not supported (most of these were about domestic partner policies), two were voluntarily withdrawn (possibly resolved), two were pending and one was supported. This distribution of outcomes approximates the overall pattern of UCIRO's work.

Methods

In evaluating the state of public safety and comfort on the Seattle campus, the Task Force examined UW crime laws and statistics, which showed no reported incidents of hate crimes against GBLT individuals. A more telling method of judging perceptions of safety, security and comfort is through an analysis of how safe those directly concerned

feel. Certain responses to the Task Force survey, and comments made to Task Force members at the forums, indicate that at least some GBLT individuals do not feel “safe or comfortable” within the confines of the University community. A more systematic evaluation of those anecdotal responses is needed to establish the depth of insecurity felt by GBLT individuals and the reasons for it.

Recommendations

The safety, security and comfort of the UW campus communities would be improved for GBLT individuals if all concerned---the UWPD, the GBLT community, the University of Washington administration, the general campus population---move from an attitude of passive response to an emphasis on proactive involvement in GBLT issues. In order to accomplish this goal, the University of Washington should:

1. Conduct a proactive campaign to educate the entire University community on legal consequences of inappropriate action directed toward GBLT individuals.
2. Sponsor an ongoing and inclusive dialogue on issues centering around discrimination against GBLT individuals. It should make a clear inclusion of GBLT people in its use of the concept of “diversity” (along with gender, ethnicity, etc.).
3. Foster continuing and consistent interaction among the UWPD, security offices, and GBLT communities. The police and security officers should periodically attend meetings of the GBLT Commission and other relevant groups, as a means of understanding the issues GBLT individuals face and of getting to know members of the community as individuals rather than as a group. Likewise, GBLT leaders should attend UWPD and security diversity training sessions, bringing their concerns to the officers and promoting for dialogue between the two groups.
4. Ensure collaborative responses between Student Affairs offices and the UWPD or security offices to student concerns regarding GBLT issues.
5. Encourage GBLT individuals to report incidents to the appropriate authority, whether or not they involve physical violence. To do that, the Administration must work towards creating an atmosphere on each campus that makes GBLT people feel comfortable, and GBLT people must be forthcoming in expressing their concerns.

DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP BENEFITS

Definition of the Problem

The GBLT Task Force investigated the issue of domestic partnership benefits because: 1) it was the most frequently mentioned concern among UW students and employees who responded to our winter 1999-2000 survey, and 2) it directly reflects unequal treatment between legally married UW employees and those with same-sex domestic partners (who cannot yet legally marry).

While most U.S. employees with domestic partners (whether same-sex or opposite-sex) are not offered the same employer-sponsored benefits for their family members as their legally married peers, an increasing number of employers nation-wide are offering equitable benefits – and hence equitable compensation - to all employees. Until very recently, the UW and all State of Washington agencies have been among those employers that did not offer the same benefits to employees with domestic partners as they did to those with legally married spouses. Without the benefits, GBLT employees feel they subsidize the benefits offered to their peers' spouses because their domestic partners are not covered. The most frequently mentioned benefit in this discussion was healthcare coverage; however, equity is also raised in regard to a number of other employer-sponsored benefits.

Our society confers numerous legal, social, and economic privileges to legally married couples (approximately 1,000 such benefits are listed at <http://www.buddybuddy.com/mar-list.html>). Such benefits include, but are not limited to health insurance, housing, inheritance rights, hospital visitation and medical decision-making rights, tax benefits, and adoption. Recognizing that same-sex marriages are not legal in any part of the United States, numerous institutions and municipal governments across the country have established the category of "domestic partnership" (DP) as a means to grant same-sex couples some of the benefits accorded to legally married couples.

The following are three specific ways in which Task Force members - and other UW students, faculty, and staff who offered their input through focus groups and a survey - defined this problem.

1. *Equity of benefits:* The UW has not treated domestic partners of students, faculty, and staff the same as legally married spouses of their peers in terms of employee benefits.
2. *Advocating for change:* Although the UW administration was "on the record" as supporting domestic partner benefits, and while many thought that legislative action was the only avenue through which this change was likely to occur, the UW administration did not advocate proactively for domestic partner benefits among state legislators.

3. *Dissemination of information:* The UW does not have a publication with a comprehensive listing of the few benefits available for same-sex couples; therefore, potential, new, and current UW employees have a difficult time accessing information regarding the employee benefits to which their domestic partners are eligible.

While individual GBLT Task Force members support equal employee benefits for a variety of non-legally married kinship structures (including both opposite-sex and same-sex domestic partners), the Task Force's mandate was to suggest ways the UW administration could effectively address concerns of the GBLT community; therefore, our recommendations focus exclusively on same-sex domestic partners. The definition of "domestic partner" varies among the public and private entities that currently offer rights, privileges, and responsibilities to non-legally married partners, and the Washington State government has developed its own definition (in order to implement the administrative ruling discussed below).

Recent State-level Action: The GBLT Task Force began its work in summer 1999, before there was any indication that the Public Employees Benefit Board (PEBB) would decide in May 2000 to provide health benefits to the same-sex domestic partners of State employees, including University of Washington employees. Although many legislators and activists have been working on this issue for years, it was not widely believed that an equitable rule would be adopted this year, nor in this fashion. Conventional wisdom held that the PEBB administrative agency would not pass such a rule, even though it was technically empowered to do so, until the Legislature passed such benefits into law. The new rule took effect in January 2001 and includes health and dental coverage.*

The Task Force would like to express its appreciation to President McCormick and the UW administration for supporting this decision through letters to Governor Locke and PEBB members in the spring of 2000. This support, along with other encouragement, was a vital part of the decision, especially as it related to Governor Locke's change of heart on the matter.

Research conducted by our GBLT Task Force in the fall of 1999 revealed that GBLT employees thought they were discriminated against by the UW because they were not offered the same employer-sponsored family benefits as their legally married peers. Many thought that this differential treatment was equivalent to being paid less for the same work since employee benefits are an important component of the compensation package.

* Please note that the inclusion of same-sex domestic partners in health and dental coverage does not reflect complete equity with opposite-sex, legally married couples, because the benefits provided to same-sex domestic partners are considered taxable income according to federal tax laws; therefore, Washington state employees (including UW employees) taking advantage of these benefits will incur costs that are not imposed upon their legally married peers.

History

Domestic Partnership: Due to numerous steps in recent years to include GBLT people in non-discrimination regulations (including the 1983 Executive Order that added “sexual orientation” to the UW non-discrimination policy), members of the GBLT community have had less to fear from legal discrimination, and individuals have increasingly been able to be more open about their relationships. They have also been more open in asking that their same-sex partners be treated the same as their peers’ spouses. While many people think the denial of employer-sponsored benefits constitutes discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, to date, the UW administration and the state attorney general have not considered such differential treatment to be illegal or a violation of University policy. Some have suggested that since unmarried heterosexuals are treated the same as unmarried sexual minority persons, there is no illegal discrimination based on marital status. This argument fails to recognize that same-sex couples are not *able* to marry, and thus domestic partnership programs represent the only means by which their relationships can be recognized. At present, no Washington State or Federal law addresses this complex issue. (Vermont is the only state to date that addressed this issue by creating a legal civil union for same-sex couples, whereby the members of the couple receive all state- and local-level benefits and responsibilities accorded to opposite-sex married couple.)

Employer-sponsored Domestic Partnership Benefits: Harvard and Stanford were among the first universities to move forward with domestic partnership recognition. They were followed by numerous other colleges, businesses, and cities. Today, about 3,000 separate entities offer some employer-sponsored benefits to same-sex partners of their employees (<http://www.hrc.org/worknet/>). The breakdown is as follows (as of June 2000):

- Fortune 500 Companies (Total Number: 87)
- Other Private Companies, Non-Profits, and Unions (Total Number: 498)
- Colleges & Universities (Total Number: 102)
- State & Local Governments (Total Number: 79)
- Other Employers (Total Number: 2,167)

Examples in the Seattle area include, but are not limited to, the City of Seattle, Boeing, Fisher Broadcasting, Washington Mutual, Safeco, Nordstrom, Starbucks, Microsoft, and Group Health Cooperative. In a pro-active move, the City of Seattle passed the Equal Benefits Ordinance in 1999, which required that any company that contracts with the City of Seattle offer the same benefits to same-sex couples that it offers to married couples. This ordinance does not apply to state agencies such as the UW, but speaks to the broad existence and acceptance of domestic partnership programs in the region where the University is situated. While equal rights are not commodities to be bought and sold, it is worth noting that studies show that the extension of DP benefits costs employers no more than for any other family members, are not used any more extensively, and generally exhibit low enrollment rates. It has been estimated that a

national DP policy would increase health costs only six-tenths of a percent, a trivial figure in comparison to the current annual rate of increase.

UW's History of Same-sex Partner Benefits: The University of Washington has its own history with domestic partnership recognition. In general, its policies have been more progressive for students than for employees, largely due to the ability the Board of Regents has to affect student policies. In 1996, in response to complaints filed by students against the UW administration, resolutions from the Seattle campus Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW) and Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS), and peaceful protests by the university community, the UW extended certain limited domestic partner benefits to same-sex partners of students: use of the intramural athletic facility (IMA) and the purchase of Husky football tickets. In 1997, after continued and increased pressure from members of the university community, it expanded these student benefits to include purchase of the ASIP (Accident and Sickness Insurance Plan, the voluntary health insurance plan for students) and access to UW student family housing. In 1998, the UW allowed the same-sex partners of Graduate Student Service Appointees (GSSA) to purchase the "dependent coverage" of the Graduate Assistant Insurance Plan (GAIP), the health insurance plan for GSSA's. However, while the state covers half the cost of this coverage for a dependent or legal spouse, domestic partners must pay the full cost themselves.

Until recently, gains for employees have been much more modest. In 1997, after the Seattle campus opened up the IMA to the spouses of employees, comments from gay and lesbian employees to President McCormick and other administrative officials led to a quick decision to grant the same access to employees' same-sex domestic partners.

Current Situation:

1. *Health Insurance.* As mentioned earlier, in May 2000 the State Public Employee Benefits Board (PEBB) passed a regulation granting same-sex partners of state employees the same health and dental benefits as legally married spouses. This new regulation took effect January 1, 2001, and its application to UW employees is described at <http://www.washington.edu/admin/benefits/domestic.partners.html>. The PEBB took this action, in part, in response to a threatened lawsuit by two state employees with same-sex domestic partners. In Oregon, a similar lawsuit led to that state's inclusion of domestic partnerships in its employee benefits package.

There have already been several efforts to rescind PEBB's new regulation, among them: 1) a statewide initiative campaign, which did not collect enough signatures by the end of 2000; 2) a lawsuit (*Middleton v Public Employees Benefit Board*), in which the plaintiff is arguing that it is against public policy for the state to offer benefits for same-sex couples because they cannot marry and the employer-sponsored health benefits are only for legally married couples; and 3) a bill introduced in the State Senate (SB 5232) by Senator Dan Swecker, which posits that the state cannot afford to fund

benefits for same-sex domestic partners of state employees. At the time of this report, neither of the latter efforts has been resolved, but neither is expected to succeed.

2. *Other benefits.* Some state civil service personnel rules allow for equal treatment of spouses (as “family members”) and domestic partners (as “household members”) without acknowledging domestic partners directly. The Washington State Department of Personnel (DOP) defines “household members” as: “Persons who reside in the same home, who have reciprocal duties to, and provide financial support for one another. This term shall include, but is not limited to, foster children and legal wards. The term does not include persons sharing the same general house when living style is primarily that of a dormitory or commune.” A “household member” is treated like a “family member” for purposes of bereavement leave and shared leave but not sick leave.

For the most part, the UW administration has chosen to follow state civil service rules for UW employee groups for which they have rule-making authority (i.e., contract classified, professional, faculty, and other academic employees). In a departure from civil service rules, however, as of August 2000, **sick leave** rules for UW professional staff and librarians treat spouses and household members identically. Sick leave rules for contract classified employees will most likely be changed as well, after consultation with the Classified Staff Association.

University rules regarding federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) rights do not extend benefits to care of “household members” (e.g., domestic partners) for either classified or professional staff. On the other hand, UW faculty rules on FMLA leave allow the Vice-Provost to grant equivalent leave for the care of other than family members.

Parental leave is available for care of the employee's “natural newborn, adoptive, or foster child.” This applies equally to spouses and domestic partners, as long as domestic partners are either the birth or adoptive parent.

Under the PERS 2 retirement system which affects many classified and some professional staff, the surviving spouse or minor children of employees of at least ten years duration may choose between survivor benefits and lump sum payment with interest. All other beneficiaries are eligible only for lump sum payment with interest. Employees thus cannot provide for their surviving domestic partners in the same fashion as married employees can provide for their spouses.

3. *Medical Information and Decision Making at UW and Harborview Medical Centers.* RCW 70.02.050(1)(e) allows the health care provider (including the hospital) to disclose health care information about a patient “to immediate family members of the patient or to any other individual with whom the patient is known to have a close personal relationship, if made in accordance with good medical or other professional practice, unless the patient has instructed the health care provider in writing not to make the disclosure.” Thus, the hospital may share information with known domestic partners so long as the patient has not instructed otherwise.

Medical decision making is under a different statute. The laws governing informed consent allow for consent to be made by a surrogate decision-maker if the patient is unable to provide consent him/herself (RCW 7.70.065). In descending order, the statute allows the following persons to make decisions regarding a patient's health care: Legal guardian, power of attorney for health care decisions, spouse, adult children, parents, and adult siblings. Of course, if the domestic partner has been appointed as legal guardian or has the power of attorney, the partner has the authority to make decisions. Failing such an appointment, the medical centers must use the statutory categories.

Methods

To investigate the history, issues, attitudes, and facts concerning domestic partnerships at the University of Washington, our Domestic Partnership Subcommittee used the following approaches.

- We used the GLBT Task Force survey to glean information about how important domestic partnership coverage was for the university community.
- We corresponded and met with Helen Remick, the UW Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity, multiple times to learn about policies and procedures at the UW.
- We corresponded and met with individuals who had been involved in various efforts by students, faculty, and staff to change the domestic partnership policies at the UW.
- We used email to contact organized labor representatives to get their perspective on the situation.
- We used email to contact some peer institutions to learn about their domestic partnership programs.
- We used the internet to get information on the benefits programs in Washington State (e.g., PEBB and HCA).
- We met with State Representative Ed Murray to learn about his efforts to change state law to cover domestic partners of state employees.
- We met with Marsha Botzer, Director of the Ingersoll Gender Center (an Seattle-based organization serving the needs of transgender persons), who has worked on GLBT and domestic partnership issues within the state Department of Social and Health Services.
- We contacted the UW benefits coordinator to learn what tools are used by the UW to communicate benefits to new and current employees.

Recommendations

The University of Washington should follow up on its stated commitment to non-discrimination for sexual minority employees and students by expanding upon the state's recent efforts to offer an equivalent benefits package to all employees, including GSSAs. The University can do this by creating comprehensive, consistent, and clear benefits regulations that reflect an affirming attitude toward same-sex couples, i.e. recognition of the social worth of GBLT family life as well as the family life of heterosexuals. This benefits package would demonstrate total parity between benefits offered to legally married couples and those offered to domestic partners.

In order to reach that goal, the UW should undertake the following actions within the next two years:

1. Amend personnel policies under the jurisdiction of UW to define and acknowledge domestic partners as family members equivalent to spouses, wherever allowable by law.
2. Using the PEBB health insurance decision as a model, encourage Washington State Department of Personnel to recognize formally domestic partners in civil service rules.
3. Publish and disseminate widely to current, new, and prospective employees a brochure that describes comprehensively the benefits available – as well as those *not* available – to domestic partners. This brochure could include information on the importance of health care directives.
4. Sponsor a table specifically focused on domestic partnership benefits at the annual Employee Benefits Fairs.
5. Oppose any legislative action to reverse the recent PEBB decision to provide health insurance to the same-sex domestic partners of state employees.
6. Urge legislative changes in the PERS 2 retirement system to allow for equitable treatment of same-sex domestic partners and opposite-sex spouses.
7. Provide equitable treatment of domestic partners and spouses of GSSAs for the GAIP health insurance.
8. Update the definition of “discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation” as it pertains to difference in treatment of legally married spouses and same-sex domestic partners, in light of the fact that “domestic partnership” was not a concept in 1983 when sexual orientation was added to Executive Order 31, the UW's non-discrimination policy.

GBLT ACADEMICS

Definition of the Problem

Despite the fact that a significant body of interdisciplinary scholarship on GBLT theories, identities and experiences has developed across the sciences, social sciences, and humanities, the University of Washington does not formally recognize GBLT Studies as a valid and essential part of a university education. Hence, the UW does not have GBLT degree-granting units or programs in which student can enroll and develop a cohesive plan of course work, nor is there a central list that students can access in order to help them identify and select GBLT courses. Within the past decade, the University has provided support for curriculum transformation projects that primarily address racial and ethnic diversity, but it has not supported the further development of courses on diverse genders and sexualities. The absence of a GBLT course of study renders GBLT people invisible and suggests that their lives and experiences are insignificant and undeserving of serious scholarly investigation.

History

A number of courses with GBLT content (such as WOMEN 354, “Lesbian Lives and Cultures”) have been offered at the University of Washington since the 1970s. Within the last three years, UW students, faculty, and staff have attempted to increase the visibility of courses and resources related to GBLT issues and topics. In the 1997-98 academic year, a Queer Curriculum Committee (QCC) made the first concerted attempt to compile two lists of courses. One list contained courses with a primary focus on gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender issues. As of Winter Quarter, 1998, two advanced undergraduate courses and three graduate courses made this list. The second list contained 26 courses that integrated GBLT content. Several faculty members have created a new entity called the Sexual Orientation Research Group, focusing on past and present academic research.

The UW library system includes a focus on GBLT issues. The GBLT Studies Coordinator for the UW Libraries has created a number of web pages on GBLT, including holdings, GBLT organizations and publications originating in the northwest, and an annotated guide to GBLT reference and bibliographical works. The Coordinator is also available in person and by email to assist researchers working on GBLT topics. See Appendix A for web addresses.

The Robert M. Eichler and Bryan L. Dittmer Endowed Library Fund for Gay and Lesbian Studies was established Spring 2000 and will enhance GLBT holdings, programs, and related activities in the UW Libraries. The list of GBLT holdings is updated annually and now includes over 7,000 holdings, which can be accessed at both the libraries and on the University web page. Our GBLT Task Force

built upon the previous work of the Queer Curriculum Committee and the ongoing work of the UW librarians.

GBLT Studies at Peer and Non-Peer Institutions

The University of Washington lags behind its peers in both the development and visibility of GBLT curricula and programs. A preliminary search via university web sites reveals that many colleges and universities have: 1) established GBLT programs and curricula, and 2) created accessible web sites that make it easy to locate these programs or lists of GBLT-related courses. Individual scholars have also contributed to the dissemination of information on GBLT programs and courses via the web. John G. Younger, a professor and director of the Program in the Study of Sexualities at Duke University, for example, has created a number of web sites. See for example <http://www.duke.edu/web/jyounger/lgbprogs.html>.

Given that GBLT Studies is an interdisciplinary body of knowledge, it is not surprising that the institutions surveyed offer GBLT courses from many departments in the social sciences, humanities, and the sciences, and are cross-listed between departments. Both private and public universities have taken a variety of approaches to offering GBLT courses. Duke University and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee offer certificates in GBLT studies. Yale University has created a GBLT undergraduate concentration through its women's studies program. The University of Chicago has developed the "Lesbian and Gay Studies Project" within its Center for Gender Studies. The Center offers a curriculum that includes such courses as "American Lesbian and Gay History," "Ideology, Culture, and Sexuality," and "Gay Literature," and allows undergraduates who concentrate in Gender Studies to focus on lesbian and gay studies. The University of California-Berkeley and UCLA offer GBLT courses through their "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Studies" programs. Other major universities, including Cornell, the University of Arizona, the University of Colorado-Boulder, the University of Michigan, and the University of Minnesota have also publicized GBLT courses listings.

The University of Washington has an obligation to provide the best education it can to its student body. The development of GBLT Studies would serve as a means of expanding the notions of "diversity" and "cultural pluralism" by offering a cohesive academic program that encourages continued intellectual engagement with the complexities of the human experience. Specifically, GBLT Studies fulfills the spirit of the University of Washington statement on Diversity, which includes promoting "understanding and appreciation of human differences, and the constructive expression of ideas." It also would fulfill the Mission Statement of the College of Arts and Sciences, which "discovers, preserves and transmits fundamental knowledge in the arts, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences."

Recommendations

The GBLT Task Force recommends that the University of Washington initiate the development of GBLT Studies at both the graduate and undergraduate levels on the

Bothell, Tacoma, and Seattle campuses. In order to accomplish this, we recommend that the University should:

1. Provide funding to the Curriculum Transformation Project for the development of new GBLT courses and for redesigning existing courses to include GBLT content;
2. Establish a degree-granting GBLT Studies Program in the College of Arts and Sciences with its own undergraduate major and minor;
3. Establish an interdisciplinary graduate degree program in GBLT Studies; and
4. Create web site that lists and describes GBLT courses at UW.

APPENDICES

GBLT RESOURCES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Student Commission

The Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian, and Transgender Commission is one of six Associated Students of the University of Washington, Seattle, minority commissions. Formed in 1992 as the GBLC, the name was changed in September of 1997 to be more inclusive. The Director serves a one year term and is hired to facilitate weekly meetings, coordinate volunteer efforts, manage the office space and oversee special events like National Coming Out Day, World AIDS Day, the UW Talent Show, and BGLAD (Bisexual, Gay and Lesbian Awareness Days). The Commission maintains a web site with information about other campus groups. <http://depts.washington.edu/asuwgblc/html>

Administrative Offices

While there are no administrative offices solely dedicated to GBLT issues, a number have responsibilities for or are sensitive to GBLT issues.

UW Student Counseling Center
Counselors who specialize in GBLT issues
<http://depts.washington.edu/scc/>

Hall Health Student Health Center
Information on HIV
<http://depts.washington.edu/hhpccweb/>

Office of the Ombudsman and University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office
Complaint resolution services
<http://www.washington.edu/admin/hr/pol.proc/complaint.process.html>

Equal Opportunity Office
Oversight of University civil rights issues
<http://www.washington.edu/admin/eoo>
<http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/handbook/Volume4.html>

Academic Resources

The University of Washington does not have a GBLT academic program at this time. It does have special library resources and a strong Women Studies program.

Women Studies
<http://depts.washington.edu/webwomen/>

University of Washington Libraries
Gay and Lesbian Holdings and references
<http://faculty.washington.edu/alvin/gaycat.htm>
<http://faculty.washington.edu/alvin/gayref.htm>
<http://www.lib.washington.edu/subject/GayLesbianStudies>

Informal Organizations

Web site information is as of February 2001. Because informal organizations can change frequently, we suggest searching general web site, <http://www.washington.edu>, and choosing to search all washington.edu sites for the topics gbtl and glbt.

Bitter Old Hags and Grumpy Old Fags
<http://students.washington.edu/bohgoofs/>

Pride Dawgs
<http://students.washington.edu/prdawgs/>

CampusQ
<http://students.washington.edu/lpjames/campusq/>

Gay and Lesbian University Employees (G.L.U.E.)
<http://www.scn.org/ip/glue/>

LEGALS
<http://students.washington.edu/legalsuw/>

Stonewall Health Sciences
Contact cfodell@u.washington.edu

UW Courses with Queer Content (last updated in 1998)
<http://depts.washington.edu/asuwgblc/qcc>

QSPH for gay, bisexual, lesbian and transgender students, staff and faculty in the University of Washington School of Public Health.

No web page

Social Work GBLT
No web page

APPENDIX B: Summary of GBLT Resources at Select Institutions

Summary of GBLT Resources at Select Institutions

Peer Institutions	Staffing		Target Population			
	Coordinator/ Director	Additional Staff	Students	Primarily Students	Campus Community	Reports to...
Cornell University	yes	yes			yes	
Michigan State University	yes	yes	yes			Student Affairs
Ohio State University	yes			yes		Student Affairs
Texas A & M University	yes	yes	yes			Student Life
Univ. of Arizona	no					
Univ. of California, Davis	yes	yes			yes	Student Affairs
Univ. of California, Irvine	yes	yes			yes	Student Affairs
Univ. of California, Los Angeles	yes	yes			yes	Student Affairs
Univ. of California, San Diego	yes				yes	Student Affairs
Univ. of Cincinnati	no					
Univ. of Florida	yes			yes		Dean of Students
Univ. of Hawaii	no					
Univ. of Iowa	no					
Univ. of Kentucky	no					
Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor	yes	yes			yes	Student Affairs
Univ. of Minnesota	yes				yes	
Univ. of Missouri, Columbia	yes				yes	Student Life
Univ. of New Mexico	no					
Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	no					
Univ. of Pittsburgh	no					
Univ. of Utah	no					
Univ. of Virginia	no					
Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison	yes				yes	Dean of Students Academic Affairs
Univ. of Illinois, Chicago	yes	yes				
Pac-10 Institutions						
Arizona State University	no					
Oregon State University	no					
Stanford	yes	yes			yes	Dean of Students Student Activities
Univ. of California, Berkeley	yes			yes		Dean of Students Student Affairs
Univ. of Oregon	yes	Yes			yes	VP for Administration
Univ. of Southern California	yes					
Washington State University	yes	Yes			yes	

SURVEY

We're listening...to what you have to say about gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) issues at the UW.

The "President's Task Force on GLBT Issues" was created to help assess the environment faced by GLBT students, faculty, and staff at the UW (main campus, Bothell, Tacoma, Harborview, etc.) and to recommend ways to improve this environment. To this end, we are sponsoring several informal 'info-gathering' sessions and conducting a brief survey of the entire campus community. We are very interested in what YOU think, if you're gay, if you're straight, or whatever. Please come to one of these sessions. In addition, your responses to the following questions will help our effort. Please complete the survey below and return it at 104 HUB or 9 Communications, or mail it to the Equal Opportunity Office, Box 354560, via campus mail. Attach pages with any additional comments.

1. I consider myself: straight, gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, _____
2. My gender is: male, female
3. I am a/an: undergraduate, graduate student, faculty, staff, alumnus
4. I feel comfortable disclosing my sexual orientation/gender identity to: students, faculty, staff
5. I identify as a member of a racial/ethnic minority group(s): _____

Answer the following Yes, No, Unsure

6. I think it's easy for GLBT people to come out at the UW
7. I know someone who has been discriminated against at the UW because of their sexual orientation and/or gender identity
8. I have personally been discriminated against at the UW because of my sexual orientation and/or gender identity
9. I am aware of the UW's policies regarding/affecting GLBT people
10. The UW's policies adequately protect the GLBT
11. The UW's GLBT policies are widely known and followed
12. When the UW administration refers to 'diversity,' I think it that it should include the GLBT community
13. I think it is important that the UW offer courses with GLBT content
14. I know about GLBT resources on campus
15. GLBT resources on campus are easy to find
16. I would like to see a permanent UW entity to address GLBT concerns
17. I would describe the attitude at UW towards GLBT people as: intolerant, tolerant, accepting, affirming, _____
18. I want the GLBT Task Force to work on the following issues:

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Demographics (n=251)

	#	%
<i>Sexual Orientation</i> (Missing = 4)		
Straight	57	23.1
Gay Male	83	33.6
Lesbian/Gay Female	75	30.4
Bisexual	26	10.5
Transgender	6	2.4
<i>Gender</i> (Missing = 3)		
Male	116	46.8
Female	132	53.2
<i>UW Status</i> (Missing = 8)		
Undergraduate Student	79	32.5
Graduate Student	37	15.2
Faculty	18	7.4
Staff	86	35.4
Alumni	4	1.6
Undergrad/Staff	4	1.6
Staff/Alumni	11	4.5
Grad Student/Staff	3	1.2
Faculty/Alumnus/a	1	.4
<i>Identifies as Racial/Ethnic Minority</i>	45	18.1
Identified Racial/Ethnic Groups		
Asian Pacific American	13	28.9
Hispanic	7	15.6
African American	4	8.9
Native American	4	8.9
Jewish	6	13.3
Not Specified	10	22.2

Question #4: *I feel comfortable disclosing my sexual orientation to:*

Disclosure of Sexual Orientation by Sexual Minorities (n= 190)

	#	%
To Students	132	69.5
<i>To Faculty</i>	121	63.7
<i>To Staff</i>	130	68.4

Crosstabulation of Disclosure of Sexual Orientation by Sexual Minorities (n=190)

	Gay Male (n=83)		Lesbian/Gay Female (n=75)		Bisexual (n=26)		Transgender (n=6)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<i>To Students</i>	63	75.9	46	61.3	19	73.1	4	66.7
<i>To Faculty</i>	58	69.9	45	60.0	14	53.8	4	66.7
<i>To Staff</i>	64	77.1	47	62.7	15	57.7	4	66.7

Crosstabulation of Disclosure of Sexual Orientation by UW Status (n=162)

	Undergraduates (n=48)		Grad Students (n=27)		Faculty (n=16)		Staff (n=71)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<i>To Students</i>	40	83.3	23	85.2	9	56.3	41	57.7
<i>To Faculty</i>	32	66.7	18	66.7	13	81.3	41	57.7
<i>To Staff</i>	31	64.6	17	63.0	10	62.5	53	74.6

I think it's easy for GBLT people to come out at the UW.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	18	28	20	9	1	76
	31.6%	34.1%	27.8%	34.6%	16.7%	31.3%
no	13	20	27	7	2	69
	22.8%	24.4%	37.5%	26.9%	33.3%	28.4%
unsure	26	34	25	10	3	98
	45.6%	41.5%	34.7%	38.5%	50.0%	40.3%
total	57	82	72	26	6	243
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I know someone who has been discriminated against at the UW because of their sexual orientation and/or gender identity.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	19 33.3%	35 43.2%	31 43.7%	8 30.8%	1 20.0%	94 39.2%
no	34 59.6%	37 45.7%	27 38.0%	15 57.7%	4 80.0%	117 48.8%
unsure	4 7.0%	9 11.1%	13 18.3%	3 11.5%		29 12.1%
total	57 100.0%	81 100.0%	71 100.0%	26 100.0%	5 100.0%	240 100.0%

I have been personally been discriminated against at the UW because of my sexual orientation or gender identity.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	10 17.5%	20 24.7%	21 29.2%	4 15.4%		55 22.8%
no	45 78.9%	52 64.2%	41 56.9%	21 80.8%	3 60.0%	162 67.2%
unsure	2 3.5%	9 11.1%	10 13.9%	1 3.8%	2 40.0%	24 10.0%
total	57 100.0%	81 100.0%	72 100.0%	26 100.0%	5 100.0%	241 100.0%

I am aware of UW's policies regarding/affecting GBLT people.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	19 33.3%	41 50.0%	34 46.6%	12 46.2%	1 16.7%	107 43.9%
no	27 47.4%	32 39.0%	22 30.1%	11 42.3%	4 66.7%	96 39.3%
unsure	11 19.3%	9 11.0%	17 23.3%	3 11.5%	1 16.7%	41 16.8%
total	57 100.0%	82 100.0%	73 100.0%	26 100.0%	6 100.0%	244 100.0%

The UW's policies adequately protect the GBLT.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	10 17.9%	7 8.5%	1 1.4%	1 3.8%	1 16.7%	20 8.2%
no	9 16.1%	27 32.9%	30 41.1%	10 38.5%		76 31.3%
unsure	37 66.1%	48 58.5%	42 57.5%	15 57.7%	5 83.3%	147 60.5%
total	56 100.0%	82 100.0%	73 100.0%	26 100.0%	6 100.0%	243 100.0%

The UW's GBLT policies are widely known & followed.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	8 14.0%	3 3.7%		2 7.7%		13 5.4%
no	29 50.9%	41 50.0%	29 40.3%	15 57.7%		114 47.1%
unsure	20 35.1%	38 46.3%	43 59.7%	9 34.6%	5 100.0%	115 47.5%
total	57 100.0%	82 100.0%	72 100.0%	26 100.0%	5 100.0%	242 100.0%

When the UW administration refers to 'diversity,' I think it should include the GBLT community.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	41 74.5%	75 91.5%	73 100.0%	25 96.2%	5 83.3%	219 90.5%
no	12 21.8%	3 3.7%			1 16.7%	16 6.6%
unsure	2 3.6%	4 4.9%		1 3.8%		7 2.9%
total	55 100.0%	82 100.0%	73 100.0%	26 100.0%	6 100.0%	242 100.0%

I think it is important that the UW offer courses with GBLT content.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	34 59.6%	75 92.6%	66 93.0%	26 100.0%	5 83.3%	206 85.5%
no	19 33.3%	1 1.2%	1 1.4%			21 8.7%
unsure	4 7.0%	5 6.2%	4 5.6%		1 16.7%	14 5.8%
total	57 100.0%	81 100.0%	71 100.0%	26 100.0%	6 100.0%	241 100.0%

I know about GLBT resources on campus.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	27	42	25	10	3	107
	48.2%	51.2%	34.7%	38.5%	50.0%	44.2%
no	24	34	30	14	2	104
	42.9%	41.5%	41.7%	53.8%	33.3%	43.0%
unsure	5	6	17	2	1	31
	8.9%	7.3%	23.6%	7.7%	16.7%	12.8%
total	56	82	72	26	6	242
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

GLBT resources on campus are easy to find.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	14	15	8	3	1	41
	25.0%	18.3%	11.1%	12.0%	16.7%	17.0%
no	9	31	31	13	4	88
	16.1%	37.8%	43.1%	52.0%	66.7%	36.5%
unsure	33	36	33	9	1	112
	58.9%	43.9%	45.8%	36.0%	16.7%	46.5%
total	56	82	72	25	6	241
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I would like to see a permanent UW entity to address GLBT concerns.

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
yes	32	68	59	23	6	188
	59.3%	84.0%	83.1%	88.5%	100.0%	79.0%
no	16	4	2	2		24
	29.6%	4.9%	2.8%	7.7%		10.1%
unsure	6	9	10	1		26
	11.1%	11.1%	14.1%	3.8%		10.9%
total	54	81	71	26	6	238
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I would describe the attitude at the UW towards GBLT as . . .

	sexual orientation					total
	straight	gay male	lesbian	bisexual	transg'r	
intolerant	5 9.4%	8 10.5%	5 6.9%	1 4.0%	1 20.0%	20 8.7%
tolerant	23 43.4%	45 59.2%	37 51.4%	12 48.0%	2 40.0%	119 51.5%
accepting	13 24.5%	15 19.7%	16 22.2%	6 24.0%	1 20.0%	51 22.1%
affirming	6 11.3%	1 1.3%	1 1.4%	1 4.0%		9 3.9%
other	6 11.3%	7 9.2%	13 18.1%	5 20.0%	1 20.0%	32 13.9%
total	53 100.0%	76 100.0%	72 100.0%	25 100.0%	5 100.0%	231 100.0%

“other” included:

60% tolerant 40% accept, accepting & affirming, accepting & tolerant, accepting so far, accepting, not affirming, all of the above, apathetic, behind the times, benign neglect, denial, depends ... tolerant, depends on department, don't know, from outside: different, gen. ok w/ some probs, hypersensitive, ignorant, inconsistent, Indiff/don't ask/tell, indifferent, indifferent/anxious, intolerant (from peers), intolerant to affirming, mixed, no idea, not fully tolerant, not positive, p.c. tolerant, passive, predominately tolerant, ranges, reluctant, semi-tolerant, Subversive/intolerant, super intolerant, tolerant as necessary, tolerant most of the time, tolerant w/ exceptions, tolerant, don't ask/tell, too damn tolerant, unknown, varies by department, varies widely, very tolerant

SUGGESTIONS FOR TASK FORCE FOCI

One hundred sixty-six persons responded to the question “I want the GLBT Task Force to work on the following issues:” Most persons responded with short answers while others wrote several paragraphs. After transcribing these responses from each survey word for word (including misspellings), categories were created that summarized the content. Following are these central categories with my interpretation of their meaning with example responses.

Response	#	Other responses
Benefits	76	diversity of GLBT
Education	30	attention to bisexuals’ issues
Information/Referral	17	attention to transgender issues
Visibility	15	educating physical plant
Support	13	research on glbt issues
Curriculum	12	tolerate straights
Housing	10	be more open
Social events	5	care for children of glbt parents
Enforce current policies	5	mentoring
Lobbying for benefits	4	sexual harassment training
Safety	5	funds
Disband	4	gay marriage
Office space	3	church issues
Remove ROTC	3	awareness of suicide
Educate Hall Health	2	sexual health
Attention to Hate Crimes	2	fixing Hall Health

Benefits

This was the most common response. In all, 76 individuals listed domestic partnership or same-sex couple benefits as the most important issue. Some individuals specified that staff and faculty were denied equal provision of benefits to their same-sex partners, and that this was discriminatory. These respondents urged the Task Force to consider ways to redress this discrimination by either creating additional policies or enforcing existing ones. Several individuals noted that while the University may be more or less favorable toward providing domestic partner benefits, there is a larger hurdle in the form of the State legislature. Four individuals specifically suggested that the Task Force focus on lobbying the state for these benefits.

Insurance coverage for domestic partners – I think it is unfair and discriminatory that my married co-workers can cover their spouses and children at the same rates that I am charged as a “single person” – and I am not allowed to cover my domestic partner at all. Gay Male Staff Member (Respondent #13)

Domestic partnership benefits for faculty and staff (this includes insurance coverage, as well as all benefits extended to heterosexual couples). Failure of the university community to recognize this fundamental benefit of stable relationships that are not heterosexual is the strongest factor undermining any expressions of

tolerance/acceptance otherwise made by UW leadership, and effectively constitutes the discrimination I refer to above. Lesbian Faculty Member (Respondent #23)

Lobbying the state to extend benefits to their GLBT employees. UW administration does NOTHING in this regard. And they certainly lobby for their other concerns in Olympia! Gay Male Staff Member (Respondent #97)

Education

Thirty respondents wanted the task force to prioritize educating the larger UW community about GLBT people, homophobia, and policies. Two specific departments were noted as needing special attention: Hall Health and the physical plant.

Exposing incoming undergraduates to GLBT issues and people. All of the problems that I have experienced have been with young undergrads harassing GLBT students on campus, walking holding hands, etc. Gay Male Graduate Student (Respondent #31)

Given the prevalence of homophobia and violence toward GLBT students in elementary and high schools, there is no way that internalized homophobia and prejudice is not a serious problem at the UW. The Task Force should work on promoting affirming diversity through education of faculty and staff, forums for students and the community, and a much higher level of public and proactive discussion of gender, affectional and sexuality issues generally. Lesbian Graduate Student (Respondent #72)

Information and Visibility

Fifteen respondents suggested the Task Force focus on increasing its visibility. Seventeen individuals noted that they were either unaware of information regarding GLBT concerns available on campus or that they felt it needed expanded access.

... There is a real lack of awareness on my part of issues and resources. I would like to see the results of this survey and then make a decision on what might take priority. Some more visibility of people and resources would be good. While GLBT have had reasons throughout history to hide, things are changing and we as individuals need to take more initiative to become visible; a university environment like the UW is potentially an excellent place for this endeavor. Gay Male Staff Member (Respondent #24)

I would like to see the task force be more out in the open – running across this on the internet was the only way I knew of it. I feel that if this group is more well known, the participation and the positive effects of the group will grow. What can I do to help, and where would one go to find out? Gay Male Undergraduate Student (Respondent #69)

Establish resources on campus to relieve the burden felt by existing GLBT student groups (for example, some administratively supported resources, GLBT resource center for faculty, students, staff, and so forth); work to include references to GLBT

issues in all University publications where appropriate (for example, new student materials, UW website, advising centers, and so forth). Gay Male Alumnus Staff Member (Respondent #124)

I would like to see the gay community become more visible on campus. By that I mean blending in with regular campus events. (From speaking at the Frosh convocation, to being a recognizable presence at regular campus dances, to having an IMA team, to speaking at graduation ceremonies). I think the U of W gay community should set an example to the Capitol Hill Gays by showing tolerance towards our fellow gays and celebrating its diversity. Not just being an exclusive club for the young, the white or the pretty boys. Activities should be planned where young and old gays could mix together – embracing each other rather than discriminating against each other. Also the Frat Houses (i.e. Greek System) seems to run or be behind everything on this campus. Communication between the gay community and the greeks need to be opened up. Educate them so they're not so homophobic – perhaps by co-sponsoring one of their charitable events – or being part of Rush Week or even forming a Gay Frat House. More media attention with McCormick is necessary – photo ops – let him be seen with us – the way he is with other minorities in the press. Maybe even get him to participate in the Gay Pride Parade in June. Gay Male Staff Person (Respondent #134)

Support

Five individuals stated a need for social events for the GBLT community and 13 said there was a need for additional social support. Several noted the need for an official office. Mentoring programs for both staff/faculty and students were suggested. Three individuals wanted to see the UW take an active role in providing external leadership for other academic institutions as well as the local Seattle GBLT communities.

Set up an office that centralizes diversity education efforts and includes race, gender, ethnicity, GBLT, ability, and class issues. Overall GBLT education efforts and promote conversation on campus.... Straight Male Graduate Student (Respondent #41)

A permanent office on campus for GBLT concerns would be terrific provided the UW puts an administrator in who has the respect of their peers. Gay male Staff Member (Respondent #97)

Educating the administrative employees. Putting on more events supporting GBLT musicians, comedians, etc.. Having more openly OUT people in public view. Lesbian Staff Member (Respondent #52)

As an example that comes to mind, two years ago (or maybe three) there was a dance planned in one of the dorms on campus. A group of students wanted to set up a web-page to do date-matching. The Resident Director of the hall told them no, because their plan automatically matched guys with girls and vise-versa. So they corrected the oversight and added to the plan an option for people using the date-match to

choose homosexual or heterosexual. The Resident Director then stepped on the idea again and said that it would make many residents uncomfortable to see such an option available. Aside from the fact that this RD was a hypocrite, the main point is that possible chance to enhance an event in a queer-friendly way was destroyed before it even got off the ground because the visibility factor was not politically acceptable. That is, to me, wrong. Gay Male Undergraduate Student (Respondent #115)

Perhaps the single best experience I have had as an openly lesbian grad. Student was when my long-time colleague and office-mate referred one of his students to me. He realized that our academic interests were similar, and suggested that she talk to me for help in developing her term paper. The professor of her course had directed her to an lgbt Faculty member whose interests were in now way similar. It would be fantastic to see the development an lgbt academic network that gave ppl tools for figuring out who would actually be useful in developing their interests rather than just someone sympathetic. Lesbian Staff Member (Respondent #166)

Inclusion

Several individuals suggested that GBLT people should be included in the UW's diversity mosaic and a few noted the need for GBLT people to focus inward on its own diversity, including race, gender, and age. Four individuals noted there needs to be additional focus on the needs of transgenders. One person suggested a need to focus specifically on the intersection of sexuality and religion.

Recognize that GBLT issues differ among ethnic/racial minority groups. This diversity within the GBLT community can be recognized by presenting affirming speakings, history, film, and literature involving other groups. GBLT people don't just exist in the white community, but exist in all communities, but have frequently felt left out because of a failure to recognize contributions by other racial groups. Lesbian Staff Member (Respondent #2)

Safety

Seven individuals specifically stated a need for additional safety. Some expressed a need for safety in the classroom and others were concerned about hate crimes.

Curriculum

Twelve individuals would like to see 1) additional courses focusing specifically on GBLT people and 2) inclusion of GBLT people and issues across the curriculum.

Housing

Ten individuals expressed a need for housing for GLBT people. Some felt current housing was discriminatory in that GLBT people were denied family housing. Others were interested in making residence halls safer or establishing gay halls or gay fraternities.

Removal of the ROTC program

Three individuals specifically asked that the ROTC program be discontinued as they practice discrimination.

Disbanding

Four individuals suggested the Task Force was wasting taxpayer dollars and should disband.

Responses to Question #18: “I want the GBLT Task Force to work on the following issues:”

ID	Response(s)	Code(s)
2	Domestic partner benefits Social events for glbt students	BEN SOC
6	Lobby the state for improved “domestic partnership” benefits	BEN LOBBY
8	Creating an even more open place, where same-sex couples feel as welcome holding hands walking through campus as the straight couples currently do. I’m comfortable about it, but I’m used to the stares and mockery, younger kids aren’t.	Welcoming
9	Recognize that GBLT issues differ among ethnic/racial minority groups. This diversity within the GBLT community can be recognized by presenting affirming speakings, history, film, and literature involving other groups. GBLT people don’t just exist in the white community, but exist in all communities, but have frequently felt left out because of a failure to recognize contributions by other racial groups.	Diversity of GLBT
10	Getting an office for lgbt programs and concerns Staff and faculty social events	OFFICE SOC
13	Insurance coverage for domestic partners – I think it is unfair and discriminatory that my married co-workers can cover their spouses and children at the same rates that I am charged as a “single person” – and I am not allowed to cover my domestic partner at all. I would also like to comment on this form – these questions concern some very sensitive issues – discrimination against GBLT individuals can be VERY subtle – I do not think this form allows more than black and white response which is unfortunate. In discrimination there is quite a bit of gray area that “unsure” does not cover adequately.	BEN
15	Domestic partner benefits for staff!	BEN
16	Equal benefits for partners of gay/lesbians in the University Community. If, in the absence of marriage as a possibility for these couples, they require some other proof of partnership, this would be fair. But GBLT employees and their partners have the same needs as any other couples; GBLT employees do the same work as anyone else, therefore they should enjoy the same benefits. It seems fairly simple. That universities in much more conservative areas of the country (such as Iowa, my home state), should have gone ahead and given equal benefits and the University of Washington still can’t seem to put their money where their mouth (or their anti-discrimination policy) is, is absurd and shameful.	BEN
19	Domestic partner benefits	BEN
22	I would like to see more open information. This is the first time I heard about such things at the UW ...	INFO
23	Domestic partnership benefits for faculty and staff (this includes insurance coverage, as well as all benefits extended to heterosexual couples). Failure of the university community to recognize this fundamental benefit of stable relationships that are not heterosexual is the strongest factor undermining any expressions of tolerance/acceptance otherwise made by UW leadership, and effectively constitutes the discrimination I refer to above.	BEN

24	I believe this survey is a great step toward finding out which issues need work. There is a real lack of awareness on my part of issues and resources. I would like to see the results of this survey and then make a decision on what might take priority. Some more visibility of people and resources would be good. While GLBT have had reasons throughout history to hide, things are changing and we as individuals need to take more initiative to become visible; a university environment like the UW is potentially an excellent place for this endeavor.	INFO
25	Domestic partner benefits	BEN
27	Medical benefits for life partners	BEN
28	Domestic partner benefits (e.g. health insurance)	BEN
31	Exposing incoming undergraduates to GLBT issues and people. All of the problems that I have experienced have been with young undergrads harassing GLBT students on campus, walking holding hands, etc.	EDUC
34	Benefits for Domestic Partners Get discriminatory groups off campus (R.O.T.C.)	BEN remove ROTC
35	Providing domestic partners with health care is one of the most important issues for the GLBT community. This could be set up by having a registration for domestic partners and offering the same range of services that is currently available for married spouses.	BEN
37	Extension of benefits to life partners!!! It is so unjust that I am unable to extend my health benefits (and others) to my long-term partner. I am new to the UW and will not comment much further. UW could exhibit more visible affirmation to glbt population. AS a new employee (4 months) I have not received any information regarding support available to me as a glbt professional.	BEN INFO
38	Same sex partner benefits. If the UW has a “non-discrimination” policy for sexual orientation then the UW IS discriminating by not offering those partner benefits.	BEN
39	Safety Resources, especially for students Domestic Partnership benefits	SAFETY Resources BEN
40	I would like to know more about the resources that are available and where to find them. In addition, I would like to know whom I can address if I feel there is an issue regarding the school or their policies.	INFO
41	Set up an office that centralizes diversity education efforts and includes race, gender, ethnicity, glbt, ability, and class issues. Overall glbt education efforts and promote conversation on campus....	OFFICE EDUC
42	Benefits for partners equivalent to those available to heterosexually married couples.	BEN
43	Coming out, how to meet other bisexual women, community education	EDUC
44	I feel that faculty and students have more tolerance toward GLBT than the Physical Plant. The administrators of Facility Services do nothing to promote GLBT persons in their employ.	EDUC Educ. Physical plant
46	The 1% who feel free to make homophobic remarks in the workplace.	REDRESS
47	Providing a group for staff and/or faculty – such as a caucus	SOC organize
48	Domestic partner health care benefits	BEN

52	Educating the administrative employees. Putting on more vents supporting GBLT musicians, comedians, etc.. Having more openly OUT people in public view.	EDUC SOC VISIBILITY
53	Health insurance coverage for domestic partners-same as for spouses-we could pay for it. It is important to do this so UW can compete with other research/teaching oriented employers in Washington that already provide these benefits.	BEN
54	GBLT's in the military/ROTC issues	Remove ROTC
55	Disbanding and stop wasting taxpayer money. The amount of time, man-power and money being spent on this is appalling [sic].	Disband
56	Greater "acceptance" of bisexual/transgender. I know a lot of out gay/lesbians but NO out bisexual/transgender folks (including myself)	Attn to bi/tran
59	Domestic partnership benefits Public awareness/education Training of UW police and Hall Health in GBLT-specific issues	BEN EDUC Educate Hall Health
61	GBLT issues being taught in classrooms, education of campus	CURR EDUC
62	GLBT content in academic curriculum (specifically health sciences) More visible and substantial support of GBL students	CURR VISIBILITY
64	Hiring gay faculty and offering courses with gay content. I haven't been here long enough to see much of the community responses to gays and lesbians but the people in my department who are out are accepted and have been elected president of our first year grad class.	CURR
67	I would like to see the GBLT task force continue to encourage more domestic partner benefits and other such initiatives which seek to establish simple functional equality with the rest of the community, without adopting an off-putting "thought police" tone or victim mentality. I am uncomfortable with most politics of identity and fee that seeking an officially recognized "minority" status may do more harm than good in the long run.	BEN
69	I would like to see the task force be more out in the open – running across this on the internet was the only way I knew of it. I feel that if this group is more well known, the participation and the positive effects of the group will grow. What can I do to help, and where would one go to find out?	VISIBILITY INFO
70	Health insurance benefits for the domestic partners of staff.	BEN
71	Dissolving itself so time, tuition and state tax money isn [sic]	Disband
72	Given the prevalence of homophobia and violence toward GLBT students in elementary and high schools, there is no way that internalized homophobia and prejudice is not a serious problem at the UW. The Task Force should work on promoting affirming diversity through education of faculty and staff, forums for students and the community, and a much higher level of public and proactive discussion of gender, affectional and sexuality issues generally.	EDUC
73	Domestic partnership.... Why is one of the countries [sic] most prestiges [sic] universities not recognize that equal rights have been overlooked. If you cannot recognize our rights, it would only be fair that nor rights be recognized. All employee's [sic] partner, should be allowed to have rights. (Straight or Elsewise)) (King County is ok)	BEN
74	Keeping class situations more comfortable for gay students.	Making classes comf.

75	Further support for undergraduates and perhaps some trainings for administrators and support staff who might not have had as much exposure to glbt concerns.	SUPP EDUC
76	Offering more classes, such as womens studies, in the area of sexual orientation and gender identity.	CURR
77	More exposure	VISIBILITY
79	I guess I am not the person this survey was intended to study. However, I am interested in seeing the U of W as a place where people of very different identities can communicate and accept each other. That includes sexual identity. I personally am a little uncomfortable with the subject but am trying to deal with it.	EDUC
80	Helping people out.	SUPP
81	1. Equal benefits for staff/faculty. (I know this is a thorny state issue, but it's a lawsuit waiting to happen. See Tumeo v. University of Alaska – the University lost.) 2. End on-campus military recruiting. Soloman Amendment or not. (The Law School administration was very responsive to student request that our building not be leased to military groups and that off-campus CLE programs only lease space from organizations that follow the UW non-discrimination policy.)	BEN Remove ROTC
83	Domestic partner benefits	BEN
85	Domestic partner benefits	BEN
87	I would like to see the GBLT Task Force organize campus-wide forums to discuss GBLT issues, “town meetings to talk about issues like discrimination (i.e., does discrimination against the GBLT community exist at UW?) and whether the University should support lobbying efforts to include domestic partnership benefits for its students and/or staff.	EDUC LOBBY
88	Same-sex health benefits Continued awareness training to promote affirming attitudes toward GBLT members of the UW community	BEN EDUC
89	My main concern is getting the university to cover benefits of partners (straight or gay). I've read that other state universities have been able to do this (even in sates where it is not permitted) by not using state money, but other money in the University coffers. I would very much like to see the university move on this issue, and will be in touch with the TF to work on it, if the TF decides to work on it.	BEN
90	Domestic partner benefits for all areas of UW related benefits, i.e., for student housing, staff IMA privileges, medical benefits, etc.	BEN HOUSE
92	More supportive of transgender issues	Attn to trans
93	Hate crimes, produce a forum of hate issues: where they come from, why they exist, etc. perhaps via the sociology dept. of the A&S College	EDUC Hate crimes
96	Full benefits and insurance coverage for non-married same gender partners	BEN
97	Lobbying the state to extend benefits to their GBLT employees. UW administration does NOTHING in this regard. And they certainly lobby for their other concerns in Olympia! A permanent office on campus for GBLT concerns would be terrific provided the UW puts an administrator in who has the respect of their peers.	BEN LOBBY OFFICE

99	<p>Insuring safety to speak out in the class room when slanderous remarks are made. Faculty should address respect and diversity in every class. GLBT presence on campus should be more prominent. Safe dormitories.</p>	SAFETY HOUSE
101	More GLBT themed classes and research	CURR Research
102	Domestic partner benefits, including insurance, bereavement leave, life insurance, etc.	BEN
106	To focus on the review of University policies toward non-discrimination.	ENFORCE
108	Health insurance for domestic partners. I realize that such policy matter are formulated by the State of Washington but it'd be great of the university went out on a limb in advocating for a change.	BEN
109	Domestic partner benefits An ongoing presence on campus	BEN
110	Procedures to enforce the policies and really protect folks	ENFORCE
112	<p>Ending discrimination in terms of compensation benefits Creating a permanent entity for GLBT folks Having programs to assist GLBT students in the same vein as the EOP Strengthening rules/policies/sanction regarding anti-gay activity to equal racist activity, anti-Semitic activity, etc. SAFE SPACE program throughout campus Making Residence Halls safe for students Inclusion of GLBT in curriculum – perhaps even GLBT studies??</p>	BEN HOUSE SAFETY CURR SUPP
114	Creating a healthy awareness of glbt students on campus (or in the world for that matter). This does not mean parading around shouting “We’re here we’re Queer etc”. That is quite a negative image. Being GLBT does not imply any sort of activism, liberalism etc. GLBT students shouldn’t disappear but should become more “human”, i.e. by being themselves whenever and wherever they need to, not to feel threatened or in danger academically/professionally if the use the wrong pronoun etc.	EDUC
115	<p>Queer visibility Making events more queer friendly to give a chance to meet others</p> <p>As an example that comes to mind, two years ago (or maybe three) there was a dance planned in one of the dorms on campus. A group of students wanted to set up a web-page to do date-matching. The Resident Director of the hall told them no, because their plan automatically matched guys with girls and vise-versa. So they corrected the oversight and added to the plan an option for people using the date-match to choose homosexual or heterosexual. The Resident Director then stepped on the idea again and said that it would make many residents uncomfortable to see such an option available. Aside from the fact that this RD was a hypocrite, the main point is that possible chance to enhance an event in a queer-friendly way was destroyed before it even got off the ground because the visibility factor was not politically acceptable. That is, to me, wrong.</p> <p>Most queers don’t come out to even themselves until they move away from home for the first time. (Source: Lois McDermott’s class, PSYCH 210) So, to</p>	VISIBILITY SOC

	believe that statistic, this implies that there are probably a good number of gay or transgendered students wandering around campus just coming to terms with themselves. UW is tolerant, yes, but I guess I'd like to see a more pro-active welcoming. College is a time to explore who we are and where we go with life. Diverting a couple dollars to helping that exploration along is what I consider a worthwhile cause. ☺	
116	<p>I think that a review of different programs policies would be interesting. For example, the physician's oath that medical students take upon graduation does not say that one should treat regardless of sexual orientation (or gender, for that matter) yet it does not say one should treat regardless of religion of political party. Not to say the medical school is discriminatory as a rule (same-sex partner do get travel support when student are away for clerkships, for example). It's just interesting how inconsistent things can be – even within a program that does many things well.</p> <p>The main focus of any actions should be educational, however. Something as simple as a web-page that put together a listing of all the available resources would help. And on the other side of the educational issue, is educating students on the need for protections and equity. I'm personally tired of having to explain (to other students) WHY the medical school should give travel support to same-sex couples – apparently the fact that married couples get the same support isn't enough of an explanation.</p>	EDUC INFO
117	Domestic partner & enforcing non-discrimination	BEN ENFORCE
118	As I mention above, there needs to be more awareness around gender and transgender issues	Attn to trans
119	Domestic partner health insurance benefits	BEN
120	Equal rights and benefits for all domestic partnerships including medical, dental, etc, which are extended to married couples. Also, benefits that are extended to step children of glbt staff, students, and faculty.	BEN
121	Finding a better way to spend State money.	Disband
122	Education, being sex positive, and sexual health	EDUC Sexual health
123	Provision of information about resources available	INFO
124	Establish resources on campus to relive the burden felt by existing GBLT student groups (for example, some administratively supported resources, GBLT resource center for faculty, students, staff, and so forth); work to include references to GBLT issues in all University publications where appropriate (for example, new student materials, UW website, advising centers, and so forth).	SUPP VISIBILITY
125	Employment benefits, curriculum support, proactive stance in residence halls to improve the climate for students	BEN CURR HOUSE
126	Domestic partner benefits	BEN
127	Domestic partner benefits	BEN
128	Ways to make GBLT people feel heard.	SUPP
129	Same sex/domestic partner benefits	BEN
130	Benefits for domestic partners; making it impossible to be dismissed because of orientation	BEN ENFORCE

131	Student outreach Education	EDUC SUPP
132	1. Domestic partner benefits 2. Survivor benefits for registered domestic partners	BEN
134	<p>I would like to see the gay community become more <u>visible</u> on campus. By that I mean blending in with <u>regular</u> campus events. (From speaking at the Frosh convocation, to being a recognizable presence at <u>regular</u> campus dances, to having an IMA team, to speaking at graduation ceremonies).</p> <p>I think the U of W gay community should set an example to the Capitol Hill Gays by showing tolerance towards our fellow gays and celebrating its diversity. Not just being an exclusive club for the young, the white or the pretty boys. Activities should be planned where young and old gays could mix together – embracing each other rather than discriminating against each other.</p> <p>It would be nice if there was a weekly column in the Daily and Seattle Gay News on U of W Gay events of just campus life from a gay perspective.</p> <p>Also the Frat Houses (i.e. Greek System) seems to run or be behind <u>everything</u> on this campus. Communication between the gay community and the greeks need to be opened up. Educate them so they're not so homophobic – perhaps by co-sponsoring one of their charitable events – or being part of Rush Week or even forming a Gay Frat House.</p> <p>More media attention with McCormick is necessary – photo ops – let him be seen with us – the way he is with other minorities in the press. Maybe even get him to participate in the Gay Pride Parade in June.</p>	VISIBILITY Inclusion External leadership
135	Homophobia Domestic partnership issues!	EDUC BEN
136	How straight people can help with increasing same-gender oriented people's acceptance into straight society. Reducing straight people's ignorance and fears.	EDUC
139	Available visible resources, curriculum integration, more discussion of issues – visibility	INFO VISIBILITY
142	Stop being queer	Disband
143	Be tolerant of straight people	Tolerate straights
145	Domestic partnership benefits on a par with those for married couples.	BEN
147	Extending health care benefits to domestic partners as well as other employee benefits.	BEN
148	Expanding GBLT policies to adequately protect members of the GBLT community	Expand policies
149	<p>As far as I know, the UW's policies regarding/affecting GBLT people consist of: including sexual orientation in the UW's non-discrimination policy; allowing GBLT students' domestic partners the same IMA access, health insurance and housing benefits that are given to straight students' spouses; and allowing GBLT employees' domestic partners the same access to the IMA as straight employees' spouses.</p> <p>These policies do not adequately protect GBLT people. For example, although</p>	BEN Expand policies

	<p>sexual orientation is included in the UW’s non-discrimination policy, it is not followed. GBLT faculty/staff are not allowed to cover their domestic partners under their health insurance. This treats GBLT faculty/staff differently, as unequal to straight faculty/staff. In effect, the UW violates its own policy and discriminates against GBLT people. In understand this is something that only the Washington state legislature has the power to change. However, this does not excuse the UW from any effort to make this change. The UW and this GLBT task force should make an effort to bring the UW in line with its own policies.</p> <p>This inequality also lends itself to the belief that GBLT people are somehow “different”, “strange” and less valid than straight people; that we are not as “good”, or “human”. This is the kind of attitude that allows some people to feel that it’s alright to discriminate or to be violent towards GBLT people. We are not some unidentified group on campus; we are not “others” or just those “GBLT people”. We are the people you sit next to at lunch, and the people you work with everyday in the office. We are just as much a part of this university as anyone else and we contribute just as much to it to make it run. We should also be given the same compensation as others for the work we do.</p>	
150	Health benefits for domestic partners	BEN
151	Employment discrimination Spousal benefits GBLT/gender studies curriculum	ENFORCE BEN CURR
154	Diversity workshops for faculty & staff	EDUC
155	Domestic partnership benefits for UW employees!	BEN
156	The current agenda is a good start – wait for these tasks to be completed before adding more –	
157	Make policies more widely known, easier to access.	INFO
158	Health care benefits for domestic partners	BEN
159	Benefits for committed partners Opening doors @ UST & UWB to students	BEN External leadership
160	I would like greater dissemination of policies pertaining to GLBT faculty and staff. Are domestic partner benefits available?? If so, how do I go about applying for them? Are personnel offices at the UW/HMC centers aware of these policies??	INFO BEN
161	Domestic partner benefits coverage for staff.	BEN
162	Domestic partner’s benefit coverage.	BEN
163	Ranking different areas of University as gay-friendly atmosphere for staff. Insurance benefits for same sex partners of staff. Professional mentoring for queer employees. All we have now are invisible email lists.	INFO BEN SUPP
165	Including GLBT issues as part of University culture of diversity.	Inclusion in diversity
166	Faculty/grad student/undergrad. Mentoring’ “community” development	Mentoring
	<p>Perhaps the single best experience I have had as an openly lesbian grad. Student was when my long-time colleague and office-mate referred one of his students to me. He realized that our academic interests were similar, and suggested that she talk to me for help in developing her term paper. The professor of her course had directed her to an LGBT Faculty member whose interests were in no way similar. It would be fantastic to see the</p>	

	development an lgbt academic network that gave ppl tools for figuring out who would actually be useful in developing their interests rather than just someone sympathetic. The list (curriculum/ppl) that circulated late in the 1997-98 academic year was an excellent start, but I've not seen anything similar since. That information needs to be made more accessible in order to encourage students & discourse.	
167	Providing information about our real lifestyles, similarities and not just the bizarre or sensational.	EDUC
168	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including domestic partners in health insurance • Informing all UW staff and faculty of gblt rights 	BEN INFO
169	Domestic partners health care coverage and other benefits.	BEN
170	Domestic partner insurance benefits	BEN
171	Domestic partner benefits	BEN
173	Partner benefits	BEN
174	Domestic partner benefits – my sense is that there's a number of things the UW does, like partner accommodations. But, they're forced to do them under the table.	BEN
176	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health care and other benefits for domestic partners of GBLT staff 2. Student housing – GBLT students with domestic partners should be able to apply for family housing (I was <u>denied</u> that privilege when I was a student). 	BEN HOUSE
178	Putting D.P. in place ASAP – the city & country have it – why not U.W. the greatest university in the country?	BEN
179	Partner benefits	BEN
181	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Domestic partner benefits 2. Child care issues for (gay or lesbian) parents 3. Support systems for students struggling w/ sexual orientation 	BEN Child care SUPP
184	Insurance eligibility for registered domestic partners	BEN
185	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Domestic partnerships 2. Place for folks to go who experience problems. 	BEN SUPP
188	Open acknowledgement of the GBLT community as an important part of the UW	VISIBILITY
190	Domestic partner benefits, hate related violence, + GLBT curriculum content	BEN Hate crimes CURR
191	GBLT lecture sessions, workshop, inclusive sexual harassment training!	EDUC Sex. Harass. Training
193	To create a faculty “safe-space” program; to develop more courses dealing with GBLT issues, increased visibility for GBLT Commission	SUPP CURR VISIBILITY
195	Domestic partnership, ending homophobia (easier said than done ☺)	BEN EDUC
198	Educating the non-GBLT community	EDUC
199	<p>Making knowledge of this organization known to all</p> <p>I have been looking for a club like this @ UW, but have had nearly no luck. I e-mailed the department that register all clubs, but received no response ... Discrimination? Who knows. I am glad to finally that this club really does</p>	VISIBILITY INFO

	exist. Please send me more information! Hopefully, we can make information and resources available to those wanting or needing it. Thanks! ☺ P.S. Are there any other gay-oriented clubs?	
200	education	EDUC
201	Housing (domestic partner), housing in dorms, resources made more available to students, faculty & staff	HOUSE INFO
203	Better info accessibility to new students. Greater visibility for all the Commissions Gay/Lesbian etc. courses	INFO VISIBILITY
204	GBLT issues in classes	CURR
205	Gay marriages	Gay marriage
206	Educating people	
207	Gay dorm, visibility, more funding for GBLTC	HOUSE VISIBILITY Funds
208	More g/l classes More speaking bureaus on campus	CURR EDUC
209	Domestic partnership – health insurance for domestic partners	BEN
210	Safe-zone training for staff, faculty, students	SAFETY
211	Domestic partner benefits for faculty/staff	BEN
213	Accessible information/education on GBLT issues	INFO EDUC
214	Guaranteeing inclusion of GBLT resource information in packets given to students	INFO
215	Making sure GBLT is included in university offerings	Inclusion
216	Increasing awareness, more events/programs specifically inclusive/appropriate for GBLT community	EDUC Inclusion
219	1. Making coming out on campus easier & more comfortable 2. Improved residence hall life (particularly w/ higher staff)	SUPP HOUSE
223	I don't know yet but I'll keep it in mind ☺	
229	Making Hall Health deal with the medical problems of queer individuals willingly and sensitively. Let me relate to you the bad experiences with Hall Health that either I or friends have had. 1. Someone didn't want the fact that they were taking a test for HIV reported to their insurance, so they explained this and paid out of pocket, but Hall Health reported the result to the insurer anyway; 2. Someone came with an STD, and Hall Health refused to treating, saying the person should go to a clinic for that such as at Harborview; 3. Someone came to Hall Health with a chronic medical problem, and the nurse asked how the disease was acquired. The person answered that it began as an STD, one prevalent among gay men, and the nurse said that then they couldn't help the person with that problem and that the person should see a psychologist to deal with being gay.	Fix Hall Health
231	Loving us. Protection. Making it easier to hold events on campus. Gay/Straight Alliance Work (Bridgebuilding)	SUPP
232	Keeping Res. Halls safe & supportive	HOUSE SAFETY
235	Gay dorm	HOUSE

237	I think you do good work. Educating Univ. community and lobbying for equal protection/benefits from UW are most important for GBLT to continue, in my opinion.	EDUC Lobby
238	A greater awareness & understanding	VISIBILITY
239	Visibility	VISIBILITY
240	Partner benefits Gay/Lesbian Student Support Center	BEN
241	Discrimination in insurance coverage of medical treatment of Transsexualism (Gender Disphoria, Gender Identity Disorder) – it is flat out <u>denied</u> . I will send a short paper with info. This is not only a UW issue – it is national, & in great part due to a combination of insurance company resistance and the general ignorance on the part of employers selecting insurance. But, this will change & is changing now. I hope the UW will be proactive on this issue.	Attn to trans.
242	I would like to see the UW develop guidelines for providing benefits to same sex partners of employees as it does for married spouses of employees.	BEN
243	The state, and the University as a result, are light years behind other entities (schools, [unreadable]; private corporations) in acknowledging, let alone developing/advocating policies for, gays and lesbians. To me the primary issue is the recognition that gays and lesbians are in long-term relationships too, that this is a fact of life all across America and in other societies; and that we are just as much in need of leave and reciprocal benefits as are unmarried people. As long as we are unable to be publicly/officially recognized in marriage, then the focus must be on leave and benefits in recognition of these relationships. I would like to see the GBLT task force, and the university as a whole, push for these benefits. IMA passes are nice, but they don't cut the mustard. Thanks.	BEN
244	Educating the UW community about GBLT issues	EDUC
247	Not being so antagonistic toward contrasting viewpoints	Be more open
250	Benefits for faculty domestic partners	BEN
251	1. Support groups on campus for Family & Friends of GBLT 2. Alternatives & openness for Religious/Christian GBLT both on campus & from local churches & campus student religious groups so that students who are gay AND Christian don't have to waste time, energy & suffering being forced to choose between them ... I've seen it happen. P.S. There also needs to be more education for students about the link to <u>suicide</u> risk in this population & focused crisis services, counseling, etc.	SUPP Church concerns Focus on suicide