

LGBTQ Task Force Final Report

Table of Contents

0. Recommendations	2
I. Introduction: Background of LGBTQ Task Force	7
II. Professional Issues: Overview of Survey Results	8
III. Taskforce Findings	13
1. <i>AHA</i>	
• <i>Policies and Practices</i>	
• <i>Annual Meeting</i>	
2. <i>Publishing</i>	
3. <i>Research</i>	
4. <i>Teaching, Curriculum, and the Classroom</i>	
5. <i>Employment and Workplace</i>	
6. <i>AHA LGBTQ Standing Committee</i>	
IV. Appendices	26
1. <i>Appendix 1: Research on Other Professional Associations</i>	
2. <i>Appendix 2: Selective Bibliography</i>	

0. Recommendations:

In this report, the LGBTQ Task Force recommends that the AHA take the following actions:

1. AHA Policies, Practices, and Annual Meeting

A. *Policies and Practices*

- 1) Review AHA policy statements and best practices documents that address fair treatment and nondiscrimination and amend these statements to refer consistently and comprehensively to sex, gender, gender expression, gender identity, sexual orientation, and marital status. Among the policy statements that should be revised are the Professional Division Mission Statement; Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct; Statement on Diversity in AHA Nominations and Appointments; Criteria for Affiliation; Policy on Exhibits, Advertisement, Mailing List Rentals, and Sales; Guidelines for the Hiring Process; Annual Meeting Location Policy; and Annual Meeting Site Selection Procedures.
- 2) Review AHA field descriptions and revise these descriptions to include, each as distinct categories, gender, sexuality, and LGBTQ.
- 3) Review the Criteria for Affiliation and require all AHA affiliates to affirm on a regular basis (at least once every three years) that they do not discriminate on the bases specified in the Criteria for Affiliation.
- 4) In consultation with the Committee on Minority Historians, the Committee on Women Historians, and the committee proposed in Recommendation 6 below, the AHA should review the antidiscrimination language used in various AHA policies and practices to minimize conflicts with desirable affirmative action and employment equity goals.
- 5) Review the “Policy on Exhibits, Advertisements, Mailing List Rentals, and Sales” and amend as follows: (a) Section A should be revised to recognize that it is untrue that “job discrimination is illegal”; instead the policy should make clear that the AHA disapproves of employment discrimination on the specified bases; (b) Section A should be reviewed in the context of Recommendation 1A4 above to make clear that the AHA’s nondiscrimination policies do not conflict with federal, state, local, and private affirmative action policies within the United States and affirmative action policies in other countries; (c) Section B should be reviewed in the context of Recommendation 1A4 to clarify the prohibition on job listings that “directly or indirectly link” various personal characteristics to “specific job offer[s]”; (d) Section D should be reviewed in the context of Recommendation 1A4 to determine whether the exceptions to the rule against accepting discriminatory advertisements (for minority vita banks, religious institutions, and fellowship advertisements) are appropriate or desirable; (e) The policy should be revised to require exhibitors, advertisers, and mailing list renters to affirm, on an annual basis, that they do not discriminate on the bases specified by the AHA; (f) The policy should be revised to specify a mechanism that would allow AHA members to challenge the nondiscrimination claims of exhibitors, advertisers, and mailing list renters.

- 6) Review the AHA Statement on Peer Review and amend it to condemn bias, prejudice, and discrimination based on sex, gender, gender expression, gender identity, race, sexual orientation, marital status, and other relevant categories in the peer review process for research and publication. The Professional Division should report to the AHA Council at least once every three years on credible allegations of bias in the peer review process for research and publication by historians (with special attention to publicly-funded agencies such as the National Endowment for the Humanities).

B. AHA Annual Meeting

- 1) Instruct the AHA Program Committee to (a) consult on an annual basis with the chairs of the Committee on Minority Historians, the Committee on Women Historians, the proposed new committee (See Recommendation 6 below), and other relevant diversity-oriented committees to discuss concerns about inclusion and representation on the AHA annual meeting program, (b) Encourage the AHA Annual Meeting staff to develop an improved system of alerting the Committee on LGBT History and other relevant affiliated societies about panels that might be appropriate for affiliate co-sponsorship, (c) Encourage the AHA Program Committee, whenever possible, to avoid scheduling unnecessarily large numbers of sessions cosponsored by specific affiliated societies in the same time slots; (d) the AHA Program Committee and AHA President should encourage and promote the inclusion of LGBTQ history and LGBTQ historians on relevant panels that do not focus exclusively on LGBTQ history.
- 2) Direct the AHA Program Committee to continue working with the Committee on LGBT History to look for possibilities of creating multi-session workshops or thematic strands out of independently proposed panels on lgbtq history when appropriate.
- 3) Review and clarify AHA Annual Meeting policies to make clear that the Program Committee does not automatically reject all-male and all-female panels but instead encourages “representation of the full diversity” of the AHA membership on the Annual Meeting program as a whole, with sex, gender, gender expression, gender identity, and sexual orientation listed among the relevant diversity considerations.
- 4) Review the “Annual Meeting Location Policy” and amend it to declare that (a) the AHA will avoid meeting in cities, counties, and states that have not adopted policies that restrict discrimination based on sex, gender, gender expression, gender identity, sexual orientation, marital status, and other appropriate bases in employment, housing, and public accommodations; (b) the AHA will avoid meeting in hotels and conference centers that practice anti-LGBTQ discrimination in their treatment of employees, their customer relations practices, or their business practices.
- 5) Provide information about local LGBTQ history in materials that orient members to the history of the Annual Meeting site.
- 6) In negotiating its contracts with hotels and conference centers, the AHA should ensure that all members have appropriate bathroom facilities in annual meeting locations.

2. Publishing

- a. Encourage scholarly publishers of books and journals to refrain from practicing sexual censorship or anti-LGBTQ censorship when reviewing, accepting, editing, and publishing LGBTQ history.
- b. If credible evidence of sexual censorship or anti-LGBTQ censorship by scholarly publishers is brought to the attention of the AHA, the AHA should determine whether those publishers are non-compliant with the AHA's nondiscrimination policies.
- c. In consultation with the Committee on LGBT History, *Perspectives* should commission and publish an article on sexual censorship and anti-LGBTQ censorship in historical publishing.
- d. In the next several years, the AHA Annual Meeting Program Committee, in consultation with the Committee on LGBT History, should organize a session on sexual censorship and anti-LGBTQ censorship in the discipline of history.
- e. Authors, editors, and publishers of college- and university-level historical survey textbooks, primary source collections, and classroom-oriented book series should review their publications to determine whether they provide adequate and appropriate attention to LGBTQ history. If they do not, the works should be revised or new works should be commissioned.
- f. In consultation with the Committee on LGBT History, *Perspectives* should publish, on an occasional basis, reports on the treatment of LGBTQ history in college- and university-level historical survey textbooks, primary source collections, and classroom-oriented book series.
- g. In the next several years, the AHA Annual Meeting Program Committee, in consultation with the Committee on LGBT History, should organize a session featuring the authors and editors of popular historical survey textbooks, primary source collections, and classroom-oriented book series to discuss the steps they are taking to provide adequate and appropriate attention to LGBTQ history.
- h. The editors, editorial boards, and publishers of historical journals should review their publications, including scholarly articles and book reviews, to determine whether they provide adequate and appropriate attention to LGBTQ topics. This includes articles, reviews, and special issues that focus on LGBTQ history, in addition to references to LGBTQ history in articles and reviews that focus on other themes.
- i. In consultation with the Committee on LGBT History, *Perspectives* should publish, on an occasional basis, reports on the treatment of LGBTQ topics in historical journals.
- j. In the next several years, the AHA Annual Meeting Program Committee, in consultation with the Committee on LGBT History, should organize a session featuring the editors of historical journals to discuss the steps they are taking to provide adequate and appropriate attention to LGBTQ topics.
- k. The AHA should develop a strong policy statement that criticizes any and all efforts to ban or restrict the inclusion of LGBTQ history in primary and secondary history textbooks.

1. The AHA should distribute the Task Force report to all affiliated publishers of books and journals (including those that advertise in *Perspectives* and the *AHR*, along with those that sell their materials at the Annual Meeting).

3. **Research**
 - a. Request that the *Professional Division* report to the AHA Council at least once every three years on credible allegations of bias in the peer review process for research and publication by historians (with special attention to publicly-funded agencies such as the National Endowment for the Humanities).
 - b. Request that the *Research Division* advertise research fellowships in lgbtq history, the history of gender and sexuality, or related areas and facilitate the compliance of research archives and libraries across the United States with federal and state anti-discrimination provisions through a set of guidelines or best practices.
 - c. Request that the *Research Division* conduct a survey of major institutions that support historical research to determine whether they are funding lgbtq projects—including but not limited to the American Council of Learned Societies, Guggenheim Foundation, Mellon Foundation, NEH, and National Humanities Center.
 - d. Request that the *Research Division* work with the American Library Association to conduct a survey of library fellowships to determine whether they are funding LGBTQ projects.

4. **Teaching, Curriculum, and the Classroom**
 - a. Request that the Teaching Division work with the Committee on LGBT History and/or the new LGBTQ standing committee we recommend (see 6. below) to create a LGBTQ history teaching guide (along the lines of the AHA's other teaching guides).
 - b. On a semi-regular basis offer AHA sessions on teaching LGBTQ history in survey courses, working with the Committee on LGBT History to create these sessions.
 - c. Encourage departmental discussions about LGBTQ curricular matters, including LGBTQ-themed courses and inclusion of LGBTQ content in gender/sexuality themed courses, other chronological/thematic courses, and survey courses.
 - d. Encourage further research on bias and discrimination in teaching evaluations and support the development of an AHA website bibliography of scholarly research on teaching evaluations and equity issues.
 - e. Instruct the *Teaching Division* to work with the Committee on LGBT History to request and compile syllabi on LGBTQ history in order to assess and disseminate the extent of the teaching of LGBTQ history in the academy.

5. **Employment and Workplace**
 - a. Request that the *Professional Division* create best practices documents as guidance for implementing LGBTQ-sensitive measures in hiring/search guidelines and promotion/tenure guidelines
 - b. Request that the *Professional Division* work with the Committee on LGBT History and the LGBTQ History standing committee we are recommending (see

6. below) to organize annual meeting sessions addressing the job market and employment experiences for LGBTQ historians.
- c. Request that the *Professional Division* collaborate with the Committee on LGBT History and the LGBTQ History standing committee we are recommending (see 6. below) to produce a series of *Perspectives* articles bringing attention to key issues for LGBTQ historians and those doing LGBTQ history in the profession, including but not limited to: 1) An article analyzing job ads over the last ten years to see when and whether sexuality/LGBTQ are mentioned in position descriptions/announcements. 2) An article that analyzes, state by state, the status of LGBTQ-inclusive partner benefits. 3) An article on LGBTQ-sensitive and – insensitive experiences on the job market. 4) An article following up on the Committee on Lesbian and Gay History report on LGBTQ history careers.¹
 - d. We request that the AHA Council and *Professional Division* consider requiring job postings to mention whether the college/university provides domestic partnership benefits to same-sex partners and/or whether the university includes sexual orientation and gender identity/expression in its non-discrimination policy. The American Anthropological Association has adopted this policy.
 - e. We request that when *Perspectives* publishes articles on the job market it make an effort to be LGBTQ inclusive.
 - f. We request that the AHA consider recommending that departments do self-assessments and if a department has at least 20 people and no one who teaches LGBTQ history that this be made a hiring priority. Or if a department has at least 20 people and no one who self-identifies as LGBTQ that this be taken seriously as a diversity consideration in hiring.

6. AHA LGBTQ Standing Committee

AHA should establish a permanent standing committee on LGBTQ history and historians. The committee's name should be added to appropriate AHA policy statements that refer to the Committee on Minority Historians and the Committee on Women Historians. The AHA should also convene an ad hoc committee made up of the chairs of the Committee on Minority Historians, the Committee on Women Historians, the proposed new committee, and other relevant diversity-oriented committees, along with the AHA President and the AHA Executive Director, to discuss how to improve consultation, coordination, and action to address diversity and equity in the profession.

¹ "Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Survey on LGBTQ History Careers," *Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (May 2001): 29-31.
<http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2001/0105/0105aff1.cfm>;
Marc Stein, "Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Survey on LGBTQ History Careers," June 2001. <http://clgbthistory.org/resources/reports/lgbtq-history-careers>

I: Brief background on the formation and activities of the task force

In 2008, the Committee on Lesbian and Gay History (now the Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History – CLGBTH) contacted the AHA Professional Division (PD) about conducting “further research and analysis of the climate facing lgbtq historians and lgbtq history” within the AHA and the profession as a means to more fully integrate lgbtq history and historians into the intellectual and functional life of the AHA and the discipline. The Professional Division recommended creating a task force on lgbtq historians to be co-chaired by the Vice-President of the Professional Division and one other PD member and whose membership would include at least two individuals selected by the Committee on LGBT History (AHA affiliate) and one additional member selected by the PD. This PD recommendation was approved at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association. The task force (LGBTQH TF) formally began its work in June 2009. The LGBTQH Task Force includes five members, with the PD vice president (David Weber through October 2010, Trudy Huskamp Peterson through January 2011, Jacqueline Jones through January 2014, and currently Philippa Levine) and Leisa Meyer of the PD and AHA serving as co-chairs, one additional AHA member appointed by the PD (Marc Stein, Jamie and Phyllis Pasker Professor of History, San Francisco State University), and two members appointed by the Committee on LGBT History: Jennifer Brier, Associate Professor of History, University of Illinois, Chicago; Susan Stryker, Associate Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies and Director of the Institute for LGBT Studies at the University of Arizona, Tucson. The LGBTQH TF was provided support by the staff of the Professional Division, most notably Debbie Doyle, Coordinator, Committees and Meetings, American Historical Association.

The charge of the task force was to gather information about the concerns of LGBTQ historians and propose concrete, practical solutions for as many of them as possible. One focus of attention was to the practices and policies of other professional organizations. The task force was also asked to address issues for LGBTQ historians at the annual meeting and the problems facing LGBTQ historians on the job market and at all stages of their careers. Lastly, the task force was charged with producing a “special publication of interest to teachers” and/or a “publication on teaching concerns” that addresses LGBTQ history. In addition to organizing three open forum sessions (2010, 2011, and 2012) at the annual meeting, the task force held two-three conference calls each year to discuss its work and set forth subsequent plans. In 2011 the task force carried out a survey of AHA members addressing LGBTQ history and historians. .

In each section of the report that follows, the LGBTQH TF presents an overview of its work and suggests concrete and practical solutions to the Professional Division for approval and implementation by the AHA and its members. Our goals are to make the profession more accessible and amenable to LGBTQ people, make the field of LGBTQ history more integral to historical scholarship and teaching, and promote the field of LGBTQ history as a rich, rigorous, and exciting sub-field of history.

II: Professional Issues: Overview of Survey Results

Link to Survey:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=vXCkClOHIPYMbmWa41AZ0KlupgYWo3GHsKzgXf_2fncAU_3d

Password: "LGBTQTF"

The LGBTQH TF created and disseminated a survey for AHA members to answer about LGBTQ-related concerns in the profession. In drafting the survey the task force tried to capture both the challenges faced by LGBTQ scholars and their coping strategies and support systems; the goal was to get a sense of both agency and oppression. The analysis below (and throughout this report in relevant sections) tries to capture both of these dimensions of LGBTQ experience and also give us a sense of how gender and sexual identity are mutually constitutive with race, class, disability, etc. This survey was conducted during Fall 2011 with a final deadline of 15 December 2011 for responses. Since that time a number of legal reforms in relation to LGBT people have occurred and some of these reforms, most notably the U.S. Supreme Court's *Windsor* decision on same-sex marriage (2013), have implications for some of the issues raised by survey respondents.

The following discussion covers some of the main themes and results of our survey.

1. Brief Overview

391 respondents began the survey; 255 completed or nearly completed the survey, bringing the completion rate to approximately 65%.

Those who completed or nearly *completed* the survey self-identified as follows

a. Self-Identification

Bisexual: 15.4%

Female: 42.1%

Female-to-Male: 2.4%

Gay: 51.4%

Genderqueer: 4.9%

Heterosexual: 7.3%

Homosexual: 29.1%

Intersex: .4%

Lesbian: 31.2%

Male: 37.2%

Male-to-Female: .4%

Man: 32.8%

Queer: 45.7%

Straight: 4.9%

Trans: 4%
Transgender: 4.5%
Transsexual: 2.4%
Two-Spirit: 1.6%
Woman: 30%
Other: 4.5%

b. Select Responses

- i. *LGBTQ history as a research and teaching field:* The majority of respondents listed LGBTQ history as either a research (63%) or teaching field (45%); 9% of respondents who cited LGBTQ history as a teaching specialty *did not* specify it as a research field and 41% of respondents who listed LGBTQ history as a research field *did not* list it as a teaching specialty.
 - 160 (63%) of respondents answered that LGBTQ history was one of their fields of research; 80 (32%) answered no and 2 did not answer.
 - 115 (45%) answered that LGBTQ history was a teaching specialty; 129 (50%) answered no to this and 3 did not answer.
 - 11 (9%) of the people who cited LGBTQ history as a teaching specialty *did not* specify it as a research area.
 - 53 (41%) of the people who cited LGBTQ history as a research area *did not* cite LGBTQ history as a teaching specialty.

- ii. From the responses in this survey it appears that identifying one's sexual orientation and/or gender identity/expression in the workplace is increasingly typical (84% of respondents indicated they have done so), although some of those who made such identification also reported discrimination and/or hostile climate experiences as a result, either in the classroom or among their colleagues (22%). Of the 12% that did not so identify themselves in their workplace, several noted concerns with hostile climate and/or discrimination as reasons for not doing so.
 - 215 (84%) respondents have identified their sexual orientation and/or gender identity/expression in the workplace of their current institution; 31 (12%) have not and 1 person did not respond.
 - 126 (49%) reported moments where they have chosen not to identify their sexual orientation and/or gender identity/expression; 116 (45%) answered no to this question and 5 did not answer.

- iii. Educational, Employment, and Workplace Experiences: From the quantitative and qualitative responses it is clear that while overall climate and discrimination issues seem to be getting better (many comments highlight how different things are "today" versus 10-30 years ago), both remain a problem for a significant number of LGBTQ professionals. In relation to the academic job market, almost 25% of respondents indicated that they had a strongly or somewhat negative experience on the job market because of reactions to their sexual orientation and/or gender identity/expression, with another 21% indicating that their experiences were equally positive and negative.

c. Select Comments

i. Job Market Discrimination

- “My article on LGBT hist tends to come up in interviews -- it's the first thing that appears when you google my name -- and can be polarizing, either positive or negative.”
- “It is significantly harder for persons who do glbt research to get tenure-track history jobs. Many "old guard" departments see this research as worthless and have negative stereotypes about gay people.”
- ”My gender expression more than my orientation has probably had a negative effect on my prospects - I am genderqueer and this is not a good fit in conservative departments. They don't know what I look like when they invite me to interview but they go cold as soon as I walk into the room. After 8-9 interviews this year, could only get hired as an adjunct by somewhere that already knew me as a student.”
- “When I was on the job market, I felt as if I had to hide my sexual orientation and my interest in LGBTQ topics. I was on the job market for five years; it was very stressful for me to be very cautious not to reveal anything personal about myself in interviews.”

ii. Domestic Partner Benefits: Almost 30% of respondents indicated that “benefits” were the main reason for their selection of “strongly negative” or “somewhat negative” in response to the survey question on “employment experiences”:

- ”My current and past employers have provided health care for my partner, which was a significantly positive experience and helped me decide to work for them as opposed to other institutions that did not offer those benefits.”
- “I moved from one university to another because of domestic partner benefits--not just the benefits themselves, but what it said about the university's commitment to anti-discrimination. Those benefits are now being challenged by our state legislature.”
- “When I was in graduate school, I was advised by other graduate students not to pursue a research topic in LGBTQ history... Although I was tenured and promoted, I cannot help but think that some of the less positive comments from some of my colleagues reflected their discomfort with my sexual orientation. For a few years my partner was covered on my health insurance. Unlike heterosexual married couples, we faced discrimination in the provision of benefits. The amount that my employer paid for my partner's insurance was treated as income paid to me, and I was liable for taxes on that additional income.”
- “I live and work in Connecticut where access to health care, etc. for gbltq people is better, but with "marriage equality" has come a reduction in access to benefits for gbltq partners who do not want to marry.”
- “We don't have meaningful partner benefits (so we can buy in at 450 or so a month, while married faculty can just add their spouse and it costs about 20

dollars). We also had a run in with Benefits when we switched my daughter to my partner's insurance (we're both employed at the U). The employee from benefits said that my partner couldn't cover Rosalie because Rosalie wasn't "her child." When we asked what documentation they wanted, they seemed confused. My partner had adopted Rosalie in CA, so we offered to bring in either the new birth certificate, or the adoption order. We called the VP for academic affairs and everyone was very apologetic."

- "Even though I work in at a state institution in a state that recognizes extensive benefits for domestic partners, and now same-sex married couples, I had to educate the benefits office repeatedly at to my status and the benefits that I and my spouse were due. On the positive side, I think that my graduate advisors took special care to protect me during my graduate education as well as warn me of the challenges I would face in the future."
- "Securing healthcare for my partner was (and is) a major burden. Now that we are legally married in the state we live in, it has become a little easier. But it is still a challenge. I will add that as a graduate student I had more than once negative experiences with faculty both in the seminar room and in offices due to really insensitive and offensive things they said about gay people and gay history. One wonders if they would feel free to make such disparaging remarks about other minorities, or to create an environment where straight students felt uncomfortable."

iii. Climate Issues and Overt Discrimination: Another 20% of respondents indicated that "workplace and climate" issues were critical to their selection of "strongly negative" or "somewhat negative" in their responses:

- "Victim of sexual harassment. Anti-gay slurs by asst. dean of Social Sciences."
- "On numerous occasions, I was "invited" to certain lectures on GLBTQ history, "because, well, you would be interested in that" even though I do not work on that history. Those moments were obvious failures on certain faculty members. Also, a highly misogynistic faculty member interacted with me in a very aggressive manner due to my perceived orientation."
- "To put it bluntly, although I received tenure and promotion to Associate Professor at my former institution, I know that my sexual orientation was an issue of contention with senior scholars. Furthermore, due to the campus climate and the anti-LGBT climate of the state in which my former institution is located, I decided to give up tenure and promotion and move to another university where LGBT issues are respected and tolerated. I'll have to go through the tenure process again, but it's a small price to pay to feel happy, safe, and valued."
- "Again, being in the closet protects me from discrimination."
- "I have served on a campus-wide LGBTQ concerns committee, and my interaction with other faculty and staff on that committee was generally positive. Our faculty union has generally been supportive of LGBTQ faculty; two gay people have served as officers of the union. However, most of the straight people on the campus, whether they are other faculty, staff, administrators, or students seem largely unaware of the experiences of LGBTQ people, and some

administrators, staff, faculty, and students are openly hostile toward LGBTQ people.”

- “When I began teaching the campus climates were positive, but still not completely comfortable. But by 2000, I felt extremely comfortable with all aspects of the environment where I work. In part this too has to do with the nature of a small campus where one knows most everyone, at least by sight, and there is a general willingness to be open to others. I have already mentioned the benefits issues, which are very important. Because LGBTQ people staff all areas of the College, it has helped me to get to know more people in more divisions and walks of life. Again, I have been fortunate to work at an institution that has made a priority of respect for LGBTQ people and issues.”
- “I honestly believe my department goes above and beyond to support gay and lesbian faculty. But their hands are tied somewhat by State and Federal Law.”
- “My department chair, who made the case for my tenure and promotion, announced that he, as a straight Christian man, could not read my work on Two Spirits history (published by a peer-reviewed University press), as he found it morally offensive. How he KNEW it was morally offensive without reading it, I do not know. Although he said this in front of colleagues, they refused to testify against him in a grievance. BTW, I got tenure and promotion; but he is still chair, and votes on the promotion and tenure of my LGBTQ colleagues across campus.”

iv. Trans issues in relation to workplace and campus climate: While the number of respondents who articulated concerns with transgender issues was relatively small, the lack of resolution for many of the issues raised by these respondents warrants representation of their voices, as the types of discrimination and harassment they encounter is quite distinct from those experienced by cisgender individuals, whether LGBTQ or not.

- “My non-conventional gender presentation is very rare on my campus and often remarked upon. That is exhausting, but bearable.”
- “I changed jobs when I transitioned and lost my health care coverage.”
- “While my university offers domestic partner benefits for SAME-SEX couples, HR refused to give healthcare coverage to my domestic partner because she is female and I am now legally male (I am FTM and have changed my legal gender from female to male), even though we are legally registered as domestic partners in our city of residence. As a result, my partner currently has no health insurance. Essentially, the university has a heteronormative track for male/female couples (get married, get insurance) and a homonormative track for same-sex couples (get domestic partnership, get insurance). Male/female couples who get a domestic partnership (my situation) or same-sex couples who get married will not get insurance.”
- “My university's grad student healthcare coverage didn't include coverage for my hormones during my first 2 years, & still doesn't cover them well; there's also a distinct lack of grad-student-specific mental health support on campus, especially for the intersection of GLBTQ life & early-career-scholar issues (navigating the job market, avoiding tokenization, etc).”

d. Institutional Resources/Support: In analyzing the data there appears to be a correlation between the availability of resources explicitly supporting lgbtq faculty and graduate students on campus and a more “welcoming” experience for lgbtq faculty and graduate students. Respondents reported that their institution had:

- LGBTQ Resource Center/Office: 134 (53%)
- LGBTQ Student Group: 206 (80%)
- LGBTQ Faculty/Staff Group: 96 (38%)
- LGBTQ Studies Program: 95 (19%)
- LGBTQ Union Caucus: 21 (8%)
- Gay Straight Alliance: 69 (27%)

III: TASKFORCE FINDINGS

1. AHA Policies, Practices, and Annual Meeting

A. Policies and Practices

In the AHA Task Force survey, when respondents were asked to identify the most important issues that the AHA Task Force should address to support the professional interests and concerns of LGBTQ historians, 24% selected “AHA policies and practices.” AHA policies and practices came up repeatedly at each annual open forum offered by the Task Force from 2010 to 2012. Based on these responses and its research, the Task Force has identified several general problems for LGBTQ historians that are related to AHA policies and practices. First, AHA policy statements use inconsistent language when referring to sex, gender, sexual orientation, and marital status, and some of the language used is unclear, outdated, and non-inclusive. Some relevant AHA policy statements (such as the Statement on Diversity in AHA Nominations and Appointments) do not reference LGBTQ issues at all. Second, AHA field descriptions, which include gender, gay/lesbian, and sexuality/gay/lesbian, are outdated and non-inclusive. Third, while the AHA has a standing Committee on Minority Historians (which historically has defined its mission in ways that emphasize racial/ethnic minorities) and a standing Committee on Women Historians, there is no comparable standing committee that exists to address the concerns of LGBTQ historians. Fourth, the AHA does not have a mechanism to ensure that all of its affiliates continue to meet the AHA’s revised criteria for affiliation, which means that some may exclude members based on LGBTQ-related factors. Fifth, some of the antidiscrimination language contained in AHA policies and practices may conflict with desirable affirmative action and employment equity goals, including those that emphasize the value of gender and sexual diversity in the workplace. Sixth, the AHA’s “Policy on Exhibits, Advertisements, Mailing List Rentals, and Sales” appears to permit certain types of public and private institutions that openly and explicitly discriminate against LGBTQ people to advertise in AHA publications or to misrepresent themselves as not discriminating on gender and sexual bases. They also ask non-U.S. advertisers to adhere to U.S. antidiscrimination laws, without appearing to address whether this is appropriate and without appearing to acknowledge that there are other countries with greater or lesser protections against anti-LGBTQ discrimination. Seventh, the AHA’s 2005 “Statement on

Peer Review” criticizes political interference with the peer review process for research and publication, but makes no reference to allegations of gender, sexual, and racial bias in the process used by the National Endowment for the Humanities in granting awards to historians. Nor has the AHA publicly reported on whether historians have reasons to remain concerned about these forms of bias in the peer review process.

B. Annual Meeting

The task force has identified several issues relevant to LGBTQ historians in relation to the AHA’s annual meeting.

First, there have been ongoing concerns about the inclusion, number, and scheduling of sessions and papers on LGBTQ history accepted by the program committees. These concerns relate not only to sessions that focus specifically on LGBTQ history but also to the inclusion of LGBTQ history and historians on other types of sessions. Second, AHA Annual Meeting policies have been interpreted to preclude all-male and all-female panels, which is not always the best way to ensure diversity in the program as a whole and which arguably is based on heterosexist assumptions. Third, the AHA “Annual Meeting Location Policy” is not clear and may not be realistic in declaring that the AHA will not hold its meetings “in locations where its members reasonably believe they would be subject to discrimination on the basis of gender...or sexual orientation under state or city laws.” Given the pervasive nature of anti-LGBTQ discrimination and the supremacy of anti-LGBTQ federal law in some arenas, this policy may preclude the AHA from holding its Annual Meeting anywhere in the United States. Nor does this policy appear to preclude holding the Annual Meeting at sites that practice anti-LGBTQ discrimination in their treatment of employees, their customer relations practices, or their business practices. Fourth, the AHA Annual Meeting supplement has not consistently provided adequate treatment of LGBTQ history in materials that orient members to the local history of the annual meeting site. Fifth, the AHA has not taken steps to ensure that all members have appropriate bathroom facilities in Annual Meeting locations.

The Task Force has reviewed matters related to the 2009 AHA Annual Meeting in San Diego, which was held in part at a hotel accused of anti-labor and anti-LGBTQ practices and which also, in response to these accusations, featured a mini-conference on the history of same-sex marriage. Some LGBTQ members of the AHA have indicated that they chose to not attend the Annual Meeting because of the hotel’s actions, the organized boycott of the hotel, and the AHA’s responses. Some attended the Annual Meeting, but did not attend sessions held at the hotel. Members have also expressed concern about whether the AHA made adequate efforts to inform members about alternative hotel accommodations and alternative meal options, the use of which could have reduced members’ contributions to hotel profits without cost to the AHA. Some members who participated in the miniconference have criticized communications and directives received from the AHA about how to handle potential disruptions and other matters related to the boycott campaign. There have been questions raised about whether the AHA has taken all necessary and reasonable steps to make it less likely that the types of problems experienced at the 2009 Annual Meeting will be repeated in the future.

Resources:

[“Council Reaffirms 1996 Meeting Site”](#) September 1994

[“AHA Will Not Meet in Cincinnati”](#) February 1994

APSA on New Orleans Site Decision:

<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/08/27/political-science-meeting-faces-boycott-over-gay-rights>

Annual Meeting Supplement

The first two annual meeting supplements, for the 2004 Washington, D.C., meeting and the 2005 Seattle meeting, included LGBTQ history in their overview of the meeting location. The supplement for the 2006 Philadelphia meeting neglected both LGBTQ history and women’s history, prompting a complaint from the Committee on LGBTH. Since then the AHA annual meeting organizers have reminded the Local Arrangements Committee that they “should be conscious to consider the full diversity of AHA membership in determining the scope of articles.” AHA annual program committees, working with Local Arrangements Committees, have published articles focusing on queer history in the meeting city for subsequent annual meetings (2007-2015).

Select Survey Comments on the AHA:

- “Beyond a non-discrimination policy, the AHA could more aggressively encourage departments, administrators/chairs, and faculty to give more consideration to sexual diversity in its recruitment of faculty and students--or to assess and discuss the (lack of) diversity that exists in their departments.”
- “Benefits are a major problem and the AHA can try to advocate for changes. Also, it's important that the AHA stand with professors who are discouraged from teaching LGBTQ topics, for instance, by having to post their syllabi for an unfriendly state legislature to peruse. Also, the AHA should make a stand against the use of Freedom of Information Act requests designed to intimidate faculty working on LGBTQ issues. For example, while working in Texas I received a FOI request to turn over all of my emails (using a state-university server) with keywords related to LGBTQ subjects.”
- “The AHA should not support or work with colleges or universities with discriminatory hiring policies. If someone wants to work at that type of institution, that is fine, but the AHA should not publish their jobs calls or allow for prizes to go to such faculty working at these schools. Until the AHA becomes an active organization, rather than a passive witness, things will not change. It is the professional organizations responsibility to fight racism, sexism, AND homophobia, not just let the latter occur with a blind eye.”
- “There needs to be a discussion surrounding tenure and promotion practices and expressed and implied homophobia add another layer of tension and stress to an already stressful practice.”

- “The AHA should develop means of encouraging department to hire in this area and of pushing history departments to take a stand in favor of LGBTQ-friendly campus employment policies – particularly inclusive non-discrimination policies and domestic partner benefits, which are currently under attack at many state universities.”
- “I think that that the AHA needs to take a firmer stand on distinguishing between institutions based on their non-discrimination policies. I would like to see AHA policies that inform those seeking jobs as well as faculty conducting the job searches (and hopefully the institutions) that discrimination based on sexual orientation us a labor issue, and therefore central to the profession, especially the organization that oversees the central mechanisms of job placement.”
- “Benefits are a major problem and the AHA can try to advocate for changes. Also, it’s important that the AHA stand with professors who are discouraged from teaching LGBTQ topics, for instance, by having to post their syllabi for an unfriendly state legislature to peruse. Also, the AHA should make a stand against the use of Freedom of Information Act requests designed to intimidate faculty working on LGBTQ issues. For example, while working in Texas I received a FOI request to turn over all of my emails (using a state-university server) with keywords related to LGBTQ subjects.”
- “Sessions on being gay on the job market and being gay in the classroom would be most helpful.”

2. Publishing

LGBTQ historians confront a set of distinct challenges when it comes to publishing their work. On the positive side, the Task Force does not believe that publishers of scholarly monographs have, on the whole, been reluctant to publish works on LGBTQ history. Some publishers have outstanding records in this area; others occasionally publish works on LGBTQ history. Those that have not published works on LGBTQ history include some that can point to legitimate explanations related to their areas of specialization and others that cannot. In the Task Force survey, when respondents were asked if, on balance, their sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, or specialization in LGBTQ history has influenced their experiences as historians, only 2% reported predominantly negative experiences with book publishers and editors, 3% with journal editors, and 2% with editorial boards. Many survey respondents reported that scholarly publishers have supported the publication of works on LGBTQ history.

On the negative side, there have been disturbing reports of anti-LGBTQ bias in the ways that some publishers and editors have handled the process of editing manuscripts and selecting visual images, especially when the materials are sexually explicit or address controversial aspects of the LGBTQ past. There are also ongoing concerns about the inclusion of LGBTQ materials in college- and university-level historical survey textbooks, primary source collections, and classroom-oriented book series. For many students, these texts are critically important resource for learning about the past, yet many provide no coverage, superficial coverage, or outdated coverage of LGBTQ issues. Another concern about publishing relates to scholarly journals. While several journals have longstanding commitments to publishing work on LGBTQ history,

some of the leading journals in the field do not, and some have been criticized for not publishing and not reviewing works on LGBTQ history. In the Task Force Survey, when respondents were asked about the most important issues that the AHA Task Force should address to support the professional interests and concerns of LGBTQ historians, 39% selected “research, publishing, and scholarship.”

Select Survey Comments about Publishing:

- “Discrimination is pervasive: on the academic job market, in research grant competitions, in classroom settings, in historical journals and textbooks, etc.”
- “Some journal editors are very encouraging about LGBTQ history; some refuse to publish work or review books in LGBTQ history.”
- “While work on sexuality in Antiquity is unwelcome on the job market, it is generally very welcome at publishing houses (though I have heard from my editors that they had to fight to get my projects approved.”
- My article on LGBT hist had *very* careful vetting from the journal, and the anon reviewers had very touchy, political reactions.”
- “I have faced rejection from one blind reviewer of a U.S. history journal calling my work in applying trans studies to U.S. history a “manifesto” rather than scholarship.”
- “I have had very positive experiences with book publishing and journal publishing as well, although I notice a difference between work in women’s history, which now doesn’t have to justify itself, and work in queer history which needs to connect to some larger issue.”
- “LGBTQ history is not widely accepted by academic journals.”
- “Boards and awarding groups in my field tend to be more conservative and given that I have not been hesitant to express my views in support of a more radical approach to such issues, my tenure on editorial boards especially has tended to be brief.”
- “Editors can be still overly concerned about any references to homosexuality or androgyny in works in which that is not the primary focus.”
- “My two greatest concerns are job market discrimination against LGBTQ history specialists and the failure to incorporate LGBTQ history into survey courses and survey textbooks.”

3. Research

In response to the survey question on “discriminatory practices” 53 of the 141 (37%) qualitative responses highlighted or included examples of discrimination they had faced in relation to their LGBTQ research topics or fields. On specific survey questions on research 23% of respondents offered ratings of strongly negative, negative, or both positive and negative on the subject of “access to external grants.” The qualitative comments included those from graduate students discouraged by advisors or graduate directors from pursuing LGBTQ topics, junior faculty whose research was trivialized or not taken seriously by colleagues and who were subsequently concerned about their tenure prospects, and tenured faculty who as members of grant/fellowship review boards

witnessed bias toward applications focused on LGBTQ topics. In general LGBTQ historians experience distinct difficulties in conducting historical research. As Antoinette Burton has pointed out in her studies of archives, the archive is a “contact zone” between persons and institutions where the full range of social attitudes and behaviors comes into play and informs the research process.² Researchers who identify themselves as, or are perceived by others to be, LGBQ or gender variant may face additional barriers to access to research materials due to ignorance or prejudice on the part of service providers. At the Huntington Library in San Marino, California, for example, the security guard who was the first point of contact between research patrons and the institution asked a researcher registering on the first day of a summer fellowship if she had ever been a researcher at the Huntington before, because the Library kept a database of previous users, and if she was already in the database she would not need to fill out the registration paperwork. The researcher, who had changed sex in the years since her last visit to the Huntington and did not wish to “out” herself verbally in a public space where other researchers were walking past to enter the archives, replied, “Yes, but it was a long time ago, and I had a different name. I’ll just fill out new paperwork.” The guard insisted on being told the old name, and when the researcher refused, she was taken to the head of patron services. The researcher had to come out as transsexual to library staff in order to receive access to the archive.

As this anecdote suggests, the additional difficulties LGBTQ historians may face in conducting research are not necessarily related to attitudes within the profession about research on LGBTQ topics, but to homophobia and heterosexism in society. A doctoral student in U.S. history who travelled to Abilene, Kansas, to use the Eisenhower Presidential Library learned, upon arrival, that the bed and breakfast recommended by the Eisenhower Foundation's Host Committee had a policy of turning away gay couples. Because Kansas does not prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation, this was a perfectly legal policy.

There are other difficulties for LGBTQ researchers that pertain directly to the content of their research. LGBTQ materials, and materials related to sexuality or diverse expressions of gender more generally may not be collected by libraries and archives in the first place. If they are, they may be segregated from the general collection (this is particularly true of public libraries) and may require special permission (including age restrictions) not required for other types of material. Such materials may not be adequately indexed or described. Library or archive staff may not be as helpful in providing reference and other patron services.

Select Survey Responses about Research:

- “I’ve found historians of LGBTQ life have to work extra hard to avoid the perception that their scholarship is “narrow.”
- “Told not to pursue history of AIDS because it is “too recent” and will not “get me tenure.”
- “One faculty member I know was denied a research grant by a state funding

² Antoinette Burton, *Dwelling in the Archive: Women Writing House, Home, and History in Late Colonial India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003). See also Antoinette Burton, *Archive Stories; Facts, Fictions and the Writing of History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).

- agency because his research dealt with LGBTQ history.”
- “I would only have said that I know second-hand that funding for sexuality research can be difficult to come by.”
 - “In my field (Classics) it is generally almost impossible for males working on queer issues to get tenure-track jobs. A few have, but in almost case, it has only happened after many years on the job market (and in several cases despite impressive scholarly and pedagogical records). I also know (informally) that after one department voted to hire me, the dean turned the hire down, saying that my work (on Greek pederasty) was "offensive."
 - “I think students are discouraged from pursuing overtly LGBTQ topics for research and teaching. They are urged to be more broad or mainstream.”
 - “In my profession/discipline as well as at my institution, LGBTQ work and identities are looked upon with suspicion.”
 - “Mostly of the indirect variety, e.g. discouragement or discomfort with certain research topics (LGBT history is not "real" history); marginalization in units where heterosexual marriage and families are the norm; suspicion that our research proposals and grant applications are not taken seriously”
 - “I have been discouraged by a faculty member at a previous institution from doing LGBTQ history. I was told it would not be a good career choice, as this type of history was a "fad" and that people would believe that I was gay, which could hurt my chances of being hired.”
 - “While on the NEH board it was common to see that gay/lesbian research topics, though highly ranked by peer panels, would mysteriously get taken off the discussion docket. What was that about? No insulting the Senate?”
 - “As a trans person with a passport that didn't reflect my gender ID/perceived gender, it was a nightmare trying to arrange a research trip (through an exchange program between my university and an overseas archive), particularly because I did not want to be outed as trans to my faculty mentor if at all possible. Ultimately, I chose to undergo an expensive and invasive surgery before I was financially and personally prepared to do so just in order to get appropriate paperwork in time for the trip.”

4. Teaching

LGBTQ historians and their allies report a range of experiences in the history classroom. Whether they identify LGBTQ history as a teaching specialty or not (in the case of the LGBTQ Task Force AHA survey, just over 44 percent of respondents, 129/250, reported *not* teaching LGBTQ history), respondents report a wide range of pedagogical experiences.

Over the last two decades, many colleges and universities have begun to regularly offer classes explicitly organized around LGBTQ themes. These curricular changes have largely come about because of actions undertaken by faculty, students and staff, ranging from protests to strategic intellectual bargaining. In many cases these courses have been offered because LGBTQ scholars used standard procedures for proposing new courses, though there were often challenges in doing so, in having these courses approved, in having them offered, and in having them staffed by tenure-track and tenured faculty.

LGBTQ historians have been at the forefront of these intellectual and political endeavors. Whether by sharing ideas for how to queer history as a practice or incorporating the experiences of LGBTQ people into historical narratives, LGBTQ historians have also lobbied various professional organizations, including the AHA, the OAH and the Berkshire Conference of Women Historians, to provide models for fellow historians who want to incorporate LGBTQ content and methods into their teaching. One straight woman explained, “It creates a transformative classroom space when we problematize such ‘essential’ categories as identity and identification -- I, a straight woman, am interested in understanding the historical experience of gay men? Unexpected!” In fact, it was in this arena, the ability to incorporate LGBTQ content into survey courses and decide what topics in general to teach, that we found the most significant positive responses. Over 60 percent of the total respondents reported a positive (strongly or somewhat) answer to questions about ability to teach LGBTQ content as they wanted in classes that were not necessarily named LGBT. We saw a slightly lower positive response rate for ability to offer LGBTQ history/studies courses named as such. Here just under 43 percent reported this decision making power. While the ability of many LGBTQ historians to teach this subject is a positive sign, there are ongoing concerns about the ability and willingness of non-LGBTQ history colleagues to address LGBTQ subjects in their classes.

Institutionally, the history classroom has been one of the places where LGBTQ work has found a home, although the home has not been universally welcoming. Often we found this linked to fear that gender and sexuality studies are not rigorous enough. One genderqueer woman responded, “My department doesn't take my gender studies courses as seriously as they take my other courses.” The argument about rigor was often twinned with responses that described a sense that LGBTQ history was one-dimensional and only required a gay instructor, not necessarily a person who researched LGBT history. A lesbian respondent wrote, “Assumption that dept. shouldn't hire someone specializing in gay history because I have taught LGBT history 2x in 20 years (and because having a lesbian was equated with having someone in the FIELD. Students appreciate having a gay professor, either as role model for LGBT students or 'enlightening' for straights; i've been discouraged from teaching anything focusing on sexuality at the grad level.”

Beyond the content of classes, LGBT historians expressed myriad experiences as instructors and advisors to undergraduates and graduate students. As is the case with many under-represented faculty members, LGBT historians often find themselves serving as one of the only sympathetic advisors to LGBTQ students, particularly at the undergraduate level. Just over 41 percent of respondents reported “strongly positive” or “somewhat positive” classroom interactions with undergraduates, while another 21 percent reported an “equally positive and negative effect,” and 22 percent reported “no significant influence.” While this kind of mentoring is clearly important to survey respondents--many reported that it was some of the most critical work they did—qualitative responses suggested that people struggle to maintain boundaries with students and often try to develop relationships with other relevant support staff on campus to help young students cope with and hopefully thrive with their discovery of sexual and gender difference. One queer lesbian wrote, “Being openly queer, it has been easier for me to relate to queer, trans, etc. students, and to teach 'queer' topics in class. At the same time, I

have felt uncomfortable when outing myself to students and colleagues, and I have felt that some of my students interpret all my teaching in relation to their knowledge about me as a lesbian (in a way they do not interpret my teaching in relation to me being a mother or being white)." A gay man described, "Being able to talk to a student wishing to write an LGBTQ topic for her term paper in front of other students at the end of class was an amazing experience. She was definitely nervous, and I think my matter of fact endorsement and support gave her quite a bit of confidence."

Respondents also expressed ambivalence when it came to being out to all students. A lesbian wrote, "I prefer not to come out to students, unless it's a one-on-one interaction in which it is relevant. In the classroom I try to appear as neutral and unidentifiable as possible. I think that sometimes in my effort to do that---to perhaps overcompensate for being gay---I actually pass myself off as straight. I don't mean to, but I see it happen sometimes. I think that's bad on many levels." A bisexual, queer woman provided a related yet distinct explanation that focused on how straight students respond to LGBTQ faculty. "I'm always worried about being out to my students: for every student who feels a sense of camaraderie or is happy that I'm out, I worry that others will feel alienated from me or think I'm biased against them because they are straight (this has occurred)."

Faculty also reported feeling as if they were the "only one" to whom students turned. A lesbian reported, "I am assigned and have difficulty handling the high number of LGBTQ undergraduates who come to me because I am one of the few young, out, and very queer faculty who also teaches queer studies." This sentiment was echoed by a gay man who explained, "I am expected to singlehandedly take responsibility for all students interested in these subjects, which can be burdensome given the substantial level of student interest. Job applicants who specialize in LGBTQ history tend to be ruled out because the assumption is that I can cover the entire field myself. In addition, in many departmental contexts I am seen as just a specialist in LGBTQ history, not in all of the other subjects that I cover."

Respondents also reported having to provide a shield to students dealing with homophobic or transphobic colleagues. One lesbian wrote, "There is one faculty member, particular, whom all queer students have had problems with. He hasn't said anything discriminatory, but every queer grad who interacts with him has faced open hostility and disrespect." Respondents were evenly split across the sample in terms of teaching related experiences with colleagues: 35 percent reported positive interactions; 25 percent reported negative or equally positive and negative; and 33 percent reported no influence. Gender expression also appeared in the qualitative responses to the survey. While trans* identified respondents made up between 4 and 6 percent of respondents, the experience of trans* historians crystallized how and why gender matters in classroom interactions. For example, a person identified as genderqueer, lesbian, and trans wrote, "My gender presentation and outness have helped me be a visible resource for LGBTQ students on campus. Sometimes people, usually outside of the classroom, react negatively to me on the basis of my LGBTQ status, usually in the form of avoidance or public staring, but this is not worse on campus than in general life." A bisexual, female-to-male, genderqueer talked about outness: "As a trans person, it's never clear whether I should be out to students unless I want them to see me as "the trans professor", and there's a substantial lack of experienced, available mentors on such topics."

Some of the most stinging trans* critiques were for cisgender LGB historians: “But the bigger issue is that people tend to connect with one another through gender--gay men often feel a connection with one another that they don't with lesbians, and the same with lesbians re: gay men. I sense that cisgender faculty members, both gay and straight, aren't always sure how to interact with trans students. I've also found that straight people tend to be more humble and work harder to include trans people, while cisgender LGBQ are more likely to make off-color jokes or to assume they know how to include trans people when they really don't.”

The final area of significant qualitative reporting was in the area of student evaluations. As was the case in the rest of the survey, answers here suggested that student evaluations can be a double-edged sword, with very mixed consequences for LGBTQ faculty. A genderqueer female reported, “I get negative teaching evaluations in which students explicitly critique my introduction of issues related to sexuality and this impacts my course evaluations. I am given opportunities to explain this in my tenure and promotion file, and I feel that my department accepts my explanation. While I know discrimination exists it is not always overt and so hard to identify.” A gay man reported more negative responses: “Being ‘out’ and focusing on LGBTQ topics has been the most difficult in undergraduate surveys. Many student evaluations have been highly negative about a focus on sexuality in a U.S. history survey and a significant number of evaluations include blatant and/or coded homophobic expressions.”

Resources

1) Textbooks

- Vicki L. Eaklor, “Of Politics and History: Gay Americans In and Out of Textbooks,” *Perspectives*, Oct. 1991, <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/1991/9110/9110VIE.cfm>
- Vicki L. Eaklor, “How Queer-Friendly Are U.S. History Textbooks?” History News Network, <http://historynewsnetwork.org/articles/3200.html>.
- Lewis Gannett, “Representations of Homosexuality in College-Level American History Textbooks: A Survey and Critique,” M.A. Thesis, History, University of Massachusetts-Boston, June 2007.

2) Teaching

- Michael S. Sherry, “Teaching Lesbian and Gay History,” *Perspectives*, November 1993, <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/1993/9311/9311TEC.cfm>
- Henry Abelove, “The Queering of Lesbian/Gay History,” *Radical History Review* 62 (Spring 1995): 45-57.
- Nancy Unger, “Teaching ‘Straight’ Gay and Lesbian History,” *Journal of American History* 93 (March 2007): 1192-99.
- Vicki L. Eaklor, “Teaching LGBTQ History: Two Situations,” *Perspectives*, May 2010, <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2010/1005/1005for5.cfm>
- Rachel Mattson, “Anti-Homophobia Education: Predicaments and Possibilities,” *Perspectives*, May 2010, <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2010/1005/1005for6.cfm>
- Eds. Leila J. Rupp and Susan K. Freeman, *Understanding and Teaching U.S.*

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History (The Harvey Goldberg Series),
(Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2014).

5. Employment and Workplace

The LGBTQH TF AHA survey asked a series of questions on employment, professional life, and respondents' experiences on the job market and in their workplaces. 42% of respondents reported experiencing discrimination, 30% did not, and 28% were not sure. Qualitative responses suggest that the key issues for those reporting discrimination include a lack of policies and infrastructure for preventing, reporting, and addressing discrimination. Faculty reported lack of access to domestic partner benefits. Many institutional antidiscrimination policies do not contain language about gender identity and expression or sexual expression. Graduate students reported problems with a lack of sensitivity in student housing and health insurance. Some graduate students are still advised that researching LGBTQ history could hurt their employment chances. Administrators often fail to recognize that scholars of all sorts do extra mentoring and uncompensated work. The most commonly reported negative experiences in relation to workplace and the professional environment included discrimination on the job market, lack of access to benefits, negative teaching experiences, and a negative campus climate. Some respondents reported fearing for their personal comfort and safety. In the Task Force Survey, when respondents were asked about the most important issues that the AHA Task Force should address to support the professional interests and concerns of LGBTQ historians, 71% indicated that employment issues were the most important.

Discrimination

The most frequent topics of open responses on the question of discrimination included the lack of policies and practices preventing discrimination against LGB, transgender and transsexual people, especially having “sex,” “sexual orientation,” “gender identity,” and “gender expression” in non-discrimination policies at institutions; the lack of domestic partner benefits; the lack of services at health centers for transgender and transsexual people; and the continuing experience of discrimination on the job market. As one respondent noted, “Discrimination is pervasive: on the academic job market, in research grant competitions, in classroom settings, in historical journals and textbooks, etc.” Another quotation captures more specific sentiments: “Student health insurance is part of my grad student benefit package. Not only does this insurance explicitly exclude trans-related medical procedures, but it also obliges me to use the student health center where providers, although well-meaning, are completely ignorant of trans-health issues (hormone management, reproductive health, etc.). Thus, trans students take on a significant burden of additional effort and costs to receive basic medical care. There are similar exclusionary policies and difficulties in student housing, gym access, etc. that were not directly related to scholarship, but do reduce access to the support systems that are supposed to make grad school more bearable.” A number of respondents also highlighted explicit harassment and discrimination as key problems in their employment and educational experiences, from “outright harassment” through being discouraged from studying lgbtq history to difficulties with colleagues and students once

hired. One response by a gay man that captures very well what a number of respondents offered: “There are certainly the obvious examples of students and colleagues who demonstrate various forms of discomfort about ‘having’ to work with or be taught by a ‘known homosexual,’; but these forms of discriminatory practice are often subtle and sometimes even unconscious rather than overt. The far more pernicious form of discrimination I have to face is actually a refusal of my institution to recognize that minority scholars of all sorts end up doing ten times as much service work and uncompensated emotional labor as anybody else because we are absolutely besieged by students who regard us--appropriately, but exhaustingly--as singularly qualified mentors and advocates. Indeed, my university like many actively encourages this in many ways, usually under the sign of well-intentioned though super badly thought out commitment to diversity. Unfortunately, it has yet to come up with a mechanism for recognizing this additional work, or compensating minority faculty for it.” Several respondents also commented on difficulties for themselves and their students at “religious” schools, as one lesbian offered: “Because I work on religion and place many students in religious institutions, discrimination is a constant threat--and a frequent reality.”

Other responses to this question challenged what respondents saw as the presumptions of the survey’s questions - that LGBTQ might be the only categories through which discrimination or harassment occurred - and highlighted gender, disability, class, race, and trans status as equally if not more significant. As one queer woman related, “I believe that the negative experiences I have often are as much related to my gender (as a woman) than to my sexuality (as a lesbian); my queerness seems to make the limitations as a woman stronger. At the same time, i am sure that being white and middleclass make many things easier for me (also in being queer and openly queer/lesbian at work).”

In general the open questions generated many responses that suggested that we think about intersections between and the mutual constitutiveness of identity categories as well as the multiple vectors of stratification and hierarchy that frame our lives and in doing so think about how we might work toward creating solutions that engage multiple issues of discrimination. One open comment from a queer woman that captures this suggestion explicitly stated, “I think people tend to treat lgbtq issues in isolation. What happens when you are poor, female, diabetic lgbtq? Lgbtq immigrant and person of color? Sometimes it's hard to know exactly what aspect of yourself is holding you back or being targeted for discrimination. It's important to try to uplift all of us and join in partnership with other groups.”

Resources:

Link to Research on LGBTQ Employment Opportunities:



LGBT Employment.mht

“[Exchange on Anti-Gay Discrimination in Colorado](#)” September 1993.

Lisa Duggan, “The Discipline Problem: Queer Theory Meets Lesbian and Gay History,” *GLQ* 2, no. 3 (1995): 179-191.

Marc Stein, “[Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Survey on LGBTQ History Careers](#)” May 2001.

Marc Stein, "Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Survey on LGBTQ History Careers," *Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (May 2001): 29-31.

<http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2001/0105/0105aff1.cfm>

Marc Stein, "Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Survey on LGBTQ History Careers," June 2001. <http://clgbthistory.org/resources/reports/lgbtq-history-careers>

Linda Kerber, “[The Equitable Workplace: Not For Women Only](#),” February 2006.

6. AHA LGBTQ Standing Committee

This report and the recommendations it contains sets out an ambitious and critical agenda for the AHA over the coming years for revising AHA policies and practices and improving the experiences of LGBTQ historians and those doing LGBTQ history in the realms of publishing, research, teaching, and employment. To accomplish this agenda the AHA requires a standing committee dedicated to LGBTQ history and historians.

While there are currently permanent standing minority and women’s history committees, the LGBTQ History Task Force is ad hoc and temporary and the Committee on LGBT History is an independent membership organization; it’s an AHA affiliate, but is not an AHA committee. A permanent standing committee is necessary given the amount of work left to be done, including following up on the implementation of our recommendations.

4. Appendices

Appendix 1: Research on Other Professional Associations

Below is a description of the actions of scholarly associations in regards to LGBTQ issues, including statements, policies, guidelines, and committees.

1. American Anthropological Association - Association of Queer Anthropology (AQA)

Website: <http://queeranthro.org/>

About: AQA is a section of the [American Anthropological Association](#) and was founded in 1988.

Mission: AQA promotes communication, encourages research, develops teaching materials, and serves the interests of gay and lesbian anthropologists within the association.” *Activities:* AQA also gives out two main prizes: the Ruth Benedict Prize for outstanding scholarship on a LGBT topic and the Kenneth Payne Student Prize for students of LGBT issues in anthropology.

2. American Bar Association – Commission on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Website: <http://new.abanet.org/sogi/>

About: “The Commission is responsible for undertaking programs and activities that promote full and equal participation by persons of differing sexual orientation and gender identity in the ABA, the legal profession, and the justice system.”

Mission: “The mission of the ABA Commission on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity is to secure for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons full and equal access to and participation in the ABA, the legal profession and the justice system. Through education efforts, policy development, building relationships with leaders in the profession, and other activities, the Commission seeks to secure equal treatment in the ABA, the legal profession and the justice system without regard to sexual orientation or gender identity, remove barriers to professional advancement, and promote diversity.”

Activities: Prior to the 2007 creation of SOGI and the 2009 SOGI report, the ABA had initiated a number of policies and statements, which include: broadening the meaning of diversity to include sexual orientation and gender identity, a prohibition of bias against lawyers based on sexual orientation, opposition to the constitutional amendment banning gay marriage, and so forth. For a complete list of LGBT policies, ABA amicus briefs, and other information, see the website: <http://new.abanet.org/sogi/Pages/default.aspx>

3. American Educational Research Association

Website: <http://aeraqueerstudiessig.wetpaint.com/>

About: AERA hosts a special interest group “To foster empirical, interpretive, and critical educational research relating to lesbian and gay issues, and to network individuals and organizations conducting or supporting such research.”

4. American Political Science Association

a. Committee on the Status of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transgendered in the Profession

Website: http://www.apsanet.org/content_3689.cfm

Mission: “The Committee on the Status of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transgendered (LGBT) in the Profession assesses the status of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered scholars in the profession; advances the research on LGBT issues; develops curriculum materials; and works to ensure tolerance toward LGBT political scientists.” The APSA has passed a law that it will not hold annual meetings in states that have enacted anti-same-sex marriage legislation.

APSA on New Orleans Site Decision:

<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/08/27/political-science-meeting-faces-boycott-over-gay-rights>

Activities: Work that the committee does includes: 1) a web-published bibliography of recent works on LGBT Politics; 2) publishing an article on the integration of LGBT issues in introductory textbooks in *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 2007; and 3) it has begun to collect and review available online syllabi for classes in gender, sexuality, and American politics. The collection can be accessed here:

http://www.apsanet.org/content_3807.cfm

b. APSA – LGBT Political Science Caucus

About: The APSA also has a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Political Caucus.

Mission: “Founded in 1987, the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Political Science Caucus (LGBT Caucus) is the principal association of lesbians and gay men within the American Political Science Association and an important arena for the presentation of research on the interaction of sexual identity, theory and political behavior. There are currently over 200 members of the caucus from the United States and Canada, as well as Australia and several nations of the European Union. All academically affiliated social scientists, practitioner political scientists, and graduate students interested in the goals of the caucus are welcome to join.”

**5. American Psychological Association
Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender
Issues (SPSLGBTI)**

Website: <http://www.apadivision44.org/>

About: The organization was founded in 1985, and it currently has approximately 1,500 members across the country. It also has an archive at Cornell Library.

The organization offers a webpage with a description of relevant policies that the APA has implemented. These policies include: guidelines for working with parents, marriage, youth and parents, military service, and appropriate therapeutic responses to sexual orientation. For more information about implemented policies, see:

http://www.apadivision44.org/resources/apa_guidelines.php.

The organization's bylaws and policies can be accessed respectively here:

<http://www.apadivision44.org/about/Division44Bylaws.pdf>

<http://www.apadivision44.org/about/Division44PolicyManual.pdf>

Mission: "The Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Issues (SPSLGBTI) welcomes all those interested in psychological research, education and training, practice, and advocacy on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered issues and all lesbian women, gay men, bisexual women, bisexual men, transgendered people, and their allies."

SPSLGBTI respects the diversity of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered people and recognizes that multiple dimensions of diversity including race, ethnicity, gender, ability, age, and class affect lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered issues.

We support and mentor students and others interested in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered issues. We work collaboratively with others on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered concerns locally, nationally, and internationally.

The purpose of the organization shall be:

- 1) To advance the contributions of psychology as a discipline to the understanding of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered issues through basic and applied research
- 2) To promote education and training in matters of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered issues including special issues associated with practice, research, education and training, and the public interest
- 3) To promote the development and delivery of affirmative psychological services to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people
- 4) To use psychological knowledge to advocate for the advancement of the public interest and the welfare of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people
- 5) To inform the general public about research, education and training, practice, and advocacy on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered issues."

Activities: Its main activities are an annual convention, a fundraising dinner, and a national multicultural conference and summit. It also gives out a number of prizes, and has a book series, newsletter, website and listservs. The organization has task forces on health initiatives, mentoring, and aging, and it also has a number of committees, which include: bisexual issues, education and training, fellows, finance, membership, programs, racial and ethnic diversity, science, scholarship, transgender and gender variance, and youth and families.

6. American Sociological Association - Committee on the Status of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered Persons in the Study of Sociology.

Website:

http://www.asanet.org/cs/root/leftnav/committees/status_of_gay_lesbian_bisexual_and_transgendered_persons_in_sociology.

Mission: “Council established this and three other Status Committees to advise and guide the Association on the status of the discipline and profession of those groups that have experienced a pattern of discrimination in society. Every five years Council reviews the work of these committees and renews or retires the committees. The most recent review occurred in 2004.”

Activities: The ASA currently hosts a section on sexualities, which lists its purpose as “to encourage, enhance and foster research, teaching and other professional activities in the sociology of sexuality, for the development of sociology and the benefit of society.” The ASA also hosts a section on Sex & Gender, which aims “to encourage research and curriculum development on the organized patterns of gendered social relations and sexuality. The Section examines face-to-face interaction, political processes, culture and mass media, the medical, judicial, and educational systems.”

<http://www2.asanet.org/sectionsexgend/>

Committee on the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Persons in the Discipline, "Report on the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Persons in Sociology," 16 July 2002, <http://www.asanet.org/governance/GLBTrpt.html>.

Committee on the Status of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Persons in Sociology, “Report on the Status of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons in Sociology,” 28 May 2009,

[http://www.asanet.org/about/Council_Statements/GLBT%20Status%20Cmte%20Rpt%20\(Aug%202009\).pdf](http://www.asanet.org/about/Council_Statements/GLBT%20Status%20Cmte%20Rpt%20(Aug%202009).pdf)

7. American Studies Association

a. Queer Caucus

Mission: “The ASA Queer Caucus serves four purposes: 1) to work for inclusion of issues of interest to gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender faculty, independent scholars, and graduate students at the ASA annual meeting; 2) to serve as a networking group for scholars interested in queer studies; 3) to offer mentorship to gay/lesbian/transgendered graduate students, independent scholars, and faculty as they pursue their work; 4) to keep the ASA apprised of issues (institutional, academic, national and international) affecting

the queer members of its constituency. The Caucus also sponsors, with the Women's Committee and the Minority Scholar's Committee, a reception at the ASA Annual Meeting.

Activities: The ASA Queer Caucus, Women's Committee and Minority Committee hosts the Gloria Anzaldúa Award for Independent Scholars and Contingent Faculty, which supports ground-breaking work for studies of women of color and queer theory.

c. ASA Women's Committee:

Mission: "The Women's Committee is committed to creating coalitions between feminist, queer, anti-racist, transnational, working-class, and dis/ability studies scholarship and organizing within (and occasionally outside) the ASA. The Women's Committee carries out advocacy, theory, and praxis through membership recruitment and placement, selection of co-chairs, program planning, coalition building, and involvement in the administration of the Gloria E. Anzaldúa Award for Independent Scholars and Contingent Faculty. In the process and content of these activities, the Women's Committee explores and practices possibilities for anti-racist feminist organizing by attending to intersecting identities of gender, race, geographic location, sexuality, class, and dis/ability. Attending to these intersections, the Women's Committee seeks to make space at the association for discussions about anti-racist feminist scholarship and strategies."

8. International Communication Association

Division of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual & Transgender Studies

About: The Division of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual & Transgender Studies "is concerned with the analysis and critique of sexual systems, discourses and representations, particularly those which animate, inform and impinge upon the lives of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people."

Activities: The division hosts a section of the annual conference every year.

9. National Association of Social Workers (NASW) – National Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues

Website: <http://www.socialworkers.org/governance/cmtes/nclgbi.asp>

About: "The Committee was originally created as the Task Force on Gay Issues in January 1976. In 1979, the Task Force was restructured as an authorized committee of the association. The NASW Board of Directors subsequently formed the National Committee on Lesbian and Gay Issues at its June 1982 meeting. The words "Bisexual" and "Transgender" were added by the Delegate Assembly in 1996 and 2005 respectively. The Committee was established to enable NASW to further the cause of social justice by promoting and defending the rights of persons suffering injustices and oppression because they are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender."

Mission: “The National Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Issues develops, reviews and monitors programs of the Association that significantly affect gay men, lesbians, bisexuals and transgenders.”

Activities:

- a. Given that gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender issues are core to all association work, this committee shall develop, promote and/or collaborate on methods of insuring inclusion of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender issues in all activities of the association.
- b. To promote the development of knowledge, theory and practice as related to gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender issues.
- c. To review proposed Delegate Assembly public social policies for their impact on gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgenders and make recommendations for their acceptance or modification.
- d. To monitor policy changes, and data affecting policy changes, with regard to gay men, lesbians, bisexuals and transgenders- both native-born and immigrant.
- e. To identify ways to eliminate homophobic social work practices and policies and make recommendations to appropriate organizational units for action.
- f. To support lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender affirming legislation or policy related to equal protection, inheritance, insurance and property rights, services for youth, hate crimes, adoption, foster care, parental rights, health and mental health services, domestic partnership, and same sex marriages.
- g. To assist the association in developing lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender affirming policies, procedures, programs to guide the association in supporting the objectives of NCLGBTI.
- h. To participate with coalitions of related organizations, agencies, and professional associations.

10. National Communication Association (NCA) - Caucus on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Concerns

About: Caucus on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Concerns “is the advocacy and political action arm for LGBT identified individuals in the National Communication Association.

Mission: The caucus works to ensure that the policies and actions of the larger association are equitable and considerate of LGBT members.

Activities: Specific duties of the caucus include annually bestowing the Randy Majors and Lambda Awards, sponsoring an annual forum or panel on a political or advocacy issue at the NCA convention, providing mentoring to faculty and students in the discipline, and building/maintaining relations with other minority caucuses within NCA.”

11. National LGBT Bar Association

Website: www.lgbtbar.org

About: The association was founded in 1988, and has a large membership governed by a Board of Directors.

Mission Statement: “The National LGBT Bar Association is a national association of lawyers, judges and other legal professionals, law students, activists, and affiliates lesbians, gay, bisexual, transgender legal organizations. The LGBT Bar promotes justice in and through the legal profession for the LGBT community in all its diversity. The National LGBT Bar Foundation is a nonprofit organization that supports the LGBT Bar, encouraging its charitable, scientific, and legal educational purposes.”

Vision Statement: “The LGBT Bar aspires to improve the quality of life for LGBT legal practitioners until the time that LGBT legal professionals are recognized without discrimination, stigma or negative bias.”

Values Statement: “The LGBT Bar and its sister organization, the National LGBT Bar Foundation, value bar associations and the extensive and unique programs they present. Bar associations become professional homes for our communities. These home communities are most successful when they are built by those who are the best and the brightest in our legal community. The builders must have skills to execute administrative tasks efficiently, they must have good moral character to provide leadership, and they must exhibit the self-confidence to work as a small part of a much larger team. As a matter of principle and ethics, the LGBT Bar and the NLGLF, operates within the code of professional ethics for legal practitioners. In addition, both organization board of directors and staff comports themselves within the standards of good nonprofit governance as expressed by leaders in the nonprofit association field.”

Activities: The National LGBT Bar Association supported the 2009 ABA Report on Diversity and Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity, as well as the host of LGBT-supportive policies that the ABA has passed. The LGBT Bar Association also runs a number of committees (academic, estates, diversity), a Job Center and educational programming. Finally, the Association sponsors various Continuing Legal Education (CLE) programs on LGBT issues.

In 2011, LGBTBA supported “a resolution urging all state, territorial, and tribal governments to “eliminate all of their legal barriers to civil marriage between two persons of the same sex who are otherwise eligible to marry.”

12. National Women’s Studies Association

About: Includes the Lesbian Caucus and the Transgender/Variant Status Caucus.

Mission: Caucuses designate groups that are under-represented within society or NWSA as an organization. Task Forces focus on an issue or problem, relevant to the policies and principles of NWSA and women’s studies that can be addressed through action.

13. Organization of American Historians –

About: In 2013 the OAH established a Committee on the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) Historians and Histories. The committee considers all professional issues bearing upon LGBTQ historians in the historical profession as well as the study of LGBTQ histories.

Activities:

During 2012 and 2013 the Committee worked to:

- 1) Improve the presence and visibility of LGBTQ historians and histories at the OAH annual meeting.
- 2) Propose revisions to several OAH policies.
- 3) Address OAH nominations for officer positions, executive and nominating boards, and program committees.
- 4) Make a public statement about the role of historians in the Supreme Court's same-sex marriage decisions. (2013)
- 5) Express support for LGBTQ history educational reform in California, (2012)

Appendix 2: Select Bibliography

1) Studies of LGBTQ Issues in the Discipline of History

Employment

Committee on Women Historians, "Report on the Lesbian and Gay Historians Survey," *Perspectives*, April 1993, 13-15.

<http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/1993/9304/9304AHA2.cfm>

Lisa Duggan, "The Discipline Problem: Queer Theory Meets Lesbian and Gay History," *GLQ* 2, no. 3 (1995): 179-191.

Marc Stein, "Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Survey on LGBTQ History Careers," *Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (May 2001): 29-31.

<http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2001/0105/0105aff1.cfm>

Marc Stein, "Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Survey on LGBTQ History Careers," June 2001. <http://clgbthistory.org/resources/reports/lgbtq-history-careers>

Textbooks

Vicki L. Eaklor, "Of Politics and History: Gay Americans In and Out of Textbooks," *Perspectives*, Oct. 1991,

<http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/1991/9110/9110VIE.cfm>

Vicki L. Eaklor, "How Queer-Friendly Are U.S. History Textbooks?" 26 Jan. 2004, History News Network, <http://historynewsnetwork.org/articles/3200.html>.

Lewis Gannett, "Representations of Homosexuality in College-Level American History Textbooks: A Survey and Critique," M.A. Thesis, History, University of Massachusetts-Boston, June 2007.

Teaching

Michael S. Sherry, "Teaching Lesbian and Gay History," *Perspectives*, November 1993, <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/1993/9311/9311TEC.cfm>

Henry Abelove, "The Queering of Lesbian/Gay History," *Radical History Review* 62 (Spring 1995): 45-57.

Henry Abelove, Richard Ohmann, and Claire Potter, eds., *Radical Teacher* 45 (Spring 1997).

LGBTQ Task Force Final Report 2015

J. Elizabeth Clark, Erica Rand, and Leonard Vogt, eds., "Teaching about Gender and Sexuality," *Radical Teacher* 66-67 (Spring/Summer 2003).

Ian Lekus, Horacio N. Roque Ramirez, and Marcia M. Gallo, "Teaching Resources," *OAH Magazine of History* (special issue on the History of Sexuality) 20, no 2 (March 2006): 32-45.

Nancy Unger, "Teaching '*Straight*' Gay and Lesbian History," *Journal of American History* 93 (March 2007): 1192-99.

Susan Stryker, Paisley Currah, and Lisa Jean Moore, "Trans-, Trans, or Transgender," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 36, nos. 3-4 (Fall/Winter 2008): 11-22.

Vicki L. Eaklor, "Teaching LGBTQ History: Two Situations," *Perspectives*, May 2010, <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2010/1005/1005for5.cfm>

Rachel Mattson, "Anti-Homophobia Education: Predicaments and Possibilities," *Perspectives*, May 2010, <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2010/1005/1005for6.cfm>

Eds. Leila J. Rupp and Susan K. Freeman, *Understanding and Teaching U.S. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History (The Harvey Goldberg Series)*, (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2014).

Journals

Carolyn Dinshaw, "LGBTQ Studies, Censorship, and Other Transnational Problems," *GLQ* 12, no. 1 (2006): 5-26.

"Sexual Revolutions," *OAH Magazine of History* (March 2006).

Leila Rupp, "What's Queer Got To Do With It," *Reviews in American History* 38, no. 2 (June 2010): 189-198.

Archives

Martin Duberman, "'Writhing Bedfellows': 1826, Two Young Men from Antebellum South Carolina Ruling Elite Share 'Extravagant Delight,'" *Journal of Homosexuality* 6, nos. 1-2 (Fall/Winter 1980-81): 85-102.

Martin Duberman, "'Writhing Bedfellows' in Antebellum South Carolina: Historical Interpretation and the Politics of Evidence," in *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, ed. Martin Bauml Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey Jr. (New York: New American Library, 1989), 153-168.

Steven Maynard, "Police/Archives," *Archivaria* 68 (Fall 2009): 159-182.

Marc Stein, "Did the FBI Try to Blackmail Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas," History News Network, 18 July 2005, <http://hnn.us/articles/13170.html>

"Queering Archives: Historical Unravelings," *Radical History Review*, Volume 2014, Number 120 (Durham: Duke University Press, Fall 2014).

http://outhistory.org/wiki/Main_Page

Research Grants

Marc Stein, "Post-Tenure Lavender Blues," History News Network," 7 January 2006, <http://hnn.us/articles/19941.html>.

2) First-Person Accounts of LGBTQ Experiences in the Discipline of History

Peter Boag, "Foreword," John Gerassi, *The Boys of Boise: Furor, Vice, and Folly in an American City* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001), vii-xvii.

George Chauncey, "The Queer History and Politics of Lesbian and Gay Studies," in *Queer Frontiers: Millennial Geographies, Genders, and Generations*, ed. Joseph A. Boone et al (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000), 298-315.

John D'Emilio, *Making Trouble: Essays on Gay History, Politics, and the University* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

John D'Emilio, *The World Turned: Essays on Gay History, Politics, and Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).

Martin Duberman, *About Time: Exploring the Gay Past* (New York: Gay Presses of New York, 1991).

Martin Duberman, *Cures: A Gay Man's Odyssey* (New York: Dutton, 1991).

Martin Duberman, *Left Out: The Politics of Exclusion* (New York: Basic, 1999).

Martin Duberman, *Midlife Queer: Autobiography of a Decade, 1971-1981* (New York: Scribner, 1996).

Martin Duberman, *Waiting to Land: A (Mostly) Political Memoir, 1985-2008* (New York: New Press, 2009).

Lisa Duggan and Nan D. Hunter, *Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

Estelle Freedman, *Feminism, Sexuality, and Politics* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

Leila J. Rupp, *A Desired Past: A Short History of Same-Sex Love in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

Marc Stein, "Crossing Borders: Memories, Dreams, Fantasies, and Nightmares of the History Job Market," *Left History* 9, no. 2 (Spring/Summer 2004): 119-139.

Susan Stryker, "(De)Subjugated Knowledges: An Introduction to Transgender Studies," in *The Transgender Studies Reader*, ed. Susan Stryker and Stephen Whittle (New York: Routledge, 2006), 1-17.

3) **Studies of LGBTQ Issues in Other Disciplines**

Anthropology

Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Issues in Anthropology, Final Report, November 1999, <http://www.aaanet.org/reports/report.pdf>.

Political Science

Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession of the American Political Science Association, "Report on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Political Science Profession," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28, no. 3 (September 1995): 561-574.

Julie Novkov and Charles Gossett, "Survey of Textbooks for Teaching Introduction to U.S. Politics: (How) Do They See Us?," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40, no. 2 (April 2007): 393-398.

Julie Novkov and Scott Barclay, "Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and the Transgendered in Political Science: Report on a Discipline-Wide Survey," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43, no. 1 (January 2010): 95-106.

Sociology

Verta Taylor and Nicole C. Raeburn, "Identity Politics as High-Risk Activism: Career Consequences for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Sociologists," *Social Problems* 42, no. 2 (May 1995): 252-273.

Committee on the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Persons in the Discipline, "Report on the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Persons in Sociology," 16 July 2002, <http://www.asanet.org/governance/GLBTrpt.html>.

LGBTQ Task Force Final Report 2015

Committee on the Status of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Persons in Sociology, “Report on the Status of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons in Sociology,” 28 May 2009,

[http://www.asanet.org/about/Council_Statements/GLBT%20Status%20Cmte%20Rpt%20\(Aug%202009\).pdf](http://www.asanet.org/about/Council_Statements/GLBT%20Status%20Cmte%20Rpt%20(Aug%202009).pdf)