DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 773 HE 027 872

AUTHOR	Swoboda, Marian J., Ed.; And Others
TITLE	Women on Campus in the Eighties: Old Struggles, New Victories. University Women: A Series of Essays, Volume IV.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	117p.; For other volumes in the series, see HE 027 869-871. Funding provided by the Elizabeth Conrad Fund.
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Wisconsin, Office of Equal Opportunity Compliance, Post Office Box 8010, Madison, WI 53708-8010 ($5).
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Disabilities; *Educational History; Females; *Feminism; Higher Education; Public Colleges; Sex Bias; Sex Discrimination; Social History; *Women Faculty; Womens Education; *Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*1980s; *University of Wisconsin System

ABSTRACT

This volume of essays focuses on the programs and people in the women's movement at the University of Wisconsin (UW) System who shaped, and were shaped by, the decade of the 1980s. The first part, "Programs," reflects the broadened concerns of the women's movement, with programs which affected women at all levels of society. The second part, "Personal Voices," reflects on the growth and development of women's studies on college campuses and their professional as well as personal focus. The last part pays tribute to the lives and scholarship of five eminent women faculty members and offers a glimpse at the ways their fields intersected with feminist scholarship and activism. Essays include: "Women's Studies Outreach: Evolution at Extension" (Kathryn F. Clarenbach and Dolores H. Niles); "Meeting the Needs of Disadvantaged Women: The Single Parent Self-Sufficiency Program" (Elizabeth K. Reedy); "The 'Real World,' Women of Color, and the Curriculum at UW-Eau Claire" (Jane M. Pederson); "Women on the Margin: College Women Who Have a Disability" (Mary Hopkins-Best and others); "Collaborating for Change: The UW System Women's Studies Consortium" (Jacqueline Ross and Susan Kahn); "Women's Studies Librarian" (Sue Searing); "The Professional Socialization of Women's Studies Scholars: Living, Learning, Doing" (Sharon Nero); "A New Direction for UW-Stevens Point" (Kathy Ackley); "Coming from Behind: Women's Studies at UW-River Falls" (Laura Quinn); "On Trying a Feminist's Soul" (Estella Lauter); "Women's Studies in Prison: Lessons for Offenders, Lessons for Educators" (Rhonda Ambuehl and Barbara Sniffen); "Women with Disabilities in Higher Education: A Personal Perspective" (Sue A. Schmitt); "Salary Equity: A Legal Case" (Louise Witherell); "Sexist Language is Alive and Well at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee" (Eleanor Miller); "Ruth Bleier: Feminist Scientist" (Sue Rosser); "In the Days When Nutrition was New" (Dorothy Pringle); "Nancy Datan: 'My Candle Burns at Both Ends'" (Dean Rodeheaver); "A Tribute to Raquel Kersten" (Virginia Gibbs). (Some essays contain references.) (JDD)

Volume IV
University Women
A Series of Essays
University of Wisconsin System

WOMEN ON CAMPUS IN THE EIGHTIES:
OLD STRUGGLES, NEW VICTORIES

UNIVERSITY WOMEN
A Series of Essays
Volume IV

Editors: Marian J. Swoboda, Ph.D.
Audrey J. Roberts, Ph.D.
Jennifer Hirsch

Cover Design: Patricia J. Clark, M.F.A.

Published by the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs
and Policy Studies
1802 Van Hise Hall
1220 Linden Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Price: $5.00

VOLUMES IN *UNIVERSITY WOMEN, A SERIES OF ESSAYS*

Volume I: *They Came to Learn, They Came to Teach, They Came to Stay*

Volume II: *Wisconsin Women, Graduate School, and the Professions*

Volume III: *Women Emerge in the Seventies*

Volume IV: *Women on Campus in the Eighties: Old Struggles, New Victories*

Contents

PART THREE

Tributes

INTRODUCTION

In 1980, the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs and Policy Studies of the University of Wisconsin System published the first three volumes of *University Women, A Series of Essays*, a monograph series which provides a female perspective on the history and current status of Wisconsin public higher education. As the preface to those volumes states, "One notices in reading the pieces a perpetuation of concerns: academic rank and promotion differences between men and women, salary inequities, marginal participation in university governance and administration, conflicts between social and career roles." In this, the fourth volume in the series, these same concerns and conflicts remain very much in evidence, however much we might have hoped they would be alleviated or resolved over the past decade.

In comparison with the upheavals of the 1960s and heady progress of the seventies, the eighties were a relatively quiet time for women in higher education in Wisconsin, perhaps matching the conservative mood of the country. While the decade was not free of struggle, many of the battles took place behind the scenes rather than in the form of the open trench warfare and well-publicized victories and defeats witnessed in the sixties and seventies. The eighties were a time to regroup though not retreat, to rethink strategies which had been stymied, to move on where the bases were strong.

If the eighties were a time to move quietly and consolidate the legal and regulatory gains realized during the previous decade, they were also a time to expand the focus and reach of the campus women's movement. Even as women scholars continued their dogged quest to achieve parity in salary and professional status with male colleagues, the spectrum of concern for women's rights was broadened to include women marginalized not only on campus but by society in general—women of color, single mothers, women with disabilities, incarcerated women.

This volume focuses on the programs and people who shaped, and were shaped by, the decade of the 1980s. The first section, Programs, reflects the broadened concerns of the women's movement, with programs which affected women at all levels of society. The groundbreaking work of Kathryn Clarenbach and her colleagues at UW–Extension is recounted in the first essay. Elizabeth Reedy describes a support program for single mothers. Jane Pederson discusses the Ford Foundation's Women of Color in the Curriculum project. And Mary Hopkins-Best, Ann Yurcisin, and Shirley Murphy report on the method and results of their program in career education for women with disabilities.

For many academic women, the advent of women's studies programs was central to their professional lives. These campus programs are now under the umbrella of the system-wide Women's Studies Consortium, whose history is given by consortium director Jacqueline Ross and Susan Kahn. The two essays that follow—on the role of the women's studies librarian by Sue Searing, and a study of women' studies scholars by Sharon Nero—provide perspective on the emergence and growth, over the past two decades, of this unique field.

As Nero explains, women's studies is unique in that it has provided not only a professional focus but a personal focus as well for the women engaged in the field. This personal/professional dualism is vividly rendered in the essays by Kathy Ackley, Laura Quinn, and Estella Lauter, who lead off the middle section, Personal Voices, with reflections on the growth and development of women's studies on their campuses.

Echoing the theme of vast societal change that runs throughout this monograph series is a theme of profound personal change—in many cases the individual change and growth of the writers themselves. The voices in the middle section of this volume vividly convey the personal impact of societal changes. In moving counterpoint, Rhonda Ambuehl and Barbara Sniffen relate their own experiences as student and teacher in the Post-secondary Re-Entry Program for prison inmates. Sue Schmitt, who did not let physical disability hinder her ascent to the upper levels of academic administration, outlines her struggles and victories in a lighthearted autobiographical essay. Another memoir bears a more somber tone: Louise Witherell's poignant description of her decade-long fight for salary equity. Recognizing that inequities are often embedded in the very language we speak and think with, Eleanor Miller relates several small but significant struggles to phase out sexist terminology and raise awareness levels within the university administration.

The last section of this volume pays tribute to the lives and scholarship of five eminent women faculty members from a range of disciplines—biology, gerontology, nutrition, and Hispanic studies—and offers a glimpse at the ways these fields intersect with feminist scholarship and activism.

With humor and hope, bitterness and rage, always tempered by the cool wisdom of hindsight, these writers testify to the momentous changes that accompany social evolution, and to the contributions and sacrifices women have made to address and correct long-standing inequities in higher education.

PART ONE

PROGRAMS

1. Women's Studies Outreach: Evolution at Extension

by Kathryn F. Clarenbach and Dolores H. Niles

Introduction

From 1962 until the late 1980s, the three women who comprised the core faculty of Women's Education Resources (WER) worked together in developing and delivering a university outreach program on behalf of Wisconsin women. Over those years there were many changes: in the title of the office, the administrative units to which it reported, the program thrust and content, the size of the staff, budgetary expectations and requirements, and in general the levels of receptivity and cooperation both within and beyond the university. Throughout these various changes, Constance F. Threinen, Marian L. Thompson, and Kathryn F. Clarenbach worked closely together, rather as a collective. Consensus followed their group discussions of assessed need and new directions, while specific program leadership or involvement alternated, based on their individual interests, expertise, and skills. As retirees, all three are pleased to be honorary members of the UW System Women's Studies Consortium.

The decade of the eighties was significant for the continued contributions of WER, across the state and nation. It was also significant in that several changes had a lasting impact on WER and the future of women's studies outreach in Wisconsin.

In many ways, events during the eighties took shape earlier. We will first review the programs and contributions that marked the decade and then discuss the changes and the impact of these changes as we move into the last decade of the 20th Century.

Program priorities are always strongly influenced by the social and political climate of the times. To devise and develop agenda at the cutting edge of positive social change, we engaged in continuing investigation of the actual circumstances of women's lives, the problems and barriers women faced, and the various programs being proposed. Research, analysis, interpretation, dissemination of information, and then the selection of workable vehicles were prerequisites to each of those steps, to avoid duplicating what others were doing, and to live within the constraints of time and budget.

International Women's Year/Decade—1975-85

The United Nations declared 1975 as International Women's Year and urged all member nations to participate with appropriate observances. Subsequently the U.N. extended the year to a "Decade for Women." The first international conference was held in Mexico City in 1975, a mid-decade one in Copenhagen in 1980, and a final one in Nairobi in 1985. In addition to the official conference of government appointed delegates, non-government organizations (NGOs) created a forum open to anyone. The outpouring of women from every continent to take part in those companion forums of NGOs was beyond all expectations. The *World Plan Action* (1975) and the 1985 final report, *Forward Looking Strategies*, brought to world attention heretofore little known, and certainly undocumented, facts of women's lives around the globe, with comprehensive recommendations for basic improvements.

In the United States, President Ford in 1975 established the national commission on the observance of International Women's Year (IWY) with Jill Ruckelshaus as chair. Women's Education Resources, along with educators and women's organizations throughout America, greeted this opportunity with great enthusiasm. The first response of WER was to conduct an ETN (educational telephone network) class which we subsequently published under the title "Mexico City and After."

From the beginning WER's involvement with IWY was one of active contributor. Because our successful 1973 national Women and the Arts conference at Wingspread was highly regarded, Kay was invited to serve on the arts and humanities committee of the national commission on the observance of IWY. Congresswoman Martha Griffiths knew of our 1974 Wisconsin series of meetings on "Homemaking and the Family: Changing Values and Concerns," and she invited Kay to also serve on a second IWY committee, the one she chaired, "The Status of Homemaking."

Marian Thompson agreed to prepare material on "Women in Elective and Appointive Office," which was published as an IWY brochure. Other Wisconsin women testified before several committees. By June 1976 the commission's report, *To Form a More Perfect Union*, a comprehensive document containing 115 hard-hitting recommendations, was presented to the President and distributed widely.

Meanwhile, in December 1975, Congress passed legislation calling for a national women's conference to be preceded by 56 state and territorial meetings. Jill Ruckelshaus asked Kay to be the conference coordinator, but she opted instead to serve half-time as deputy coordinator. The first assignment was to prepare a how-to and how-not-to manual of rules, procedures, strategies, and anticipated outcomes for the 56 state meetings.

Early in 1977 President Carter chose Bella Abzug to head the IWY commission, and she persuaded Kay to serve full time as executive director. This she did until the IWY office in Washington D.C. closed in April 1978.

The excitement, anxieties, hazards, and accomplishments culminating in the November 1977 Houston conference and passage of *The National Plan of Action* is told in the beautiful publication *The Spirit of Houston*. Gloria Steinem refers to that conference as the American constitutional convention for women. We think of the conference and its preceding state meetings as the largest, most effective continuing education program ever assembled.

In June 1977, Connie Threinen chaired the Wisconsin state IWY meeting attended by 1,300. As with all but a few state IWY meetings, representation of black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American participants, as well as low income, young, homemaking, working, rural and urban women, more than fulfilled the congressional mandate for broad-based participation. Participants recommended resolutions and selected delegates for the national conference. Dolores Niles, then a Madison psychotherapist and frequent lecturer on women's issues, was not yet with the university. She remembers that attending the conference as an observer was a compelling experience.

The 25 planks selected by the delegates for the *National Plan of Action* have formed the basis of the United States women's agenda since Houston. The continuing committee of the Houston conference, now named the national women's conference committee, monitors the implementation of the plan. Its 1986 update. *Decade of Achievement*, which Kay helped to write, is a mosaic of ups and downs, progress and backsliding.

Here in Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Women's Network (which formed in 1979 when then-Governor Dreyfus "croaked" the Status of Women Commission) comprises a coalition of 90 organizations committed to the principles of the *National Plan of Action*. Both Marian Thompson and Connie Threinen have served as elected chair of the Wisconsin network, Kay as vice chair, and Marian has edited the quarterly newsletter, *The Stateswomen*.

Education Equity

Education equity at all levels has always been a priority of WER. Since the early sixties we have encouraged Wisconsin's Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to identify and eliminate sex-role stereotyping in the schools. We prepared materials and conducted in-service training for Madison teachers and counselors and served on the superintendent's human relations advisory committee. As early as 1965, several DPI staff and Kay took part in a Midwest conference sponsored by the women's bureau of the U.S. Labor Department. The published report was called "New Approaches to Counseling Girls in the '60's." In 1975 State Superintendent of Public Instruction Barbara Thompson agreed to create a task force on sex-role stereotyping and named Connie Threinen its chair. That was the first of a number of fairly continuous close associations Connie had with DPI, some assignments on grants, some as paid consultant, others as volunteer on loan. In 1982 she co-authored *Ten Years of Title IX*, in recognition of progress made in the schools toward eliminating sex bias. It was followed by a workbook, *Implementing Title IX*, that was used by DPI in training school staff.

The national rise in adolescent pregnancy has been of great concern to feminists in Wisconsin. In 1980 Connie called together a group of people concerned about the problem. They secured funding through Barbara Bitters, the vocational equity coordinator at DPI, for production of a manual called *Increasing Options Through Life/Work Planning*. The project was directed by Connie. One of the first such manuals in the country, it was made available at no cost to any teacher in Wisconsin. With the help of Barbara Bitters and Melissa Keyes, the sex equity coordinator at DPI, Connie arranged a number of training sessions for its use in various parts of the state. In 1990 DPI updated and reprinted the manual.

Connie has also served on the committee administering the Choices Project, a major effort initiated by the Wisconsin Women's Council in 1985 to stimulate local community coalitions to offer programs for girls to enrich their lives and help them establish life goals. That interagency project is now funded and administered through the Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services.

One attempt to reduce Wisconsin's startlingly high teen pregnancy rate was the legislature's creation in 1985 of the adolescent pregnancy prevention services board. Connie Threinen has served as a nonvoting member of that grant-making board since its inception. Equal representation of right-to-life and pro-choice advocates on the board makes its meetings predictably spirited.

Meanwhile, Kay's activities in the interest of girls led along a different path. Kay served for a number of years on the advisory committee to the national project on equal education rights of NOW's legal defense and education fund. The federal Women's Education Equity Act engaged her as a reader of their grant applications for several years. As a consultant to the national advisory committee on women's education programs, she helped design and conduct four regional conferences (Wisconsin, California, New Mexico and North Carolina) on "Educational Needs of Rural Women and Girls." The final report which Kay wrote under that title, published in 1977, was subsequently credited by more than ten substantial projects as their foundation.

Sports for Girls

In 1973 the National Education Association published as a chapter in their book *Sex Stereotyping in the Schools* Kay's paper, "School Athletics and Sex Discrimination," which she had delivered in 1970 at the invitation of UW's women's athletic department for a conference in Indiana. Amazingly, it was later excerpted in *Sports Illustrated* in 1973, the *Readers Digest* in 1974, and quoted in the *Liberated Woman's Appointment Calendar* of 1975.

By the time Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act was finally interpreted to encompass athletics, after long and bitter opposition from male athletic representatives, school sports for girls and women had begun to skyrocket everywhere. To help assure the best possible direction for these new programs, WER collaborated with the UW women's athletic department and the Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association to hold conferences for coaches of high school girls' sports. Connie Threinen chaired the committee that planned and conducted six highly successful annual conferences during the 1980s, three in Madison and three in Stevens Point.

Employment Equity

Women's struggle for employment equity in America is actually older than this nation itself. In 1990 the struggle goes on, with WER having contributed its own modest efforts toward a more humanized workplace and justice for working women.

The issue of the 1980s was frequently identified as "comparable worth" or "pay equity," the evaluation of the occupations in which women workers predominate at a level consistent with the true value of the work. That was not a new idea, though its opponents derided it as a radical, unreasonable, unworkable concept

that threatened to undermine the economy. The idea had actually been proposed as a companion part of the federal Equal Pay Act of 1963. Equal pay for work of substantially equal effort and value was passed, but the comparable worth requirement of proper evaluation of all jobs was excluded from the drafted bill.

We in WER knew that both avenues had to be followed for women workers to be treated fairly and for society to benefit from the fullest contributions of women. During the 60s and early 70s, we had concentrated on helping remove the labels of "men's work" and "women's work," and on opening "nontraditional" jobs and professions to women. Many of those efforts bore fruit. Our 1970–73 women in apprenticeship project is still used as a model by the U.S. Department of Labor. And in 1990 the Directory of Occupational Titles, whose sexist devaluation of "women's" jobs we exposed in our 1972–75 project, is once again being reviewed by the federal government. Our publication, *Women's Work—Up From .878*, has been used extensively by congressional committees and by a number of states in their development of comparable worth.

In 1984–85, then-Governor Anthony Earl's task force on comparable worth faced opposition not only from business interests but from the University of Wisconsin, which refused to be covered by the recommendations until specifically so ordered by Wisconsin's Department of Employment Relations. Even then the university moved very slowly toward implementation, finally distributing the funds intended to correct underpayment of academic staff by giving disproportionate raises to high-level administrators, and ultimately being required to re-structure its entire job evaluation system along truly sex-neutral lines. It is a sad chapter in our university's history.

WER prepared materials and made presentations at a number of educational conferences around the state. At the request of the Wisconsin council on affirmative action and funded by them, Marian Thompson and Kay in 1981 wrote a booklet, *The Status of Clerical Workers: A Case For Pay Equity*. UW–Milwaukee hosted a major conference on pay equity in May 1986, co-sponsored by some 20 groups, at which Kay was a speaker. We were involved periodically with CETA (Comprehensive Employment Training Act), and its successor JTPA (Joint Training Partnership Act), with planning committees, conferences, written materials, and speeches.

The National Commission on Working Women (NCWW) and the Center for Women and Work of the National Manpower Institute both engaged Kay as a consultant. She assisted the latter in 1979 and 1980 in designing educational programs and resource centers for working women. For the NCWW she coordinated a Midwest regional dialogue in Madison of 150 working women from seven states; the final report of that 1978 experiences contains a wealth of information that is still timely today. We also had the pleasure of arranging the program for 20 Latin American blue-collar women workers during their three-day stay in Madison, one leg in their nationwide visit sponsored by NCWW. Whenever we had international visitors in our office, as we frequently did, it never failed to be valuable and sometimes led to warm friendships. In 1978, at the invitation of the Aspen Institute of West Berlin, Kay participated in a week-long international seminar in Germany on women's employment. The trip concluded with several days of meetings with feminist groups in London.

Women in the Criminal Justice System

Our involvement in this important subject was multi-faceted: discrimination in the law itself, disparate sentences for convicted felons, treatment of and facilities for women offenders, treatment of victims and witnesses by the courts and law enforcement personnel, and court attitude and behavior toward women attorneys.

Carolyn Wilson and Kay co-authored *Violence Against Women: Causes and Prevention*, an annotated bibliography in 1979, under a grant from the Wisconsin council on criminal justice. The following year we were invited to expand the publication as a monograph for the National Clearinghouse on Domestic Violence. In 1981 Carolyn Wilson's further expansion was contracted by G.K. Hall and Company, Boston, and published in hardback as part of their series of publications.

Kay had much earlier been a guest of the Johnson Foundation at a *McCall's* magazine symposium in New York on "What Women Can Do To Reduce Violence." A Wingspread conference followed in 1968 for Wisconsin women, at which she moderated one of its sessions. During the 1970s the U.S. commission on civil rights invited Kay to take part in five or six regional conferences and an international meeting in Canada. (Those invitations ended with the Reagan years.) In 1980 Kay coordinated the first victim/witness statewide conference in Wisconsin for the council on criminal justice. Other conferences and many improvements in advocacy and fairness for victims and witnesses have taken place since that time.

Marian Thompson had a key role on the criminal justice task force on women offenders, and wrote the final report of their statewide conference in 1984. She has also worked closely with the Wisconsin Women's Network task force and encouraged the Wisconsin Women's Council to establish a similar task force on women offenders.

Workshops on family violence, sexual assault, and sexual harassment were incorporated in several statewide Women's Conferences, and WER prepared and distributed educational materials on those issues. WER also helped plan and write each edition of *Wisconsin Women and the Law*, published by the commission on the status of women (1975, 1977 and 1979) and by the Wisconsin Women's Council in 1989. These publications not only informed citizens of the law and de-mystified heretofore unfamiliar territory, but were also influential in reforming and modernizing many relevant Wisconsin statutes. Divorce reform, sexual assault, and marital property are prime examples.

Women and the Arts

When Rita Goodman of the Wingspread staff suggested we review what had happened to and by women in the arts in the decade since our watershed 1973 national conference, we agreed at once. Professor Ed Kamarck, of UW-Extension arts, and Kay chose a planning committee, consulted with the faculty from women's studies across the system, and in 1984 held a small, intensive two-day planning session at Wingspread.

In June 1985, the second national conference met on the Madison campus, bringing together women from every art field and discipline. UW women's studies faculty led discussion sessions and served as panelists. Funding from the UW-Extension chancellor, the Ford Foundation, and Miller Brewing Company

enabled us to include a diverse range of authors, poets, painters, performers, scholars, composers, and musicians. The major conference addresses, summaries of the 15 discussion groups, and Elizabeth Durbin's fine research paper on the decade of progress for women in the arts are recorded in our publication, *The Green Stubborn Bud: Women's Culture at Century's Close.*[1] The title is from a moving poem by Robin Morgan, which she read at the conference.

Women's Studies Outreach

For 15 years, 1970–84, Marian Thompson compiled and wrote a quarterly newsletter, *Wisconsin Women*, later called *Wisconsin Women and Public Policy*. Comprehensive items covering events that affect all aspects of women's lives made up every issue. The cessation of this statewide newsletter has left a serious gap that has yet to be filled.

Also sadly discontinued for reasons of budget was the distribution of our award-winning packets of selected materials on eleven basic issues. We had devised this system of responding to requests from across the nation for information on virtually every aspect of women's lives addressed in the National Plan of Action. Keeping the packets up to date eventually required staff time we could no longer afford.

In 1981, Connie Threinen and Marian Thompson arranged and escorted author Laurie James of Massachusetts to ten Wisconsin sites for performances of her one-woman original dramatization of Margaret Fuller. For three years in the early eighties, Kay broadcast a weekly commentary on "Morning Edition" over WHA-radio on women's issues. From 1983–85 she taught "Women and Politics" on the Milwaukee campus.

UW–Milwaukee's March 1988 conference on civil liberties, which Kay addressed, dealt with basic questions of democracy and the Bill of Rights—a subject other women's studies programs might well emphasize.

WER administered three correspondence courses in women's studies, two for college credit and one high school course. Virginia Sapiro wrote the introductory college course "Women's Studies 102" and Mariamne Whatley prepared "Women's Studies 103: Women's Bodies in Health and Disease." All three of us in WER had co-taught an ETN class for high school teachers titled "Integrating Women's Studies in the High School Curriculum." Our experiment was not totally satisfying, but we believed it is an idea that should be pursued. One student in the class, a teacher at LaFollette High School in Madison, subsequently wrote the independent study high school course in women's studies for our department.

In 1986 and 1987, Kay coordinated a team of five political scientists to produce an independent study course in American national government under an Annenberg grant from the Center for Public Broadcasting to WHA, UW–Extension's public radio and television station on the UW–Madison campus. She wrote the study guide and conducted most of the interviews which are incorporated in the audio tapes that accompany each lesson. Bella Abzug, Judge Barbara Crabb, Barbara Jordan, Catherine East, and Gloria Steinem are among those on tape.

Statewide women's conferences, cosponsored with the Wisconsin Women's Network, incorporated a range of long-term as well as emerging issues and ideas. In 1984 the theme was "Educating, Activating, Advocating." In 1987 we emphasized "Voices and Votes." In 1989 we arranged a small conference called "Show

and Tell" that brought women policy-makers in the state government together with faculty from the women's studies department at the university. It was hoped that each group would benefit from a mutual exchange of ideas on problems and solutions regarding the situation of women in our state.

A vital component of successful outreach was maintaining close ties with women's organizations and women's centers. WER received from them information and materials useful to us, we provided educational and organizing help that could be passed along to their various memberships, and we served as a link to put groups in touch with one another. Our roster and gatherings of nascent women's centers in the seventies helped accelerate the spread of local centers that provide counseling, job placement, assistance to displaced homemakers, rape crisis hotlines, shelters for abused women and their children, and women's health care information.

We developed a *Directory of Women's Organizations and Services* for distribution by the commission on the status of women and later by the Wisconsin Women's Council whose staff keeps the directory current. The three editions of the *Handbook for Commissions* which Marian Thompson and Kay wrote were widely used in and well beyond Wisconsin by many women.

Marian Thompson's responsibilities as women's education specialist with Cooperative Extension's family living included such assignments as working on a national farm women's conference, the leadership training series, college week and college days committee, and conferences on marital property and comparable worth.

Changing Events

During October 1980, we conducted an ETN course prophetically titled "Crisis and Crunch: The Threat to Services For Women," for in many ways the decade of the eighties was not kind to women. Federal public policy with its "inequality of sacrifice" widened the gap between rich and poor and pushed millions of American women below the poverty level.

Budget policies of UW–Extension had something of the same effect on WER. State dollars became more scarce and Extension departments were expected to increase program revenue to cover expenses. Unlike professional development departments such as engineering, medicine, and business, which can charge clients for services, increasing program revenue was not easy for WER. A series of reductions left us without our nonresident staff—Shirley Haas in La Crosse, Delores Harms at Superior, ad hoc researcher/librarian Carolyn Wilson, and secretary Jeanette Rieder. Marian Thompson moved from WER to family living in Cooperative Extension and Connie Threinen opted to take a part-time salary despite little reduction in work load. The department of governmental affairs (DGA) invited us to join them, as that was Kay's academic home. WER's public policy emphasis was consistent with DGA's general mission, and economies of scale could be gained.

Shortly after this, the Board of Regents declared the "integration" of academic and program departments of the division of Extension, with UW–Madison and UW–Milwaukee under the concept of a statewide extension function. DGA became a part of the UW–Madison campus division of outreach. The transition period was filled with uncertainties, frustration, and shifting loyalties. The retire-

ments of Kay, Marian, and Connie left a void that DGA would seek to fill through a new faculty hire, but other events were also developing that would signal a new era in women's programming in the UW System.

Kay recalls that by the end of the Reagan administration, most of the allies in the federal bureaucracy who were advocates for women had been replaced by ultra conservatives. Programs on behalf of equity for women were unfunded or discontinued altogether. *Women in Washington, Advocates for Public Policy*, some of whom contributed to 20 essays in Irene Tinker's 1983 book of that title, were no longer of our government.

UW–Extension had responded to the changing needs and problems of women through programming by WER from 1962–1989. During those years this highly successful program was dedicated to activities aimed at educating women about the changes that were taking place in their lives and in society. Also, during the same period, new research on women created an extraordinarily large body of knowledge with implications for every discipline in higher education. During the 1970s, women's studies programs had developed on every UW campus and by the late 1980s they officially became part the UW System Women's Studies Consortium.

According to Jacqueline Ross, director of the consortium, "Since their inception, the women's studies programs have developed some innovative outreach activities. They have reached outside the university to bring women's studies scholarship to new audiences. People who have been unable or reluctant to become part of the regular student body have become involved in women's studies projects which enrich their lives."

In 1988 a comprehensive review of the consortium and its programs was conducted. Outside consultant Dr. Myra Dinnerstein, University of Arizona, made several recommendations for expanding and enhancing consortium programs, including instituting expanded outreach activities. In 1989, partly in response to the recommendation and certainly influenced by the need to fill the gap left by the demise of WER, the consortium designated outreach programming as one of its four initiatives.

The first coordinated outreach event, undertaken cooperatively by members of the consortium and campus continuing education offices, was held in spring 1990. Jackie Ross came to Dolores H. Niles, associate dean in continuing education Extension, to propose the idea. With funding from the dean's office and UW System, the consortium was able to hold Women and Science Days events involving twenty campuses and featuring distinguished outside women scientists. These events brought girls and young women with their teachers, counselors, and parents to campuses where they not only heard about careers in math, science, and technological fields but were able to go into labs for hands-on activities.

Subsequent to planning the Women and Science Days program, Jackie Ross and Dolore Niles discussed the potential of designing an expanded outreach program. The consortium submitted a proposal to the division for curriculum and program development initiative (CPDI) funding. The proposal, to establish an ongoing outreach program of the consortium, was approved with funding for a three year period beginning in 1990–91.

The goal of the CPDI is to demonstrate the unique potential of the consortium, with both its campus faculty resources and the coordination and leadership offered by its executive committee and staff, to meet the need for gender-related information which will inform public policy and the citizenry of the state and to

serve as a national model of outreach education for and about women. It has been conceived as a means of combining the outreach interests of UW institutional women's studies programs with the extension function in the UW System. With this evolution, involving more campus faculty in the extension function, the CPDI will serve to implement one of the goals of integration as conceived by the regents. Thus, we move into the last decade of the century.

Still in process as we move into the next decade is an oral history project developed and administered by Professor Gerda Lerner. To record a more complete and more accurate account of the current wave of the U.S. women's movement, some 30 Wisconsin and other Midwest feminists are being interviewed. The tapes and pertinent papers of these women are to be deposited in the Wisconsin State Historical Society. Says Kay, "It has been a privilege to collaborate with Gerda Lerner in planning this project and to be the first interviewee."

NOTES

1. *The Green Stubborn Bud: Women's Culture at Century's Close* (Scarecrow Press, New Jersey, 1987).

2. Meeting the Needs of Disadvantaged Women: The Single Parent Self-Sufficiency Program

by Elizabeth K. Reedy

In 1988, the Single Parent Self-Sufficiency Program (SPSSP) was developed by Sandra Krajewski (women's studies), Kay Robinson (extended education), and me in response to a request for curriculum and program development initiative proposals from UW-Extension. Our first concern was to provide access to the university for poverty-level single parents, most of whom are women. In that sense, our thinking about self-sufficiency started with the feminization of poverty. Because "self-sufficiency" understood strictly as economic goal suggests a conception of human existence which is merely individual and exclusively material, the term has always, for us, included an additional dimension which locates the person within community—of people, of creatures, of the natural and social worlds. Consequently, our educational goal tends more toward a liberal education, traditionally understood, rather than a technical or specialized education.

A second major concern in that original proposal was how to make higher education more responsive to the needs of these women. Historically, postsecondary institutions were designed for 18- to 20-year-olds whose only responsibilities were attending class and studying; as the college student population changes, colleges must follow suit. After the program had been funded for a three-year period by UW System Extension, Sandra Krajewski developed an in-depth evaluation process to help us track our progress.

Description of the Program

The program is quite small (the staff consists of two three-quarter-time people) to allow for flexibility. There is no charge to the students for the program or for the child care provided to those who need it; there is also no credit for completion of the program. Students meet for one three-hour class session per week for two semesters. Our schedule follows the university calendar to help students understand the pace and demands of regular academic work. Because of the logistical demands of child care, class size is limited to 10 students (we sometimes can squeeze in one or two more, depending on child care needs). Every effort is made to keep the environment as non-threatening as possible. During the first semester, for example, classes meet in the Women's Resource Center which is a

comfortable, casual room. Students and staff sit around a table. Coffee and tea are available, as is a phone for emergency calls from the child center.

First Semester

Each class session is divided roughly in half with a break in between. One half is for resource counseling; the other consists of more traditional academic work. During the resource counseling segment, students are introduced to college terminology, catalogues for the three local postsecondary institutions (Western Wisconsin Technical College, Viterbo College, and UW–La Crosse), people from admissions and financial aids offices, currently enrolled single parents, and visiting faculty talking about such topics as the history of women and education, ways of learning, etc. We help familiarize students with the campuses: that might mean a visit to an art gallery, a lecture, or a concert. One Halloween the students went on a scavenger hunt which included the library, the student union, the fine arts building, and other important locations. Students are also encouraged to talk about stress, to consider the necessity of learning experiences in order to understand how they learn, what they do well, and how they can best utilize their time and energy. The resources with which we try to familiarize them, in other words, are external and internal, official and institutional as well as informal and personal. We emphasize the need to rely on themselves and their friends and peers—and we introduce them to students who, having "graduated" from the program, are now enrolled in local institutions.

Academically, during the first semester, students read, think, write, and talk in order to do basically two things: renew tired skills and increase their self-confidence. Readings are selected to speak to the students' lives. The focus is on well-written pieces which raise complex issues or introduce complex perspectives, thus challenging the students to read carefully and to think carefully about their ideas and their writing. In addition, the teacher reads and comments extensively on each paper. No grades of any kind, however, are assigned. The point is for students to see for themselves that they are capable of reading difficult work, that they have things they want to express about what they have read and what others say, and that they can be capable and sensitive critics of their own work as well as the work of others. As students begin to recognize their own interests and competence, they begin to feel more confident.

Second Semester

Second semester work continues and expands upon that of first semester, but differs from it through the introduction of three preparatory modules in history, English, and math. Faculty are selected from the regular university staff. The intention of this part of the program is to introduce students to a variety of instructors, teaching styles, assignments, and other activities customarily required of college students, including exams and grades. The preparatory modules function as a transition to a regular classroom setting; for these segments, students move from the Women's Resource Center to a regular classroom. Students can see for themselves how they handle regular college work, whether they can understand lectures or reading assignments and what kind of grades they get on tests and papers. They learn whether they can make it in college. During the first

semester, the SPSSP staff is willing to assist students in virtually any way possible; however, we make it clear to them that by second semester, they need to be ready and able to function on their own, relying more completely on themselves and the support networks they've generated.

Accomplishments

The program works. Virtually all of the students who complete the program, and a few who must, for one reason or another, drop out after a semester with us, go on for postsecondary education. So far, all who have gone on (with the exception of one student who had to drop out temporarily for financial reasons) are still in school and doing well academically, getting mostly "B" grades. Given the fact that our students are first generation college students, that in high school they overwhelmingly followed a general education track and were just average students, this seems a solid record.

Sandra Krajewski's ongoing evaluation of the program has helped us understand our students and modify what we do to teach them better. Her evaluation uses both quantitative and qualitative procedures, including several interviews with each student during the course of the program year. We are beginning to identify major reasons for students dropping out of the program, and we are beginning to correlate certain kinds of responses to interview questions with success in our program. We still need a few more years before we can compare attrition rates between our "graduates" and nontraditional students who have not gone through the SPSSP.

The Students

Our students are primarily white and female, although we've also begun to attract Native American women. So far, most of the Native Americans are Winnebago women who are keenly interested in their Winnebago heritage and in working, one way or another, for the tribe. Roughly half of our students are working at least full time; the other half subsist on AFDC. Of those receiving AFDC, many entered poverty after a divorce. Most have either graduated from high school or earned their GEDs; a few are high school dropouts. A few have started and then dropped out of college. Virtually all of our students did not, in high school, anticipate going to college or pursuing a career.

There is a significant difference in basic outlook between our students and the traditional freshman student. For the traditional student, the prospect of college is positive: it opens a new world which is inviting, exciting, full of potential. Traditional students look forward to college as a chance to break from old patterns and old relationships which seem confining and restricting, and to move into a more open world which seems conformable to their ends. Our students, too, look to college with hope insofar as they want a better life, especially for their children. Beyond that, however, college often appears more threatening than appealing. Growing up in families where college was not typically a goal, they break from customary patterns and assumptions when they plan to enroll. On occasion, their families—parents, siblings, children—actively oppose their plans. College thus threatens to cut them off from families and friends. Furthermore, they are often nervous about a world which demands new ways of thinking

and talking, ways which seem foreign, which seem to ask that they reject their families and neighbors, their ways of living.

We assumed from the beginning that our students would be primarily women who would probably have suffered from the effects of poverty, drugs, alcohol, and/or abusive, demeaning relationships, both personal and social. We assumed that many, if not most, would be AFDC recipients, that they would know little about college, and that they would feel fairly intimidated about applying to college—that they would not, in short, see themselves as college material. We also assumed that having survived so far, they would be relatively resourceful, with a solid base of self-esteem. Finally, we assumed that they were likely to be pretty highly motivated. Our students proved these to be valid assumptions.

Our students are typically quite anxious about coming to campus; they feel conspicuously older and out of place. Surrounded by traditional students in $85 jeans, they are all too aware of the two dollar jeans they bought at the Salvation Army store. They know how much time and energy their children require, and they worry about taking on the responsibilities and demands of college. At the same time, their children are often a major reason for their decision to go to school: "I don't want my child to have to grow up the way I did." Similarly, the shame which comes with their poverty (a common theme in class discussion is their discomfort in grocery stores when they must use food stamps to purchase groceries) is countered by their pride in having learned to manage their meager incomes for the benefit of their families. Without that kind of pride and confidence in their basic intelligence and ability, none of them would stay in the program.

For several reasons, attrition is heavy during the first six or eight weeks in the program. At the simplest level there are management problems: kids—or a parent—get sick unexpectedly, the boss changes the student's work schedule, or an old car just dies. Sometimes bad weather is the straw that breaks the camel's back; sometimes a student can t drive and the lack of transportation—or the difficulty of managing public transportation with, say, three small kids—is just too much. Many of our students are isolated, with few friends, often no phone, and no nearby family to turn to.

Friends, family, and boyfriends often disapprove of the woman's entering our program, and may even work to sabotage her efforts. Unexpectedly dramatic examples of such sabotage came with alarming frequency from "significant" males—boyfriends, or separated or ex-husbands. Many students have told us of arguments and threats of separation and/or violence because of their involvement in the program. On occasion, students have been advised by the police to go into hiding or not to come to class to avoid physical attack by boyfriends or ex-husbands. Such male disapproval is clearly one major cause of attrition in the first few weeks of school.

Another major factor in the attrition rate is the lack of male authority figures in the SPSSP. Women who derive their feelings of self-worth from males cannot manage in a program peopled almost entirely by women (there have been two male students so far; occasionally a speaker--from an admissions office, for example—is male; at least one Preparatory Module faculty member is male). This same factor, however, has a very positive effect in another way and frequently turns out to be one of the most important elements in the program for the women---their discovery of vital, interesting, competent women, in books and in person. For many, this opens a window onto a whole new world---and they love

it! Their confidence soars with their spirits, and they are eager and ready to take off. This liberation—and there seems no other apt word for it—is often quite dramatically evident in the very physical appearance of the student. One student, for example. who routinely sat apart from the rest of the class and curled protectively into herself, transformed herself—metamorphosed really—into an open, expansive woman who is not only delighted with school, but quite realistically prepared to cope with her poverty while pursuing her education. Not all change is so visible.

Problems

Trying to reduce the number of students who drop out of the program will be an ongoing challenge for us—as it is for any educational program. Recruiting students is another problem. It's difficult to reach people who do not think of themselves as college material and to convince them to consider going to school. We regularly send out letters about the program to counselors, social workers, parenting programs, local high schools. etc. We've put posters at places like Job Service, and twice a year, we arrange for flyers to be sent out with AFDC checks. We believe that what will prove most effective in the long term is word of mouth. Already, we are receiving inquiries from potential students who have heard about the program from counselors, social workers, and, most importantly, other students.

The other external problem is securing permanent funding. From the beginning we have worked closely and cooperatively with local service providers and the three local postsecondary institutions: UW–La Crosse, Viterbo College, and Western Wisconsin Technical College (WWTC). Happily, the three schools provide a good range of educational choice, and we have been able to encourage our students to attend the school that makes sense for them. Consequently, we at UW–La Crosse have strong working relationships with both WWTC and Viterbo. We have also assumed from the beginning that our success would benefit the entire local community in the long run. The success of our program means hope for poverty-level single mothers. Education for those women means interacting with a professional world of women who know first hand what it's like to be poor in this country, what it's like to feel helpless, alienated, and isolated. Such women can provide role models for young women, can make important political contributions, and can speak authoritatively about our educational, social, and political priorities. From our point of view, then, the whole community has a stake in what we do. Consequently, we are now setting up a cooperative funding arrangement which will include funding from the state, all three postsecondary educational institutions, and community groups as well as private individuals.

UW–Extension has very generously made available to us partial funding for a fourth year which is what is keeping us going right now. Thanks to the bipartisan support of our local politicians, led by Representative Virgil Roberts, the state budget provides matching funds for our program. We have established a board of advisors, including both representatives from the three local postsecondary educational institutions and citizens concerned about providing education for low-income single parents. The board is now developing a plan which will help us raise locally the funds necessary to match what the state has set aside for us.

What We Have Learned

Lots. We know that whatever the modifications we've made, we started out on the right foot. We've learned quite a bit about the obstacles women like our students face when they try to change their lives in major ways. We've learned that what happens to our students in the program causes significant changes in their children, that when our students have to study and write papers for class, their children see them as models and take their own studies more seriously (sometimes the older children come with their parents to the preparatory modules sessions, especially the math classes). We think that what we do can make quite a difference in the attrition rate of nontraditional students who enroll as regular students. We are learning a lot about the importance of helping students to understand how they learn and why they can rely on their own abilities. On the other hand, we learn again and again that values, expectations, and habits that took years and years to develop cannot be changed in the course of a few weeks or months.

We've learned that we don't cause what happens to the students in our program; they do. We don't "teach" them; we don't "enable" them. They are perfectly able themselves. We do set up situations—opportunities and an atmosphere—to which they respond. We offer respect and trust. We know that if our students are to gain any lasting self-respect and self-confidence, they must see that what has happened to them, how they have been treated, is not simply the consequence of their own weaknesses or deficiencies. They must understand that none of us lives as an individual apart from the effects of our society and community, that the tribulations associated with being on AFDC—or the benefits associated with a Ph.D. from Yale—may stem from community attitudes and choices. If, in other words, they are uncertain about their self-respect, it may be in part because the community treats them as though they are not respectable.

Each of our students comes initially alone, nervous, and often fearful. Each who stays chooses to act, to think, to speak—and in so doing, finds shared experiences and knowledge. The courage to respond creates both relationships with others and self-reliance. As we act responsibly toward ourselves, we learn to trust ourselves; as we perceive our inextricable relationships with other people and the natural world, we recognize a larger kind of wholeness, a more complex kind of integrity. Only within that totality does the self, finally, find sufficiency.

3. The "Real World," Women of Color, and the Curriculum at UW–Eau Claire

by Jane M. Pederson

> The tension engendered by my black feminism merely confirmed the fact that boundaries between the classroom and the real world "out there" were virtually nonexistent .
> Marilyn Sanders Mobley[1]

My recent participation in the Women of Color in the Curriculum (WOCC) project clarified for me the many implications of the "real world" construction of race and gender for our curriculum, course content, and institutional and classroom experiences. Negative images and privileged identities assert themselves in often hurtful and volatile ways in the educational process as they do in our society as a whole. These are the issues that the Ford Foundation's Women of Color in the Curriculum project has attempted to address.

The Grant

During the summer of 1989 before my teaching position began at UW–Eau Claire, Lee Grugel, the dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, called to invite me to represent UW–Eau Claire as one of the two coordinators of the Women of Color in the Curriculum project. This was my first introduction to the Ford Foundation WOCC project, which was national in scope. While the grant originally targeted faculty at major research institutions such as Columbia and UCLA, the University of Wisconsin–Madison proposal included the entire UW System. With one exception, all the UW System institutions participated. Coordinators of this project attended six workshops held at UW–Madison on Fridays and Saturdays during the 1989–90 academic year. Nationally-known scholars in a variety of topical and disciplinary specializations directed each of these two-day WOCC workshops, where they introduced recent theories and scholarship about women of color including African American, Native American, Asian American, and Hispanic women. In advance of each workshop, we received extensive readings which familiarized us with the issues and literature and made it possible to have some hard and hair-raising discussions.

As campus coordinators we had the responsibility, as defined by Dean Grugel and the grant, to organize workshops for UW–Eau Claire faculty and transfer the new scholarship and ideas about women of color to them. Faculty in

turn were to revise their syllabi in light of new scholarship, provide model syllabi incorporating women of color to their departments and curriculum committees, and act as resource persons for their departments on women of color. Faculty involved at this level included three from English including Karen Welch (also a coordinator), two from history including myself, two from sociology, one from nursing, one from social work, and two from psychology (who later dropped out).

The Workshops

At our opening workshop, we invited all interested faculty; about 40 people attended. Few had the time for the level of commitment necessary for course revision, but in light of the level of interest we organized two different groups of workshops: six workshops were held with those committed to course revision, and three for those who wanted information. Thus over the year, we organized two three-hour workshops on Saturdays, and six two-to-three-hour afternoon and evening workshops. For these workshops, the readings and bibliographies provided by the workshop consultants in Madison were copied and distributed. We formally presented many of the ideas and the information distilled from readings and workshops, and facilitated the discussion of the issues.

In addition to the Madison workshops, each of the West Central Wisconsin Consortium (WCWC) institutions (UW–Eau Claire, UW–La Crosse, UW–Stout, UW–River Falls) arranged for campus workshops with distinguished scholars to which all faculty participants of the WOCC project were invited. In the planning stage of this project before I became involved, the WCWC women's studies coordinators had agreed that each would arrange one of these workshops. In order to fulfill UW–Eau Claire's commitment to this plan, I wrote and was awarded a Faculty Development and Curriculum Improvement Grant to bring Rayna Green, a distinguished scholar of Native American culture and history, to UW–Eau Claire for our WOCC workshop on Native American women. About 60 to 70 faculty attended the workshop with Rayna Greene, including faculty from all the WCWC institutions. Another high point of the project was Johnella Butler's workshop at UW–La Crosse.

Significance of the Project

What does all this mean for UW–Eau Claire, the history department, and for myself? A great deal. The WOCC project has been a catalyst on many levels. First, coordinating the WOCC project has been the most challenging task that I have undertaken in my academic career. It was like going to graduate school in an interdisciplinary program and then teaching in the same program in three or four disciplines at the same time—but not teaching undergraduates or even graduate students but rather my academic peers. The nature of the scholarship meant that it was an intellectually intense, exciting, and demanding experience; the realities of the lives of the women of color who were our consultants and whose culture and history was the subject of study also meant that it was an emotionally intense experience as well. As a first-year faculty member at UW–Eau Claire, I found attending and coordinating the WOCC workshops challenged all my capacities and skills as an organizer, intellectual teacher, and human being.

The WOCC project is an exciting and important project that reflects new scholarship and theory and should reshape course content, teaching strategies, and curricula. Why are the scholarship and pedagogical issues raised by the WOCC project so important? Because when women of color are included in any kind of analysis—be it sociological, literary, psychological, or historical—when you grasp the dynamics of their reality, you must grapple with the "whole story." One stretches to the reality of the most marginalized population deeply in need of visibility and the tools of survival. To understand their circumstances, the entire culture, economy, and structure of power must be delineated. The WOCC project offered real insights on how to begin to teach diversity in its most inclusive form.

Those of us working in American social history for over 20 years have understood the different point of view. The consequences of that research is transforming historical interpretations in dramatic ways. Presently research on women of color is at the cutting edge of women's history, and historians of ethnicity are awakening to the consequences for their understanding if they exclude women from much of the analysis. Gender, race, and class are categories of analysis which social historians can no longer respectably neglect. Inclusion can transform the entire framework of understanding, as Patricia Limerick dramatically demonstrated in her powerful new synthesis of the meaning of the frontier as a "legacy of conquest" rather than a "legacy of freedom." Inclusion of the story of all of the people compels a transformed vision.

What does a project like this mean to students who are women of color? We have heard from many of them over the last year. The pressures on them are overwhelming, their anguish is difficult even to witness, their stories of marginalization outraging, their courage and achievement both stunning and humbling to those of us who listened. Scholarship, course content, and classroom climate issues are critical to them. At the recent session of the 15th annual women's studies conference, "Teaching About Women of Color: A Progress Report," a Potawatomee woman and student of one of the WOCC participants tried to explain her view of the new course's significance to women of color. As so often happened for the students to whom we listened, she tried but could not contain the high emotions. "She gave me my life" was about all she could say.

Understanding their own social, political, economic, and cultural reality is for some women of color, as Rayna Green argued, an issue of personal survival, not to mention cultural survival. As I see it as a teacher and scholar, these are questions both of accuracy and morality.

WOCC and the Institutional Setting

In some disciplines, junior faculty who have been in graduate schools in the last decade may already be well acquainted with the issues of gender and ethnic diversity. This was certainly true of many of those involved in WOCC at UW–Eau Claire and elsewhere. These small numbers of junior faculty, however, cannot carry the responsibility for diversity alone. We face potential resistance from both colleagues and students. Just to do our jobs as we know they should be done leaves some faculty feeling like conspirators. On other campuses where senior faculty were involved, the coordinators faced difficult conflicts and tensions. The

WOCC project at UW-Eau Claire included only what could be called the converted among the junior faculty.

What can the administration and departments do about these realities as we pursue our quest for diversity? The workshop brought to the fore some very hard questions that must be addressed institutionally if there are going to be effective changes. Faculty who transform content and pedagogy related to issues of gender and race take real risks. A constant theme of this project was the resistance, hostility, and tension that develops in the classroom when issues of gender, race, and class are raised. There are no easy or quick ways to find effective strategies to counter these responses. The classroom may even be more problematic among students as homogeneous and limited in their exposure to cultural diversity as those at UW-Eau Claire. The level of resistance in the classroom is no doubt directly correlated with the need for this kind of exposure. But for faculty and students this can be tough going. We have repeatedly been told student evaluations will slide. To make this all work comfortably in classes targeted by the WOCC project—freshman-level classes—is a daunting task indeed. My own experience tells me upper-level students and graduate students are very receptive. Freshmen or sophomores in introductory classes, which they are taking merely to meet requirements, respond very differently. It will take time, tolerance, risk-taking, and commitment to make it work. As Lana F. Rakow, a WOCC participant from UW-Parkside, explained in the December 1990 Teaching Forum, "What happens to this kind of classroom cannot be predicted, nor can the pedagogical approach that is appropriate be learned through any kind of 'cookbook' approach to teaching methods." Faculty attempting this need to know they will have support in the face of student resistance.

For a social historian consistently raising issues of gender, race and class, the workshops offered the first forum in which I have received any hints at all as to how to defuse classroom tensions. In fact, the workshops made me aware of the sources of problems which I had never explicitly considered. Why was it, that in the final weeks of the semester, when we discussed the civil rights and feminist movements, my classroom climate suddenly became notably chillier for me and, I now realize, for many of the students? Like Lana and other WOCC participants, I am now working on conceptual and classroom approaches "hoping to derive better ways to deal with the conflicts and resistance and to come out the other side of the semester less bruised, our identities more intact..."

But as Lana also pointed out, individual effort is not enough:

> Faculty need institutional support. The colleges and universities in which we teach generally express their approval of teachers who do not take risks in the classroom, who do not re-think the content and format of their courses, who do not address the potentially explosive social relations of their classrooms, who speak and encourage the dominant discourse that silences and explains away most people of the world, including many of those represented in their own classrooms.[2]

Lana's remarks remind me of an experience at a previous institution at which I taught. When we were discussing the American survey class, a popular and award-winning teacher (who supposedly knew that of which he spoke) said: "The students just do not like this social history stuff." Teaching traditional topics in history in traditional ways brought success. From his point of view, why should he change?

A related issue of which UW System institutions need to be mindful is the consequences not just of content issues and the classroom, but of students' responses to faculty who are people of color and women. Students bring into the classroom their cultural values and judgments. As one scholar and teacher, Marilyn Sanders Mobley, a woman of color, concluded:

> [B]oundaries between the classroom and the real world 'out there' are virtually non-existent. The shifting notions of marginality, privilege and authority were operative not only in class but in my relationship to my colleagues in the department, to people of color who worked in the offices and in maintenance, and to the administrative staff.

Students will respond to faculty based on their background. In a society that devalues women and especially women of color, there will be classroom dynamics operating quite differently from those where the faculty member is a white male. Research substantiates that this will influence student evaluations. Department chairs and administrators need to understand this as they seek to diversify their faculty. Student evaluations used as a key guide to assess the quality of teaching become a tool which uses the biases of students to legitimate discrimination in salary and tenure.

The Future of WOCC

In September of 1990, I attended a follow-up WOCC workshop which also included the interviews by the Ford Foundation's Evaluation Team. As it happened, I was the last person interviewed from the UW System institutions. They informed me that they had consistently found that the WOCC project had been demanding and stressful for everyone they interviewed. However, they also were amazed at how much had been done with the minimal resources made available in Wisconsin. The overloaded teaching faculty of the UW System appeared to have done as much or more than other states where among other things coordinators were given release time for their WOCC work. They also recommended that we should ask for release time to recover lost ground in our scholarship. The Ford Foundation's evaluators were very impressed with what was done at the cluster campuses in Wisconsin and are in the process of discussing where to focus future resources. They clearly indicated that in Wisconsin they had achieved the "biggest bang for the buck."

The task of continuing curricular transformation on the topic of women of color is a large one. Institutionally, thought should be given to applying for major grants for curricular transformation related to gender and race similar to those that have been received by other institutions. WOCC has clarified issues of race and gender—issues of course content, curriculum, classroom, and institutional climate for students and faculty—which once raised cannot be ignored. The project has been an important beginning, but only a beginning. For this critical work to continue and in order to meet our student and faculty needs at UW–Eau Claire and perhaps throughout the system, women's studies resources and faculty must be strengthened, and gender and race issues must be institutionally addressed.

NOTES

1. Marilyn Sanders Mobley, "In a contrary voice· when black women critics cross boundaries," *The Women's Review of Books*, 8:5 (February 1991).
2. Lana F. Rakow, "Gender and Race in the Classroom: Teaching Way Out of Line," *Teaching Forum*, 12:5 (December 1990).

4. Women on the Margin: College Women Who Have A Disability

by Mary Hopkins-Best, Ann Yurcisin and Shirley Murphy

Introduction

There was nothing unique about the way women students who had disabilities were treated at UW–Stout in the early 1980s. While there were and still are support services for students who have disabilities, the enrollment, retention, reaction from peers and professors, and placement rates at UW–Stout indicated a dual discrimination reflective of being female and having a disability. This essay provides background information about dual discrimination and a three year project at UW–Stout that addressed the unique needs of women students with disabilities.

Background

Research done at UW–Stout in 1982 revealed that within the total labor force of 16- to 64-year-old workers, women with a work disability had the highest unemployment rate of any category.[1] Women with disabilities were overrepresented in social and human service fields such as counseling, teaching, and rehabilitation—lower paid fields with fewer advancement opportunities compared to higher paid fields of business, engineering, and computer science.[2] Women with disabilities were also overrepresented in clerical positions and underrepresented in administrative and technical fields.[3] Even the most current national population survey revealed that only 27 percent of work-disabled women participate in the labor force compared to 69 percent of nondisabled women and 32 percent of all adults with disabilities.[4]

Disabled women students at UW–Stout reflected these national trends: they were overrepresented in the human service majors, had a higher than average drop-out rate, and had difficulty securing employment after graduation. For example, a hearing-impaired woman who graduated in special education with academic honors and an excellent student teaching recommendation was interviewed countless times, but received no teaching job offer after a year of searching. She was the only graduate of that program who did not have a job-in-major within three months after graduation.

The Problem

Why do women who have a disability experience more education and employment difficulty than women in general, and than men who have a disability?

Consider the stereotypical labels often applied to women: dependent, helpless, vulnerable, undependable, subservient. People who have disabilities are frequently saddled with these same stereotypes, so women who have a disability often encounter compounded discrimination in employment and education.[4] "The age-old cliche of men treating women as beings which should be cosseted and pampered is compounded when that same woman happens to be disabled."[5]

A woman with a disability may also contribute to her own education and employment difficulties, particularly if she did not develop appropriate independence in her youth. Many families of girls who have a disability encourage unnecessary dependency behaviors, albeit usually with good intentions. Ruffner (1981) found that employment problems were often caused by inadequate job-seeking skills rather than the attitudes of the employer. Campling (1981) reported that "women in general find it easier to accept a disability since it is still a widely accepted norm that women are dependent on men economically."

College women who have a disability need the same skills and coping mechanisms as all students, but also need unique skills to overcome the discrimination and self-defeating behaviors they may experience during their education and as they move from education to employment. These needs provided the rationale for developing a program to provide career education for women with disabilities at UW–Stout. The project training goals described later in this essay reflect those unique needs.

The Project

Personnel: The "Career Education for College Women with Disabilities" project was funded in 1983 at UW–Stout by the Educational Equity Act program of the U.S. Department of Education. The three year project was cooperatively administered by the School of Education and student services division. The project staff included the director of special education, the director of the office of services for students with disabilities, and a full-time project assistant with an M.S. in counseling. An advisory committee of business women, counselors, educators, and women students with disabilities provided project direction and oversight.

Participants: Women were recruited through the office of services for students with disabilities at UW–Stout. Thirty women, from a pool of 100 eligible women, chose to participate in the project. The group included women with hearing and visual impairments, mobility impairments, epilepsy, learning disabilities, emotional disturbances, and alcoholism. They were enrolled in fashion merchandising, psychology, vocational rehabilitation, special education, and business majors; they ranged in age from 18 to 35.

Goals: The major goal of the project was to help the participants develop the skills and competencies to deal with the dual discrimination they would encounter in their careers and to provide a strong support system and facilitative environment that would foster risk taking and personal growth. Skill development seminars focused on career exploration, self-assessment, assertiveness behavior, and job-seeking and job-keeping skills.

Career exploration, with an emphasis on nontraditional careers, provided the women with an expanded view of the opportunities and options available to them. Program participants tended to have selected their majors based on the opinion of significant people such as rehabilitation counselors, teachers, and parents. In many cases these majors were in the human service area, especially in disability-related fields. It was assumed that because of their disabilities, the women would work well with other disabled individuals, regardless of their interests or aptitudes. Self-assessment became a critical part of the project to encourage women to select college majors consistent with their career interests and aptitudes and because self-awareness fosters self-confidence and assertive behavior. Learning and demonstrating assertive behavior further enhanced the independence and job-seeking skills of the women. Emphasis was also placed on developing resumes, learning interviewing techniques, developing a professional image, and preparing for when and how to reveal information about disabilities.

Related project goals included increasing campus and community awareness and acceptance, involvement in career development for disabled women, and dissemination of the training model.

Methodology: The women participated in monthly seminars, weekly small group meetings, and weekly individual counseling. The large group seminars often involved guest speakers who were successful career women with disabilities as role models. The topics addressed included: assessment and self-awareness activities, legal rights, resume development, job interviewing, professional image, nontraditional careers, networking, coping mechanisms, and resources. Experiential learning was stressed in all activities. For example, the job-seeking unit included a televised professional image style show where the women modeled interviewing outfits they had selected. Cooperative learning was used to foster interindependence within the group; groups critiqued and developed strategies for responding to media portrayals of disabled women as depe. dent and sick. Group feedback was always used to develop leadership and collaboration skills. For example, after role playing job interviews with community employers, the individual, the employer, and the entire group critiqued the interviews. Role models had a very significant effect in the training. For the first time, many of the participants were introduced to women with similar disabilities who were living independent, fulfilling, adult lives. Role models were selected who would share personal insight about growing up with a disability, making career choices, and overcoming barriers.

During the weekly small group sessions, participants had the opportunity to further explore the topics addressed in the monthly training sessions. The small group sessions facilitated by the staff counselor allowed women the opportunity to more safely share their feelings. Topics typically explored during these sessions included the experiences related to growing up with or acquiring a disability, sexuality, family issues such as breaking away to become an independent adult, risk taking, and exercises in stress reduction. A frequent discussion during these sessions related to the similar concerns all women have and the unique issues facing women with disabilities. Many of the participants had never experienced typical female "rites of passage" such as pajama parties, dating, etc. The weekly support group resulted in the formation of a local chapter of the national H.O.W. organization (Handicapped Organized Women).

The individual counseling sessions provided opportunities for self-assessment and personal growth. For example, the participants were involved in more inten-

sive self-assessment by taking and analyzing the results from the Strong Campbell Interest Inventory and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Each woman also developed a comprehensive career plan during the counseling sessions.

Project Impact

Impact on the Participants: Participants evaluated the effectiveness of the project through seminar evaluations and narrative evaluations. While all seminars were rated as significantly important (above a mean of 3 on a 5-point Likert scale), the seminars viewed as most important included: Identifying and Overcoming Career Barriers; Assertive Behavior; Job Market Information; Employer Expectations; Transition to Work: Job-Seeking Skills; Nontraditional Occupations, and Professional Image. The overall impact on the participants was increased self-confidence as revealed by the following quotations from the narrative evaluations.

"I learned a lot about myself—what I can do to remove barriers that may be in my way," noted one woman. Another felt she had "a lot more confidence now." A college senior said, "I think being in the group has given me the confidence to focus on my positive points even though I have a disability." A younger participant stated, "I realized that people with disabilities are not frowned upon, but rather are respected by the majority of people in the community. Are we defeated only by ourselves?" A returning adult student stated "I've learned to accept my disability and overcome the denial. . . to be more patient and understanding of people who don't understand my disability." One woman expressed the feeling of many participants by stating that the project had given her the "courage to face the unknown."

While the project did not provide funding for long-term follow-up of participants, most of the women still retain contact with the staff. Based on this informal follow-up, the staff estimates that over 65 percent of the women are employed in their chosen field.

University and Community Impact: Many UW-Stout faculty and staff were utilized as consultants during the project. Through their involvement they became more aware of the needs of the women. Also, campus-wide in-service on the career needs of women with disabilities was provided by the staff. A direct outcome of this project was development of a three credit graduate course for guidance counselors, Career Preparation for Disabled Girls. As of 1991 this course has already been completed by 30 counselors in northwestern Wisconsin. The staff have also consulted with the staff of the Wisconsin Equity project in the areas of assessment of high school programs for gender and disability equity, and project staff members have presented at several of the annual state equity conferences.

The project continues to influence campus policy and practice. Cooperative education, available through the university career services office, has expanded its programming to recruit more disabled students to enroll. At the completion of the project, the woman who had been the full-time project coordinator was hired as a counselor at the university. In that capacity she continues to work with many college women who have a disability.

Development of a Training Guide: At the completion of the project, the project staff coauthored the book *Reaching the Hidden Majority, A*

Leader's Guide to Career Preparation for Disabled Women and Girls. This book, published by The Carroll Press, includes all of the training activities utilized in the project, plus additional suggestions for career development activities, and an annotated bibliography of career development resources for disabled women.

NOTES

1. J.M. McNeil, *Labor Force Status and other Characteristics of Person with a Disability* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982).
2. R.H. Ruffner, "Just where's the barrier? A new look at employer attitudes," *Disabled U.S.A.*, 4:10 (1981), pp. 3-6.
3. E. Fiorito, "Severely disabled women in the federal work force," *Programs for the Handicapped* (ISSNO565-2804; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1982).
4. J. Campling, *Images of Ourselves: Women with Disabilities Talking* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981).
5. Ibid.

5. Collaborating for Change: The UW System Women's Studies Consortium

by Jacqueline Ross and Susan Kahn

The development of women's studies programming in Wisconsin recently reached a milestone when the UW System vice president for academic affairs, with the support of the institutions' vice chancellors, decided to allocate permanent funding to the system's Women's Studies Consortium. This decision marks the culmination of years of cooperation among women's studies faculty and programs throughout the system. It also lends credence to the premise underlying that cooperation—that by working together, women's studies programs can be more effective and influential than any single program working alone.

This paper traces the development of the cooperative and collaborative activities that resulted in the establishment of a systemwide Women's Studies Consortium with a permanent funding base. This development can be envisioned as taking place in, roughly, three phases: an early period of networking and information-sharing that helped support the growth of campus women's studies programs and that saw the beginnings of formal collaborative efforts among those programs; a period of more concerted planning and effort among institutional faculty and programs to establish the consortium as an official administrative entity; and the first several years of the consortium's operation as a pilot program. We will discuss each of these phases in turn.

The Early Years

Fundamental to the development of the Women's Studies Consortium was the administrative structure provided by the 1971 merger of the University of Wisconsin with the Wisconsin State Universities to create a single system of public higher education in the state of Wisconsin. The early years of the merged system coincided with the beginnings of women's studies as an academic field and with the creation of the first women's studies courses and programs in the nation and the state. At the instigation of UW-Madison's association of faculty women, a number of women interested in gender issues took advantage of the linkages made possible by the new state university system to form the systemwide coordinating council of women in higher education. Working with sympathetic faculty members and administrators throughout the system, the council began lobbying for women's equality in all areas of university life, including academic programs.

As a result of the council's activities, the UW System vice president for academic affairs appointed a system-level task force on women's studies to advise the system on program development. Basing its arguments on language in the UW System mission statement that emphasized the importance of "providing new approaches to the search for truth" and of "developing in students heightened intellectual, cultural, and humane sensitivities," the task force recommended that every system institution initiate a women's studies program. That recommendation became regent policy in 1974.

An instrumental leader and orchestrator of these early efforts was Dr. Karen Merritt, at that time an academic planner in the UW System office of academic affairs. As campuses plunged into the business of organizing women's studies programs, Karen began convening regular meetings of the directors of these programs. At the meetings, the directors exchanged information and ideas on curriculum and course development as well as strategies for attracting resources and enhancing the status of the sometimes beleaguered programs.

Systemwide networking soon led to more formal system-level program initiatives. The office of academic affairs began publishing an annual UW System women's studies directory with information on programs, course offerings, enrollments, and contact people. An annual UW System women's studies conference, organized and held on a different campus each year, enabled faculty and students to share ideas and research results and to maintain connections across campus and institutional boundaries. Perhaps most important of all, this period saw the creation of the office of the UW System women's studies librarian. Several years in the making, this office was instituted on a permanent basis in 1977. It has since proved invaluable to the continued development of the campus women's studies programs and has become a national and international bibliographical resource in the field of women's studies. All three of these programs, now under the oversight of the consortium, continue to make important contributions to the work of women's studies programs systemwide.

Planning the Consortium

The cooperative efforts mentioned above gave crucial visibility and prestige to women's studies within the UW System and provided further linkages among the campus programs. During this period, the early and mid-1980s, the UW System began developing several system-level grant and other programs aimed at responding to systemwide needs and making the most of fiscal resources. In this environment, when the Board of Regents decided in 1986 to request funding to support a group of "centers of excellence," several women's studies directors had the idea of using the initiative as a vehicle to launch a permanent office responsible for planning and coordinating women's studies activities at the system level.

With seed money from the system's Undergraduate Teaching Improvement Council, a small group of women worked together for close to a year developing a proposal for a Women's Studies Consortium that would administer existing system-level programs and initiate new activities in such areas as curriculum reform, research, and outreach. They argued that an investment in a permanent consortium would reap substantial returns in the form of extramural grant dollars and that such a consortium could serve as an innovative model for similar efforts in

other states. In the spring of 1986, the Board of Regents approved the proposal, designating the consortium a center of excellence.

This success was followed, at least initially, by disappointment. The state legislature saw little merit in the centers of excellence concept and voted not to fund the regents' initiative. But by this time the concept of a system-level Women's Studies Consortium had taken on a momentum of its own and, because of the "center of excellence" designation, had gained important visibility and credibility among campus and system administrators. The time seemed ripe to pursue alternative possibilities for funding the consortium.

The women's studies administrators thus decided to request funds to support a consortium office from the system's vice president for academic affairs. In making this request, they argued that funding the consortium would increase the potential for attracting external grant dollars to support women's studies programming in the system. They pointed to system priorities that could be effectively addressed by such a consortium—for example, expanding the pool of women and minorities pursuing majors and careers in science and technology. They noted that consortial programs, by their very nature, would have a great impact for relatively little money, and they described specific initiatives to be undertaken with the proposed funding. At the same time, the administrators approached their individual campus vice chancellors to request their support for the concept of a central consortium office.

After conducting a formal evaluation of the consortium and bringing in an outside consultant to evaluate its potential, the vice president agreed to allocate modest funding for a pilot consortium office and to request additional funding support from the vice chancellors, who granted it. In the spring of 1989, the consortium appointed Jacqueline Ross, professor of English and founder of the women's studies program at UW–Platteville, to the position of director. That summer, the real work of the consortium began.

Establishing the Consortium

Once the appointment of the director was made, the impetus for establishing the consortium on a permanent basis gathered further momentum. An executive committee—consisting of women's studies administrators from the two doctoral institutions, the four-year institutions, UW Centers, and UW–Extension as well as the office of the UW System women's studies librarian—was also appointed by the acting vice president for academic affairs. Together, the director and the executive committee began working on a number of collaborative initiatives aimed at gaining support for the consortium systemwide. For the sake of history and the consequent lessons, it is instructive to examine a few salient examples of these early initiatives and how they were carried out. The women's studies administrators and the director were faced with "selling" the consortium at a time when the university was under severe budgetary pressures. An additional challenge involved convincing administrators that women's studies should be regarded as central to the mainstream of university education.

With these concerns in mind, the director and the executive committee established women and science as a major priority. Aware of the UW System's goal of increasing the numbers of women and minorities in scientific fields, the consortium developed a key initiative, Women and Science Days, in support of

this goal. The initiative was also aimed at enhancing the visibility of the women's studies program on the campuses and demonstrating the consortium's ability to mount a major systemwide program.

Pulling together $15,000 from a number of sources, the director asked campuses to submit proposals for day-long events aimed at attracting middle and high school girls to science education and careers. Using this cost-effective collaborative approach, the consortium was able to offer the campuses the opportunity to host distinguished women scientists as part of this event. As it turned out, eighteen campuses participated in this initiative, which attracted over 2,000 women in the spring of 1990. In addition to talks by such scientists as Sue Rosser, Ann Fausto-Sterling, and Jane Butler Kahle, these programs also featured such activities as career seminars, tours of laboratories, and hands-on demonstrations of laser and other technologies.

The success of Women and Science Days attracted the attention of many faculty and administrators—including those in the male-dominated scientific fields—to feminist education. As a follow-up during the 1990–91 academic year, the consortium sponsored, in addition to another series of Women and Science Days, training workshops in the sciences featuring Sheila Tobias. By strengthening the links between women's studies programs, science departments, and outreach units on each campus, the consortium began to institutionalize its women and science initiative. Continuing with this approach, the consortium developed a "Women's Studies and the Sciences" grant, to be funded by the National Science Foundation, which will provide nine campuses in the UW System with visiting professors who have expertise in gender and science.

Building on the linkages established as the result of Women and Science Days, the consortium developed a pilot systemwide outreach program on women and the economy, which was funded by UW-Extension. Called "Self-Sufficiency for Women, Prosperity for All," the program is in the process of developing and implementing projects throughout the state that address the economic situation of women in the state of Wisconsin—from education and career training to health care and family issues. Through these projects, which will eventually involve most of the campuses in the UW System, the consortium hopes to influence policy-makers, work with providers, and, at the same time, provide low-income women with knowledge to help them overcome the barriers preventing their independence.

Perhaps the most far-reaching initiative with which the consortium has been involved brought eight feminist scholars from the Soviet Republics to Wisconsin in October 1991. The impetus for the initiative began in the spring of 1990 when two Soviet women, on a visit to Madison, asked if the UW System could help them introduce women's studies into what was then called the Soviet Union. In the fall of that year, Jacqueline Ross and Marian Swoboda, assistant to the president of the UW System for equal opportunity programs and policy studies, traveled to Moscow, where they met and signed a memorandum of agreement with representatives from the Soviet women's committee as well as the Institute of Philosophy and the Center for Gender Studies of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. The consortium devoted much of the following year to developing plans and seeking funds for a two-week-long visit by leading Soviet women scholars and feminists. Despite the dramatic historical events which shook the Soviet Union and the related crises that affected their professional and personal lives that fall, the Soviet women arrived as scheduled.

As it turned out, the year of meticulous planning resulted in a program which was memorable for all involved and which promises to lead to important future exchanges with the Soviets. The visit began with a thought-provoking conference at Wingspread, sponsored by the Johnson Foundation, where representatives from each institution in the UW System joined with national scholars and the Soviets to discuss developing curriculum, research, and outreach in women's studies. After the conference, the Soviets spent the following several days at a total of nineteen UW campuses, visiting classes and meeting with faculty, administrators, and community leaders involved with women's issues. In addition, they participated in public forums sponsored by the Wisconsin humanities committee, speaking on a wide variety of topics relating to the status of women in the Soviet Republics. Several of them spoke on radio and television programs, and all were interviewed by newspapers throughout the state. They were also featured at the UW System annual women's studies conference, held at UW–Milwaukee. Their trip concluded with an intensive program, including seminars in feminist theory, hosted by UW–Madison's women's studies program and Women's Studies Research Center.

At the conclusion of the visit, an agreement was signed between the consortium and representatives of the three sponsoring Soviet organizations regarding future exchange programs. It was agreed that a joint steering committee would be formed to further plan and carry out the ideas discussed in the course of the Soviets' stay. Developing this initiative will continue to be one of the consortium's goals in the future.

It seems reasonable to suggest that, by November 1991, the consortium had demonstrated its ability to deliver high quality programs systemwide by stretching its shoestring budget. The test came that month when Vice President for Academic Affairs Stephen R. Portch, already a strong supporter of the consortium, proposed to the vice chancellors that the consortium be funded and staffed on a permanent basis. In preparation for that meeting, the women's studies administrators, by now skilled politicians as well as academics, mobilized their efforts on behalf of the consortium, conveying their support to their vice chancellors. Clearly, these and the other efforts of the past two years must have been convincing since the vice chancellors supported the consortium. For the first time, the consortium has a stable basis from which to operate.

The Future

As to the future, the consortium has already identified several initiatives which it wishes to pursue. In addition to those already mentioned are several others—including promoting curricular reform and developing the women's studies audiovisual collection—all of which will require extramural funding. While the status of the consortium seems to be secure, the measure of its success may well depend on its ability to raise funds to support its goals. In addition, the consortium will have to build upon the linkages developed during its formative stages and develop stronger and more effective relationships with the nonacademic as well as the academic community. Perhaps most important, the women's studies administrators, while maintaining the autonomy of their own programs, will continue to work effectively together through consensus—providing a model of effective interinstitutional cooperation.

6. Women's Studies Librarian

by Sue Searing

"Librarian-at-large," the original job title for the UW System women's studies librarian, signalled the innovative nature and wide-ranging responsibilities of the position. Today, as at its founding, the office of the women's studies librarian supports and enriches women's studies research, teaching, and outreach throughout the UW System. This essay surveys the history of, and rationale for, the women's studies librarian, provides an overview of her services, and concludes with a look to the future.

An Idea Takes Shape

Hours spent digging through old office files have failed to pinpoint the precise moment when the "librarian-at-large" concept was born. Clearly, the idea reflects the creativity and nontraditional thinking that invigorated academic feminism in the 1970s. The emerging field of women's studies was causing severe bibliographic headaches which an expert librarian seemed best prepared to cure. Every nascent academic discipline passes through stages in the growth of its literature base, and the early years—before the appearance of specialized journals, indexes, authoritative reference works, and regular reviews—are typically a difficult period for students writing papers, librarians building collections, and faculty compiling course reading lists and shaping research agendas. There is no "bibliographic control," as librarians call it.

Women's studies presented additional complicating factors. From the outset the field drew on theories and methods from a range of intellectual traditions in the humanities and social sciences. On a practical level, this meant that pioneering writings in women's studies were scattered across the familiar channels of scholarly communication. Information was dispersed in libraries, shelved under a bewildering range of call numbers. Moreover, women's studies was inextricably linked to the women's movement, and thus built upon a nonacademic knowledge base as well. Women's newspapers, newsletters of activist organizations, and books from small women-owned presses played a critical role in keeping feminists informed, yet these materials were often overlooked by academics. Furthermore, by foregrounding gender as a category of analysis, women's studies spotlighted sexism in subject catalogs and classification systems, and thus made library use even more frustrating for the alert researcher. Feminist scholars on UW campuses realized that someone with dual expertise in feminist studies and library/information science—in short, a women's studies librarian—could help faculty, students, and librarians identify relevant resources despite these obstacles.

Why was the position envisioned as systemwide, when no other librarian in the UW serves more than one campus? The inclusive approach acknowledged the varying resources of smaller and larger campuses and strove to counter the political mistrust that lingered from the merger of the state's higher education systems in 1971. Beyond that, it was a pragmatic embodiment of the feminist ideals of cooperation and networking. A librarian accountable to all the campuses, with an adequate travel and telephone budget, could respond flexibly to differing needs. Furthermore, she would signal the interest of UW System administrators in the strengthening of women's studies programs; she could play the role of advocate in meetings with chancellors, vice chancellors, and library directors.

Getting Off the Ground

Transforming a good idea into a functioning, funded program is seldom a smooth process. Karen Merritt, formerly of the UW System office of academic affairs, recollects how a group of women embarked on a program of self-education about the UW's fiscal process. Having delved into the mysteries of budget proposals and back-room politicking, the study group decided to push through a new program of their own design, couched in the standard language of a Decision Item Narrative, or DIN. When the first proposal for a women's studies librarian-at-large was floated in the mid-1970s, it was endorsed by the UW System task force on women's studies and the Board of Regents, and became part of the university's biennial budget request for 1975–77. The women's studies librarian-at-large became a vivid demonstration of the ability of feminists to influence budget decisions and marshall university funds for women's needs.[1]

Unfortunately, the new program (like all new programs in that biennium) was squelched by the governor's office. Disappointed but hardly defeated, faculty and librarians mobilized to accomplish some of the goals they had formulated for the women's studies librarian. They convened a statewide conference on the development of library resources for women's studies, generated lists of women-related materials held at each campus, and compiled a core list of essential books, based on faculty recommendations.[2] By 1977, however, it was clear that the limits of voluntary collective action had been reached. The directors of women's studies programs throughout the system persuaded the vice president for academic affairs to fund the women's studies librarian-at-large position as a pilot project.

The librarian's office came to be housed in Memorial Library on the UW–Madison campus, first as an adjunct to the statewide Wisconsin inter-library services office and later as a unit within the General Library System of UW–Madison. The original job title, "women's studies librarian-at-large," aptly labelled a program that reached out to all twenty-six UW campuses and Extension, with a further mandate to offer information services at the state and national levels.

Shortly after the pilot funding was announced, an advisory panel was appointed, consisting of women's studies program directors, faculty, librarians, a member of System Administration, and a student. Among the early advisors who sustained an involvement in the office over many years were Edith Bjorklund (UW–Milwaukee), Alice Randlett (UW–Stevens Point), and Jacqueline Ross (UW–Platteville). Karen Merritt (UW System Administration) and Nancy Marshall

(UW–Madison General Library System) acted as twin guiding lights, scraping together money and resources and providing unstinting mentoring and moral support. The panel assisted the librarian-at-large in formulating and implementing policy, recommended new services and projects, and dispensed frank advice on coping with procedures and personalities within the system.[3]

Into this supportive environment came Esther Stineman, the first women's studies librarian-at-large, in the fall of 1977. In her nineteen-month tenure in the position, Esther tackled several major projects. The creation of a union catalog of women's studies materials—an author and subject card catalog of books and other library holdings throughout the System—permitted Esther and her staff to conduct subject searches for individuals and to compile reading lists on current topics. She also engineered the purchase of the *History of Women* microfilm collection as a systemwide resource. This mammoth, expensive set is a rich repository of primary sources. Housed in Memorial Library on the Madison campus, reels of the set are easily obtained on interlibrary loan by users elsewhere in the state. The purchase price included printed indexes for each campus.

With the assistance of Catherine Loeb, Esther expanded and annotated the core bibliography of women's studies books. This effort resulted in *Women's Studies: A Recommended Core Bibliography*, a groundbreaking guide to 1,763 books and periodicals deemed essential to undergraduate library collections supporting women's studies courses.[4]

Not limiting herself to traditional printed means of disseminating information, Esther obtained a grant from the system's Undergraduate Teaching Improvement Council to produce a series of slide-tape shows collectively titled "Where Are the Women?" to illustrate the specific problems and intrinsic rewards of researching women in the social sciences, history, and the humanities. The slide-tapes are available on interlibrary loan from Karrmann Library, UW–Platteville.

In addition to these large and visible projects, Esther laid the foundation of reference assistance, library user education, and faculty/librarian networking that undergirds all the office's ongoing services. Her exhausting schedule of campus visits and public presentations guaranteed that the needs of librarians, faculty, students, and staff at UW campuses were heard, and that word of the new librarian-at-large spread quickly throughout the state.

Esther's successor, Linda Parker, used her three-year tenure to strengthen the network of women's studies scholars and librarians in Wisconsin and to maintain an active program of public service, enhancing rather than duplicating reference and instruction functions at the UW libraries. Linda embraced wholeheartedly the goal of the librarian-at-large that reads "to establish the University of Wisconsin System as a national leader in the discipline of women's studies." She became an activist in women's groups in the American Library Association and organized librarians into a task force within the National Women's Studies Association. She spoke in a variety of forums about the office and its projects and stressed the critical need for academic libraries to acquire and publicize women's materials.

The office entered the automated age when Linda acquired a microcomputer and instituted an online search service. Putting their women's studies expertise to work, the office staff conducted efficient searches in commercial bibliographic data bases. Linda also launched a national ad hoc group to develop an electronic

data base in women's studies, an effort later backed by the National Council for Research on Women.

Filling in the Gaps: Librarian as Publisher

The expansion of the office's publication program, nurtured by Catherine Loeb, also occurred during Linda's tenure. As the office became better known to students and researchers, regular publications proved the most efficient means of communicating information about print and audiovisual resources. The publications rapidly became the centerpiece of the women's studies librarian's services.

New Books on Women & Feminism began as a periodic alerting service under Esther Stineman—a "low tech" replication of card catalog records supplied by the Library of Congress. It grew into a formidable annotated bibliography, requiring a huge investment of intellectual labor and gradually falling years behind in coverage, until *New Books* was an embarrassing misnomer. Today, trimmed of its annotations, but enhanced with a thorough subject index, *New Books on Women & Feminism* survives as a semiannual classified guide to current books on all areas of women's studies and women's lives, including fiction and poetry. The most comprehensive serial bibliography in the field, it chronicles over 2,500 English-language titles per year.

Feminist Collections premiered in 1980. This substantive newsletter, now sub-titled "A Quarterly of Women's Studies Resources," has featured review essays by specialists, evaluations of new reference books, reports from UW women's studies programs, descriptions of library collections and archives in Wisconsin and elsewhere, reviews of films and videotapes, announcements of new journals and special issues, profiles of feminist presses and bookstores, interviews with authors and booksellers, and much more.

Feminist Periodicals: A Current Listing of Contents was launched in 1981 to compensate for the slim coverage of women-focused journals and magazines in standard indexes. Today this quarterly service reproduces the tables of contents of more than a hundred periodicals. As acquisitions budgets feel the pinch of rising serial costs, and libraries are forced to cancel subscriptions, *Feminist Periodicals* continues to alert scholars to a wider universe of scholarly and activist writing.

A series of topical reading lists, *Wisconsin Bibliographies in Women's Studies*, has addressed such broad topics as American women's history and such specialized subjects as the mother/daughter motif in adolescent fiction. At this writing, the office distributes some sixty bibliographies compiled by librarians and office staff, contributed by faculty in and outside the UW System, or prepared by students at the UW–Madison School of Library and Information Science. Two substantial bibliographies were created with financial support from outside agencies and individuals. "The History of Women and Science, Health, and Technology" (1988) was prepared with the assistance of Rima D. Apple and several members of the women's caucus of the History of Science Society. "Women, Race, and Ethnicity" (1991) represented a massive in-house effort, resulting in nearly 2,500 annotated entries, topically arranged, on African American, American Indian, Asian/Pacific American, Latina, Euro-American, and Jewish women.

In 1980, the first edition of *Women's Studies in Wisconsin: Who's Who & Where* appeared. The directory, now a biennial in its sixth edition, identifies and

indexes people statewide. In compiling a "who's who" of feminist educators, the office acknowledges that human experts are among the information resources most useful to women's studies students and teachers.

Originally, all office publications were free upon request. As word of these unique resources spread around the country and the world, subscription fees were instituted to keep up with the costs of printing and postage. A two-tiered fee structure guarantees that members of the UW community can continue to subscribe at discounted rates, even as the publishing program moves toward a more stable, cost-recovery basis.

The Women's Studies Librarian Today

No longer a pilot project, the office has logged a steady record of service to Wisconsin scholars and librarians and is accepted as an integral component of academic library services in the state. The office has earned a national and international reputation, confirming the foresightedness of its originators.

As the women's studies librarian since mid-1982, I have watched women's studies programs mature and library collections grow richer. In recent years, I've assisted in the development of the systemwide Women's Studies Consortium. Within this changing institutional context, the responsibilities of the women's studies librarian have evolved from a succession of special projects and experimental services to a stable constellation of ongoing activities. The publications continue to represent the major commitment of staff time and office resources. A research grant from the Council on Library Resources enabled Margo Anderson (former director of the Center for Women's Studies, UW–Milwaukee) and me to survey the subscribers about their information needs, and to follow up with a series of focus group interviews; the resulting modifications have made the publications more useful. Reference service, by telephone and letter as well as in person, complements the fine efforts of librarians on the UW's far-flung campuses, who have honed their own knowledge of women's studies to support the emerging curriculum. As library holdings on the smaller campuses have expanded to meet undergraduate needs, attention has shifted to beefing up the collections at UW–Madison, which serve as resources for the system's active interlibrary loan program.

We now emphasize improvements in existing services and resources, rather than new programs. Currently, for example, we are compiling an exhaustive five-year guide to nonprint media, to complement our coverage of print publications in *New Books on Women & Feminism* and *Feminist Periodicals*. In support of the Women's Studies Consortium's efforts to attract girls to the study of science, we have expanded our earlier work on women and science, which includes several bibliographies and an instructional videotape.

In 1987, Catherine Loeb, Esther Stineman, and I published *Women's Studies: A Recommended Core Bibliography, 1980-1985*, a supplement to Esther's original volume.[5] The National Endowment for the Humanities underwrote the project. The volume dramatically illustrates the changes in women's studies since the first women's studies librarian was hired. A decidedly selective guide to a mere half-decade of writing, it cites 1,211 books and journals and recommends another thousand or more within its annotations. Clearly, the days of scrambling for references are past. Now women's studies practitioners suffer

from information overload, and the women's studies librarian's primary mission is to help them "sift and winnow" a bumper crop of published scholarship.

As we work on the publications, we are conscious of our part in shaping the bibliographic infrastructure of a new discipline, and of our responsibility for preserving the history of women's studies in a definitive record of its scholarly output. Still, our immediate attention must be focused on the vital activities of teaching, research, and outreach on the UW campuses. Many of our materials have been developed to support specific campus-based and consortial initiatives. For example, a reading list on Asian American women enriched the "Talking Story" conference sponsored in 1987 by the Asian and Pacific Women's Alliance at UW–Madison. References to working women in the United States were compiled in 1988 for the Leadership Institute for Trade Union Women jointly sponsored by UW–Extension and the AFL–CIO. A popular list of books in lesbian studies was first distributed at the 1988 UW System women's studies conference at UW–River Falls, during a momentous speak-out session; and a bibliography on women and addiction was part of a packet assembled for the 1989 conference of the Wisconsin Library Association.

The instructional functions of the office are likewise linked to both campus and consortial objectives. I have participated in faculty seminars on several campuses aimed at mainstreaming women's studies into discipline-based courses. In 1989–90, the multi-campus Women of Color in the Curriculum project, organized by the UW–Madison Women's Studies Research Center, aimed to transform the undergraduate curriculum by incorporating information on minority women in core liberal arts courses. Our office generated several discipline-based bibliographies and featured articles and reviews in *Feminist Collections* to highlight specialized resources and research strategies.

Over the years, some office programs that were once on the cutting edge of library service have been discontinued. With the increasing availability of shared bibliographic data in electronic format (OCLC) and microform (Wiscat), the Women's Studies Union List became redundant. When local campus libraries began to offer computerized bibliographic searching as a routine component of reference service, the separate online search service in women's studies was no longer needed. The women's studies librarian makes far fewer presentations to undergraduate classes than in the past, because such instruction is now viewed as a standard element of academic library services.

On the other hand, new responsibilities have fallen to the women's studies librarian. In 1987, following a reorganization of the General Library System of UW–Madison, I was given a budget to purchase women's studies materials for Memorial Library. Since the UW–Madison libraries serve as resource collections for the entire system, I am able to acquire books, journals, and microforms that will benefit scholars throughout the state. In the same vein, I work closely with the newly-established UW System women's studies audiovisual collection, which is housed and administered by Karrmann Library at UW–Platteville. Like the print collections at UW–Madison, the films and videotapes at UW–Platteville are available to users throughout the system through interlibrary loan.

A Look to the Future

What does the future hold for the UW System women's studies librarian? Predictions are always risky, but the general directions seem clear.

The office will intensify its activities in support of the initiatives of the UW Women's Studies Consortium. The librarian serves on the consortium's executive committee and has been instrumental in the development of several of its programs. As those initiatives move into the implementation stages, new demands for bibliographic support will surely emerge.

New information technologies will play an increasingly central role in the dissemination of office products. In my nine years as women's studies librarian, we have progressed from compiling bibliographies on index cards, to manipulating massive data files on the campus mainframe computer, to maintaining our own databases in-house and using desk-top publishing software. The inevitable next step, on which we are about to embark, is the distribution of our bibliographies in electronic formats. Someday soon, researchers will opt to receive our reading lists on diskette or over an international computer network.

Given the present and projected lean budgets in the UW and the state, our staff will not grow nor our funding increase. We will be forced to think creatively about stretching our resources to serve the greatest number of users. We will achieve full cost-recovery for our publications, and we will become more savvy at marketing and publicizing our materials.

Finally, we will continue striving to meet the diverse needs of women's studies faculty, librarians, administrators, students, and community-based researchers, always placing priority on services to the University of Wisconsin, but aware that our materials reach an audience around the globe.

NOTES

1. Karen Merritt, "A Braid of Associations: Ten Years of Women's Studies in Wisconsin," *Frontiers* 8:3 (1986): pp. 20–25.

2. Dorothy Schultz and Miriam Allman, *Women's Studies Resources: A Core Collection List for Undergraduate Libraries* (Madison: University of Wisconsin System, September 1977).

3. It is impossible in this brief report to detail the many people who have supported and assisted the office in so many ways. Among those not mentioned elsewhere in this history, I wish to acknowledge Cara Chell, Eileen Diambra, Susan Kahn, Estella Lauter, Sandra Pfahler, Judith Pryor, and Rachel Skalitzky—all members of the advisory panel for many years—plus the many others who served briefer terms. Members of the office staff, without whom the projects and publications described here could never have been accomplished, include Linda Shult, Carolyn Wilson, and Ingrid Markhardt (all currently on staff), Catherine Loeb, Elli Lester-Massman, Hilary Bruce, Alice Saben, Nancy Laehn, Lisa Hilfiker, and dozens of dedicated student assistants.

4. Esther Stineman, *Women's Studies: A Recommended Core Bibliography* (Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 1979)

5. Catherine R. Loeb, Susan E. Searing, and Esther F. Stineman, *Women's Studies: A Recommended* Core Bibliography, 1980-1985 (Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 1987)

7. The Professional Socialization of Women's Studies Scholars: Living, Learning, Doing

by Sharon Nero

The growth of women's studies as a field of inquiry in American higher education is nothing short of miraculous. Between 1971 and 1985 the number of women's studies courses increased from 600 to 20,000, and about 500 programs were established. Likewise, in the University of Wisconsin System, a modest beginning of one course at UW–Madison in 1972, followed by a UW System Task Force on Women's Studies in 1974, has developed into a nationally recognized consortium of programs on each four-year campus and a myriad of courses at the two-year UW Centers. The impetus for and implementers of the field were the women's studies scholars themselves.

Because faculty members themselves comprised the source from which the discipline was created, women's studies has grown without the benefit of the usual professional academic line of development. That is, professional socialization is generally conceptualized as a three-stage, linear process of role-taking whereby a person: (1) chooses an occupation; (2) undergoes a formal training period during which the values, knowledge, and skills of the occupation are internalized; (3) a career is established and maintained in the chosen occupation. For academics, stage two is typically the graduate school experience, and includes both the formal and informal interaction with faculty and peers. Especially important here are role models, mentors, and reference groups for successful acculturation into the profession. This entire model, however, fails to explain the professional socialization of women' studies scholars. There was no such occupation to be chosen at the time today's scholars were in graduate school, no formal programs, role models, mentors, or reference groups, and no idea as to how such a career might be established and maintained. Consequently, I conducted a study in 1990 to gather the stories of UW women's studies scholars to bring to light how professional socialization had occurred for them.

There were about 160 academic women doing women's studies scholarship at the 13 system campuses that offer a degree or certificate in women's studies.[1] One-fourth, or 40, of these academics graciously (and, I would add, enthusiastically) agreed to participate in the study. The effort was made to sample proportionately by size from each campus. Also, diversity was a goal in terms of traditional discipline, rank, and race and ethnicity. Semi-structured interviews of career histories were taped, transcribed, and analyzed along with vitas and course syllabi.

Demographics and Cohorts

The demographic information from these forty women's studies scholars proved interesting. In spite of a wide variance in age, parents' socioeconomic status, marital and parental status, etc., a picture of the typical women's studies scholar emerged:

> She is a Caucasian in her mid forties, married, with one child. She grew up in a working class to middle class family where her mother was a full-time homemaker. She was one of the first two children born into a female-rich home. She probably earned her Ph.D. in one of the arts or humanities, although she did not continue straight through in her undergraduate/graduate education, and she has worked for several years at some other paid employment outside of the UW System. She has been with the UW System for over 10 years and is tenured at the associate professor level.

The notion of a "female-rich" home emerged as scholars spoke of their families of origin. While all had had fathers who were regularly employed in the paid labor force (7.5 percent had experienced their parents' divorce), close to half of their mothers had been strictly homemakers. For another one-third, their mothers were predominantly homemakers who occasionally took part-time or seasonal employment or who assisted the father in his business. As a group, these scholars grew up with 42 brothers and 43 sisters. What is interesting is to examine the total composition of the family: adding the 40 women from the sample to the sibling figures gives a 2:1 ratio of female children to male children. Remembering also that most of these children had at-home mothers, the women in this sample may be described as having grown up in "female-rich" homes.

Also, demographic and career information was analyzed to ascertain if the three "types" of women's studies scholars described by Florence Howe (1977) were present in the sample: one-third re-entry feminist scholars; one-third young feminist scholars; and one-third traditional discipline scholars turned feminist scholars.[2] Indeed, they were present in the sample, but also a fourth "type" or cohort had since developed. The four cohorts are here named and described:

> *Pioneer* = Howe's original "young feminist scholars." They are being called "Pioneers" because they were the first group of women to go through the academic cycle of undergraduate/graduate/novice professor with feminist politics and consciousness. Most are now in their 40s
>
> *Turned* = scholars who focused most of their early academic energies on their traditional disciplines and later became involved in feminist concerns/women's studies.
>
> *Re-entry* = scholars who interrupted formal education at some point for extensive involvement at other work, usually including homemaking, and who later returned to academia with feminist politics and interests in women's studies
>
> *Establishing* = the *new* young feminist scholars: women in their late 20s and 30s who are newly out of graduate school establishing their careers in academia, and who have involvements with feminism and women's studies

It should be understood that these cohorts were not discrete entities but overlapping categories. Generally speaking, each cohort was about one-fourth of the sample. Each group shared some important aspects with one or another cohort but each also diverged sharply in some areas.

Unique to each cohort was the route by which scholars came to feminism and eventually women's studies. For Pioneers, it started early in undergraduate and/or graduate school, and coincided with the social movements of the 1960s:

> I was an activist student before I was a feminist.
>
> [Feminism] sounded like a pretty good idea. I was always pretty liberal and left, so it was a natural affinity.
>
> I was supposed to be a high school teacher . . . Never did that because the events of the 60s and 70s were such that I got involved in the women's movement and the anti-war movement.

For Turned scholars, both personal and professional events were instrumental in their awakening to feminism and incorporating it into their scholarly work. One respondent spoke of coming to feminism by watching her divorced mother sink into "poverty, powerlessness, and bitterness," seeing this situation "destroy my mother's character." Another spoke enthusiastically of a summer seminar a few years ago: "That has done more to shape my scholarship toward a feminist orientation and interpretation than anything." Yet another told her story this way, speaking first of her graduate school days: "Some women I was in school with were in C-R (consciousness raising) groups, and I didn't have a clue what they were, but I was pretty sure that I didn't want to be in one—that it was some of that flaky West Coast stuff." Not until a number of years later did she become involved in research that dealt with gender and turned her toward feminism. "Getting involved professionally preceded a lot of the personal change. I think I was very ready for it, but I think it started professionally."

The cohort of Re-entry scholars discovered feminism during their years outside of formal education or soon upon returning to college. One woman spoke of being one of only a few "nontraditional" students back in the sixties and how her politics were completely changed by the experience, appreciating the validation of her worth that she received from one of her "young hippie professors." Another spoke of her years at home raising her children: "I became interested in general issues of equity and justice and that led me very quickly into feminism. I remember when other women had to tell me what ERA meant." Yet another came to feminism through "working at minimum wage jobs to get through school and support my children. . . . It was the divorce that made me aware of sexism. . . ."

For Establishing scholars, feminism was the answer to some of life's most perplexing difficulties: "Probably had something to do with being a woman with brains in a small town where girls weren't supposed to show they had brains," one speculated. Said another, "I was a feminist before I had the term . . . because of a childhood of restraints and frustrations and fighting those restraints and thinking that if those were not there. . . ." However, this cohort was unique in that several of the youngest members had had formal education in women's studies and had come to feminism through courses: "My first real exposure was as an undergraduate taking a course from Mary Daly. It was really exciting, it made a lot of sense to me and I found it more important and interesting so I took a lot of classes."

It might also be argued that the women of color in the sample could be viewed as a unique cohort. Nancy Hoffman's (1986) advice proved very applica-

ble: "Perhaps most important for white women to remember is that for most people of color, race, not gender, is the primary source of felt oppression."[3] Race was definitely more salient for this cohort than gender. One African-American woman told of transferring from the small, white, religious liberal arts college she was attending in the mid sixties to a campus that was in the vanguard of the Black Power and student activist movements because she "wanted to be where the action was." There, she recalled, "I became introduced to Black people on a real social level—as a community of peers," and that as a group they were "about planning our cultural agendas." Feminism became a later agenda but continued to be deeply embedded in, informed by, and targeted to the Black experience.

Thus much of the demographic and career history information shared by the women's studies scholars indicated that there were important commonalities and crucial differences among them. One of the differences, the generational gap, was mentioned several times. One respondent spoke of an incident on her campus of a younger woman's remark concerning an older colleague: "She wasn't trained in women's studies and it shows." Another women's studies scholar revealed her concern: "I worry about the upcoming generation that takes it for granted. . . . The older ones get tired and there's no one to pick up and do it." Another feminist echoes this fear: "My biggest worry is about how much of what is valuable of women's studies has rested with a particular generation of feminists. Can't tell what the intellectual interests of young feminists will be or produce. What happens when this cohort ages?"

Taking into consideration some of the cohort characteristics outlined earlier, as well as these observations from the field, it is quite possible that cleavages may develop along generational lines. That may prove as much of a challenge to the profession and its integrity as anything else such as funding cutbacks, ideological issues, or conservative backlash.

The Professional Socialization Experience

In spite of the differences between cohorts, all had a common theme when it came to their professional socialization experience: it was outside the academic norm, and it was grounded in feminism and female-rich groups. (Only for the youngest scholars in the Establishing cohort was the typical three-stage socialization pattern beginning to emerge.)

Professional socialization was atypical of the academic norm in several respects. First, the three stages—occupational choice, formal training, and career—did not occur in the usual linear and sequential fashion, but simultaneously as an interactive process. Second, there was indeed little or no formal learning available. Consequently, informal learning—such as political involvements, family relationships, volunteer work, reading, and team-teaching women's studies classes, and nonformal learning experiences of reading and discussion groups (especially C-R groups), participation in professional organizations, and independent study projects—was the substitute. The outcome of this situation was that women's studies scholars did not experience their professional socialization in the usual manner of *role-taking*, which is defined as learning to assume an already-established coherent pattern of knowledge, skills, and values. Rather, they experienced *role-making*, which is the process of discovering and creating

the needed knowledge, skills, and values. It was from their informal and nonformal experiences of feminist insights and principles within female-rich groups that they constructed the phenomena of women's studies scholars. The following quotes exemplify the experience:

No direct professional training.

A self-taught kind of thing.

I had no courses to take as a student

I never had a women's studies course.

No formal grad courses or faculty development; seat of the pants.

Well, life was my preparation.

There's a fine line between activism and scholarly work. . . . It was an outgrowth of my activities with the women's health group.

Just my own reading and discussions with people—and the teaching, thinking about the issues.

It was my rabble-rousing from my college days.

Teaching high school social studies was a real feminist action. . . . There are so few women.

My work with feisty immigrant women in the community.

I began informally about fifteen years ago. I read material that was becoming sort of the underground of science. I looked for and sought out those women's points of view.

Life experiences and ten years of interest in women's issues.

I worked with a radical feminist organization between undergrad and graduate school . . . an awesome organization. . . . My Ph.D. program was important in showing me that my politics *did* have something to do with my theoretical work . . . I've been preparing to teach that course for most of my adult life.

I was interested in anything that had to do with women, plus my own experience as an organizer . . . my jobs had to do with planning things and pulling them off. That's kind of what I do best.

If you don't get this in your own college experience, but if you're open to it, you're almost in the same place. You have an academic experience. You read, you study, you go to the critics . . . a self-education process. If you are willing to do your in-service training . . . you go to conferences—you are truly doing many of the things academic training would have done for you anyway.

In grad school I got involved with a self-help group. A group of friends and I had gone to conferences and things and thought there was a need for it.

My women and science group started out as ten of us who got together weekly—a current events group. We started as a group to write a paper for a conference. We got along so well we did a whole journal issue By that time we were just such a close-knit group we worked on projects for the next six years.

During my Ph D I had been teaching. There were no courses in women's or Black literature. . A group of Black women . . we'd get together and read books; first we had to

search out the books; we'd xerox copies. We had meetings among ourselves that sometimes went on all night. We tried to integrate them into our courses, have sessions at conferences about them. It was a co-op venture, talked to each other, learned from each other.

In grad school a friend and I started a women's reading group. . . . There was an older woman who helped a lot, like with a reading list. . . . It was a sufficiently bright enough group and charged by this older woman that it was good training.

A few years ago I merged my feminist interest and interest in people of color and formed a group . . . get together . . . raise consciousness, talk, a personal and cultural link. . . . We started doing conferences, one after another. We decided the best way to empower ourselves was education. . . . The core group has learned to love each other as sisters.

Since the formal training was so atypical, it follows that the usual role models, mentors, and reference groups were also nonexistent in terms of women's studies. Rather, scholars drew on the women in their informal and nonformal learning experiences. Even now that they were employed as academics, they looked to other feminist women wherever they could find them, for often they felt very alone and isolated:

I sometimes feel I'm in an alien world—I see things differently than my male colleagues.

I'm it [women's studies] on campus.

I feel I'm doing very different kinds of work . . . I don't fit in anywhere and that's always pretty much been the case.

You're just stuck in there even though nobody ever cared if you lived or died.

Mentored? Absolutely not, none in any shape, size, or form, from the administration to my academic discipline. Mentoring?! I wasn't even getting supervised!

Mentoring and support, when it happened, came from female-rich groups:

The women on the steering committee. We're supportive of each other personally and professionally and we champion each other.

The adjunct women's studies faculty . . . We give each other a tremendous amount of support . . . we place these people in power positions in the university . . . we present a strong front . . . always emotionally supportive . . . it's a family almost, kind of.

I'm the only woman in a six-person department. I'm on the floor with the women's bathroom, all the men are on the other floor . . . but it turned out to be an advantage. There are other women there and I've networked with them.

Women friends of mine, we talk about where to send papers, how do you change fields, but it's a much more kind of sororal-horizontal relationship.

The four T.A.s I team-teach with and people from the battered women's and racism work groups.

Not official mentoring but unofficially. Women academics share information and support each other—collective mentoring.

While the professional socialization experience was atypical, it was certainly effective; these academic women spoke of their work with passion and enthusiasm.

In terms of career maintenance, there were both costs and benefits perceived in being a women's studies scholar. Costs included heavy work loads as scholars

struggled to keep up in their traditional disciplines and departments as well as women's studies responsibilities, "career crunch" due to marginality and lack of advancement, and situational conflicts. These conflicts included incongruence between the mainstream content, knowledge, theories, etc. of their traditional disciplines and the feminist scholarship; problems with colleagues and students; teaching and research behaviors; and problems and concerns about the policies, procedures, and values of their employing institutions.

However, these costs were usually offset by the benefits. These included the satisfaction of a life's work that was compatible with personal and political beliefs; the love and excitement of the scholarship itself; and for some scholars, career opportunities that they might otherwise not have had.

> I've ended up in a department that has no interest in what I'm doing. But I love doing the research. I find it fascinating. I have a vested interest in it and I wouldn't change.
>
> My interest became my passion.
>
> There isn't that excitement in the disciplines. It's a plus you can't quantify...I can't imagine what my life would be like without teaching women's studies.
>
> One of the liberating things about teaching women's studies is that you don't have to hide what you're doing.
>
> I wouldn't have stayed in academia at all if I couldn't have done women's studies. I feel if I didn't have it I wouldn't have survived.
>
> Women's studies has given me a pathway to a career, given me the intellectual questions that I pursue in my research, given me the passion for my subject, given me the belief that I can connect my work to my belief about social change.
>
> Doing women's studies scholarship is like bringing your work and your life together.

In talking with these forty women's studies scholars, I found their expertise, dedication, and enthusiasm inspiring. Their commitment is the result of role-making, the creation of personal and professional identities that seek to change and transform by living, learning, and doing.

NOTES

1. *Women's Studies in Wisconsin: Who's Who and Where* (Madison, Wisconsin: Office of the Women's Studies Librarian, 1989).
2. Florence Howe, *Seven Years Later: Women's Studies Programs in 1976*. A Report of the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, 1977.
3. Nancy Hoffman, "Black Studies, Ethnic Studies, and Women's Studies: Some Reflections on Collaborative Projects," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 14: 1 & 2 (Spring/Summer, 1986), pp. 49–53.

PART TWO

PERSONAL VOICES

8. A New Direction for UW–Stevens Point

by Kathy Ackley

Donna Garr, assistant to the chancellor, has a wonderful anecdote about the beginnings of the Women's Resource Center at UW–Stevens Point that indicates what the women who worked to create the programs we now have were up against. She says that her story took place in the mid seventies:

"At that time in Stevens Point there were no shelters for abused women, no centers or homes of any kind where they could escape the violence. I was in the affirmative action position in those years, and several women spoke to me about the possibility of creating a campus Women's Center that would also serve the community by providing shelter and assistance for abused women. Never having started a center before, I figured the first task would be to find space for the project. Campus space was at a premium in those days (it still is, I guess), but Vice Chancellor Ellery suggested we ask for a room in the Home Economics Management House (now the Suzuki House) on the corner of Main and Reserve streets. For many years, the Home Economics Management House had served as a teaching site for home economics majors—the place where they learned to dust, cook, and clean. A faculty member named Orthula Doescher not only taught these "skills," but also lived in the facility. Orthula was the stereotyped, old-fashioned home economics teacher. For her, "placement" in the home economics field included marriage and raising a family. However, by the mid seventies, the home economics profession was moving away from the training of women for homemaking and shifting toward more scientific studies like child development and nutrition.

"But Orthula was too old and entrenched in the past to change her habits. Despite dwindling enrollments, she continued to cling to her role as teacher of future wives and mothers (even though she, herself, remained single), and to retain "squatter's rights" in the Home Economics Management House. Well, you can see a battle shaping up: on the one hand a group of progressive, young feminists seeking a haven for abused women; on the other hand, a nineteenth century keeper of the old ways, thoroughly ensconced in the only under-utilized space on campus. To break the impasse, I asked to meet with Orthula and associate dean of home economics Agnes Jones to talk about using just one room of the Home Economics House for a center. I thought I could appeal to their commitment to serving women's needs to gain their acquiescence. After all, I reasoned, home economics teachers and feminists are both interested in the well-being of women. Surely we share this common ground.

"To help me in my mission, a young woman named Anita, who was eager to see a center launched, agreed to accompany me. Unbeknownst to me, Anita had to rush to this meeting directly from work, still dressed in her work "uniform." Anita was a bartender at the Holiday Inn, and—you guessed it—she came to meet with Orthula and Agnes wearing black mesh hose and what amounted to a Playboy bunny costume.

"Now picture this vignette: four women seated across from each other at a table in a small room in the College of Professional Studies building. On one side, Orthula and Agnes, both near retirement, reserved, a bit out of date, stiff and uncomfortable at Anita's scanty outfit, wanting to preserve the best of what they had worked for all of their lives, really puzzled by the changing role of women; and on the other side, Donna and Anita, feminist, assertive, talking about taboo subjects like wife and child abuse, threatening to take away what these older women had valued for so long. A near-mythic confrontation between old and new, ideal and real, female chauvinism and feminism.

"As you might guess, nothing was actually resolved that day. Eventually Vice Chancellor Ellery more or less dictated that a room in the Home Economics Management House was to be designated as UW-Stevens Point's Women's Resource Center. Orthula, firm in her beliefs to the end, did not take defeat lightly. She continued to occupy the rest of the house, instructing a handful of students, and doing whatever she could to harass her feminist neighbors: keeping her garbage cans under their open window, removing all furnishings from the room that housed the center (including a large mirror actually bolted to one wall), and complaining about center clients parking in "her" driveway. But, as time takes care of most problems, Orthula finally retired to her home on the plains. The Women's Resource Center struggled and survived, while the Home Economics Management House did not. How difficult change can be!"

The Women's Resource Center was moved a few years after Donna Garr located a home for it, to the basement of Nelson Hall, one of the oldest buildings on campus. Then, in the mid eighties it was moved to the end of the third floor of that building, where it remains now, slightly out of reach, certainly out of mind for most people on campus.

What happened with the shifting about of the Women's Resource Center reflects the general sense of complacency that set in around that time. Though difficult to document objectively, the feeling that problems had been solved, that there was no longer a need to worry about women's issues, seemed to set in during the mid eighties. After all, an affirmative action office had been in place since 1972, the Women's Resource Center still had a home, and the women's studies program was filling classes to capacity and graduating a small but steady number of minors. At a meeting of Women in Higher Education in the fall of 1990, women were asked to give their assessment of the campus climate for women. Several observed that toward the end of the 1980s there appeared to be a relaxing of the guard, as it were. At one point some administrative appointments had been made without, it was felt, giving due consideration to females on campus. The way in which those appointments were handled brought about the reorganization of Women in Higher Education and a commitment by that group to ensure that women sit on hiring committees and monitor affirmative action efforts.

Women in Higher Education (WHE) is an organization open to all women employees at UW-Stevens Point. It has functioned as a pressure group, as a con-

sciousness-raising group, and as a social organization. First established in the early 1970s to monitor the treatment of all women at the university, especially in hiring decisions, it became inactive for several years but was re-established as a result of what seemed to be insensitivity to affirmative action considerations in administrative appointments. WHE has made it its business to ensure that women's issues remain at the forefront of people's agendas. It has provided input on comparable worth within the UW System, provided ongoing feedback to the affirmative action committee and the chancellor's office on the adequacy of affirmative action, implemented a scholarship for a nontraditional student minoring in women's studies, and provided opportunities for women in different job areas and different buildings to come together to get to know one another. WHE meets monthly over lunch and often invites either outside speakers or members to talk informally about their areas of expertise. Twice yearly, it hosts a carry-in dinner in a member's home. Often the purpose of meetings is purely social, but the agenda can evolve into political discussion on matters of concern to women.

With the appointment in 1990 of Chancellor Keith Sanders has come the promise of continued focus on women's issues and the assurance that hiring, retention, and promotion of women is of top priority. Acting in response to a report to the Board of Regents entitled "An Evaluation of Compliance with the University of Wisconsin System Gender Equity Policies" that listed UW–Stevens Point as one of the four institutions in the UW System least in compliance, Chancellor Sanders asked the affirmative action committee to study the campus climate for women. The committee's report observed that eighteen years after the creation of the affirmative action office on campus and six affirmative action officers later, the university had made only minimal progress in addressing issues that affect campus women. The committee noted that despite frequent reports, complete with recommendations, compiled for campus or UW System bodies on the climate for women, "so little has been accomplished in advancing the status of women at UW–Stevens Point over this period that any one of these archival reports could be resubmitted today as current."[1]

The evidence the committee cited to support that statement includes the following: As of the 1989–90 academic year, women made up only 20–25 percent of faculty ranks, a fairly stable percentage over the past twenty years. No women held department chairships in three of the four major academic colleges, and only two women held high-level, decision-making, line administrative posts (the dean of the college of professional studies and the assistant chancellor for university relations). In the student life division, there were no women in the highest echelons. Many academic departments, such as geography/geology, philosophy, and political science, employed few or no women, while in other departments (e.g., biology, sociology, and psychology) there was a discrepancy between the number of women majors and the number of women faculty. Female students were still clustered in traditionally female disciplines. The bulk of the curriculum failed to include recognition of women's contributions, although women's studies curricula have met with some success. Finally, low-paid teaching academic staff ranks and lower level faculty ranks remained overrepresented by women.

The report on the campus climate for women did include some positive efforts and successes by campus units to improve the employment picture for women. Both the College of Natural Resources and the College of Letters and Science have made significant gains in recruiting women in underrepresented areas, and the business affairs division has hired a woman administrator. The

report made two major recommendations: (1) create, by December 1990, an Office for Women administered by a full time director with adequate clerical support, and (2) ensure that women are appropriately represented at all levels and in all areas of the university. Each recommendation was accompanied by a long list of recommended related activities and goals.

Acting on these recommendations, in January 1991 Chancellor Sanders appointed Judith Goldsmith to serve as a special consultant to augment affirmative action efforts at UW–Stevens Point. Past president of the National Organization for Women and well-known and highly respected in Washington, D.C., Judy has a national reputation as a human rights advocate. Moreover, as a native of Wisconsin, a graduate of UW–Stevens Point, and a member of the board of visitors, she has kept in touch with the campus and is familiar with its women and minority issues.

In the fall of 1990, Chancellor Sanders appointed a task force made up of faculty, administrators, academic staff, classified staff, and students to plan a year-long celebration of women's achievements on the UW–Stevens Point campus. The task force was chaired by Professor Kathy Ackley, English and women's studies, and Professor Nancy Bayne, psychology. All campus units and groups were asked to give particular consideration to programs that would fit the theme. Offerings included a one-credit lecture/forum course called "Celebrating Women's Achievements" and programs in the areas of fine arts, film, science and math. Women's history month was celebrated and nationally recognized women were invited to speak at major campus events, including Bernice Sandler as convocation speaker. The faculty newsletter ran a weekly feature highlighting the achievements of former UW–Stevens Point women faculty. The year culminated in a major exhibition in the Edna Carlsten Gallery of paintings, sculpture, and works on paper produced by the National Association of Women Artists.

Given these initiatives and others, such as the recently completed survey undertaken by the affirmative action committee to assess the needs for and attitudes about infant care, child care, and elder care on campus, the campus climate for women is much more encouraging than it seemed to be for a time in the last decade. Assuming continued commitment across campus, the future for women at UW–Stevens Point looks bright and promising.

NOTES

1. Affirmative Action Committee, UW–Stevens Point "Campus Climate for Women Report" (1990).

9. Coming From Behind: Women's Studies at UW–River Falls

by Laura Quinn

In May of 1984 I attended the spring meeting of the women's studies coordinators/directors of the UW System. Ellen Smith, affirmative action director at UW–River Falls, asked me to go in her place. At that time it was the affirmative action director who served as liaison to the system women's studies network. This institutional confusion between women's studies as an academic area and affirmative action as an administrative function meant that our institution was often not represented at the fall conference meeting or spring meeting of women's studies coordinators. Since our affirmative action director was both overextended and not formally connected to academic programs through faculty status, her presence and involvement in the state network had been limited. Ellen Smith recognized this problem and worked to correct it—hence her effort to find a faculty member to represent UW–River Falls at the May 1984 meeting in Madison.

I was not perhaps the best choice. Having been an academic staff member of the English department for two years, I had just been hired as a tenure track employee who taught three sections of freshman English and one section of sophomore literature quarter in and quarter out, a schedule I would carry for a total of six years. The only women's studies courses I had a chance to teach were two- and three-week team-taught summer workshops, one in "Women in the Arts" and one in "Women in Literature for Secondary School Teachers." What I knew about the discipline of women's studies I had learned in grapevine fashion from friends at the University of Minnesota, and I certainly had no formal training in anything close to women's studies or feminist theory. Had I been asked what women's studies was in 1984, I would have been unable to give a very informed answer. I did know, however, that somewhere people were involved in women's studies and that whatever it was, I wanted to be a part of it. Thus, I leapt at Ellen Smith's offer to send me to Madison to the meeting of those who knew what it was and who were involved.

The meeting was epiphanous and revelatory for me, even though I arrived at it in no condition to participate. I started the day at the Minneapolis airport with a bad cold which progressed into serious ear distress and thoroughgoing laryngitis during the small plane flight to Madison. At the luncheon meeting of women who seemed awesome and luminous to me, I had trouble hearing because my ears were plugged and I could not speak at all courtesy of the laryngitis. I heard enough, however, to learn that several women's studies programs in the UW

System were highly developed and institutionalized, that their coordinators were high-powered and politically astute strategists, and that a statewide women's studies librarian served us all in a variety of capacities. I was stunned. I returned to UW–River Falls with the vestiges of my cold and a new psychic disorder, a feminist variant of castration anxiety: everyone had one—that is, a "real" women's studies program—except for me, for us, for UW–River Falls. I returned determined to fill the air at my institution with both lamentation and demand.

I made myself obnoxious over the next several months with my everybody-except-for-us-has-one grievance. Once I laid my hands on the April 1981 Regents' Task Force Report on the Status of Women Recommendation 30, which stated that "during the 1970's each UW System institution developed courses on women and twelve out of the thirteen universities initiated formal women's studies programs," and realized that UW–River Falls was the anonymously infamous *thirteenth* institution, the one without, I had even more fuel for my "everybody's doing it" tantrum. My performance elicited three different responses. Many of my colleagues saw not "having one" as a mark of distinction at UW–River Falls and were thus not in the least interested in getting one. The official institutional position on campus—the second response that I encountered—was that we did, in fact, "have one." UW–River Falls offered the "academic study of women," an Option B specially-designed program. This appeared in our catalogue and constituted the progress report we sent to the UW System Office of Women yearly to confirm our compliance with the 1974 Task Force on Women recommendations. That UW–River Falls believed the academic study of women to be a program comparable to those which had been developed at the other UW System institutions was a measure of its geographical isolation from the system and its dearth of faculty members with any updated women's studies experience or consciousness. The academic study of women was a grab bag of courses, many of which had no substantial content featuring women and certainly no feminist or female perspective; the American and British literature surveys in the English department were listed, for instance, even though these were sometimes taught by faculty who were not friendly to feminism. Courses in social science such as "American Political Ideologies" counted toward this program even though the course syllabus makes no reference to women or feminism. The program lacked a core course or capstone seminar, as recommended by the task force, and certainly it had no academic coordinator with women's studies experience who had appropriate release time for administration of the program.

This administrative response—that we did indeed "have one"— contributed a great deal to my political education. It became clear to me, through the gentle and patient instruction of several people who had been at UW–River Falls for a while longer than I had been, that there indeed was a history of "working toward" women's studies at UW–River Falls and that it was important to acknowledge that history, important not to disparage it, and important to see ourselves as building upon it rather than to claim the status of upstart originators of a program. A 1974 document which was brought to my attention was the ad hoc committee on women's studies report to the vice chancellor of our campus, bearing the signature of M. Susan Beck, then the affirmative action director and a faculty member in the English department. This report contains a sophisticated recommendation for the establishment of a formal certificate in women's studies at UW–River Falls and includes such recommendations as creation of an interdisciplinary minor as well as employment of a half-time faculty member, trained in

women's studies and interdisciplinary scholarship, to oversee the minor and to be responsible for interdisciplinary seminars in women's studies. That the administration of the campus was not friendly to this well-developed proposal was in no way the fault of the proposers, who had done their work well.

I had to learn to see myself as part of a continuous struggle at UW–River Falls to institutionalize women's studies. At the same time it was crucial to convince those who voiced the "we-already-have-one" position that what we had in 1984 was not close to what had been recommended by the ad hoc committee ten years earlier and not comparable to the programs on our peer campuses. In this effort—the move toward "we-have-one-but-we-need-a-bigger-and-better-one"—the resources made available by the system women's studies librarian's office and the sharing of materials and experiences on the part of the other coordinators in the system proved to be invaluable. I learned that the abstract complaint that "everyone is doing better than we are" evoked resentment from my colleagues, but the presentation of program brochures, course listings, course descriptions, and program rationales from the other campuses generated enthusiasm for change and growth.

The third response to the bandwagon case I and others were attempting to make came from relatively new faculty with some measure of exposure to women's studies' phenomenal growth as an area of study since 1969. Often these younger faculty members were male as well as female. Indeed, the support for women's studies at UW–River Falls has always had a substantial male component, and these men, much to their credit, have, for the most part, understood that men's role in women's studies is not unproblematic. That the leadership of the program and the teaching opportunities it offers have got to intersect with the imperative of empowering campus women is something that has been consistently grasped by the program's male supporters and fellow travellers at UW–River Falls.

With the combined support, then, of "veterans" of the women's studies wars at UW–River Falls and the contingent of the young and the restless come-latelies, we began to put together a proposal for a minor.

Clear to us immediately was the organizational need to separate the academic area of women's studies from the affirmative action functions. What happened at UW–River Falls was that the separate strands of the 1981 Regents' Task Force recommendations—1) affirmative action policy-making, 2) development of women's studies programs, 3) providing opportunity for administrative experience for women, 4) record-keeping to document progress in women's hiring, promotion, wage levels—were never kept separate. Two effects ensued: the work could not all be done, and the academic arm of the larger effort to empower women—that is, women's studies—came to be identified at UW–River Falls with support services rather than with curriculum. The first move required, to develop a program at River Falls comparable to those of other system campuses, was the amicable divorce of affirmative action and women's studies.[1]

This was accomplished in June of 1985. A committee to study and plan a women's studies minor had been established by the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences during the 1984–1985 academic year; this was an interdisciplinary, gender-balanced committee which I chaired and for which Nan Jordahl, assistant dean of arts and sciences, served as the liaison to the dean's office. Solid and crucial support for our efforts came consistently out of the dean of arts and science's office, particularly in the person of Associate Dean Nick Karolides, who had a

long history of commitment to women's studies in his teaching and his administrative work.

The thirteenth campus—the one "without one"—was able to move swiftly to the establishment of a formal minor program. The minor and the introductory core course both passed all bureaucratic hurdles—curriculum committee, faculty senate, administrative approval—during the 1985–86 school year. That we were able to move so fast and to encounter so little resistance to our efforts was, I believe, attributable to the support we got from the dean's office, to the change in the top-level administration—chancellor and vice chancellor—on our campus, to the widespread cross-disciplinary support that our committee marshalled, and, perhaps most importantly, to the statewide network of resource-suppliers, precedent-setters, well-wishers, advice-givers, and co-strategists that women's studies systemwide afforded us. There was much to be said for being the thirteenth campus, strategically; so many others had danced through the minefield and could offer dance lessons and mine maps.

The program has done well. The introductory course, "Introduction to Women's Studies: Theory and Method," which I taught for the first time in the winter quarter of 1986 and which we developed with the models provided us by system campuses and resources from Sue Searing's system librarian office, filled to its capacity of thirty-five students and has continued to do so. Our first minors began to graduate in Spring 1987, and we graduated our first male minor in 1989. The number of minors has not been large—around six to eight at any given time—but course enrollment in all of the women's studies courses has been consistently high. Those courses in women's studies which existed before the introduction of the minor experienced increased enrollment with the institutionalization of the minor and the interest generated by the well-enrolled core course. New courses were and continue to be developed, including "Women and the Law," "Minority and Ethnic Women's Literature," "Psychology of Sex Roles," and others. The move to semesters in 1990–91 and its concomitant reduction of the number of courses offered curbed the increase in course offerings temporarily, but the women's studies academic advisory committee and its current chair, Meg Swanson, look forward to the development of women's studies courses in science and agriculture. The UW–River Falls campus hosted the state women's studies conference in the fall of 1988, and, in that same year, won the important gain of release time from one course for the coordinator of the program. New faculty in a variety of departments—as well as recruits among veteran faculty—express strong interest in contributing to the program.

It is clear that continued course development, recruitment of minors, and movement toward a major program are on the horizon for UW–River Falls. I believe that its institutional experience of "coming from behind" in women's studies—and making an impressively rapid catch-up move—has given the players in women's studies at UW–River Falls confidence in their ability to move the program forward, in the ongoing strength and value of the statewide women's studies network as a base of support (enhanced for all of us by the statewide funding and institutionalization of the UW System Women's Studies Consortium) and in the resilience and potential of women's studies as a discipline. It is clear, however, that there is a companion risk for the women's studies program in UW–River Falls' institutional self-confidence. The sense of having "come from behind" leads all too easily to a relief in having done enough; the program is threatened currently by a sort of self-congratulatory stasis which requires vigilant

prodding. The combined factors of UW–River Falls' geographical isolation and the limits of the coordinator's release time (one course per year) mean that ongoing, consistent contact with the consortium and with other programs remains a hardship. Women's studies advisory committee members believe that the program lacks visibility on campus and that the coordinator is not sufficiently integrated into the institution's power structure. A separate space for the program is needed as well as a library budget for women's studies holdings. The switch to semesters has stalled course development, and committee members believe that more institutional and administrative support for continued development of women's studies courses is needed. As in the past, the catalyst for movement at this individual institution can and will be provided by the systemwide women's studies network/consortium; the UW–River Falls program has requested and will receive a formal evaluation by members of the consortium, as well as a companion evaluation of the library holdings by women's studies librarian Sue Searing. Such an evaluation will provide the structure and authority that the local committee needs for shaping its agenda and for approaching the administration with requests for resources. The "everybody's got one" strategy, we hope, has amassed some muscle by now.

NOTES

1. Thanks to Nan Jordahl and Nick Karavides for providing me with an oral history of this phase of the struggle.

10. On Trying A Feminist's Soul

by Estella Lauter

An essay is a trying out, an effort—in this case a trial response to the question asked by the editors of this publication about the nature of my experience during the past twenty years in the University of Wisconsin, and specifically at UW-Green Bay—easier to start, I find, than to finish. Neither wholly personal nor completely historical nor fully philosophical, the following essay is a partial representation of a mixed experience, in keeping with my life as mother-teacher-writer spanning at least two generations of work in women's studies and several fields within its interdisciplinary arena—an experience both exhilarating and troubling.

I was neither born nor raised a feminist. Although my alma mater in upstate New York named a wing of its women's dorm for Susan B. Anthony and encouraged women students to participate in campus governance, it released me with a Ph.D. in English wholly ignorant of the history of feminism—not to mention the history of achievements by women in literature or art. My life before college in twelve very different towns anc cities of the United States had taught me well that the world I lived in was constructed arbitrarily, but I had not yet learned much about how its political mechanisms worked. In my efforts to complete my degree, find a job, and become a responsible participant in the movement for civil rights, I might have missed the feminist resurgence of the sixties had I not been *called* a feminist for supporting coeducation in the bastion of male vanity where my husband worked as a dean. My commitment to women, fostered by my extended families of origin (for the most part, poor farmers bound together by inventive women) and solidified by two years in a boarding school for girls as well as in the women's dorm at the University of Rochester, had marked me; I would find out what I had chosen little by little over the next twenty years.

My first step toward conscious feminist identity was to read the poets—feminist or not—and to begin collecting a bibliography of feminist writing. My second step was to become very determined not to waste my doctorate. After three short-lived jobs based on my status as a "faculty wife" and the birth of my first child, I began my teaching career in earnest at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay in the fall of 1971.

At first I was hired *ad hoc* at the last possible minute to teach "Aesthetics and the Environment," a core course for freshmen framed by a committee in a new curriculum based on problem-solving, ecological approaches to education. When it became apparent that I would willingly develop other new courses in the unpopular general education program, the University found a tenure-track place for me in the interdisciplinary unit that housed the arts. In the first year of that

appointment, I offered seminars for seniors called "Imagination and Myth" and "Images of Woman and Man," along with a January interim course in American women poets, thereby launching my career in women's studies before I was aware that the field existed; the books I published in 1984 and 1985 came out of those courses and two others developed later for students in the arts. After this unlikely beginning, I owe much of my present success to the freedom I've had within the university.and to the network of feminist colleagues at Green Bay, in the state of Wisconsin (under the wing of Karen Merritt in the UW System Administration), and across the nation in the professional organizations I joined. One purpose of this essay must surely be to thank the people who enabled me to develop so much agency.

The seventies were exhilarating years for me despite some difficult times. As I remember it, the movement toward women's studies on the Green Bay campus was led by a young social scientist, Bridget Mugane, who listed the courses about women we were offering helter-skelter and called the women who were teaching them together for regular discussions. Since several of us from different units (Sidney Bremer, Julie Brickley, Wava Haney and Bridget Mugane) worked together in the general education program, it was relatively easy for us to communicate with each other. This was one of the benefits of our unusual curricular structure.

We were also helped by the establishment in 1974–75 of a women's center, founded by a student organization and staffed by a half-time director, where the political, expressive, and academic directions of the feminist movement could come together in one space. According to Pat Maguire, the director from 1978–1991, about 20 students met regularly throughout the early seventies to organize community outreach projects in the areas of health and education, to do consciousness-raising about sexism on campus, and to conduct student-led courses. Faculty members also met in the Lucy Stone Center to share ideas and to support various feminist initiatives until the facility was withdrawn by the chancellor in 1981. In the six years of its existence, however, faculty members worked with students and community women for day care, programs for battered women, and an array of social services. With the help of Marge Engleman, director of outreach and UW–Green Bay's first affirmative action officer, we bought books, films, and slides to mount programs for the community and our classes. We even decorated one room of the center's most spacious and effective location as a womb to which we could retreat from the chillier aspects of the University's climate. And, of course, we hammered out the contours of our academic program there.

The year 1976 was pivotal for me. I had used the option of reduced teaching load for child care, and amidst confusion over how many years I had accumulated towards tenure, I was required to come up for an early decision in an unusually large group that also included Wava Haney and Bridget Mugane; we three were denied promotion. While Wava and I were encouraged to apply again, Bridget was not, and she left the university for a career in law. While I also considered leaving, Sidney Bremer gathered signatures on my behalf from students and other faculty members; Audrey Roberts (UW–Whitewater) invited me to participate as a panelist on research in women's studies at the first statewide meeting of what has become the UW System Women's Studies Consortium; Linda Mistele (then UW–Extension) welcomed my work on behalf of Wisconsin Women in the Arts; and Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar accepted my proposal for a paper on

Margaret Atwood at the Modern Language Association convention. That year, despite the dean's decision, I chose women's studies as my primary concern.

By 1977, women faculty members, including those mentioned above plus Carol Pollis, Thea Sager, Lynn Walter and others who have since left the university, had taught courses that proved our capacity to offer a full program. Working with many students, among the most dedicated of whom were Claudia Hoover, Lynn Savitsky and David Ward, several of us hammered out a curriculum that spanned four concentrations (UW–Green Bay's name for budgetary units). A subcommittee chaired by Sidney Bremer crafted the document that continues to govern the program and, helped by the regents' mandate for women's studies on each campus, we secured approval from the Faculty Senate to offer a minor. In a burst of energy, we put the core courses in place and Lynn Walter organized a conference to mark our formal debut. A few years later, we seized an opportunity to develop two more courses in literature and the arts to fulfill the general education requirement.

Five of the founding faculty members remain among the nine who now teach women's studies (or related) courses; four of us regularly chair or co-chair the program committee. Although we have never had a separate budget line or release time for the chair, we have procured necessities in piecemeal fashion from helpful individuals in various administrative positions. The recent appointment of Carol Pollis as dean of humanities and social sciences has been particularly helpful. After many minor skirmishes with the university over the women's center, our interdisciplinary organization, our (in)visibility in the catalogue, and our status (until 1991) as an "extra" minor that did not count for graduation, we still teach about 400 students each year, attract a reasonable number of minors, offer programs for the university community, and participate in Women's Studies Consortium activities each year. Several of our faculty members are leaders in university governance and administration. Several have substantial publication records. We have disagreed with each other over many issues, but we have remained feminist allies for more than fifteen years, and we have created an ambiance in which an all-university faculty "women's meeting" can occur whenever it is necessary. These are no small achievements, and besides, I have learned to value sheer survival more than I did at the beginning of the decade.

Still, in the political and economic climate of the eighties, we entered a holding pattern. As the careers of the founding faculty members and the developments of women's studies became more complex, we were unable to replenish our resource Although many wonderful women have joined the women's studies faculty in the past two decades, all but Joanne Stohs (psychology) and Sarah Meredith (music) have left. The deaths of two women in the program, Nancy Datan and Raquel Kersten, cost us dearly: Nancy Datan, a prominent gerontologist and fireball of energy, lost to cancer in her forties; and Raquel Kersten in her fifties—after chairing the program but before she could offer a course in Latin American women. Retirements in 1990 included Alice Goldsby and Louise Witherell, who had not only developed courses in women and science and women in French literature but also had worked on behalf of women in myriad ways for years. Several others with relevant background have not been able to free themselves from other assignments to teach for us. Some electives are in danger of being dropped from the curriculum because they are taught so infrequently; one core course is housed in a concentration that has lost interest in women's studies. In the context of a budget desperately driven by enrollment figures, we cannot

offer new courses without proving student "demand," and the women students on campus now rarely demand anything *as women*. Indeed, they sometimes seem as unaware of feminist gains as I was in college—a circumstance that ever calls my optimistic assessments of those gains into question.

This discomforting state of affairs is complicated by the feeling among both male and female colleagues that we "won" the "battle" for equality in the seventies. To them, our academic successes as individuals proves that nothing more needs to be done. But even if we had achieved full equality for women faculty and students through our efforts, I would be troubled by the fact that other dimensions of feminist concern—for the preservation, development, and interaction of women's cultures or the deconstruction and reformulation of the dominant culture—remain downright invisible, unimagined and perhaps, to some, unimaginable! The moral imperatives for justice that worked in a (slightly) more liberal climate are now heard as just so much "politically correct" rhetoric to be brushed aside in serious academic discussion. Because of general education and diversity requirements, women and people of color receive more attention in the curriculum now than ten years ago, but we have a long way to go to affect the general esteem of women in our region. Mainstreaming, if women's works are presented without analysis of their marginality in the dominant culture, may actually cover up their status without disturbing it. The vastly expanded field of women's studies contains vital information, concepts and practices that we cannot currently deliver.

With no way to expand our resources to reflect the changes in the field, particularly its growing global consciousness, we are faced with the task of redeveloping our program from within existing courses and structures. At Green Bay, where most of us have already taught too many different courses (I've done more than thirty) and weathered too many curricular changes, this is more difficult than it sounds. Further, the interdisciplinary organization of the university that originally fostered our alliance has become, under economic siege, resistant to change.

Our predicament in the eighties has seemed to me another version of the "glass ceiling," where those below it have knowledge they cannot use. My own response to this ceiling has been to break out of the campus setting to gain new perspectives on the situation of women and women's studies in other contexts. Once again, the university's flexibility proved helpful. Because of family commitments, I could neither seek permanent employment elsewhere nor move into administration, but I did go to Germany as an exchange professor in 1985–86 to teach some courses I could not do here ("American Women Poets," "Black Women Writers," "Adrienne Rich: Poetry and Politics"). When I returned, I became heavily involved in the UW System Women's Studies Consortium, drafting proposals for the "center of excellence" status (which we won only to have the initiative voted down at the state level) and for a grant on women and science. In 1988–89, I received a research fellowship at the Center for Twentieth Century Studies at UW–Milwaukee to rethink my ways of studying American culture. In 1989–90, I accepted a visiting appointment in women's studies at UW–Madison.

I have emerged from these expeditions somewhat hopeful about the future of women's studies at UW–Green Bay and elsewhere but also (still) frustrated. During my sojourn in Germany, I saw that our collective situation could be worse. Despite German feminist critiques of the generic resistance that sets in when

feminism enters the university, I am proud of the economic and political gains we have secured for at least some women of each class and race in the United States; one look at the program for the December 1990 Modern Language Association meeting where multicultural women's issues and their representatives are now visible on virtually every page is enough to convince me of the positive impact we have had on academia (and many women from Wisconsin were instrumental in achieving this result). In my work for the consortium, I experienced the joy and pain of collaborative projects all over again, with no less belief in their potential to motivate creative initiatives but with diminishing hope that they can solve the economic problems we face in higher education. During my year in Milwaukee, I sorted out some of the competing claims of contemporary theory and optimistically began an interdisciplinary study of the impact of feminism on aesthetics (the often invisible system that governs much of what happens in the arts). At Madison, however, amidst internal debates about the validity of various feminist positions, I set that project aside until I see more clearly how and to whom I can speak effectively in the nineties.

What remains firm is my commitment to flesh and blood women, and increasingly to the multicultural dimensions of our history and our future. During the past year I have spent most of the money from my named professorship on preparing an anthology of woodland sources for American Indian studies in the belief that as long as women of any group are considered inferior in the society's basic "texts," women's studies scholars still have important work to do in higher education. I do not believe, however, that women can effect significant changes now, even in academia, without engaging the political and economic structures that determine so much of our lives, in coalition with nonfeminist as well as with multiple feminist forces.

These are trying times, times to try a feminist's soul (not to mention her body and psyche), having achieved so much, to come up against still another wall. But I figure that which survives can change.

11. Women's Studies in Prison: Lessons for Offenders, Lessons for Educators

by Rhonda Ambuehl and Barbara Sniffen

Rhonda: I became involved in the PREP program in January 1986, while serving a 15 year sentence for attempted first degree murder. At the time of my arrest, I was in one sense very much a feminist. I make that claim because rather than submitting to an attack, I had defended myself, albeit with a gun. And rather than ending up the victim, I had aggressively stepped out of my role as helpless female; I was transported from the scene in a police car rather than an ambulance. I had learned to survive in a violent male-dominated sector of society, an extension of my childhood in many aspects. Throughout the course of my trial, the prosecutor vehemently denied that I was in any danger when I committed the offense, and that by shooting the man who threatened me I had attacked him rather than defended myself. The prosecutor was so convincing at times that I could almost see a world where women and children are always safe, but that had not been my experience.

As a child I had learned how to sustain physical pain. A close-fisted punch could be diffused (if I thought quickly enough) into a slap. Even the slap could be avoided if I could anticipate what was expected of me. It was truly a liberating moment to realize I did not have to settle for minimizing pain—that I could fight back blow for blow.

What I eventually learned from PREP as a whole, and women's studies in particular, was that I had come to believe everyone lived in a similarly violent environment, and that there were no alternatives. Choice, to me, involved either being a victim or taking the risk of fighting back. That was the extent of free will and, indeed, of happiness that I had learned, and that is the point of moral development that I was at when I began PREP. That is the approximate point that most of my peers were at as well.

Barb: Jacqueline Ross called me in the fall of 1985 to ask if I was willing to teach a women's studies course for PREP, the Postsecondary Re-entry Education Program, at Taycheedah Women's Correctional Institution. The course was to be a part of a semester's emphasis on feminism but would be the only course labelled "women's studies." I accepted immediately; I had already taught a modern civilization class there in 1985 and had learned that going to a prison to teach was not very different from teaching any other college class. More impor-

tant, however, was the exciting prospect of teaching women's studies to a group whom I knew had often been victims of males and a male-dominated society. I looked forward to teaching women students who would be eager to discuss their oppression. I really didn't expect that they would be resistant to the ideas of feminism.

Rhonda: My first impression of Barb Sniffen was that she was incredibly naive and had probably lived quite a sheltered life. She did admit to coming from a remote place in Montana, after all. The first day of class, she said that women were oppressed in our society. We students rolled our eyes. Talking amongst ourselves afterwards we agreed that Barbara was not very streetwise and was in for quite an education. A few just laughed, thinking that Barb was hopeless and that we had better just go along with her. In retrospect, Barb did get more of a reaction than most of our instructors.

Most incarcerated women tend not to warm readily to authority figures. Many of our past authority figures were abusive parents, abusive husbands or boyfriends, or pimps. Few of us had ever known someone we could look up to. Even the criminal justice system—the police, judges and prosecutors—had failed to protect us when we were young, and now imprisoned us for doing what we had to do to protect ourselves. As with other authority figures, our immediate response to PREP instructors was largely unenthusiastic. Those who claimed that education could change our lives were greeted with a very bored "show me" attitude. We had no reason to trust these people. Our experiences had shown us that trust had often led to betrayal; many of us were in prison for trusting the wrong people.

Barb: Fifteen students were enrolled, including Lawrencia Bembenek who had been in my earlier modern civilization course. Laurie is a former policewoman from Milwaukee convicted of killing her former husband's ex-wife in a controversial trial. She made national news after her escape from Taycheedah and subsequent capture in Canada. Laurie gave me some good advance publicity, based in part on the fact that I had made the trips to Taycheedah in 1983 in spite of blizzards and cancer therapy: I was perceived, by Laurie anyway, as tough and yet caring for my students.

The women in the new class were as varied as any group of fifteen women on the outside, with different backgrounds and experiences in life, albeit heavier on unpleasant adventures than most college women. One—in for drug-related activity—was very WASPish and upper middle-class; most were from more modest backgrounds. When the class began I did not know anyone's background except that of the well-publicized Lawrencia (who was *not* called by her media nickname, Bambi). And all I knew about Laurie was what had been in the papers; I never discussed the circumstances of her conviction with her until a year or so after the class ended. Three of the women were African-American, at least one was a grandmother, and another had been a student in the UW System the year before.

Rhonda: I have incredible respect for Barb today. Day after day she came back into our class and chipped at the wall we had thrust between the claims she made about the oppressed status of women and our beliefs that even if women in general were truly oppressed (which we didn't accept), *we* certainly were not. After

all, we were women who either survived by independent means like car theft and street hustling, or we had proved our lack of oppression by killing or maiming someone who had hurt us. Some of us despised coming to class and we let it be known. She had probably begun to break through and reach something inside of us, something that was raw and painful.

One day she came into class and paced back and forth demanding, "What's wrong with this picture?" When we shrugged she pointed out that she was wearing a narrow skirt that restricted movement, causing her to take smaller strides. To me it was quite apparent that she was foolish for wearing such a narrow skirt. However, it was not long before I began to get angry over shoes that were stylishly narrow, women's jeans designed to fit men, and blouses so tight through the shoulders that even the most petite of women could not throw a baseball in them. At this early point in my education I had not made any connections between the status of women in society and my anger, although I did say in my evaluation that I saw consciousness-raising as the purpose of the course and noted that it had raised mine.

Barb: The course had been developed for the UW–Oshkosh women's studies program as three one-credit modules. It was entitled "Women's World"; the modules were called "Home/Work/Force," "Tarzan, the Apes, and Jane," and "Sexual Equality: New Views."

For the first module I used Susan Strasser's book *Never Done: A History of American Housework*. I believed the women would find it interesting for several reasons: its fascinating historical facts about changes in housework as a result of the Industrial Revolution; its Marxist analysis of work in the home as part of the economy, shaped and determined by corporate decisions; and its attack on the idea that women lived in a "separate sphere" far from the hurly-burly of the marketplace and the outside world.

I was naive. It turned out that they thought they knew all about housework and that it was an insult to their intelligence to foist a book about it on a university class. I faced some hostility toward feminism and some sneers about the nature of the topic. It was uphill work to persuade them that there might be some value in understanding women's traditional roles in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and how women were affected by industrial developments. The idea of a "separate sphere" is of course foreign to most students today. It certainly was to the incarcerated women whose "spheres" were far from separate from the males whose actions often contributed to their being in prison.

Rhonda: Our first text was *Never Done*, the history of housework. I thought the subject was too traditional, and it was inexcusable that in studying women we should study housework. I rebelled both vocally and inwardly without recognizing that I connected traditional womanhood with my own unhappy childhood, and saw the only escape from that in denying tradition and anything else commonly used to define women. I was threatened. When I complained about having to write a segment about doing laundry for Barb's class to my literature professor, Rebecca Ferguson, Rebecca asked me why I reacted so strongly to associating myself with anything that was traditional for women. I dismissed her with a growl. I did not understand the broad implications of her question.

PREP has, as one of its definitive goals, the mission of providing a curriculum that embraces gender and cultural diversity in all of its courses. This means

that I was being taught feminist principles in classes that were not specifically "women's studies" courses. I was able to reiterate my disdain for traditional women's values in literature, composition, and philosophy classes.

Barb: I expected the students to do the readings and be prepared to discuss them in class; as in every such class, some read and some did not. Gradually some of the women came to see that there was more to the study of housework than they thought. One outcome was an appreciation of mothers and grandmothers who had done housework in the primitive ways described in the book; it was surprising how many of the students had some memory or experience of preindustrial housework—wood ranges, hand washing, primitive plumbing, no electricity. I had been struck when I read the book about how many experiences I had had of housework before labor-saving devices when I lived in rural Montana and small-town Minnesota. I recognized that I was becoming a historical artifact myself! As we talked about the book stories emerged; one student—I'll call her Beth—told us that her mother had been killed in an accident with a wood stove. Another student came to appreciate the grandmother in rural Mississippi who had been the center of an extended family and whose housework had contributed to family unity and comfort when the children in the north gathered for summer reunions. From the assignment about doing laundry came humorous stories and sad ones; they all provoked responses and by sharing them women saw more common threads in women's histories.

Some of the students began to see the point about corporate decisions impinging on women's lives, and to recognize that how housework was done did indeed have an impact on everyone's life. A few began to appreciate the analysis of women in the economy and the class implications of housework. One of the women—I'll call her Suzy—had seen women's work from inside and outside the house: she had worked all her life at the Volrath plant in Sheboygan for a very small wage, had borne ten children, and had kept house for a husband who often lost his job. Volrath, by the way, was one of the corporations Strasser cited as producing products for the home—enameled steel utensils—at the end of the nineteenth century. Suzy had done housework with a minimum of conveniences, very much like the descriptions of nineteenth-century labor in the home, and without recognition or appreciation of her contributions. Older than any of the others, she told of a kind of exploitation that made them conscious of class as well as gender and of the limited opportunities for unskilled women of the working class. Most of the students came from the working class but none had had the personal experience of the combination of factory labor, big family and unsupportive husband that Suzy had.

Rhonda: So many of us had been reared in single-parent families that we could not conceive of a world in which women did not work—and work hard. After my father abandoned us, my mother worked in cheese or meat-packing factories. She worked in a laundry for awhile, but was fired for staying home with my brother and sister one day when they were seriously ill. After a brief interlude as a waitress, she got a job as a housekeeper and took a second job tending bar at nights. By this time, my stepfather, who had worked only sporadically during their marriage, had moved out of the house. We children had learned to do housework and prepare the evening meal when we were very young. Even when our stepfather was not working, he would not do any household chores—that was "women's work."

Barb: A number of the students believed that they were superior women and somehow different from "ordinary" women; part of their resistance to Strasser's book was a rejection of the idea that they had anything to do with the mass of women who had let themselves be used to do housework. As Rhonda notes, some of them were in prison in part because of their rejection of the traditional woman's role. Deborah (not her real name) had worked as a roofer and apparently identified with men. She thought she had disassociated herself from women's concerns.

Rhonda: Barb remembers the "tough" women as being disassociated with housework. I also recall the "ultra-feminine" women who had worked as prostitutes also rejecting housework. Greatly concerned with clothes and jewelry, some of these women sported fingernails so long they could not put their hands to any functional use. (It makes me think of Chinese foot-binding practices). These women bragged of their ignorance about housework and any other kind of work that did not involve street hustling. I still juxtapose images of these women with any mention of traditional middle- and upper-class women who feel physical work is demeaning.

Barb: For "Tarzan, the Apes, and Jane" we used Elizabeth Fisher's book *Women's Creation; Sexual Evolution and the Shaping of Society* and Ruth Bleier's *Science and Gender*. Right away we had a problem with at least one student who did not want to hear about evolution. Nevertheless, the students got interested, if only to argue against Fisher's speculations about male domination developing out of domestication of animals, the realization of the male role in reproduction, and the awareness that animals, children, slaves, and women could be "owned." Some of them were also enrolled in an anthropology course that semester which enhanced their receptivity to ideas about evolution and varieties of human experiences. Ruth Bleier's book opened their ideas to bias in the sciences, and between hers and the Fisher book they began to think about why it was that males dominated. I think they began to have a bit more respect for themselves as women and for all women. Even Deborah showed signs of recognizing that no matter how androgynous or even masculine she was, she shared the fate of women. They also visibly improved their self-worth as they began to absorb the notion that women had also contributed to human development, perhaps even more than men did.

Rhonda: As I began to study women's history in PREP, my philosophy of feminism—the belief that women are equal to men and only have to recognize our equality and act accordingly—was validated by learning that other women believed as I did. The first women's suffrage movement stemmed out of this belief. In my studies, I also learned how women had actually gained rights through history, and I resented the idea that women were not given the right to vote because we were equal to men. Rather, we were allowed to vote because we were perceived as more moral than men and it was thought that women could improve the quality of society if we were enfranchised. Eventually I came to accept this unfair belief as a necessary evil, convinced finally that what mattered was whether you won or lost, not how you came about winning.

Barb: Fisher's contentions that human evolution started with the relationship between mother and child, and that human beings had advanced much more because of cooperation than because of competition, generated a lot of intense discussion. The students' starting point, no doubt based on experiences in hostile environments, was that aggression was necessary. I was astounded to hear their reaction to gun control—they rejected, I think to a woman, the idea that guns should be controlled. I had expected that as a result of their own experiences, in which guns had, at least in the case of the lifers, brought them to prison, they would welcome curbs on violence. Many of them regarded the situations that brought them to prison with cool rationality; accepting gun control as a method of reducing capital offenses did not seem to fit their logic, however.

Rhonda: As I have said, my sense of being a feminist when I began my studies in PREP came from the belief that I had exercised free will in defending myself. If there is a common denominator among the incarcerated population, it is most likely that we did not grow up in safe, nurturing families that allowed us to live as children rather than take on the responsibility for our own safety. Many of us had grown up believing, at least subconsciously, that adulthood meant winning the power struggle more often. We protested gun control because we had a total lack of faith in the criminal justice system. Access to guns at least gave us the option of being able to fight back.

Barb: The leaders of the class, Kathy, Laurie, and Rhonda, were keenly interested in current events. They and others began to apply some of Fisher's ideas about aggression and cooperation to the contemporary world. That semester the United States bombed Libya, and some of them began to question our aggression and to analyze for themselves Khadafi's program for Libya as reported by *Newsweek*. They were very astute in analyzing the United States' propaganda with respect to Khadafi, and they began to question the use of force on an international level.

Fisher's original intent was to try to explain why humans were the only creatures who raped. This brought out stories about their own experiences with rape. One very quiet African-American woman whom I will call Kippy was not necessarily hostile to feminism. Instead, she appeared to be beaten down by life and accepting of whatever happened to her, including a teacher with weird ideas. One day we were talking about how women were blamed for enticing rapists and thus bringing rape upon themselves. She did not say anything in class, but at the break I felt a presence behind me, someone sitting on the teacher's desk. I turned around and saw Kippy, who said softly, "I always thought it was my fault." Another time I asked rhetorically, "Who told your grandmother about birth control? Who told your mother? Who told you?" Kippy blurted out, "No one told me, and I was thirteen." I wish I knew more about what was going through her head as she sat there silently. I do know that the content of the women's studies course increased her respect for herself; I just hope she has been able to sustain that respect through whatever has happened to her since. Each life story is unique, but the thread of abuse winds through every one of these women's stories.

The last unit, "Sexual Equality: New Views," was based on Carol Gilligan's *In A Different Voice*, as well as on Ruth Bleier's book. I had some qualms about the results of discussing the development of morality with a group of people who

had obviously had problems in that realm, at least in society's view. I should not have worried. I think it was the most profitable part of the course. I found their reactions fascinating. They were intrigued with the ideas of moral development and with comparing their experiences with the issues Gilligan studied. Perhaps they appreciated the fact that I accepted them as moral creatures in spite of their being in prison. Their thoughtfulness in discussing the issues was remarkable. There was a difference of opinion about abortion; some of the women had strong fundamentalist beliefs. However, most of them could agree with the idea that the decision to have an abortion might be made on the basis of what was the most responsible thing to do.

Rhonda: I thought the most interesting part of this section was our response to Gilligan's portrayal of Hans's dilemma. Hans's wife was very sick and needed medicine. Hans could not afford the medicine. The question was, "Should Hans steal the medicine?" Gilligan's theory was that men traditionally answer yes to this question and women answer no, and that psychologists have used this inability to make a decision to break a rule for a good reason as proof of women's arrested psychological development. It is curious that most of the class vehemently said yes, of course Hans should steal the medicine, thus aligning with the traditional male response. I find this interesting because I have long suspected that many women are incarcerated overtly for committing crimes, but covertly for not conforming to society's view of acceptable female behavior. A historical example of this is the imprisoning of women solely for having venereal diseases.

Barb: Rhonda's observation about females being imprisoned for acting like men is a good one. Gilligan, however, pointed out that women often looked for alternatives, like persuading the druggist to give them the medicine on credit. Perhaps some of the women prisoners, raised as many were in a violent man's world, had incorporated the instant solution of illegal action into their repertoire of responses rather than searching for alternatives. In any event, it is an interesting subject for possible future research. I have noted some—not the majority—of female students at UW-Oshkosh are just as willing to accept violent and perhaps illegal solutions to problems as some men are. The different responses to the Gulf War provide an example of this.

Bleier's demolishing the psychobiologists pleased the class; by this time most of them had begun to be convinced that women had gotten a raw deal in society. I will not say that sisterhood prevailed, but I think it is fair to say that the books studied had changed their views about a lot of things. It was especially interesting to hear some changed views about aggression both on the personal and the political level: that aggression maybe didn't work so well after all, and that cooperation and other methods of resolving conflict might be given a whirl.

Rhonda: PREP also sponsored a women's group that met bimonthly and brought in outside speakers to address the group on issues that were important to women. One of the guest speakers on our agenda was a woman who collected women's art. On the day she came, I learned that the art she collected was quilts made by women on the outer banks of North Carolina. I was speechless to learn that we were expected to welcome a guest speaker who collected quilts and called them art. The speaker arrived with slide presentations of her "collections." At first I tried to tune her out, but I was captivated by the passion she obviously

had for the quilts. Her slides included the "artists"—thin, wiry, tired-looking, sun-baked women who had stitched tiny bits of bright fabric into the quilts creating an overall look of English gardens or Northern Lights. The quilts portrayed a spirit that was not visible in the artists themselves. The quilts became a voice that told the secrets that the women themselves dared not speak. They betrayed deep joy and excruciating pain. The women's faces betrayed nothing.

I began to see the secrets other women kept. I discovered that Margaret Fuller's poetic prose masked titanic strength and fierce courage. I wrapped myself in Virginia Woolf's fury. I thought the love expressed in Elizabeth Barrett Browning's poems so strong that it would cause a less formidable heart than hers to burst. I finally came to realize that women did indeed possess moral differences that made women's values, in my mind, better than men's.

Barb: What were the results of immersion in women's studies? What I know about the results are derived for the most part from my correspondence with the women in the intervening years. I have heard regularly from Kathy, less often from Lawrencia and Rhonda, and a few times from Beth and a student I'll call Libby.

There is concrete evidence of action taken, at least in part as a result of this course, and that is the lawsuit filed by Kathy Braun, Lawrencia Bembenek, and Rhonda Ambuehl against the Taycheedah Correctional Institution on the basis of unequal treatment for women. The suit was settled out of court, leading to a Consent Decree that, at least on paper, gives he women incarcerated at Taycheedah the same access to educational programs, health care, and institutional job opportunities as men incarcerated in Wisconsin. Another aspect of the settlement is that women are to be held accountable to the same kinds of rules as the men, but this change is slow in coming. Like much of the rest of society, women are held to more rigid rules that reflect higher moral expectations and are based more on paternalistic attitudes than the rules written for men. Kathy has written me many times that the lawsuit came out of our discussion in class. She has given me some marvelous compliments about the course. I have to say that my contribution to their lives was principally to bring to them the work of feminist scholars and to convince them to think about it.

Another concrete outcome was that one student, "Beth," divorced her husband, a convicted rapist and murderer. She could no longer face being married to him after she learned about feminism. She had been sexually abused for the "crime," as she put it in her final paper, of being a woman. Hers is one of the many tragic stories of prisoners—sexual abuse, marriage to a vicious abusive man, demolished self-esteem.

Each faculty member at Taycheedah has the opportunity of naming the most improved student in the course. It was a hard decision for me; a number had shown growth in understanding and in class work. I finally chose Beth and I believe that the fact that someone found her worthy was an important step in her development.

Suzy, the Volrath worker who never spoke above a whisper, has come back to Taycheedah after her release as a volunteer counselor.

Rhonda: Deborah is working as an industrial spray painter, earning a very good wage. She is the only woman working on the crew, but is proud of having won the respect of her male co-workers. In fact, she enjoys working hard in order to

challenge them, and is secretly happy that they see her competence as a threat to their traditional view of male dominance in the trade.

Barb: The religious fundamentalist, "Leah," wrote for awhile, heart-rending letters that revealed her confusion about her religious convictions, feminism, and the horror of being in prison and in solitary confinement. She was very disturbed when she wrote the letters, and it is hard to say that women's studies benefitted her in the long run.

Rhonda: I have seen occasional glimpses of a skewed reality at times when I think I have delved too deeply into women's studies. I question at times how much we submit to insanity to make ourselves numb to the inequities of male domination.

Barb: Libby, in prison for murdering her newborn child, was in the depths of despondence when the class began and did not really improve a whole lot in spirit during the class. However, she was helped eventually by the course, and even more by the support and affection of Kathy Braun; she is now continuing her college education in a private school.

Kathy was especially responsive to the course. A motherly woman, she was the leader in the class and was very understanding of the different points of view. She is a "very present help in times of trouble" to the other women, and a mainstay for her children and husband in spite of being in prison. That Rhonda has done well is evident from this account; her conviction was overturned on appeal which enabled her to be released much earlier than anticipated. She moved to Madison where she graduated from UW-Madison with a bachelor's degree in May 1991. She currently works as an aide in the Wisconsin state legislature.

As for me, the experience of teaching women's studies in prison changed my life. These women have been an inspiration to me, with their ability to survive excruciating circumstances with courage and even humor. I have taken care to point out to my campus "western civilization" and other history students that prisoners are people like they are; that some of my best friends are in prison for murder; that capital punishment is unfair because of the potential for irreversible mistakes; and that we need to look at the causes of crime in order to bring real peace to our country.

Rhonda: PREP changed my life, too. The impact that Barb and my other instructors had on me cannot be measured. I have learned that the effects of oppression and abuse can be overcome through learning to differentiate between truth and myths. I have learned to trust myself and to nurture my abilities. I have learned that strength is not measured by size, that intimidation is not the only form of persuasion, and that hope, not desperation, is what keeps me going when problems seem insurmountable.

I am more cynical now than I was in my youth. I still have a lot of unresolved anger—anger directed toward the embedded attitude in our society that treats women and children as unimportant, thus permitting us to live without having our basic needs met. The needs that I am talking about are not only shelter, food, and clothing, but include safety, affection, and respect. It is only too apparent if you look at Taycheedah's population that women can prostitute themselves for

rent money, write bad checks for food, and steal clothing. It is fulfillment of those other needs that we search for and too often fail at meeting.

* * *

The Postsecondary Re-entry Education Program (PREP) is intended to help provide inmates in correctional institutions in Wisconsin with the opportunity to obtain, through a comprehensive innovative program, the knowledge and skills that will facilitate successful reintegration into society and especially the world of work. PREP offers an extensive university program emphasizing the liberal arts, college skills, computer literacy, and career skills as well as workshops and counseling dealing with life coping or "re-entry" skills. Since the inception of full-time programming in the fall of 1981, PREP has continued to grow. Beginning with a total of 39 students in 1981, the program now enrolls over 250 women and men each year, all of whom are matriculating students. In addition to credit-producing courses are workshops in such areas as goal setting, interpersonal communication, domestic violence, and career choice. Students are taught to use the computer to assist them in courses, and many are learning computer programming. Special programming at Taycheedah Women's Correctional Institution addresses the specific needs of women offenders. Academic specialists provide financial aid and academic and career counseling. In addition, cultural programs and guest lectures are presented to broaden the students' awareness of humanistic values and appreciation of cultural works.

12. Women With Disabilities in Higher Education: A Personal Perspective

by Sue A. Schmitt

Over the past 25 years as a student at both public and private institutions and a professor and administrator within the UW System, I have experienced extensive changes in the architectural and attitudinal access provided to persons with disabilities. My experience spans the time before and after the passage of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, which guarantees access for persons with disabilities to universities receiving federal funds. That progress has been made is evidenced by many of these experiences. That there is still a long way to go is also evident. Permit me to share with you my 20-plus years of experiences as a person with a disability in higher education.

The Student

After high school graduation in 1964, able-bodied and scholarship in hand, I marched off to the college of my choice in Omaha, Nebraska. Location and the ability to live with relatives, not institutional reputation or program array, were the decisive criteria. Little did I know that as I advanced academically--as an institution's program and reputation became more important—my ability to select an institution based on these criteria would totally disappear. It would be 18 years before I would be able to select—and be selected by—the institution of my choice based on my intellectual abilities and what the institution had to offer me.

Approximately a month into my sophomore year, I contracted a severe viral infection which left me a paraplegic. After two weeks in intensive care, I was evacuated to the Mayo Clinic. Not wanting to lose a semester of work, I completed a literature survey from a Minnesota hospital bed three states away from my college. Letters from the school were encouraging, including one accepting me into the School of Pharmacy. Then came the letter saying, you—yes, wheelchair—no. If when I was released from the hospital I was still in a wheelchair, I could not return to the campus because of inaccessibility.

As the spring semester drew to a close, I faced the summer and fall still hospitalized. Undaunted, that fall I "escaped" from the hospital two nights a week and took a cab to the local junior college where I completed two additional courses. My biggest problem in life was arguing my way past security at 10:00 p.m. to regain access to the hospital.

The quest for a school which would accept me and my wheelchair once I was discharged from the hospital continued throughout the fall and right up to the day I was discharged in December. Picture, if you will, my mother with her 6th grade education and iron will and me from my hospital bed taking on the formidable state and higher education systems.

My first exposure to the challenges ahead came as a client of the Minnesota Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR). Despite the fact that I had been a sophomore on a scholarship, the DVR determined that before they would support my continuation in college I would need to take a number of tests to determine whether I was college material. I had a great deal of difficulty understanding how being unable to use my legs had somehow diminished my mental capacity. A second challenge was that although there was no school in Minnesota which was accessible to me, the agency would only support me out of state if I majored in a program not offered in the state.

My first rejection was from a small private college. The reason given: I might get stuck in a snow bank going from the dorm to classes and they'd have to call the fire department to assist me. Barely weighing 115 pounds at the time, I didn't think it would take quite that much effort to dislodge me! Similar rejections from a number of other institutions followed.

The private Wisconsin college which did accept me, ironically, was one which I had rejected as a high school senior. To receive financial support from DVR, my first question for the college was what programs they had that were not offered in my home state because one of them would *ipso facto* be my major. One of the conditions of acceptance was that my family would need to provide a ramp and a stair lift. Fortunately, a talented cousin accomplished both at minimal costs. Six months later, however, a state inspector insisted that because the stair lift hadn't been wired by a Wisconsin electrician, it would need to be rewired. Foiled again!

After completing my B.A., I began the search for a graduate school. I applied and was accepted at a number of institutions. Then the letters would come—the library, dorm, classrooms, cafeteria and on and on—inaccessible. Finally I was accepted at the University of Missouri, one of the first public institutions to address accessibility. I was recruited and offered a stipend in rehabilitation counseling. At the time, I didn't even know that such a program existed. It didn't matter. The important thing was I'd finally found a school that would, literally, let me in. The area of the degree had to be secondary.

The Employee

After earning my M.S. in rehabilitation counseling, I accepted a position with the state of Wisconsin and was involved in a number of required and optional training programs. I enjoyed such exotic experiences as being transported in a food dumbwaiter to a meeting in a building without an elevator and riding in a food service truck because it was the only way to drive to an isolated reception. I've been carried up and down flights of stairs, dropped in snow banks, and gone 16 floors out of my way to find an accessible rest room. I've entered buildings through kitchens and loading docks, and have seen parts of buildings that are usually reserved for maintenance crews. But with the passage in the early 70s of the

Rehabilitation Act, which guarantees access to persons with disabilities to institutions receiving federal funding, I was sure all these challenges would disappear.

In 1976 I accepted a faculty position at UW–Stout. The interview went well and at last I was sure with the combined protection of Section 504 and a job at an institution with a national reputation in rehabilitation studies my troubles were over. Imagine my surprise when I arrived in January to find that I wouldn't be housed with the rehabilitation faculty because they were on the third floor of a building without an elevator. Thus, I began my university career housed between auto mechanics and accounting. The building had a freight elevator which opened horizontally and could only be used with the assistance of a janitor. My first day on campus was spent in the bathroom with the janitor and the department chair redoing the facilities. That summer I was moved to the Clinical Service Center where I had originally interviewed. During snow months you could always identify my graduate students. They were the ones pulling my wheelchair through the snow drifts and unshoveled curb cuts to my 8:00 a.m. class in the Home Economics Building.

In 1982, as a Bush Leadership Fellow, I left Wisconsin to pursue a doctorate at Mississippi State University. It was the first time I chose my school and program based on my goal, not the physical access of the institution. The newly constructed dorm needed bunk beds removed, a desk with a higher opening installed, and a ramp that was too steep recut. After these changes, I was a free person. Located in the south, it was a little bit of heaven not to deal with the snow. I could go anywhere unassisted, any time of day or night, in any season. The only accommodation I needed was to take my written comprehensives in a building which had readily accessible rest rooms. Since I got bumped to the deans' conference room, it wasn't such a bad deal.

When I returned to UW–Stout in the winter of 1984 as director of the Center for Independent Living, the center had moved to new quarters. I was housed in an accessible building with my colleagues and I had a parking space adjacent to the building where I was housed. In 1985 when I became chair of the department of rehabilitation, my office was located across the street in a building connected to the classrooms by an accessible overpass. It was a delight to be able to go to and from class without fighting snow banks in the winter. The one headache was that the accessible rest rooms were located on the floors above and below the floor on which my office was located.

I have learned one of the true meanings of the phrase "let my people go" as the elusive bathroom continues to plague me. In 1987, I accepted an internship at UW System Administration. My office was on the sixteenth floor and the only handicapped accessible rest room was located on the first floor. I often wondered about the message being sent when the accessible rest room was readily available to students but not faculty or administration housed on higher floors. Surely we believe that students with disabilities will achieve positions of authority and responsibility once they have completed their education.

I'll never forget when the internship was offered and I was told I needed to be able to "keep up" despite the wheelchair. I countered that I'd accept, contingent upon my being provided one of the underground handicapped parking spaces. Thus began an exciting six months which took me to many of the campuses within the system.

The system vice president for academic affairs soon learned to "warn" campuses we were coming. Finding accessible parking, the accessible entrance, the

accessible rest room were always part of the agenda. The vice president also got to see parts of the campuses ordinarily not on the tour—such as the library stacks and key-locked elevators. I remember at one point being asked by the vice president, "Who is planning for disabled faculty at our institutions?" My response was that it was really no one's specific function and furthermore there weren't a lot of visibly disabled faculty or administrators for whom to plan.

Later, in 1987, I accepted the position of associate vice chancellor at UW–Stout. My first challenge was parking since the administration parking lot is only accessible by using stairs, a steep loading dock ramp, or a steep cross-sloped sidewalk at the far end of the lot. After a round of negotiations, two wheelchair parking spaces were designated on the first floor lot leased to the city by the university. Once again I found myself on the third floor and the accessible rest rooms on the second floor and the basement. This minor inconvenience simply meant more planning time between meetings as the elevator controls how quickly I can move about the building.

Participation in Development Activities

Throughout the years, I've attended workshops and institutes for department chairs, women in higher education, issues in higher education, fiscal planning, and a host of others. At all these events, I've been struck by the absence of other visibly disabled persons. I am usually an "n" of one at administrative training activities. In fact, I am a "minority without a culture with which to identify." This is an intriguing situation when you consider that disability crosses all other minority groups: age, race, and gender. But that's another story.

In 1989 I attended the four week Institute for Educational Management (IEM) at Harvard University. Wiser by now, I didn't take the "accessible to the handicapped" note in the brochure at face value. A visit to Harvard before the institute revealed the bathroom and dorm room needed some modifications and I would need to take an alternate route involving two elevators to my room. There would also be a twelve block walk involving a number of blocks without curb cuts from the Radcliffe dorm to the Harvard Graduate School of Education. In addition, activities included a boat trip, a visit to the first President's house (complete with stairs) and a visit to the Kennedy Museum. Two events would involve a bus ride. After spending a day with the institute staff, we had all the barriers under control.

The exciting part of the program was spending four weeks with over 90 people, most of whom had never had a visibly disabled person as a colleague. Together we learned Wheelchair 101 (curbs) and Wheelchair 102 (flights of stairs and boat ramps). Also covered were how to deal with someone in a wheelchair in a crowded room, loading a wheelchair in and out of cabs, dancing, dining on top of a hill, and finding alternative routes to almost everywhere.

I learned a lot from this group of people about the concerns and uncertainties that they felt in dealing with someone in a wheelchair. I learned to answer the unasked questions and to deal with the range of personalities and expectations each person brought with them. I learned that a sense of humor works both ways whether being towed along by a participant on a bicycle or going for a several-mile jog on the weekend. During that four week period, I found that, together, we conducted an institute on disability where both the participants and I had an extraordinary learning experience.

Physical access was clearly an issue. There were many questions, spoken and unspoken, about how I would get from the Radcliffe dorms to the Harvard classroom, how I would handle the boat trip, the dinner at the first President's home, and the trip to the Kennedy museum. Then there was the myriad of evening adventures to be considered. Each day, as these challenges unfolded and solved themselves, they became more background than foreground, and our concerns faded.

At the conclusion of the institute I did a short survey of the participants to determine their initial reactions to me and what made them more comfortable. Among the most revealing responses were surprise at having a disabled participant at IEM, the belief that my disability was temporary, and early feelings that they needed to "watch out for and care for me." Among the most positive comments was the statement that "coming to IEM told 100 individuals that a wheelchair is a relatively minor matter in the great scheme of things."

One of the clearest messages was that "we are all uncomfortable in the presence of the unknown." Some individuals indicated that they were more comfortable waiting to see what others would do and how I would react to them. There were fears of intruding, looking incompetent, doing something wrong or being rebuffed or chastised for offering assistance. One person indicated that it was easier to do nothing than risk doing or saying something wrong. Some people were concerned about imposing on me. One participant indicated that while they could "escape" from anyone with whom they didn't want to interact, I would be "trapped." Interestingly, my greatest concern was "trapping" participants by making them feel they had to assist or interact when they did not want to do so. The one constant theme seemed to be the uncertainty and give and take about who was making whom uncomfortable and whether someone was being an imposition on someone else. Many participants expressed regret at the end of the institute that these issues had retarded interaction with me. Looking back at opportunities missed, they wished they had been willing to take the "risk" to get to know me or that I had made more of an effort to reach out to them.

In addition to concerns about emotional comfort, there were also concerns about physical comfort—both mine and theirs. Some people expressed fear that they would injure themselves lifting the chair and noted that they were uncomfortable when pushing the chair because of their height. The fear of injuring me also arose. One individual expressed concern that if I were tipped from my chair the other participants would be angry with him and he would be embarrassed.

The fear that I would be a "difficult" personality also surfaced. Some of the stereotypes of persons with disabilities as incompetent, unhappy, irritable, demanding, helpless, and fragile reared their ugly heads. Looking down on persons with disabilities was often mentioned. As most of the persons dealt with disabled persons as clients, patients or students rather than colleagues there had been little opportunity to deal with a person with a disability as an equal. Physical activities where participants stood up, such as receptions and breaks, physically reinforced the "looking down on" concept. In these situations it was difficult to establish eye contact or converse in a normal voice. Participants often remarked on this difficulty and preferred small group activities or situations where they could be seated.

The most interesting responses, however, were those to the question of what made you most comfortable. The terms used included my friendliness/warmth, independence, congeniality, sense of humor, ready smile, professionalism, intelli-

gence, openness, availability, and ability to laugh at myself. Among the things that made people uncomfortable were "not saying thank you" and "expecting rather than appreciating assistance" and "not clearly expressing when and how you wanted to be included." These terms have nothing to do with disability but are attributes which make people comfortable or uncomfortable in any situation.

Their responses convey that we are all more alike than different. Some persons have visible disabilities while others have "invisible" disabilities. Often persons with "invisible" disabilities are afraid to ask for accommodations because they fear being rejected or having their employment status jeopardized. Whether visibly or invisibly disabled or in perfect mental and physical health, we each have our own insecurities, strengths and comfort levels.

One of the greatest obstacles in any relationship or undertaking is taking the risk of reaching out. One of the surest ways to connect with another is clear expression of your expectations. In these two areas, persons with disabilities and those without continue to have equal responsibility. It is important that administrators remember this when interviewing and interacting with prospective faculty, staff, or colleagues. It is equally important that persons with disabilities realize that they too are responsible for explaining the unfamiliar and assisting in building bridges to understanding so they are seen as competent and competitive individuals.

13. Salary Equity: A Legal Case

by Louise R. Witherell

My case is closed now. It finished around graduation time at the end of May 1990. It is late October 1990, as I write. I would prefer to forget the painful details of the long years that led first to the filing of charges in the case in the fall of 1988 and finally to the joyous release of an out-of-court settlement. However, in the hope that my tale may be of use to others, I'll try to recall how someone perceived as a little old lady took a stand. . . .

When I entered school as a child, the school system in my town recognized that I was ahead in the academic game. I skipped the first and third grades, and could have skipped fifth. My mother was told that my IQ was exceptionally high. In any case, I knew that I could learn and comprehend as well as anyone. There was some artistic and musical talent to work with too. Oberlin would later offer me a partial scholarship in piano, but we were too poor in the depression year of 1936 for me to go there.

I graduated at the top of both my high school and college classes. From the University of Toledo, Ohio, I received a double bachelor's degree in arts and secondary education. I was then offered three graduate scholarships: to the University of Chicago, to the University of Michigan, and to the University of Wisconsin (there was only one then!). Frankly, I picked Wisconsin because it paid more money, and we were still poor in 1940. It was a happy choice, and for four years I was given better and better scholarships and fellowships there, and no teaching assistant duties. As an ABD (all but dissertation), I found my first job on my first interview at Rosary College in River Forest, Illinois. I had another happy and successful time there, but felt that they offered little future for any but nuns.

Northwestern and Toledo offered me other teaching positions for the following year, although I was renewed at Rosary. I believed that there was now a pattern of professional success begun, clearly established.

Of course, as a child of my time I had also been simmered long in all the ideal patterns for one's life as a woman, especially those dealing with marriage and the primacy of a husband's career. So in 1944, knowing that I would soon marry, I chose to go back to Toledo, Ohio to teach French and Spanish and be near my parents again. In the fall of 1945 in my second year as an assistant professor, I married. After my husband's discharge from service, he returned to his home state of Wisconsin. Naturally, I gave up my teaching and came there too.

Now the thesis could be finished. The Ph.D. became a reality in 1948, as I discovered my first pregnancy. That was a completely euphoric year! Five years later I had a second child.

However delightful home and offspring, the life of the mind makes its demands too: it was natural that the academic world where I had been happy called me back. After a few years at home, I welcomed the chance to teach freshman English part time at the University of Wisconsin–Fox Valley, a two-year center. Later I taught sections of Spanish and French also. Ten years passed in this fashion—with no fringe or pension benefits. However, I was content with this job, where respect was shown to part timers.

By 1961 my unsteady home situation made it clear to me that my full-time employment was a real necessity. Fortunately, the Fox Valley Center was growing, so I could easily have full-time status. I insisted on the rank of assistant professor, which I had held at Toledo. By 1964 I asked for and soon received tenure and the rank of associate professor, an appointment approved by the French department at UW–Madison. And I continued to feel appreciated and adequately rewarded as I revved up my performance as a teacher and a scholar. I was even permitted by UW–Madison and Germaine Bre to teach 20th century French literature for graduate credit.

Around 1968, the nearby UW–Green Bay Center was turned into a four-year institution. After a period of transition with one foot in two centers, I moved full time to UW–Green Bay in 1971. It was exciting to help create this new university—the experimental arm of the UW System's operation. I was as involved as anyone could be (without being one of the boys) in its development, serving on a central planning committee of faculty as well as an early version of its University Committee.

But the largely new and numerous faculty and administration at UW–Green Bay brought a critical change in the work place. This change was not at first perceived as detrimental. The majority of these people were young and inexperienced. Many were eager to assume power in this yet unjelled academe, and they—mostly male—were encouraged in their maneuvers. With the advantage of hindsight, I can see that my shabby treatment began now. Was this true of other UW–Green Bay faculty women too? I believe so.

In the wider world of the early 70s, the renewed movement for women's equality was in full swing. Women employed at UW–Green Bay, not faculty alone, began to meet over brown bag lunches. Soon the chancellor appointed the first affirmative action director, Marge Engelman, as well as committees to deal with affirmative action concerns. I was on such committees, sometimes as chair, for many years. I also worked with and supported the group of women who were instrumental in establishing a women's center and women's studies at UW–Green Bay.

But back in the closed meetings of male administrators, business was as usual, probably with some concealed reaction against women who were not quiet participants in academe. At this time, there was only one woman with the rank of full professor at UW–Green Bay. She was not in my budgetary unit, so could not be an influence in considerations of my merit or promotion.

During 1970–71 my name was proposed for promotion to full professor. Even though I have never seen full reports of the deliberations, a few supposedly "confidential" memos were left, perhaps accidentally, in my file for me to discover in recent years. One 1971 letter/memo asks that my file be reviewed for "women's equality"; another wishes that men had such a "gender advantage." Still another predictably argues that Louise Witherell has not shown enough leadership! Of course I was turned down for full professor. But in 1973 the promo-

tion process began again, and by 1974 I became the second woman at the UW–Green Bay with the rank of full professor.

By 1974 it became apparent that UW–Green Bay was not going to grow as fast as had been predicted, and it was seen as overstaffed. So faculty cutbacks began, among them several women. At least one of these women was more qualified than one of the men who was retained in her department. I ought to know: the woman and the man were in my own discipline, French. In any case, several of these women filed suit against UW–Green Bay. I am not sure about the actual outcomes of those cases; the terminations of the would-be lawsuits were remarkably unremarked! But male colleagues have implied since that the women's lives and careers were ruined as a result. I suppose we must assume that the women did not win against the institution.

Note that these women were relatively young and not tenured. They were very vulnerable both in their immediate status and in the possibility for future blacklisting as troublemakers. Mature and tenured, I would have a very different case. By the time I finally said "Enough!" my position was very secure, if underpaid. And my career was by then not oriented solely toward the future: I had already established myself in my field at UW–Green Bay, in the state, in the nation, and even somewhat in France.

I needed my job and income more than was apparent on the surface. My marriage was shabby, though I was not divorced until 1981. In an effort not to rock the boat, I bit my tongue and tried to keep smiling while working hard to cover all of the areas in which faculty were judged: teaching, scholarship, institutional development, and outreach. I'll skip the details, but I was strong in all areas.

However, I was sometimes not permitted to perform in the area of institutional development. Example: I was appointed to develop international programs. A younger professor of German—male—was then hired. A dean asked me sweetly to let the new man do the job since he seemed a bit more experienced than I did. Actually, he left the program undeveloped, but I had been pushed aside. Second example: When I was elected chair of literature and language (English, American and all other literatures and languages), no doubt my administrative moves were less authoritarian than those of male predecessors. I encouraged individual responsibility rather than rule from above. I was asked to step down by a dean on the grounds that some faculty members had complained of lack of leadership. . . .

The yearly recommendations for merit increase in my salary—established as was then the policy in closed session without the faculty member's presence—were often rather pleasantly worded but gave me a lower numerical rating than almost all of my colleagues. I learned from confiding faculty friends that I had one particular enemy leading the overwhelmingly male group—a man who enjoyed wielding power over other people in general. Not surprisingly, my salary declined in comparison with salaries of my peers.

It was hard to keep smiling as I continued to need to remain employed. I made a few attempts to find another position, but I was probably a little old by then, over 60, and I did not really welcome the thought of moving. Recognition, respect from peers, and general professional appreciation came to me whenever I left the confines of UW–Green Bay, whether I went elsewhere within the United States or in France. These were bittersweet experiences throughout many years.

Sweet because they were so welcome, bitter because comparable appreciation was not experienced at home.

Bitterness and rage were repressed as much as possible, but I believe they contributed to the break in my health which occurred in 1977–78. I kept on teaching, delaying the operation which was the sole cure for my type of ITP (Idiopathic Thrombocytopenic Purpura, a blood disorder) until the end of the school year to avoid hurting students and programs.[1]

In addition to the normal aging process, did my obvious fragility at this time contribute to a perception of me as a relatively weak old lady? Perhaps. However, I continued to perform well in all areas, including institutional development. For example, I became an elected member and elected chair of UW–Green Bay's committee of six—a faculty committee which makes recommendations for promotion to full professor—and was re-elected as chair for several years.

In the fall of 1986, when UW System faculty were given so-called catch-up pay after a time of salary freeze, I was shocked to see that my salary was now between $5,000 to $6,000 below other full professors in my unit whom I regarded as my equals (full professors in foreign languages, for example). I spoke, with tears of rage, to the UW–Green Bay affirmative action director, and when I had calmed down I decided to quietly consult a lawyer. What did I have to lose? I was now 66 years old, and the amount of my pension—in the face of continuing inflation—was at stake. I was relatively pessimistic about my chances of success. I had, after all, read DeSole and Hoffmann's *Rocking the Boat*,[2] and Theodore's chilling *The Campus Troublemakers*.[3]

Now let's back up a moment to look at the status of women at UW–Green Bay at this particular juncture in 1986. The first UW–Green Bay chancellor, Weidner, was stepping down; a new chancellor, Outcalt, was to take up his duties in the fall. A group of faculty women decided that now was the time to address the new chancellor with our very deep concerns. Mary Bailey, an untenured woman about to depart from UW–Green Bay, had called us together and sparked our meetings from the beginning. There was an almost joyous energy in evidence as we all put together what would become a "Position Paper on the Status of Women Faculty at UW–Green Bay." There were 21 tenured faculty women then, six of whom were full professors. Five of the full professors signed the document, as did seven brave associate professors and the one untenured woman who knew she was leaving for a better position, Mary Bailey. The position paper itself was a reasoned, specific narrative, eight pages long, supplemented by thirteen pages of appendices. The appendices were mostly statistical, some drawn from the "UW–System Report on the Status of Women 1985–86," some prepared in the office of the UW–Green Bay secretary of the faculty in June 1986. The position paper asked for specific reforms in the areas of merit, retention, and accountability of unit heads, and also asked for an elected committee to deal with concerns of women faculty. The position paper was sent to the new chancellor before he arrived on campus to take up his new duties. Chancellor Outcalt responded in his first semester at UW–Green Bay by appointing a task force on the status of women at UW–Green Bay, which would report to him by April 1, 1987. I was appointed chair of that task force.

In view of my appointment as chair of the task force, the affirmative action director, Mari Barr, advised me to delay any complaint about my own situation. And so I did. The task force, consisting of men and women from all areas of UW–Green Bay, including students, put in long hours of work, held campus-wide

open hearings, and produced a long and detailed report on schedule, with 20 recommendations for improvement. I am proud of my part in this work: indeed, a letter of appreciation came to me from Outcalt. By 1990 some of the recommendations from the position paper and the task force have been put into practice; some remain to be acted upon. But all that is another story.

Now I was free to go through channels seeking a remedy for my relatively low salary. I expressed my dissatisfaction to the chair of literature and language and to the chair of my budgetary unit, humanistic studies. The humanistic studies merit committee discussed the matter. Kenneth Fleurant, then chair of humanistic studies, wrote (April 20, 1987) to Chancellor Outcalt and to then Vice Chancellor David Jowett using the term "salary inequities" and asking them to do "what you can to improve the unfortunate situation." I requested a meeting with Jowett, which took place on May 19, 1987. Jowett said that he would talk to Cyril Backes, assistant chancellor for Fiscal and Administrative Services at UW–Green Bay, to see what could be done about raising my salary for the few years before my possible retirement. Jowett told me later that he also consulted with Outcalt and the dean of arts and humanities. Jowett was remarkably candid, saying that those he consulted had no sympathy about my current salary since they felt the responsibility lay with the unit handling my merit reviews. No comment necessary.

Meanwhile, Mari Barr, the affirmative action director, asked for a summary of my merit reviews over the years. In July 1987, I sent her a chart/summary as well as copies of all relevant items in my file, plus a letter with my general comments on the use of merit reviews which noted that "the interpretation of a file depends a great deal on the previously formed attitude of the observer . . . sympathetic or critical." What she did with that information I do not know.

And then, in a sudden move, on July 10, 1987, Jowett resigned from his position as vice chancellor. On July 15 Outcalt sent me a brief handwritten note about my situation saying, "The matter will not be dropped." (The underlining is his.) For the following school year I was given a special adjustment of $500 from his office, which I was told was a recognition of my service as chair of the task force on the status of women. But the larger problem was still unresolved.

Now came a difficult period of waiting during the academic year 1987–88. From time to time I resorted to polite reminders to Mari Barr and Chancellor Outcalt that I was still waiting. Their response was to assure me that I was not forgotten. In March 1988, Outcalt phoned to say that my request had been lost at the bottom of the pile of papers on his desk, but that now he would work on it. Mari Barr said that I would not suffer for waiting. On May 10, 1988, I received a memo from Outcalt giving me a one-time lump sum payment of $594 and a base salary adjustment of $700. Better than nothing, but I was now 68 years old with only 27 years that counted toward a pension. This was compensation for all the years that my salary had been kept modestly low?

I turned to the lawyer whom I had first consulted. He said, "The system has failed you." So we decided that the time had come to stop trying to go through university channels. I could have asked for a sort of grievance hearing with the UW–Green Bay university committee, but since they are only advisory to administrators, I felt that that would be wasting more of my very precious time. Besides, we now had a specific development on which to base charges.

The road to a lawsuit is rarely smooth and each one, no doubt, has its own particular hazards. At this moment, my lawyer announced that he would not sign

his name to the federal and state charges: he felt too close to UW–Green Bay, he said. *Now he tells me!* I was also told that somewhere in this situation there might be a legal limit of so-many-days-after-an-incident within which one must file. So the lawyer would have a junior member of his firm sign the papers. Indeed, he handed much of the work over to a brand new law school graduate who frightened me by her naïveté: she claimed to be shocked by my case.

I felt betrayed by the first lawyer. Had he been kindly indulging me for two years? Still, I knew that I needed to go on. So I let them sign the papers for filing while I hunted for another lawyer. There is no space here to describe that anxious process. What is important is that I found a lawyer in Milwaukee, Nola Hitchcock Cross, who was everything I wanted and needed.

But back to chronology: charges were filed at state and federal levels in early fall 1988. This news hit the UW–Green Bay papers around November 1. She-who-sues may never know ahead of time as to when such public events will occur. They come as a blow. And in a one-two punch in the same week, my closest friend as a colleague, Raquel Kersten, died with no warning. Small wonder that I now manifested instant high blood pressure and shingles. Fortunately, I had a good doctor who immediately got me under control.

Now developed a lengthy waltz-at-arm's-length between lawyers, theirs and mine. Again let me say that she-who-sues may not always know immediately or at every moment what is going on. But that is OK if her lawyer is trustworthy, since on the other hand every time her lawyer communicates with her it adds to the legal fees. In my case, the legal fees were kept affordably low, grâce à Dieu—et à Nola!

She-who-sues often feels isolated, I am told. I did feel odd. Surely, I became a nasty worm-who-has-turned to many of the male colleagues who were named in the charges. But many, many colleagues both male and female, from all areas of the university at Green Bay and elsewhere, in and out of the UW System, wished me well. Many of the women expressed their gratitude that I was doing something for all women, something they were unable to do—as I too had been unable to do more than grin and bear it before. I was especially touched when Marian Swoboda, UW System equal opportunity/affirmative action director and assistant to the president, said she would not abandon me. Marge Engleman, who had been UW–Green Bay's first affirmative action director, was also a constant support.

The routine of daily classes, of reaching for excellence in teaching, scholarship, institutional development, and outreach--including evaluations by students (mine were high)—went on, of course. I had already received many awards, including those from Wisconsin Association of Teachers of French in 1984, Wisconsin Association of Foreign Language Teachers in 1986, and a nomination for a named professorship at UW–Green Bay in 1988, complete with letters of support from here and abroad. Within UW–Green Bay I was now treated on the whole gingerly, perhaps with a partially frightened respect, as I continued to attend all meetings appropriate to a full professor, including merit, promotion, and search and screen committees. There was some open hostility: one male full professor in my budgetary unit objected, in a meeting where I was, to my sitting in merit considerations while I was suing the university. This occasioned a subsequent meeting of the same group with Dan Spielmann, the resident UW–Green Bay lawyer and director of intercollegiate athletics. Spielmann helped convince the group and its openly unhappy member that I had a right to be there. Sitting through such sessions was not easy or pleasant for me.

The lawyers on both sides worked for about a year and a half to reach an accord for an out-of-court settlement. I felt somewhat on the periphery of all this, perhaps blessedly so, although I shared the most obvious ups and downs of the process. There was, in the end, what seemed to me a fairly lengthy document with multiple provisions. By 1990 I was 70, and the thought of continuing teaching while pursuing a legal case for an unpredictable number of years through possibly several court levels was not really my choice for "the best [of life] is yet to be." On the other hand, I did not want to simply drop the case. Nola Cross left the decision to me.

Nola Cross said it was now time to begin to take depositions in preparation for a date set in federal court for May 2, 1990. She came to UW–Green Bay for two days in February. UW–Green Bay was represented by its own lawyer and an assistant attorney general. She-who-sues could be there only as an observer. But what a fascinating scene to observe! As a court reporter carefully recorded every word, a series of UW–Green Bay people—mostly administrators and faculty selected by my side—spoke under oath in answer to Nola Cross's calmly probing questions. This "discovery" process did indeed uncover details until then unknown about how my situation had been handled. The following month I gave my own deposition to the assistant attorney general in Nola Cross's office. She had not prepared me for what might come, but I knew who I was, right? What I didn't know was that, as I was asked to recall my academic past, the painful remembrance would cause tears to roll down my cheeks. The man asked if I wanted to stop, but I said no. After two and a half hours, it was over. To make this long story short, let me quote, with a few asides, from a letter I sent to friends in the summer in 1990:

> It's finally happened: I have retired!
>
> As I write this on May 20, 1990, it has been about 10 days since the news got out around here. That is to say, about 10 days since I was told by the head of my budgetary unit that he had just had word from the local university lawyer that I was retiring. News to me too!
>
> Of course, I did know that my retirement . . . was one of the clauses in a possible out-of-court settlement. Another clause is that I am not supposed to discuss the terms of the settlement.

(Although neither side was to discuss the settlement, the assistant attorney general was quoted in the Green Bay paper as saying that my legal fees had been paid and my retirement pension increased.)

> The various levels of university administration went into a swift tizzy to be sure to give me a properly roaring send-off. I've had emeritus status recommended all up the line—which I will receive at graduation on May 26—although they're sorry it was too late to get my name on the official program—and my plaque (!) may not get done on time.

The plaque got done in good time for the chancellor to hand it to me with a smile, but there was a last ditch attempt by my Eternal Enemy in a meeting which I attended on May 11 to delay—perhaps forever?—the emeritus status. As the French say, "plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose."

> The budgetary unit threw me a retirement reception from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. one afternoon, complete with French cheese and Proustian strawberries and cream. . . . Almost everyone came . . . the administration from the chancellor on down. I must say I had much fun and a soaring sense of satisfaction!

NOTES

1. Alice Goldsby, another recently retired faculty member from UW–Green Bay, intends to collect data on the effect of UW–Green Bay on the health of employees: she believes many have suffered from stress.
2. Gloria Desole and Leonore Hoffmann, *Rocking the Boat* (New York: MLA, 1981).
3. Athena Theodore, *The Campus Troublemakers* (Houston: Cap and Gown Press, 1986).

14. Sexist Language is Alive and Well at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee

by Eleanor M. Miller

In Volume III of *University Women*, Carolyn Sylvander described an attempt, in which she played an integral part, to get the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents to agree to change the official title of "chairman" to "chairperson" or "chair." She recounts in some detail the old-boy atmosphere of the October 1974 regents' meeting in question. It was one in which rib-jabbing snickers prevailed, encouraged by the opening remarks of Regent John Dixon. Regent Dixon questioned whether:

> [W]omen with real pride and confidence wanted this type of neuter emphasis? Would Helen Hayes want it, or Florence Nightingale, or Catherine Cleary, or Miss America, or Cleopatra? This leaves only Bella Abzug and Jane Fonda carrying the torch. . . . I can visualize how this type of thing would be extended into the future. The great songs of the barber shop chorales would go something like this, 'The person I marry will have to be the person I call my own,' or the famous Sigma Chi serenade will start, 'the person of my dreams is the sweetest person,' and so forth and so forth. Or, 'I want a person just like the person, who married dear old dad.' As Bobby Burns put it, 'a person is a person for all that.'[1]

Regent Nancy Barkla, whose motion to make such a change had gone unseconded at an earlier meeting, attempted to redirect the debate in the light of a letter Sylvander had written to the regents in the interim. In that letter, Sylvander had stated:

> A major source and symbol of positive achievement for blacks has been, I think, the transformation of a term of historical denigration—"black"—into a term of pride and positive self-image, through such simple and profound means as promotion of phrases like "black is beautiful" and "black power." No one has been more positively educated in this transformation process than whites, who are now aware that terms and principles developed and promoted by a minority group itself have a value for that group not achieved by accepting the labels and principles "laid on" from the majority culture. Whites didn't decide "Negro" would become "Afro-American" or "black"—blacks decided they preferred their own choices, and whites are now aware, for the most part, that blacks are not manipulated objects who can be labeled and forgotten, but full human being with the same self-pride and need for self-determination as whites have historically prided themselves in.[2]

A lengthy debate ensued. Strong feelings for and against were expressed. But this was progress of a sort; at least there had been a second and there was debate. In the end the attempt to change the bylaws to amend the term "chairman" was defeated, however. Sylvander ends her essay on an optimistic note

nonetheless. She writes: "Whatever the vote on the eighteenth floor of Van Hise this day, sexism in language is definitely on its way out. . . ."[3] But is it?

It is true that on July 13, 1990 the UW System Board of Regents voted unanimously, without discussion, to amend its bylaws to change the term "chairman" to "chair." There has been no discussion of that change or its significance on this campus, however. In fact, if you wandered into Bolton Hall today and looked at the building roster on the first floor, you would see a listing of all the departments housed there and their chairs. Each chair's name is followed by the abbreviation "chmn," with the exception of mine, which I physically changed to "chair" myself this fall. There remain other areas of gender inequity, however, that are a bit more subtle (the degree of subtlety, of course, depends on one's point of view) and, I would argue, more insidious, that are highlighted and reinforced by sexist images and language every day on this campus.

The analogy Sylvander makes to the situation of African-Americans remains an enlightening one. Let me begin with an image from advertising and then come back to UW–Milwaukee to make my point. Not so long ago, Stroh's Beer ran an ad on television that I found quite interesting. A stagecoach is being attacked by "Indians" (one could, of course, write a whole other essay on this scenario itself). In the coach two "cowboys" flank a plain-looking, middle-aged white woman. A brief discussion between the men ensues in which they decide that in order to escape, they must rid themselves of some baggage. Is it to be the case of Stroh's beer or the woman? You guessed it.

When I viewed this commercial for the first time, I mentally replaced the woman with an African American of either sex. The result was an image that I was sure a writer in advertising would immediately dismiss as racist if it ever even came to mind. In other words, I was quite sure it would never have hit the airwaves. But women were still "up for grabs," so to speak, or at least for throwing from stagecoaches and trains, especially if they are not perceived as desirable sex objects.

Now back to language and UW–Milwaukee. As chair, I get a lot of mail I wouldn't get as a simple associate professor. One thing I get is a publication of the staff development office called "Staff Development Programs." It lists short courses and workshops offered on campus that I, as chair, might suggest a staff person in my office take. Alternatively, staff might approach me for financial support to take such courses. These courses are generally not aimed at faculty, but at classified staff. The range of offerings is impressive, from the very technical to the socio-emotional. Although I heartily endorse the program in principle, I recently wrote to protest several of these offerings. Here is part of my letter of October 24, 1990 to John Clark, who heads the Staff Development Office:

> I read with interest the periodical offerings in the area of staff development, and I have an observation to make as someone with an academic specialty in gender. I think it is really wonderful that your office offers training of various sorts that focus on the needs of minorities and women. . . . I would like to draw your attention, however, to what I perceive as subtle sexism in some of these offerings. For example, recently a workshop was advertised that was entitled "The Promotable Woman," and the most recent catalogue describes a workshop entitled "Professional Image for Women." I think that if you substitute "Black/African American" for "Woman," particularly in the first title, you may get my point. Would you offer a workshop entitled "The Promotable Black?" I think not. To do so would be to imply that some blacks are not promotable simply because they are black; it puts the burden of proof on the members of the less powerful group. The same message is communicated to women by the titles chosen. They are victim-blaming titles that do not

occur when you offer seminars that focus on minorities. Case in point from the most recent catalogue: "Racial/Ethnic Sensitivity and the University Community." It is my impression, one that is well documented in the literature, that our culture has become more sensitive to the most blatantly racist features of language and media than it has to the most blatantly sexist. I want to be clear, however, that I do not mean to focus attention only on the titles of workshops. Those workshops whose content suggests that women need to change in order to be promoted are, I think, politically reprehensible. What needs to change are the gendered structures that evaluate candidates for promotion. Here is where we need workshops with a gender focus. . . .

Clark's letter to me was conciliatory. He apologized for not having looked more closely at the content of the workshops offered of late. He did point out that it was women on campus who suggested the vendors of these workshops; it was they who had heard that they had been well received in other arenas.

I guess (to paraphrase Regent Dixon) that leaves only Bella Abzug and Jane Fonda—and that wacko "chair" of the Sociology Department—carrying the torch.

NOTES

1. Papers of the Board of Regents Meeting, October 4, 1974. University Archives, University of Wisconsin-Madison as cited in Carolyn Sylvander, "Chair, Chairman, Chairperson," *Women Emerge in the Seventies*, Vol. III of *University Women: A Series of Essays* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Board of Regents, 1980) p. 75.
2. Carolyn Sylvander, "Chair, Chairman Chairperson," *Women Emerge in the Seventies*, Vol. III of *University Women: A Series of Essays* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Board of Regents, 1980) p. 77.
3. Ibid., p. 78.

PART THREE

TRIBUTES

15. Ruth Bleier: Feminist Scientist

by Sue Rosser

Ruth Bleier was the one individual who, more than any other person, opened up for me the possibility of combining feminism and science. In my experience as a biologist I find that many scientists are feminists in their politics or in their relationships outside of the laboratory. Although they fight for feminist causes in other arenas, they leave feminism at the laboratory door, divorced from their scientific hypothesizing, data gathering, and theorizing. Some scientists who are feminists even question whether or not gender enters into good science.[1]

Most feminists are not scientists. A quick perusal of the women's studies journals and disciplinary affiliations of most feminists in academia yields an overwhelming majority of scholars in the humanities and social sciences. Few feminists outside of academia are scientists. In fact, many feminists openly reject science, which they view as a masculine, dominating, patriarchal approach to the world and women.[2]

Ruth Bleier was one of a small group of individuals interested in both science and feminism, and the interaction between the two. Born in 1923 near Pittsburgh, PA, Ruth Bleier was an only child. She saw this as a great help and noted in a 1984 interview that she "got to do everything the son would do as well as the daughter."[3] After receiving a bachelor's degree in political science from Goucher College, she pursued a medical degree at the Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania. During this same period she became involved with AIMS (the Association of Interns and Medical Students) whose political purpose included improving the future of civilization by seeking world peace while also improving medical education and practice.

After interning at Sinai Hospital in Baltimore from 1949–1951, she practiced medicine for seven years in a working-class, racially mixed neighborhood. Here she continued to fight discrimination within medicine and in the larger political world. As one of the leading organizers in the Maryland Committee for Peace, Ruth helped petition to end the Korean War and ban atomic weapons. Because of her political activities during this period of McCarthyism, at age 28 Bleier's name appeared on J. Edgar Hoover's personal unpublished "wanted list" and she was called to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) in July of 1951. Her testimony before the committee included the following statement:

> As a physician, as a woman, as an heir to a great democratic tradition, I will continue to fight for the America I love: one where all peoples have full equality, where our constitutional rights become the unquestionable birthright of all regardless of color, creed, or belief;

where all have an equal opportunity to pursue the full development and realization of their potentialities and aspirations; where our science and technology, that produced the boundless resources of atomic energy, will be turned to peaceful construction for the benefit of all. And this is the America that my generation of Americans will achieve.[3]

The traditional medical profession in the traditional city of Baltimore would not tolerate left-wing political views during the McCarthy era. Bleier was denied privileges at Sinai Hospital and acceptance into the Baltimore City Medical Society.

In 1959 she left the practice of medicine to explore the structure and function of the brain with the aid of a post-doctoral fellowship in neuroanatomy at Johns Hopkins. Drawn to Madison, Wisconsin in 1967, Ruth Bleier's initial appointment was with the department of neurophysiology in the School of Medicine. As she stated in the text of one of her last speeches (actually delivered by someone else because of her illness):

As many of you know, my own history, before the era of women's studies and from my medical school days, was as a political activist, on the left end of the spectrum, and my preferred activity was to agitate and organize. Thus it came to pass that with the advent of the current women's movement, I decided to leave the President of the United States and his Congress to their own devices and became, instead, an agitator of the university administration and an organizer of women on this campus and throughout the state System beginning in 1970. (And that may be a much more gripping history than the one I was asked to present here.) While my activities were confined to the political, another part of our activist group, the Association of Faculty Women (a misnomer since it included academic and classified staff and students) worked consistently toward the establishment of women's studies on campus and in the U.W. System, a goal that was accomplished in 1975.[4]

At the University of Wisconsin, organized feminist activities were born in the early 1970s when HEW (the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) investigated sex discrimination charges but spoke only to men. This led to the creation of an active, militant organization, the Association of Faculty Women (AFW), co-chaired by Ruth Bleier. Involved in many issues concerning women such as faculty grievances, affirmative action, the committee of women in the sciences, and women's athletics, AFW pushed the administration and was largely responsible for the establishment of the women's studies program.

As founder of the women's studies program at UW–Madison, Bleier was a pioneer who helped develop and co-taught "Biology and Psychology of Women," one of the first four core courses in the program. Imbued with "a passionate vision of the struggle for peace, for feminism, and for truth, and justice,"[3] Ruth continued to be a guiding light for women's studies at the university, where she served as chair of women's studies from 1982–1986, and for feminists throughout the world, where her scholarship on feminism and science became well known.

Ruth was unique among scientists who are feminists in that she did not leave her feminism at the laboratory door. She spent hours explaining the connections between feminism and science to her colleagues and friends who were not scientists. She used her feminist analysis to critique existing theories of science, to point out racist and sexist flaws in experimental design and interpretation, and to begin to sketch the parameters for feminist science.

Perhaps more importantly she brought the feminist critique to bear on her own research and that of her colleagues in neuroanatomy. For example, in 1982 Lacoste-Utamsing and Holloway[5] reported that their research on autopsied brains showed physiological gender differences in the degree of lateralization of

the brain for visuospatial functions. To refute this conclusion, Ruth used magnetic resonance imaging to measure the size of a small section of the brain, the splenium of the corpus callosum, of thirty-seven *living* individuals to demonstrate that variations in callosal size and shape could not be correlated with gender-based differences in cognitive functioning.[6] Bleier's work suggested that small sample size and autopsied condition, rather than true gender differences in anatomy, probably accounted for the anatomical differences that Lacoste-Utamsing and Holloway had attempted to correlate with visuospatial function. By making presentations on feminist issues at the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and tangling with the editors of the most prestigious journal, *Science*, over these experimental methods and differing results, Ruth brought feminism to the cutting edge of research science.[7]

Ruth was unusual among feminists in that she continued to be a practicing scientist while working on and writing about feminism and science during the four years that she chaired the women's studies program. The small group of feminists interested in questions of science and feminism consists primarily of historians and philosophers of science. Fewer members of the group have Ph.D's and teach in traditional scientific disciplines. Of those who do, most of us have changed our research focus towards feminism and science, gradually dropping our "hard science," grant-supported research along the way. Ruth, however, continued active neuroanatomy research, well supported by federal grants, while also writing on feminism and science. In fact, her best known single-authored book *Gender and Science*[8] and a monograph on the cat brain were published simultaneously in 1984.

Ruth was a feminist scientist who could most skillfully use the methods and theories of feminism to critique science and the tools of science to analyze flaws in the methodology and theoretical constructs in feminism. She was unique in that respect. With her death on January 4, 1988, we lost a scientist, a feminist, a feminist scientist, and a friend.

NOTES

1. Evelyn Fox Keller, "Women and Basic Research: Respecting the Unexpected," *Technology Review* (November, 1984) pp. 44–47.
2. Laurel Holliday, *The Violent Sex: Male Psychobiology and the Evolution of Consciousness* (Guerneville, CA: Bluestocking Books, 1978).
3. Mary Martin, "A Lifetime of Action, of Passion," *Feminist Voices* (February, 1988) p. 7.
4. Ruth Bleier, *A Decade of Feminist Critiques in the Natural Sciences* (Madison, Wisconsin: Women's Studies Research Center Colloquium, December 4, 1987) p. 4.
5. Christine de Lacoste-Utamsing and Ralph L. Holloway, "Sexual dimorphism in the human corpus callosum," *Science* (1982) pp. 1431–1432.
6. William Byne, Ruth Bleier and Lanning Houston, "Variations in human corpus callosum do not predict gender: A study using magnetic resonance imaging," *Behavioral Neuroscience* 102:2 (1988) pp. 222–227.
7. Ruth Bleier, "Science and the Construction of Meanings in the Neurosciences," *Feminism Within the Science and Health Care Professions: Overcoming Resistance*, Sue V. Rosser, Ed. (Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press, 1988) pp. 91–104.
8. Ruth Bleier, *Gender and Science* (Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press, 1984).

16. In the Days When Nutrition Was New

by Dorothy Pringle

Helen T. Parsons and May S. Reynolds can truly be described as pioneers in human nutrition research at UW-Madison. Their careers spanned the years 1913–1961 when the field of nutrition was making great strides even though the research grants were very meager.

Twenty-six-year old Helen Tracy Parsons arrived in Madison in 1913 with a bachelor's degree in home economics from Kansas State University and several years of high school teaching experience in Oklahoma. The home economics department was located in the attic of Lathrop Hall and Abby Marlatt, the director, assigned Helen to E.V. McCollum in the Department of Agricultural Chemistry, who would supervise the research for her M.S. degree. Dr. McCollum had recently discovered an unknown dietary factor required by cows that he called "fat soluble A" (now known as vitamin A). This was the dawn of the vitamin era and young Helen Parsons was there at sunrise. She earned the M.S. degree in 1916 and followed McCollum to Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. After several years there as a research technician she returned to the University of Wisconsin as an assistant professor. From 1924–1928 she studied for her Ph.D. at Yale University under the direction of Lafayette B. Mendel, a distinguished nutritionist. She returned to the University of Wisconsin as an associate professor in home economics in 1928.

Extraordinary amounts of curiosity and persistence contributed to Helen's success in research. She was also a strong believer in serendipity. All of her students were told the fairy tale of "The Three Princes of Serendip" who made many accidental discoveries as they traveled around the world.

Serendipity contributed greatly to one of Helen's early research successes. In her doctoral research, she had fed various protein sources to young rats who had had one kidney removed to test the effects of high protein intake on the remaining kidney. The rats receiving raw egg white rations came down with a serious disorder: they failed to grow and had severe diarrhea and dermatitis. If the egg white was cooked, the disorder did not appear. The disease was called "egg white injury" and it was thought to be due to a bacteria or toxic substance that was destroyed by cooking. After returning to Wisconsin in 1928, Helen reported that when dried yeast, egg yolk, wheat germ, liver, or kidney was added to the raw egg white ration, the disease could be prevented or even cured. This suggested that a specific dietary substance was needed for preventing "egg white injury." In 1940, Paul Gyorgy identified the dietary substance as biotin, a B-com-

plex vitamin, required by all mammals including human beings. Other investigators isolated a protein, avidin, in egg white that bound the biotin so that it could not be utilized by the animal. Since avidin is inactivated by heat, the cooked egg white did not cause "egg white injury", but the raw egg white did. This was one of the first antivitamins identified. (In a broad sense, an antivitamin is any substance which interferes with the digestion, absorption, or metabolism of a vitamin.) This discovery pointed the way for much of Helen's later research.

Helen Parsons was also instrumental in identifying another antivitamin effect. In the early 1940s, bakers' yeast was being advertised as a good source of B-complex vitamins. People were being encouraged to break a cake of raw compressed yeast into a glass of tomato juice as a "vitamin cocktail." Some enthusiasts consumed three cakes a day. Helen and her students working with Dr. Conrad Elvehjem and Dr. Harry Steenbock in the Department of Biochemistry tested the availability of thiamin from raw and cooked yeast ingested by human subjects. Thiamin from raw bakers' yeast apparently was not being absorbed in the intestines, but the cooked yeast was. It was found that the live yeast cells did not break down in the digestive tract: the cells even robbed some of the thiamin from the food in the tract before passing out of the body unchanged. Thus, this was an antivitamin effect. The yeast companies denied the validity of these results, but the Food and Drug Administration brought charges against the companies, and the "vitamin cocktail" advertisements disappeared.

In the early days the nutritionists in the biochemistry and home economics departments enjoyed close cooperation. Most nutrition graduate students in home economics had joint majors with biochemistry; the biochemists contributed advice on laboratory procedures and the home economists supervised the metabolic studies with human subjects. It often required great encouragement to get human subjects to comply with the rigorous requirements of such studies. Graduate students were expected to participate in the so-called "diet squads" without reimbursement.

Helen continued studies on the availability of thiamin and riboflavin in foods, but she also studied the metabolism of some of the newly discovered vitamins, folic acid and vitamin B_{12}. In all of her research she used a variety of experimental animals including pigs, prairie dogs, chickens, and guinea pigs. She also studied the nutritional requirements of parakeets for a birdseed company. In 1942 Helen received the Borden Award of the American Home Economics Association for her contributions to nutritional science.

In addition to her prize-winning research, Helen Parsons had great flair in the classroom. Students in dietetics learned about the anatomy and physiology of the kidney in her senior course in diet therapy. In the first class period the walls and chalk boards were covered with her own drawings of the kidney on brown paper. By the end of the class period students were given a quiz requiring them to identify all of the anatomical parts described in the lecture. Needless to say, they quickly learned to pay close attention in class. Helen also had a taste for drama and described famous scientists with great zest. She made scientific discoveries as exciting as solving a detective mystery.

One of Helen's first doctoral students, May S. Reynolds, said, "Dr. Parsons has a way of stimulating you to greater effort—and never will you work so hard so happily for anyone." This inspiration was clearly demonstrated by May's own career.

May Reynolds grew up in Iowa and graduated from Iowa State College in 1914. She married Wallace W. Reynolds in 1915 and lived on a farm near Lodi, Wisconsin until his death from influenza in 1918. She later enrolled as a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin where she received her M.S. in 1924 and Ph.D. in 1936. During her graduate studies she was the single parent of her daughter, Margaret. She successfully juggled home, laboratory, and teaching duties throughout these years—an unusual accomplishment at that time. She started on the home economics faculty as a lecture assistant while working on her master's degree and progressed through the ranks to full professor.

May Reynolds's specific area of research departed from Helen Parsons's: her research concerned the determination of protein requirements rather than vitamin nutrition. Metabolic studies to determine nitrogen balance in human subjects were needed. It is difficult to believe that anyone could be good-humored and enthusiastic while conducting a human metabolic study, which requires the chemical analyses of all the food consumed as well as all the excreta eliminated by some five to eight human subjects over periods as long as eight weeks. But May was able to maintain her *joie de vivre* through many of these studies which she designed and supervised during 39 years of research at UW–Madison.

May Reynolds's protein research was sometimes women-focused as well. Early in the 1940s, nutritionists had identified almost all of the essential dietary substances required by human beings. Essential amino acids, building blocks of protein, had been specified and the minimum requirements for men had been determined. However, the requirements for women were not known. In an extended research program sponsored by the Institute of Home Economics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a group of women nutritionists in the North Central Region undertook a cooperative study to determine the amino acid requirements of women.

May and her graduate students studied the requirements for lysine and methionine. It was found that the amino acid requirements of women were lower than those reported for men. Her group also studied the protein requirements of women during caloric restrictions and the efficiency of protein utilization from natural food sources. Her studies were among the first to demonstrate the potential nutritional value of the seeds of what was then regarded as an exotic oriental plant, the soybean. Other areas of nutrition investigated included the metabolism of vitamin B_6, the tryptophan-niacin interrelationship, and the availability of protein from peanut butter and dried skim milk. Practical studies included protein and amino acid intake by women on self-selected diets and the dietary intake of college women. During May's tenure she supervised the studies of more than sixty graduate students and motivated many of them to continue in research after they received their degrees. Two of her former students also received the prestigious Borden Award that she had been awarded in 1958.

Teaching was one of May's greatest talents. She had started her teaching career in high schools in Iowa, where she not only taught home economics classes but also Latin, and sometimes coached the girls' basketball team. At the University of Wisconsin she taught undergraduate and graduate courses every semester for thirty years. Her courses in general human nutrition and in child nutrition were greatly appreciated—even though they required a four-hour laboratory session on Saturday morning. Her practical applications of current scientific findings and her sense of humor made her lectures very popular.

May believed in education beyond the classroom. Her enthusiasm and dedication to the cause of human nutrition led to many service programs and extensive involvement in the extension functions of the university. She was a pioneer radio nutritionist. In 1923 she started the "Homemakers Hour" on WHA and participated in the college week for women programs conducted by the UW–Extension even after her retirement. With useful nutrition information, she reached out to people through Cooperative Extension publications, exhibits, and teaching.

Almost immediately after retiring in September 1961, May traveled to Pakistan to become a nutrition research consultant for the Ford Foundation-Oklahoma State University program. After developing nutrition research programs in Pakistan for two years, she returned to the U.S. and served as a visiting professor at the University of Wisconsin, the Pennsylvania State University, Brigham Young University, and the University of Delaware. At the age of 73 she developed a new course in world nutrition at the University of Delaware.

The citation on the 1960 Iowa State University Alumni Merit Award describes Dr. Reynolds as "A wonderful mother, an earnest and never-give-up researcher and inspiring teacher; her humanitarian activities have turned thousands to better nutrition and productive lives. Her influence through her students has extended around the world."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This essay was based on the Memorial Resolution published in the University of Wisconsin–Madison Faculty Minutes, 1987, and the personal knowledge of the author and Margaret E. Nelson, Dr. Reynolds's daughter.

17. Nancy Datan: "My Candle Burns at Both Ends"

by Dean Rodeheaver

Before confronting the clutter that was Nancy Datan's office, visitors were confronted with the following quotation, handwritten on a small sheet from a memo pad, taped to her door:

> Do not say that the people must be educated, when, after all, you only mean amused, refreshed, soothed, put into good spirits and good humor, or kept from vicious excesses.
>
> —John Henry Cardinal Newman
> *The Idea of a University*

Her students learned, soon enough, that Nancy Datan did not amuse or soothe: although she could do both, she demanded of her students the excellence befitting the student-teacher relationship she held as sacred as she believed Socrates must have.

Although Nancy, my wife was in the UW System a very short time—at UW-Green Bay from 1984 until she died of cancer in 1987—most of those who met her would probably remember the passion with which she embraced intellectual rigor. For her, elitism may have been a curse, but it was not an insult. Those who knew her slightly better—her character was not hard to ascertain: Nancy was fond of saying that she wore her id on her sleeve—may have seen in her a rather tempestuous blend of that elitism, a critical, self-reflective feminism, and an unorthodox but unforgiving Judaism. She spent much of her short time in Wisconsin challenging colleagues on their academic integrity, demanding resources for women's studies, and then chastising the women's studies network for scheduling conferences on Jewish holidays.

A fondness for quoting Robert Maynard Hutchins (early on, this included his statement, "When I get the urge to exercise, I lie down until it goes away:" as a marathon runner in her final year or two, she no longer quoted Hutchins on that score) stemmed from her experiences with the Great Books program at Shimer College, a small liberal arts college a little over one hundred miles west of Chicago. (Our son's experiences with the same program at St. John's College led her to reexamine the male bias of that curriculum, although she remained a great believer in and supporter of the Great Books.) She later earned her master's and doctoral degrees from the committee on human development at the University of Chicago.

Ten years spent in Israel refined both her Judaism and her feminism. After spending so much time as a member of the majority, she never again took to

being a religious minority. Indeed, she later wrote that Jews in America should be considered not a minority but an endangered species. Her religious sensitivities were aroused easily, even though she considered herself a militant atheist Jew—it was the freedom to exercise religion as one chose that was her cause, even when that choice included observing the High Holidays by staying away from both work and the synagogue. During that time in Israel, she also was completing the empirical research for which she is best known, a comparison of women's responses to menopause across five subcultures. She did not consider herself to be a feminist at that time, but then, how many of us recognize the roots of consciousness when they are being established? Her finding: that traditional women—who had no education and who bore children almost continually from menarche to menopause—and modern women—who were educated and controlled their childbearing with contraception and abortion—dealt with the loss of fertility equally well, might have surprised both feminist and nonfeminist thinkers alike. It certainly surprised Nancy, who expected modern women to be the least affected by the end of childbearing. Out of that surprise, though, came an important reconciliation of the role of tradition and modernity in women's lives:

> . . liberation, with its attendant consequences of autonomy and choice, is not a simple progression toward new freedom and prerogatives . [but] is the exchange of one set of prerogatives for another. Freedom of choice can be accompanied by uncertainty and doubt The relative certainty of the traditional woman, moreover, seems to us to be bought at the price of ritual constraints.[1]

It was women in cultural transition who experienced the greatest stress in response to the individual developmental transition of menopause, a discovery that Nancy analyzed with a skill that was one of her greatest strengths: the ability to find universal elements of existence in the particulars of individual experience:

> in a larger sense we are all in transition. No one in middle age today was reared prepared for today's social climate. Indeed, this is particularly and poignantly apparent for many "modern" middle aged women. Reared to become wives and mothers, often at the expense of careers, they may be entering the labor force today, when affirmative action programs mandate the hiring of qualified women in preference to men—programs which create new horizons for younger women, but highlight the constricted horizons of older women, whose decisions earlier in the life cycle are likely to leave them at a disadvantage in today's social context.[2]

Nancy left Israel in 1973 to accept a position at West Virginia University, at least in part because as a newly divorced woman, she was unable financially to raise her children in Israel. Over the following years, she became more consciously a feminist psychologist, shaped by scholars like Florence Denmark and Rhoda Unger. She also developed an abiding concern for older women, whom she felt were overlooked by much of feminist research and political action.

Nancy was trained as a scientist, first in the natural sciences and then as a social scientist. Her methods were her own, though: I am sure she would prefer to be remembered as a poet and an essayist rather than as a scientist. Her poetry is apparent in the titles of her works, ranging in their scope from older women's sexuality to Dr. Seuss, from humor and the marginal identity of elders to the sociology of knowledge. Consider such titles as: "Your Daughters Shall Prophecy," "Midas and Other Mid-life Crises," and "Corpses, Lepers, and Menstruating Women." Her poetry also evolved into a private collection she hoped eventually

to publish. She wrote constantly, about our children, our dogs, education, and about her confrontation with mortality, stemming initially from an experience of post-traumatic epilepsy. An example:

> It's the end of the season of butterflies: coming home I found one dying on the sidewalk, able to flutter when I tried to hold it, but no more than that. I would be gentle to butterflies at any time but I was gentler this morning. I found it shade to die in.
>
> As for myself: I am full of living today and cannot view the dying of a butterfly dispassionately.

She approached seemingly mundane topics with the sensitivity of a Loren Eiseley or a Lewis Thomas, two of her favorite authors. As an essayist, she combined her unique ability to find commonalities in individual experience with that personal dialectic between intellectualism, feminism, and Judaism. She examined such themes of adult life as gender, sexuality, generational tensions, mastery, and vulnerability through her own life and through the messages of myth, folk, and fairy tales. At the UW–Green Bay, she found kindred spirits among returning adult women, who Nancy felt loved learning for its own sake and often overcame enormous barriers to express that love. She often said to me that she finally knew why she had been "sent" to Wisconsin. About those women, she would later write:

> They are driven from within by intellectual hunger, they are seldom supported and often opposed by the hostility of husbands and friends. . . . they have been excluded from anything like equal opportunity in higher education by parents, teachers, and family who assume that education is a male prerogative. It can only be hoped that their successes will move other teachers to open the classroom door a little wider, and thus lower the barriers that others have raised.[3]

In the fall of 1986, Nancy was diagnosed as having breast cancer. Chemotherapy and a mastectomy followed, and since there was no sign that the cancer had spread, we were optimistic. Two months before her death, ill and barely able to stand or speak because of the effects of what we would soon discover was a malignancy in her spinal fluid, Nancy delivered a paper at Hamilton College. Her topic was her battle, not just with the disease, but with societal and medical pressure to cover up what she considered to be legitimate battle scars:

> Breast cancer is a trauma: if a woman feels she is entitled to four silicone breasts after a mastectomy, I applaud her originality, and . . . I urge tolerance of the diversity of interpersonal styles, in sickness as well as in health. . . . My quarrel is not with the women who choose this procedure but with the surgeons who assert that physical self-confidence will be enhanced by this painful, potentially dangerous invasion of the body. It's one option. Another option is to live, as Audre Lourde inspired me to do, without any thought of disguise.[4]

In the same paper, Nancy insisted that she was not a victim of breast cancer but rather a survivor. In doing so, she also made clear why she felt such a kinship with the returning women students at UW–Green Bay. They, too, were survivors.

And she provided the unifying theme for much of her own life. She treasured the precious and the endangered: the life of the mind, the unexpressed potentialities of women, and the transmission of Judaism from generation to generation amidst centers of persecution. Nancy Datan was a survivor. And even as she faced her own death, from the depths of her incredibly rich mind came a

poem that highlighted that fact, a poem by Edna St. Vincent Millay that I included in her obituary:

My candle burns at both ends,
It will not last the night;
But ah, my foes, and oh, my friends—
It gives a lovely light!

NOTES

1. Nancy Datan, Aaron Antonovsky, and Benjamin Maoz, *A Time to Reap: The Middle Age of Women in Five Israeli Subcultures* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981) p. 114.
2. *Ibid.* pp. 115–116.
3. Nancy Datan, Mary Dickinson, Loretta Larkey, and Suzanne Jones. "The Androgyny of Later Life: For Women Only?" Paper presented at the conference of the Gerontological Society of America, Chicago, Illinois, November 1986, p. 5.
4. Nancy Datan, "Illness and Imagery: Feminist Cognition, Socialization, and Gender Identity," Paper presented at the conference on Psychological Perspectives on Gender and Thought, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York, April 1987, pp. 8–9.

18. A Tribute to Raquel Kersten

by Virginia Gibbs

Students called her Doña Raquel, and for them, Dr. Raquel Kersten embodied our multicultural world in all its richness. Born and raised in a small town in Cuba, of Polish-Jewish heritage, married to a northeast Wisconsinite, Raquel was never a piecemeal combination of ethnic and experiential forces, but rather a harmonious blend that celebrated both the uniqueness of every human being and the shared humanity of all people. She often laughingly pointed out to me that people in the Green Bay area really did not know what to make of a Jewish woman with a Spanish accent and a Scandinavian last name, but she herself knew exactly what to make of her eclectic heritage—she acted upon it both intellectually and socially. Although her early death at the age of 60 was indeed a tragedy, Raquel lived fully and gave immensely.

First and foremost, Raquel Kersten was a teacher. Starting with her years as a graduate student at New York University in 1954–64, Doña Raquel dedicated herself to the teaching of the Spanish language and its literature. In 1987, the Wisconsin Association of Foreign Language Teachers presented her with its certificate of recognition; but more importantly, her students flocked to her office on a daily basis for advice and help. As a teacher, Raquel was not content to teach those cut-and-dried survey courses that inform but do not necessarily inspire the student. Throughout the years at UW–Green Bay, she developed courses such as "The Don Juan Myth in Hispanic Literature," "Latin American Revolutionary Literature," and "Other Cultures Through Humanistic Studies: The Americas Look at Each Other." The approach of such courses helped students understand and deal with the real conditions in the Hispanic world and to act as responsible world citizens.

The classroom accounted for only a part of Doña Raquel's dedication to teaching. She sought every opportunity to give students times and places to practice Spanish and share Hispanic culture, meeting with them once a week for lunch at the "Spanish Table," helping them organize the Hispanic Student Organization activities, and preparing students individually for study abroad. In the mid-1980s, Doña Raquel worked towards the establishment of the UW–Green Bay chapter of Sigma Delta Pi, the national Spanish honor society, and the honor society became an opportunity for university and community to celebrate Hispanic life. In the ceremony which I attended in 1989, the initiation itself was followed by a banquet to which students, parents, university administration and Hispanic community members had all been invited, and all shared an evening of music, poetry, and Latin American food. Year after year, Professor Kersten undertook the organization of this event, which honored students who had

become conversant in Spanish and strengthened the Spanish program as well as the Hispanic community.

As Doña Raquel took on this and other tasks, she added to an almost overwhelming professional burden. She was not *one* of the UW–Green Bay Spanish professors; she was *the* Spanish professor. Under her leadership, more and more students studied Spanish, but for years she was the only full-time, permanent faculty member of the language division to teach Spanish language and literature. She was the entire Spanish language and culture program at UW–Green Bay, and she forged an excellent curriculum while always remaining available to students and colleagues. To maintain the Spanish program that she had developed, it was often necessary for her to teach eight or nine courses in an academic year, and she neither expected nor received recognition for this beyond the enthusiasm of the students themselves. Despite this almost permanent situation of overload, she took on a great number of independent studies so that individual students could pursue their own interests in Hispanic culture, literature, and language.

The memorial resolution of the faculty of UW–Green Bay states that Raquel Kersten was "a person who stood for something . . . she was like a modern day Doña Quixote." In her dignity and integrity she was indeed like Cervantes' crusading knight, but unlike Don Quixote, Doña Raquel had a strong sense of what was and was not worth struggling for, what could and could not be done. Instead of wasting her time on futile battles, she directed her energies towards goals that were both noble and practical.

In her teaching, she knew that her greatest offering to students in northeastern Wisconsin would be to open them to perspectives, appreciation, and love of another culture, and worked to set up structures that would further multicultural education. She was one of the faculty members who worked in the early 1980s to establish the UW–Green Bay American Intercultural Center with a centrally located office and staff designed to meet the joint needs of the American Indian, African-American, and Hispanic student programs and organizations. Recognizing the unique needs of the smaller campus, Doña Raquel felt that students in Spanish language classes and those of Hispanic background could best be served by one larger organization instead of two independent groups, so the UW–Green Bay Hispanic Student Organization brought together both constituencies to share cultural opportunities such as film and music, and to provide a strong, united presence on campus.

Scattered throughout Green Bay, Door County, and the Fox Valley are families and individuals of Hispanic heritage who represent a wide variety of personal circumstance and geographical origin—descendants of migrant fruit pickers, refugees from Latin American unrest, medical and business professionals, educators, spouses of northeast Wisconsin natives. Doña Raquel worked to make Hispanic events at UW–Green Bay a time in which this community could also find congruence and share a common culture and language. Perhaps most memorable were the yearly Christmas banquets in which students from Spanish classes, UW–Green Bay Hispanic and international students, and community members from all over the area danced, sang, and especially feasted together, several hundred strong. Each banquet included children scrambling after the candy in the *piñata*, Christmas carols in Spanish, and, as so many of us will remember every Christmas, Doña Raquel's annual reading of a fractured "Spanglish" version of "The Night Before Christmas." These shared community-campus events, of

which Raquel Kersten was the very soul, gave humanity to UW–Green Bay's Spanish program and a joyous sense of community to Hispanics all over northeastern Wisconsin.

Reaching out beyond the Green Bay area, Raquel was influential in many regional and national organizations. President of the Northeastern Wisconsin Foreign Language Organization from 1975 to 1977, she was active in the Wisconsin Association of Foreign Language Teachers, the Modern Language Association, the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, and the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. She served as president of the North Central Council of Latin Americanists in 1984–1985, and her mark on that organization has been recognized with the establishment of the Raquel Kersten Professional Research Award, given yearly to a scholar in any academic area for a "contribution to new knowledge on Latin America."

Active in research and publication, Raquel Kersten herself contributed to new knowledge of both Latin American and Spanish literature. She began her career dedicated to the study of Peninsular Spanish literature, then established herself as an expert in the field of Spanish Baroque Theater. Soon after arriving in Green Bay, Doña Raquel realized that as the only representative of Hispanic studies on campus she must for a time set aside her interest in Peninsular literature and carry out a plan of professional retraining in Central and South American literature and culture. In recent years Dr. Kersten was exploring current testimonial literature in which Latin American authors personally "testify" to the often tragic events of a continent searching for social and economic justice.

In the field of language teaching, Doña Raquel was a consultant to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction and a coauthor of their 1985 publication, *A Guide to Curriculum Planning in Foreign Languages*. At the time of her death, Professor Kersten had nearly completed a textbook in Spanish, and tragically, on the day of her death, she had begun the last corrections of the first chapter. She was also working on *Páginas Escogidas*, a bilingual volume of the collected works of the Mexican poet Juana Meléndez, which includes a poem written for and dedicated to Doña Raquel herself. Raquel's husband Fred and son Stephen are now putting the finishing touches on the manuscript.

As a graduate student at New York University, Raquel met and fell in love with a young student of philosophy from Wisconsin, Fred Kersten. They were married in Havana in 1955. Fred and Raquel had two sons, Stephen and Andrew, now bright young men who carry on the family tradition of intellectual curiosity, openmindedness, and kindness. At the Kersten home, friends gathered for many an evening of classical music and opera, a passion the couple shared.

Finally, Dr. Kersten held the invaluable role of mentor to women in the teaching profession. There were and continue to be only a small percentage of women, spread out among a variety of departments, on the Green Bay faculty. Professor Kersten, with several other female colleagues who had spent some years fighting uphill battles for scholarly and financial recognition in an often hostile environment, made special efforts to contact new women faculty members and make them feel welcome. Together, they often met with their newer colleagues to explain and discuss the situation of women on campus. Alone, or as part of this small group, Dr. Kersten approached the administration many times to press forcefully for fair treatment of women colleagues. During my own years at Green Bay, she was the one I turned to in times of doubt as in times of fulfillment. Doña Raquel understood the need for women to nurture other women in

academe, and her support, both public and private, has given many of us the insights and strength to continue in a profession that requires us in turn to provide role models and encouragement to our students.

CONTRIBUTORS

Ackley, Kathy: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Professor of English; Women's Studies Coordinator; Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, UW–Stevens Point.

Ambuehl, Rhonda: B.A.; Legislative Assistant, Wisconsin State Legislature, Madison.

Clarenbach, Kathryn: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Professor Emerita, Department of Governmental Affairs, University Outreach, UW–Madison.

Gibbs, Virginia: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Assistant Professor of Spanish, Luther College, Iowa.

Hopkins-Best, Mary: B.A., M.S., Ed.D.; Associate Dean, School of Education and Human Services, UW–Stout.

Kahn, Susan: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Director, Undergraduate Teaching Improvement Council; Academic Planner, UW System.

Lauter, Estella: A.B., Ph.D.; Frankenthal Professor of Humanistic Studies; Co-chair of Women's Studies, UW–Green Bay.

Miller, Eleanor: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Equal Opportunity; Associate Professor of Sociology, UW–Milwaukee.

Murphy, Shirley: B.S., M.S.; Coordinator, Returning Adult Services, UW–Stout.

Nero, Sharon: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Professor, Department of Social Science; Coordinator of Women's Studies, UW–Stout.

Niles, Dolores: B.S., M.S., Ph.D.; Director, Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory, UW–Extension, Madison.

Quinn, Laura: B.A., Ph.D.; Assistant Professor of English, Allegheny College, Pennsylvania.

Pederson, Jane: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Associate Professor, Department of History, UW–Eau Claire.

Pringle, Dorothy: B.S., M.S., Ph.D.; Professor Emerita, Department of Nutritional Sciences, UW–Madison.

Reedy, Elizabeth: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Director, Single Parent Self-Sufficiency Program, UW–La Crosse.

Rodeheaver, Dean: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Associate Professor of Human Development, UW–Green Bay.

Ross, Jacqueline: B.A., M.A, Ph.D ; Director, Women's Studies Consortium; Senior Academic Planner, Office of Academic Affairs, UW System.

Rosser, Sue: B.A., M.S., Ph.D.; Director of Women's Studies, Professor of Family and Preventive Medicine, University of South Carolina-Columbia.

Schmitt, Sue: B.A., M.S., Ph.D.; Dean, College of Human Resources and Development, University of North Dakota-Grand Forks.

Searing, Sue: B.A., M.A.; Acting Deputy Director and Acting Assistant Director for Public Services of the General Library System, UW–Madison.

Sniffen, Barbara: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Associate Professor, Department of History, UW–Oshkosh.

Witherell, Louise: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Professor Emerita of Humanistic Studies, UW–Green Bay.

Yurcisin, Ann: B.S., M.S. Ed.S.; Director of Disabled Student Services, University of North Dakota-Grand Forks.

EDITORS

Hirsch, Jennifer: B.A.; Writer, Equal Opportunity Programs and Policy Studies, UW System.

Roberts, Audrey: B.A., M. A., Ph.D.; Professor Emerita, English and Women's Studies, UW–Whitewater.

Swoboda, Marian: B.S., M. S., Ph.D.; Assistant to the President for Equal Opportunity Programs and Policy Studies, UW System.