ATHLETIC EQUALITY INDEX

A comprehensive ranking and review of LGBTQ inclusion practices and policies in the NCAA Power 5 conferences.
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“THE AEI BRINGS OUR MOVEMENT INTO A NEW ERA OF ADVOCACY, TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY. INSTITUTIONS WILL NO LONGER BE ABLE TO CITE A LACK OF DATA AND REPORTING AS A RATIONALE FOR INACTION, AND WILL OFFER AN INDUSTRY-WIDE BENCHMARK FOR THE PROGRESS NEEDED TO ACHIEVE THE FULL DIGNITY AND INCLUSION OF THE LGBTQ COMMUNITY IN SPORT.”

FOREWORDS

During my tenure as Executive Director at Athlete Ally, I have seen with rare exception, that maximizing positive outcomes means balancing punishment with empowerment. It requires establishing frameworks and systems that ensure uniform processes, protocols and practices across sport governing bodies. Without such processes, protocols and practices, examples of allyship are less easily communicated to the public, less easily celebrated by our community, and less easily understood by the organizations themselves.

While we’ve made tremendous progress in our efforts to build inclusive athletic environments over the past few years, our efforts remain patchwork, with teams, leagues and governing bodies operating inconsistently in how they relate to LGBTQ inclusion. To help provide an industry-wide framework and benchmark, Athlete Ally has developed a first-of-its-kind, multidimensional, model for assessing, amplifying, and institutionalizing LGBTQ allyship in a way that celebrates progress as much as it discourages prejudice. The Athletic Equality Index (AEI) uses an in-depth analysis and rating methodology that scored all 65 members of the NCAA Power 5 Conferences as it relates to nine critically important LGBTQ-inclusive policies and practices. This historic inaugural report celebrates schools that excel, highlights schools who fall short, and recommends areas of improvement, all together guiding teams toward major policy advances and organizational commitments to equality.

Inclusive policies and procedures make athletic, economic, and moral sense for sport institutions. But any progress made will be isolated and inconsistent without an index. As such, the AEI brings our movement into a new era of advocacy, transparency and accountability. Institutions will no longer be able to cite a lack of data and reporting as a rationale for inaction, and will offer an industry-wide benchmark for the progress needed to achieve the full dignity and inclusion of the LGBTQ community in sport.

We hope the AEI will act as the catalyst needed for institutions to continue the pursuit of proactive LGBTQ-inclusive policies and practices. We believe that everyone should have equal access, opportunity and experience in sport, regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation. Athlete Ally hopes the AEI will bring us one step closer to that reality.

By Hudson Taylor
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FOUNDER OF ATHLETE ALLY
WHO IS WINNING THE RACE FOR INCLUSION & EQUALITY IN COLLEGE SPORTS?

In an athletic world where perpetual pressure to do better is always present, the AEI becomes a roadmap for all conferences to see how they measure up on inclusion of LGBTQ student-athletes so they can make changes to improve.

By comparing the ACC, Big 12, Big 10, SEC, Pac-12 and their institutional efforts to include LGBTQ student-athletes in a visible and positive light as an integral part of the strength of their athletic program, the AEI provides top scoring institutions and conferences the opportunity to become role models for the nation. There are examples of all the components Athlete Ally has included in this work in various institutions scattered across the United States; however, this is the first in-depth piece that focuses collectively on the Power 5 NCAA conferences and their institutions in a scored comparison of the supportive, or non-supportive, atmosphere of acceptance of LGBTQ student-athletes within the individual institutions.

Evaluating these 5 conferences will challenge collegiate programs across the US to improve the actual conditions for LGBTQ student-athletes. Colleges and conferences have the opportunity to score themselves to compete to become the most inclusive campus as they upgrade the services they provide to LGBTQ student-athletes.

The necessity of closely examining the inner working of institutions and studying the steps they are taking is imperative in this day and age where action outpaces verbal commitments. Verbal commitments may be inconsistent or simply placating words that do not effect actual change within a department. The words often fail to produce the work needed to make a systematic change for equality and acceptance of every LGBTQ team member. Often, promises are made only when there is an emergency situation involving discrimination against LGBTQ student-athletes on campus. These efforts born of emergency will fall to the wayside with time. To be proactive in establishing a welcoming atmosphere for all students, including LGBTQ students means preventing emergencies and setting forth on a path of work that can add proactively to the everyday successes of the student-athlete.

The AEI should be seen as an opportunity for the institutions in the Power 5, and proposes ways for low-scoring institutions to improve and increase their score as they initiate positive change. Facts are laid bare in the ranking and comparisons available to share and give guidance as a model from the various high ranked schools and conferences.

Much has been accomplished in bettering the environment for LGBTQ student-athletes to feel the support of teammates and coaches across the country; however, there are many student-athletes and staff that are paralyzed by even the thought of being out as LGBTQ. They do not know how they will be accepted or how their athletic career will be affected. This is the reason and backbone of the AEI. Athletic departments as a whole must show that LGBTQ people are welcome and encouraged to be themselves in an open, honest way. The Athletic Equality Index is unique in that it provides a systematic profile of the components that, if present and visible, will change the face of LGBTQ equality throughout collegiate institutions.

My personal hope is that conferences and collegiate programs will take the AEI, examine the components that can assist them and improve their visible acceptance of LGBTQ people on their campuses.

By Helen Carroll
A LONG-TIME NCAA/NAIA COLLEGIATE BASKETBALL COACH, ATHLETIC DIRECTOR AND LGBTQ ADVOCATE OF STUDENT-ATHLETES FOR THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR LESBIAN RIGHTS
Sports is one of the greatest socialization mechanisms in the world. It communicates values without relying on any one language. It bridges cultures and countries, and its most respected and successful participants are known globally. Throughout history, athletics has played a tremendous role in shaping our culture and values, and it continues to be at the helm of media, commerce, and attention. Ideally, the values of sport would embed themselves into our rhetoric: values like equality, diversity, and fairness — but sport isn’t impervious to the social issues that plague our society — but rather lives at the forefront.

Thankfully, we’re witnessing the greatest expansion of athletic activism in history. Never before have we seen athletes, teams and leagues speak out so regularly for LGBTQ equality. Today’s activism builds on the iconic moments of the past. In 1968, John Carlos and Tommie Smith raised their fists on the Olympic podium — saluting black power and drawing attention to the fight for civil rights happening in the United States. In the 1970s, Billie Jean King founded the Women’s Tennis Association (WTA) and secured a historic victory in the “Battle of the Sexes” — trailblazing acts that still reverberate within the tennis community. Fast forward to present day, and Colin Kaepernick and hundreds of others are taking a knee for racial equality; entire teams and organizations are calling attention to police brutality; women like soccer legend Abby Wambach are fighting for equal pay and representation; and athletes like Serena Williams are pushing back on sexist commentary in the media. Sport continues to provide a platform that can’t be rivaled, and subsequently, an opportunity to create change that can’t be overlooked.

While activism has a rich history in sports, there remains a community that is often underrepresented and oppressed in athletics: the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) community.

A culture of toxic masculinity pervades sport — one that condemns male athletes that don’t adhere to it, polices female athletes that challenge it, and excludes anyone beyond or outside of this binary. Communities within athletics often don’t take ownership over making the space inclusive of everyone, and there’s a culture of silence that encourages the athletic community to keep their sexual orientations, gender identities, and diverse expressions out of conversation. Research shows that LGBTQ athletes drop out of sports at a rate dramatically higher than their heterosexual peers, or avoid sports altogether. The impact is devastating. It’s why we don’t have more visible LGBTQ athletes playing professional sports; why acclaimed and successful out coaches often are “let go”; why transgender athletes have to fight just to play the sport they love; and why the media jumps at the opportunity to speculate about an athletic figure’s sexual orientation. Sport remains a challenging place to navigate as an LGBTQ person at any stage of life, and at any level of sport.

Thankfully, members of the athletic community have started pushing back against this culture more frequently, and are fighting for the inclusion and equality of its LGBTQ participants and fans. In recent years, we’ve seen more athletes come out, more allies speak out and more teams and leagues take a stand than that at any time in history. Policies are being written that protect athletes from discrimination and harassment, frameworks are being created for transgender athletes to compete, and conversations are being had about discriminatory language and actions that happen in fan culture.

Athletes, coaches, fans, and officials are an extremely powerful force, but the most kinetic energy lies within the changemaking powers of athletic organizations. Sport governing bodies have the ability to mandate protective policy, provide LGBTQ inclusive trainings, create vocal commitments to equality, and set a standard that all their member institutions inherently adhere to. Governing bodies like the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), have the opportunity to lead and demonstrate a commitment to LGBTQ inclusion at sport’s highest level. The effect was felt nationally after the NCAA’s historic decision pull their championships out of North Carolina as a reaction to North Carolina’s anti-LGBTQ law (HB2), — a monumental statement of solidarity. It was then felt with equal opposing force when the organization made the misguided decision to return contests to the state. Overall, when sport organizations stand with their LGBTQ constituents, it sends a clear message that discrimination has no place in sport or otherwise.

Out of 9494 participants of all sexual orientations/gender identities: 1% of people believe LGBTQ people are completely accepted in sports.
Participating in collegiate athletics is a dream for millions of student-athletes, and the NCAA welcomes 420,000 student-athletes to the next level of sport every year. The thousands of coaches who mentor them — and their experiences at their programs — shape them as players, people, and members of society. College is a place where civic engagement and moral attitudes are shaped, but unfortunately this growth and involvement can be stunted in athletes. This may be due to the culture of sport that encourages apathy over action, or the reality that athletics often exists in a bubble on many college campuses, operating seemingly separately from the policies and practices of the university. Studies show that athletics is following the trajectory of youth demographics, and that athletes are becoming increasingly more diverse in areas including, but not limited to, gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation. Consequently, athletic departments must proactively commit to educating allies and protecting LGBTQ people — carving out a space in sports culture for everyone to thrive without fear of discrimination.

College athletics is also one of the most popular and widely viewed category of sports. While massive disparities in college access are observed for minorities and lower-income households, receiving college education has become marginally more accessible across the board due to funding and legislation. The percentage of Americans that are attending college has increased over the past two decades, across all levels of family income. As such, more people are connected to and emotionally invested in the growth and trajectory of their alma maters, providing they had a generally positive experience there. As athletics has historically been perceived as one of the more unwelcoming places on all campuses for LGBTQ people, its commitment to inclusion will be powerful and perhaps even surprising — but will undoubtedly resonate and send a clear message to the alumni, current attendees, and prospective students placing LGBTQ equality within the college’s values. This commitment to inclusion has the potential to spread, as large bodies of research show that institutions within the same conference are far more likely to resemble one another than they are to differ. As such, conferences have the power to organize their member schools to ensure a culture that is LGBTQ inclusive — whether it be through creating guiding principles, issuing statements, or mandating trainings.

Competition is a part of the foundation of sports, and we see colleges often compete with one another to attract the most esteemed academic, athletic, and well-rounded applicants. But in today’s society — younger generations expect institutions to stand for something greater than a product or service. They expect them to place purpose ahead of profit. A commitment to diversity and inclusion will only help attract a diverse group of the most qualified student-athletes.

The Athletic Equality Index was developed as a way to measure LGBTQ inclusion policies and practices in athletic spaces. This first-of-its-kind inaugural report provides a comprehensive look at how member institutions of the NCAA power 5 conferences are supporting (or failing to support) their LGBTQ student-athletes, coaches, administrators, staff, and fans. To do this, a weighted scale was developed that scored the implementation and accessibility of member school's athletic department's commitments to providing, fostering, and/or publicizing:

- School-wide nondiscrimination Policies
- Openly LGBTQ staff, or vocal allies
- LGBTQ specific resources student-athletes can access
- Student-athlete led groups or recurring initiatives that discuss LGBTQ inclusion, diversity, and equality
- A culture in which the athletic department collaborates with other campus identity centers
- Pro- LGBTQ inclusion campaigns or statements on behalf of the program
- A fan code of conduct that explicitly prohibits homophobic, transphobic, biphobic, or sexist language and behavior
- A commitment to following the NCAA's recommended guidelines for the inclusion of transgender athletes on varsity teams

A school may be scored negatively if they have an anti-LGBTQ policy, such as an honor code or exemption that needlessly prohibits or punishes LGBTQ identities, allyship, and support on campus. Conversely, conferences as a whole can receive bonus points if conference leadership has made a pro-LGBTQ statement or campaign, or has mandated inclusive training at the conference level.
METHODOLOGY

Data was collected over a 4-month period where researchers performed a comprehensive audit of handbooks, policy manuals, campus materials, social media, news sources and more in order to identify the outlined policies and practices. The scoring process involved two raters independently going through the items found and assigning no, partial, or full numeric scores in the ranges below. The Athletic Equality Index achieved an inter-rater reliability score of .9. Scores were sent to conference leadership and individual school leadership 3.5 weeks prior to the public launch of the AEI, allowing schools the opportunity to review their assigned score and make accessible any policies or efforts that weren’t previously captured by researchers.

It’s important to note that we did not receive a response from a number of schools during this feedback period. As such, the scoring process may have been altered without knowledge of athletic department staff. This may lead to inaccuracies in the ‘out or allied staff’ category (further explained below), but ultimately did not allow schools to make changes or policies and practices accessible -- leading to potentially un-maximized scores. Our team will continue to update scores on the AEI’s digital site as we receive relevant information.

DO THE MEMBER SCHOOL’S NONDISCRIMINATION POLICIES EXPLICITLY PROTECT CATEGORIES OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY AND GENDER EXPRESSION?

35 POINTS

It’s clear that the LGBTQ community faces rampant discrimination and harassment, and this effect is only magnified when we look at young people. Research has shown numbers as high as 64% of students feeling unsafe at school and 84% experiencing social problems and anxiety due to their sexual orientation. LGBTQ youth are twice as likely to be physically assaulted, three times as likely to commit suicide, and miss five times as much school as their peers due to an unwelcoming environment.

At the collegiate level, inclusive nondiscrimination policies can provide the protection LGBTQ students are lacking. Researchers at Columbia found that policies that specifically protect sexual orientation and gender identity monumentally improved mental health and inclusion outcome in schools. Additionally, it’s been reported that the presence of inclusive policies empowered people to stand up when they saw discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community and created more effective allies across the board.

Schools were awarded zero points for lacking protections, 14 points for protecting sexual orientation, 28 points for protecting sexual orientation and gender identity, and a full 35 points for protecting sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression.

DO THE MEMBER SCHOOLS HAVE LGBTQ-SPECIFIC RESOURCES THAT STUDENT-ATHLETES CAN ACCESS?

20 POINTS

Campuses across the country have experienced problems with inclusion of LGBTQ students, with these students citing lack of education and resources as a major barrier to a better climate. LGBTQ campus centers, dedicated faculty, safe zone trainings, and resources have helped remedy this and have shown to create substantial improvements in perceived support, community visibility and creating effective and active allies.

Studies with a more athletic focus showed that when this supportive campus structure lacked, there was marked hesitation for student-athletes to participate in ally behaviors or align themselves with the LGBTQ community. This was especially true in areas described as “conservative college towns.” Having resources that are accessible and available to student-athletes goes a long way in providing them the education and affirmation they need to feel supported: whether it be in allyship or as a member of the LGBTQ community.

IS IT CLEAR THAT THE MEMBER SCHOOLS HAVE ADOPTED THE NCAA’S BEST POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR TRANSGENDER ATHLETES INTO THEIR WRITTEN POLICIES?

10 POINTS

Transgender athletes don’t have a consistent framework for competing, and organizations that seek to protect and affirm them create a patchwork quilt of leagues and teams across the world. The NCAA created a model policy in 2011 that allows transgender athletes to play on the team that best fits their gender without requiring unnecessary and expensive medical intervention, which was followed by the International Olympic Committee in 2015. However, other leagues, high school athletics, and some USA teams have not since adopted the same criteria. At the collegiate level, even though the NCAA has published numerous best practice guides, it’s unclear which member schools will adhere to these policies and which have differing frameworks for transgender athletes that want to compete.

Furthermore, some athletic departments fail to support transgender athletes as it pertains to accommodations and travel considerations. Gender neutral changing spaces, access to locker-rooms and awareness of political climate when travelling are imperative to ensuring a safe and respectful climate for these athletes. In 2017 alone, 11 states have proposed anti-LGBTQ legislation that attacks the right for transgender people to exist in and access facilities in public spaces.

The reality is that transgender people are more likely to be harassed and access when forced to use the restroom or locker room that matches the sex they were assigned at birth. When LGBTQ people are barred access from affirming public accommodations, such as bathrooms, or goods and services from biased providers—it strongly impacts their psychological well-being and self-worth.

In a cultural context of ignorance and confusion about what it means to be transgender, it’s imperative that schools align themselves the NCAA’s best policies and practices as it pertains to the inclusion of trans athletes on campus and beyond. This commitment needs to be articulated clearly and available for members of the department, athletes, and recruits to access.

DO THE MEMBER SCHOOLS HAVE LGBTQ-FOCUSED STUDENT-ATHLETE LED GROUPS OR RECURRING INITIATIVES ON CAMPUS?

10 POINTS

Student-athletes have a notoriously difficult schedule, and are inundated with commitments and activities that make their time management very challenging. These constraints on their schedule have been shown to limit participation in regular campus activities, and makes the presence of student-athletes in campus groups rare.

This is especially troubling seeing as that civic development, or a student’s public and active political growth and participation, has been shown to occur mainly in college, not in earlier stages such as high school or later stages such as young adulthood. Additionally, studies have found that while college athletes are more likely to engage in volunteer activities than their non-athlete peers, they are far less likely to engage in any sort of political or social activism.
Creating student-athlete groups or SAAC initiatives that focus primarily on LGBTQ inclusion gives student-athletes the chance to engage in relevant conversation that fits their schedules and interests, and provides an opportunity to directly impact the culture of their athletic department. The presence of these groups or initiatives on campus shows that the athletics and faculty at that university are committed to actively fostering an environment where LGBTQ inclusion is important. Half scores were awarded for programs that have student-athlete groups or initiatives that tackle conversations about diversity, inclusion, or respect but are not explicitly LGBTQ focused.

DO THE MEMBER SCHOOLS HAVE A FAN CODE OF CONDUCT THAT EXPLICITLY INCLUDES AND PROTECTS THE LGBTQ COMMUNITY?

10 POINTS

Various sports leagues have a problem with anti-LGBTQ chants from the spectator stands, commonly used to taunt or degrade the other team. This comes as no surprise, given the dangerous and rigid narrative of masculinity that is celebrated in sports that harms athletes of all genders, and uses identification with minority communities as a jab or insult. The presence of language or slurs commonly used to marginalize and oppress the LGBTQ community in sport spaces sends a clear message about the level of hate and discrimination in the environment.

A recent study found that only one percent of people in a study of over 9,000 participants think that LGBTQ people are completely accepted in athletics. Furthermore, the participants of this study believe that the spectator stands are the most dangerous and unwelcoming place for LGBTQ people to exist out of all places in athletics, including the locker room.

As a result of harassment and altercations in the stand, many leagues and teams, like the NFL, have implemented a fan code of conduct. However, these policies often don’t provide explicit protection for the LGBTQ community. The clarity in these policies is extremely important—analyses of policy and climates found that explicitly inclusive policies prevent discrimination, and also empower people to speak up and be more effective allies. The NCAA has curated sample language for LGBTQ inclusive fan codes of conduct, accessible as a resource on their main site.

DO THE MEMBER SCHOOLS HAVE THE FRAMEWORK FOR OR A HISTORY OF PARTNERING WITH OTHER LGBTQ CAMPUS GROUPS FOR EVENTS?

5 POINTS

When the athletic department partners with other organizations and centers on campus to show up for LGBTQ inclusion, it displays that the campus community is connected when it comes to equality. This is critical as athletics has been shown to lag in terms of progressiveness, likely due to the hegemonic masculinity that plagues it’s culture and creates the foundation for hetero and cis-sexism. Partnering with other groups on campus can provide accountability that breaks athletics out of the cultural bubble it can exist in on campus.

Additionally, athletes hold a prestigious social status, particularly at Division I schools. Studies have found that even showing up at campus LGBTQ-focused events is interpreted as a meaningful and active ally action for athletes. Athletes often don’t attend such events due to the fear that stigma reserved for the LGBTQ community will be placed on them, but frequent integration and normalization of athletic presence at these events can help alleviate the potential for stigmatization.

If an athletic department frequently partners and collaborates with other LGBTQ campus groups, it’s likely that LGBTQ allyship and activism is normalized in the athletic community. This creates the basis for a more inclusive and affirming culture in the athletic program. Half scores were awarded for accessible forms or places to submit requests for partnership on either the athletic department or campus identity center’s materials, since this shows a campus that is willing to collaborate and the means for connection in place.

HAVE THE MEMBER SCHOOLS PARTICIPATED IN AN LGBTQ PRIDE NIGHT OR OTHER LGBTQ INCLUSION CAMPAIGN OR ACTION?

5 POINTS

Athletic institutions are being pointed to as an extremely powerful agent of social change. This is, in part, due to the massive amount of media attention that sports garners and the idolization of its most prominent figures. Researchers and sports fans alike suggest that we need new role models and new faces to engage in athlete activism and broadcast the values of inclusion, diversity, and fairness that are so core to athletics. Thankfully, we’ve seen a wave of athlete activism—such as players taking a knee to protest racial inequality, and governing bodies of athletics removing their championships from states with anti-LGBTQ laws. These social justice actions by members of the athletic community have been met with massive amounts of public attention, and their messages resonate across the country and beyond.

For an athletic department to take place in a pro-LGBTQ campaign would have the same effect, and would fortify the program’s reputation as accepting and inclusive. This action is imperative, seeing as that a study in 2011 found that the most common reason an athlete felt comfortable to come out on their team was because of a visible and vocal ally. If entire athletic departments and brands can publicly identify themselves as allies though these campaigns, they’re providing the promise of a much more supportive and respectful environment for their athletes and staff.
Coaches and athletic administrators hold considerable power in an athletic department. Consequently, they serve as role models to student-athletes, and their values and beliefs are mimicked while directly influencing the culture of their program and the cohesion of the groups they’re in.52

Having vocal leaders serve as relatable examples for the athletes that they work with, and create a ‘relevant context’ for discussions about sexual orientation and gender identity.53

Furthermore, having leaders that are vocal breaks through the culture of silence described by Pat Griffin, where the hetero/cissexist culture of athletics is maintained by a lack of conversation and apathy about inclusive practices.54 Additionally, these coaches and administrators can create meaningful change in their department through the contact hypothesis—a phenomenon that shows interpersonal contact with a member or ally of the LGBTQ community lowers negative attitudes towards the community in general.55

In terms of having openly LGBTQ staff, even if they aren’t out on a larger stage or comfortable speaking out for any reason, having resources for LGBTQ employees goes a long way in communicating that the department would be welcoming and accepting.56 It also eliminates the fear of workplace discrimination that is a sobering reality for the LGBTQ community. Studies have found numbers as high as 43% of gay people and 90% of transgender people have experienced harassment, discrimination, and mistreatment at their workplaces, and are fired at an alarming rate.57 Half scores were awarded for schools that only had resources for their LGBTQ staff.

Note: During the 3.5 week feedback period, the AEI team took information about “out” or allied staff members at face value. Though the other eight categories scores are contingent on not only implementation, but accessibility of information -- we felt that this standard could be inappropriately applied in this category. As long as athletic department staff and student-athletes were able to identify open LGBTQ staff and/or allies in their program, they were awarded full points.

AN ANONYMOUS ATHLETE, WHEN ASKED ABOUT THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH THEIR COACH, SAID: “I NEVER REALLY TALKED TO (COACH) ABOUT THINGS HAPPENING IN MY LIFE, OUTSIDE-OF-SPORT, LIKE MY SEXUAL ORIENTATION. THERE WAS JUST NEVER A TIME WHERE IT FELT RELEVANT TO BRING UP, AND THAT MADE THINGS FEEL WEIRD AND UNCOMFORTABLE… IT FELT LIKE I WAS HIDING SOMETHING, EVEN THOUGH I WASN’T ACTIVELY.”

DO THE MEMBER SCHOOLS HAVE LGBTQ OR ALLIED COACHES OR ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS THAT ARE PUBLICLY OUT, OPEN AND/OR ARE CONSISTENTLY VOCAL ABOUT LGBTQ ISSUES?

5 POINTS

Coaches and athletic administrators hold considerable power in an athletic department. Consequently, they serve as role models to student-athletes, and their values and beliefs are mimicked while directly influencing the culture of their program and the cohesion of the groups they’re in.

Having vocal leaders serve as relatable examples for the athletes that they work with, and create a ‘relevant context’ for discussions about sexual orientation and gender identity.

Furthermore, having leaders that are vocal breaks through the culture of silence described by Pat Griffin, where the hetero/cissexist culture of athletics is maintained by a lack of conversation and apathy about inclusive practices. Additionally, these coaches and administrators can create meaningful change in their department through the contact hypothesis—a phenomenon that shows interpersonal contact with a member or ally of the LGBTQ community lowers negative attitudes towards the community in general.

In terms of having openly LGBTQ staff, even if they aren’t out on a larger stage or comfortable speaking out for any reason, having resources for LGBTQ employees goes a long way in communicating that the department would be welcoming and accepting. It also eliminates the fear of workplace discrimination that is a sobering reality for the LGBTQ community. Studies have found numbers as high as 43% of gay people and 90% of transgender people have experienced harassment, discrimination, and mistreatment at their workplaces, and are fired at an alarming rate. Half scores were awarded for schools that only had resources for their LGBTQ staff.

Note: During the 3.5 week feedback period, the AEI team took information about “out” or allied staff members at face value. Though the other eight categories scores are contingent on not only implementation, but accessibility of information -- we felt that this standard could be inappropriately applied in this category. As long as athletic department staff and student-athletes were able to identify open LGBTQ staff and/or allies in their program, they were awarded full points.

DOES A MEMBER SCHOOL HAVE AN ANTI-LGBTQ POLICY, SUCH AS A TITLE IX EXEMPTION?

-50 POINTS

Title IX is a part of the USA Education Amendments, which states that no person can be discriminated against on the basis of sex in any education program or activity receiving federal assistance. While not explicit, this definition serves as an important tool in protecting LGBTQ students from discrimination across the country.

However, schools have the opportunity to request a Title IX exemption if Title IX is found to conflict with their religious beliefs. Unfortunately, these exemptions are often used to discriminate against LGBTQ students and staff. Schools have been known to deny housing to, deny services to, suspend, expel, or fire LGBTQ students and/or staff from universities with these exemptions on the basis that their identities are incompatible with the belief system held by the university. Sometimes, this climate isn’t accomplished by requesting a Title IX exemption, but through the creation of an anti-LGBTQ and restrictive honor code.

While this certainly isn’t the case for all communities of faith, religion can compound fear and negative mental health outcomes for LGBTQ people, especially in campus climates. A university with a Title IX exemption or restrictive honor code is aligning themselves with schools of faith that seek to use their belief system to discriminate against people based on their sexual orientation and/or gender identity, and not with those who seek to welcome and affirm them. Schools with a Title IX exemption can expel or fire LGBTQ students and staff at any time, simply for being who they are. This is something that can’t be overcome or compensated for in other areas.

BONUS:

DOES THE CONFERENCE HAVE AN LGBTQ INCLUSIVE STATEMENT AND/OR BEEN ACTIVE IN LGBTQ INCLUSION WORK?

+10 POINTS TO AVERAGE

DOES THE CONFERENCE HAVE LGBTQ INCLUSIVE TRAININGS?

+5 POINTS TO AVERAGE

In popular theories of change, political and social activism can be thought of by breaking agents into two groups: activist groups and reformative groups. The activist group works from the outside to call out problems, however, the reformative group is a member of the institution that is changing and seeks to serve as an example and leader from the inside. The reformative group has been shown to be much more powerful, and can create a marked effect on the members within their sphere and elicit an extreme amount of change.

In this context, athletic conferences and their governance have a unique opportunity to serve as leaders for their member schools. Research suggests that schools within a conference are much more likely to resemble each other’s policies and practices than they are to differ, and this leadership from the conference can have an enormous trickle-down effect on the member schools as it pertains to LGBTQ inclusion.

5 POINTS

If the conference has an LGBTQ inclusive statement and/or been active in LGBTQ inclusion work, they are awarded 5 points.

A bonus of 10 points to average is offered if the conference has LGBTQ inclusive trainings.
While all five conferences had a total average score within 23.4 points of one another, there are a variety of trends and notes to make about the data—as each conference scored their similar averages in drastically different ways.

A piece of the data that is important to note is the variance between schools in the conference. This isn’t captured when viewing the conference averages, but make itself apparent when you view the spread of the member schools within a conference. For example, while the ACC’s average was 72.0 and the Big 10’s was 65.7, the difference between the highest and lowest scoring member schools for the ACC was 51 points (Florida State University and Boston College/Clemson), while the Big 10’s difference was only 22.5 (University of Illinois and University of Iowa). This shows that while conferences may score similarly—it varies on whether that’s indicative of schools concentrated around the average or a diverse grouping of inclusive, proactive schools and some that are not meeting that mark.

Having a school in the Big 12 with an anti-LGBTQ policy hurts the score of the conference, which would have been 61.8 without Baylor’s detrimental anti-LGBTQ policy driving the score down to an average of 56.8. A score of 61.8 would have easily put the Big 12 comfortably ahead of the SEC at 56.4, who had a range of 40 between Vanderbilt and the University of Mississippi/Auburn University—showing all their scores are more densely concentrated around their average than in the Big 12.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MEMBER SCHOOLS WITHIN CONFERENCES WERE NOT ALL ON THE SAME PAGE

While all five conferences had a total average score within 23.4 points of one another, there are a variety of trends and notes to make about the data—as each conference scored their similar averages in drastically different ways.

A piece of the data that is important to note is the variance between schools in the conference. This isn’t captured when viewing the conference averages, but make itself apparent when you view the spread of the member schools within a conference. For example, while the ACC’s average was 72.0 and the Big 10’s was 65.7, the difference between the highest and lowest scoring member schools for the ACC was 51 points (Florida State University and Boston College/Clemson), while the Big 10’s difference was only 22.5 (University of Illinois and University of Iowa). This shows that while conferences may score similarly—it varies on whether that’s indicative of schools concentrated around the average or a diverse grouping of inclusive, proactive schools and some that are not meeting that mark.

This policy prohibits students from forming student groups, having inclusive discussions, or accessing resources about the LGBTQ community and their identities. Though this policy claims to be rooted in biblical teachings—other faith based schools such as the University of Notre Dame and Texas Christian University have no such policy. Rather, Notre Dame had a variety of language and initiatives that highlight LGBTQ inclusion in their athletic department, and Texas Christian University received a score of 85—which puts them among the top scorers in the entire report.

Only a handful of schools took the initiative to specifically note that they follow the NCAA’s guidelines for inclusion of transgender athletes, which would allow most transgender athletes to play on the team that is consistent with their gender identity. Without adopting these guidelines into athletic department policy, it’s unclear how a program would react to and work with a prospective or current transgender student-athlete. Programs that have communicated their commitment to this policy are as follows: The University of Southern California, Stanford University, the University of California at Berkeley, University of Oregon, Oregon State University, North Carolina State University, Florida State University, Texas Christian University, and the University of Texas at Austin.

In order to best ensure LGBTQ coaches, athletes, fans, and students are protected—it’s imperative to have harassment of the LGBTQ community specifically mentioned when it comes to prohibiting hate speech or harassment on game day. Many schools lacked any type of accessible guidelines for fan behavior, let alone made mention of condemning sexist, homophobic, biphobic or transphobic language used in the stands.
FORTY SCHOOLS LACKED AN ACCESSIBLE STUDENT-ATHLETE FOCUSED GROUP OR RECURRING INITIATIVE THAT CREATED SPACE FOR ATHLETES TO SHARE POSITIVE AND/OR NEGATIVE EXPERIENCES RELATING TO LGBTQ INCLUSION

THIRTY-FIVE SCHOOLS LACKED A STATEMENT, CAMPAIGN, OR INITIATIVE THAT IDENTIFIED THE PROGRAM VALUES AS INCLUDING LGBTQ INCLUSION

Programs lacked explicit support of LGBTQ inclusion in the athletic department and for student-athletes creating groups or spaces for discussion about their experiences. Without these elements, LGBTQ inclusion remains an uncertain topic and a large question mark in the program—allowing student-athletes and staff to assume the worst about the climate they’re in. Member schools generally scored these points when leadership in athletics made statements and students formed groups that when paired with LGBTQ-inclusive trainings—often made public in their school papers, describing the program on their athletic department’s website, or elsewhere.

While pairing an inclusive statement with training or programming is important, often times the events that precede these statements aren’t as positive. In many cases, athletic staff speaking out or entire departments making pro-LGBTQ statements came on the heels of an action or climate that prompted it. Many pieces that contributed to the ACC’s high scoring were due to the actions of schools in North Carolina reacting to the climate created by the state’s anti-LGBTQ bill, HB2 (now HB142). Basketball coaches Mike Krzyzewski and Roy Williams spoke out against the law numerous times, schools issued statements, student-athletes from Duke, University of North Carolina and North Carolina State penned and signed an open letter to North Carolina legislators demanding the repeal of HB2, and these athletic departments had visible conversations about how to protect their LGBTQ constituents.

THE ACC SCORED THE ONLY BONUS POINTS OF THE ENTIRE REPORT

Reacting to HB2 is also what scored the ACC the only bonus points awarded in the 2017 Athletic Equality Index (AEI), with 10 points awarded for the conference making a pro-LGBTQ statement. This happened in stages after HB2 was passed, with an initial statement about preserving diversity and inclusion, a stronger one about protecting their LGBTQ student-athletes and fans once the situation wasn’t rectified, and ultimately culminating in the ACC pulling a majority of their championships out of the state due to the discriminatory climate created by HB2.

While these actions are certainly powerful, they also illustrate that many of the points scored were due to reactive measures as opposed to proactive commitments to LGBTQ inclusion. This is true on a smaller scale across all conferences. The AEI can serve as a blueprint on how to establish more of these proactive commitments. Being intentional and prepared constructs a narrative that athletic programs are affirming and inclusive of LGBTQ people, and aren’t just scrambling to put things in place when they’re forced to do so by external forces.

The Pac-12 averaged a score of 79.7. The Pac-12 was able to score so highly due to their commitment to making their practices and policies accessible — and proactively implementing initiatives that satisfy many of the domains outlined in the Athletic Equality Index.
OVERALL AVERAGE: 68.3
PAC 12

SCORE: 82.4

DIVISION: Division I FBS
SPORTS FIELD: 23 (men's 11; women's 12)
COMMISSIONER: Larry Scott
MEMBERS: 12

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY: 33.8
OUT OR ALLIED STAFF: 4.1
ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES: 20
COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP: 4
LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE: 5.8
PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT: 3.8
LGBTQ INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT: 5.4
FOLLOWS NCAA GUIDELINES FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION: 5
TOTAL: 82.4

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY: 28/35

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES: 20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT: 0/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION: 0/10

LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE: 0/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF: 5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP: 2.5/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT: 0/5

FINAL SCORE: 55.5/100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Arizona State University</strong></th>
<th><strong>University of Oregon</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nondiscrimination Policy</strong></td>
<td>28/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible Resource</strong></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</strong></td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ Student Athlete Group or Initiative</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outspoken or Allied Staff</strong></td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration with Campus Group</strong></td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</strong></td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 55.5/100

**Final Score:** 95/100
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
PAC 12

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 10/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Final Score: 80/100

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
PAC 12

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Final Score: 75/100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington State University</th>
<th>University of Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nondiscrimination Policy</strong></td>
<td>35/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible Resource</strong></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</strong></td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outspoken or Allied Staff</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration with Campus Group</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Score:</strong> 75/100</td>
<td><strong>Final Score:</strong> 92.5/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University of Washington**

| **Nondiscrimination Policy** | 35/35                  |
| **Accessible Resource**     | 20/20                  |
| **LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct** | 5/10               |
| **Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion** | 10/10            |
| **LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative** | 10/10            |
| **Outspoken or Allied Staff** | 5/5                 |
| **Collaboration with Campus Group** | 2.5/5           |
| **Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement** | 5/5              |
| **Final Score:** 92.5/100    |
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LA  

ATHLETIC EQUALITY INDEX 2017

PAC 12

FINAL SCORE: 82.5/100

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE 20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT 5/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION 0/10

LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE 10/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF 5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP 2.5/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT 5/5

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY 35/35

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER

ATHLETIC EQUALITY INDEX 2017

PAC 12

FINAL SCORE: 85/100

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE 20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT 5/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION 0/10

LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE 10/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF 5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP 5/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT 5/5

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY 35/35
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY 35/35

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE 20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT 10/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION 10/10

LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE 10/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF 5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP 5/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT 5/5

FINAL SCORE: 100/100

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY 35/35

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE 20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT 10/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION 10/10

LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE 10/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF 5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP 5/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT 5/5

FINAL SCORE: 100/100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscrimination Policy</td>
<td>35/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Resource</td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken or Allied Staff</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Campus Group</td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 92.5/100
ACC

SCORE: 74.3

DIVISION: Division I FBS
SPORTS FIELDED: 27 (men’s: 13; women’s: 14)
COMMISSIONER: John Swofford
MEMBERS: 15

Nondiscrimination Policy: 28
Out or Allied Staff: 27
Accessible Resources: 20
Collaboration with Campus Group: 2.3
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 5
Pro LGBTQ Equality Campaign/Statement: 3
LGBTQ Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 2
Follows NCAA Guidelines for Transgender Inclusion: 2
Bonus Points: +10
Total: 74.3

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Nondiscrimination Policy: 0/35

Accessible Resource: 20/20

LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10

Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10

LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 10/10

Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5

Collaboration with Campus Group: 0/5

Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 5/5

Final Score: 40/100
BOSTON COLLEGE | ACC

Nondiscrimination Policy: 14/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBT- Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 0/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 0/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5
Final Score: 34/100

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY | ACC

Nondiscrimination Policy: 14/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBT- Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 10/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 0/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 0/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5
Final Score: 44/100
**Virginia Tech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscrimination Policy</td>
<td>35/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Resource</td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken or Allied Staff</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Campus Group</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 85/100

---

**University of Pittsburgh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscrimination Policy</td>
<td>28/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Resource</td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken or Allied Staff</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Campus Group</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 48/100
**GEORGIA TECH (ACC)**

- **Nondiscrimination Policy**: 28/35
- **Accessible Resource**: 20/20
- **LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 0/10
- **Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 0/10
- **LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 0/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 2.5/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 0/5
- **Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement**: 0/5

**Final Score**: 50.5/100

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY (ACC)**

- **Nondiscrimination Policy**: 28/35
- **Accessible Resource**: 20/20
- **LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 5/5
- **Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 10/10
- **LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 10/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 5/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 5/5
- **Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement**: 5/5

**Final Score**: 83/100
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

- **Non-Discrimination Policy**: 35/35
- **Accessible Resource**: 20/20
- **LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 5/10
- **Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 10/10
- **LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 0/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 5/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 5/5
- **Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement**: 5/5

**Total Score**: 85/100

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY

- **Non-Discrimination Policy**: 35/35
- **Accessible Resource**: 20/20
- **LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 0/10
- **Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 0/10
- **LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 0/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 2.5/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 0/5
- **Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement**: 5/5

**Total Score**: 62.5/100
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA  ACC

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY  28/35

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE  20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT  0/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION  0/10

LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE  10/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF  0/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP  5/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT  0/5

FINAL SCORE: 63/100

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY  ACC

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY  35/35

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE  20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT  0/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION  0/10

LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE  5/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF  5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP  0/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT  5/5

FINAL SCORE: 65/100
**UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE**

**ACC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nondiscrimination Policy</strong></td>
<td>35/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible Resource</strong></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</strong></td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outspoken or Allied Staff</strong></td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration with Campus Group</strong></td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</strong></td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 72.5/100

---

**UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI**

**ACC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nondiscrimination Policy</strong></td>
<td>35/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible Resource</strong></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</strong></td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outspoken or Allied Staff</strong></td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration with Campus Group</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 72.5/100
DUKE UNIVERSITY

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 10/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 5/5

FINAL SCORE: 80/100

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 10/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 5/5

FINAL SCORE: 80/100
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

**SCORE:** 69.3

**DIVISION:** Division I FBS
**SPORTS FIELDED:** 28 (men’s: 14; women’s: 14)
**COMMISSIONER:** Jim Delany
**MEMBERS:** 14

**NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY:** 32.6
**OUT OR ALLIED STAFF:** 1.4
**ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES:** 20
**COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP:** 14
**LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE:** 3.2
**PRO LGBTQ EQUALITY CAMPAIGN/STATEMENT:** 2.9
**LGBTQ INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT:** 3.2
**FOLLOWS NCAA GUIDELINES FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION:** 0.7

**TOTAL:** 69.3

---

**NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY**

- **Final Score:** 28/35

**ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES**

- **Final Score:** 20/20

**LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT**

- **Final Score:** 0/10

**FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION**

- **Final Score:** 0/10

**LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE**

- **Final Score:** 0/10

**OUTSPoken OR ALliED STAFF**

- **Final Score:** 2.5/5

**COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP**

- **Final Score:** 2.5/5

**PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT**

- **Final Score:** 5/5

**FOLLOWs NCAA GUIDELINES FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION**

- **Final Score:** 0/10

**LGBTQ INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT**

- **Final Score:** 0/10

**FINAL SCORE:** 58/100
ATHLETIC EQUALITY INDEX
2017

INDIANA UNIVERSITY AT BLOOMINGTON

58/100
Final Score: 58/100

Nondiscrimination Policy: 28/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 0/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 5/5

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

78/100
Final Score: 78/100

Nondiscrimination Policy: 28/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 10/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 5/5
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

FINAL SCORE: 55.5/100

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE  20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT  5/10

FOLLOWNS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION  0/10

LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE  10/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF  0/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP  2.5/5

PRO-LGBT CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT  0/5

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

FINAL SCORE: 57.5/100

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE  20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT  0/10

FOLLOWNS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION  0/10

LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE  0/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF  0/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP  2.5/5

PRO-LGBT CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT  0/5
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

- **Nondiscrimination Policy**: 35/35
- **Accessible Resource**: 20/20
- **LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 0/10
- **Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 0/10
- **LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 0/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 5/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 2.5/5
- **Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement**: 0/5

**Final Score**: 62.5/100

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

- **Nondiscrimination Policy**: 35/35
- **Accessible Resource**: 20/20
- **LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 10/10
- **Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 10/10
- **LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 10/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 5/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 5/5
- **Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement**: 5/5

**Final Score**: 100/100
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  

**Athletic Equality Index 2017**

**Big Ten**

**Final Score:** 65/100

- **Non Discrimination Policy:** 35/35
- **Accessible Resource:** 20/20
- **LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct:** 5/10
- **Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion:** 0/10
- **LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative:** 0/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff:** 2.5/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group:** 2.5/5
- **Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement:** 0/5

---

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA  

**Athletic Equality Index 2017**

**Big Ten**

**Final Score:** 65.5/100

- **Non Discrimination Policy:** 28/35
- **Accessible Resource:** 20/20
- **LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct:** 0/10
- **Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion:** 0/10
- **LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative:** 5/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff:** 5/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group:** 2.5/5
- **Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement:** 5/5

---
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 2.5/5
Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 5/5

Final Score: 67.5/100

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 5/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 2.5/5
Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Final Score: 72.5/100
PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 2.5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Final Score: 67.5/100

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 5/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 2.5/5
Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 5/5

Final Score: 77.5/100
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

FINAL SCORE: 85/100

ATHLETIC EQUALITY INDEX 2017

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE 20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT 5/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION 0/10

LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE 10/10

OUTSPoken OR ALLIED STAFF 5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP 5/5

PRO-LGBT CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT 5/5
### BIG 12

**SCORE:** 58.8

**DIVISION:** Division I FBS  
**SPORTS FIELDED:** 23 (men’s: 10; women’s: 13)  
**COMMISSIONER:** Bob Bowlsby  
**MEMBERS:** 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Discrimination Policy</td>
<td>35/35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Resource</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken or Allied Staff</td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Campus Group</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University of Kansas**

**Final Score:** 77.5/100

**Non-Discrimination Policy:** 35/35  
**Accessible Resource:** 20/20  
**LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct:** 5/10  
**Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion:** 0/10  
**LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative:** 10/10  
**Outspoken or Allied Staff:** 2.5/5  
**Collaboration with Campus Group:** 5/5  
**Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement:** 5/5

**Final Score:** 77.5/100
**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Nondiscrimination Policy: 28/35

Accessible Resource: 20/20

LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10

Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10

LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10

Outspoken or Allied Staff: 2.5/5

Collaboration with Campus Group: 2.5/5

Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5

**Final Score:** 58/100

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

Nondiscrimination Policy: 28/35

Accessible Resource: 20/20

LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/5

Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10

LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 10/10

Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5

Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5

Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 5/5

**Final Score:** 73/100
### Baylor University

**Nondiscrimination Policy** 0/35

**Accessible Resource** 0/20

**LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct** 5/10

**Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion** 0/10

**LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative** 0/10

**Outspoken or Allied Staff** 0/5

**Collaboration with Campus Group** 0/5

**Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement** 0/5

**Anti-LGBT Campaign or Statement** -50/50

**Final Score:** -45/100

### Oklahoma State University

**Nondiscrimination Policy** 14/35

**Accessible Resource** 20/20

**LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct** 0/10

**Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion** 0/10

**LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative** 0/10

**Outspoken or Allied Staff** 2.5/5

**Collaboration with Campus Group** 0/5

**Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement** 0/5

**Final Score:** 36.5/100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texas Christian University</th>
<th>University of Oklahoma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Discrimination Policy</strong></td>
<td>35/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Resource</td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken or Allied Staff</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Campus Group</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 85/100 | 70/100
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 10/10
Fulfills NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 10/10
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 5/5

Final Score: 90/100

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

Nondiscrimination Policy: 28/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
Fulfills NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 5/5

Final Score: 68/100
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY 35/35

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE 20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT 0/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION 0/10

LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE 0/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF 5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP 5/5

PRO-LGBT CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT 5/5

FINAL SCORE: 70/100
**SEC**

**SCORE:** 56.7

DIVISION: Division I FBS  
SPORTS FIELDED: 21 (men's: 9; women's: 12)  
COMMISSIONER: Greg Sankey  
MEMBERS: 14

**NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY:** 31  
**OUT OR ALLIED STAFF:** 1.6  
**ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES:** 18.6  
**COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP:** 1.3  
**LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE:** 2.1  
**PRO LGBTQ EQUALITY CAMPAIGN/STATEMENT:** 0.7  
**LGBTQ INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT:** 1.4  
**FOLLOWS NCAA GUIDELINES FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION:** 0  
**TOTAL:** 56.7

---

**UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA**

**NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY:** 35/35

**ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE:** 20/20

**LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT:** 0/10

**FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION:** 0/10

**LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE:** 10/10

**OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF:** 0/5

**COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP:** 0/5

**PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT:** 0/5

---

**FINAL SCORE:** 65/100
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE  20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT  5/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION  0/10

LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE  0/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF  2.5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP  2.5/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT  0/5

FINAL SCORE: 65/100

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE  20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT  0/10

FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION  0/10

LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE  0/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF  2.5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP  2.5/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT  5/5

FINAL SCORE: 65/100
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

**Nondiscrimination Policy**: 35/35

**Accessible Resource**: 20/20

**LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 5/10

**Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 0/10

**LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 10/10

**Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 5/5

**Collaboration with Campus Group**: 5/5

**Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement**: 5/5

**Final Score**: 85/100

TENNESSEE A&I UNIVERSITY

**Nondiscrimination Policy**: 28/35

**Accessible Resource**: 20/20

**LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 0/10

**Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 0/10

**LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 5/10

**Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 5/5

**Collaboration with Campus Group**: 2.5/5

**Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement**: 0/5

**Final Score**: 60.5/100
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10
FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 2.5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 2.5/5
PRO-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Final Score: 60/100

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION: 0/10
LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 0/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 0/5
PRO-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Final Score: 60/100
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

**ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE** 20/20

**LGBT-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT** 0/10

**FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION** 0/10

**LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE** 0/10

**OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF** 0/5

**COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP** 0/5

**PRO-LGBT CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT** 0/5

**FINAL SCORE:** 48/100

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

**ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE** 20/20

**LGBT-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT** 0/10

**FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION** 0/10

**LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE** 5/10

**OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF** 0/5

**COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP** 0/5

**PRO-LGBT CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT** 0/5

**FINAL SCORE:** 53/100
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

**Nondiscrimination Policy**: 28/35

**Accessible Resource**: 20/20

**LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 0/10

**Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 0/10

**LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 0/10

**Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 0/5

**Collaboration with Campus Group**: 0/5

**Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement**: 0/5

**Final Score**: 48/100

---

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

**Nondiscrimination Policy**: 28/35

**Accessible Resource**: 20/20

**LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 0/10

**Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion**: 0/10

**LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative**: 0/10

**Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 0/5

**Collaboration with Campus Group**: 0/5

**Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement**: 0/5

**Final Score**: 48/100
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Nondiscrimination Policy: 14/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 2.5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Final Score: 46.5/100

AUBURN UNIVERSITY

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 10/20
LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10
Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion: 0/10
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 0/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 0/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Final Score: 45/100
UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

FINAL SCORE: 45/100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscrimination Policy</td>
<td>35/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Resource</td>
<td>10/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken or Allied Staff</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Campus Group</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moving forward, it is imperative that conferences take leadership in creating LGBTQ-inclusive environments at their member schools. All of the conferences already uphold values that put respect, diversity, and sportsmanship at the helm of all their actions—and this commitment should extend to making sure LGBTQ student-athletes, coaches, staff and fans can thrive in and around the programs within these conferences.

Conferences have the power to organize LGBTQ-inclusive cultural competency trainings, to equip their coaches and staff with the tools necessary to create safe spaces, to make vocal commitments to the LGBTQ community, to craft their master policies around inclusion and respect, and to encourage all their member schools to follow suit and get involved. The only conference that was awarded bonus points for their leadership was the Atlantic Coast Conference, but we believe that all five should act as an example for their conference that was awarded bonus points for their leadership was the Atlantic Coast Conference, but we believe that all five should act as an example for their conference.

Additionally, it is important that conferences and schools make a habit of being proactive with their policies and practices, and not as a reactionary stance forcing their commitment to LGBTQ inclusion only when backed into a corner to do so. LGBTQ people deserve proactive action by their athletic departments for the right to compete without the burden of discrimination. They should not have to wait until harmful legislation is passed, or a starting athlete suffers through uncertainty to come out, or student-athletes are found using sexist, homophobic, biphobic or transphobic language. If schools are waiting until action is demanded and pressure is on—harm has already been done to student-athletes, and trust in the climate of the institution has already been broken.

Conferences, schools, administrators, coaches, and more need to be intentional and proactive when identifying ways to make a program more inclusive to LGBTQ individuals. Using the Athletic Equality Index as a checklist, policies can be evaluated, campus connections can be created, resources can be made accessible, and staff/athletes can be energized and rallied to take part in crafting a culture where everyone can thrive and live authentically.

Rome wasn’t built in a day, and it’s understood that entire campus cultures certainly won’t be overhauled in a week. However, simply starting to have conversations about how to align an athletic department with its LGBTQ athletes, staff, and fans can make a difference. Some of these actions are as simple as making policies and practices visible and accessible—which is an instrumental part of their utility. For example, only nine schools out of sixty-five in the AEI explicitly stated that transgender athletes can play on the team that best reflects their gender identity per the NCAA’s recommendations. To make this change in any athletic department can be as simple as editing a page on the website or adding a piece into the handbook, but it’ll move mountains for transgender athletes, coaches, fans, friends, and students who are undoubtedly watching and waiting for it to happen.

Honorable Mentions:

Transgender Inclusion in the Pac-12

Five schools in the Pac-12 have clearly articulated that they will follow the NCAA’s guidelines for transgender student-athlete inclusion. Here are some of the ways they’re communicating that commitment:

**USC**

Trans Participation in USC Athletics

USC Athletics abides by the National Collegiate Athletic Association policies and rules compliance. As a result, the NCAA policy for transgender student-athletes, as of September 13, 2011, states the following.

A new policy will allow transgender student-athletes to participate in sex-separated sports activities so long as the athlete’s use of hormone therapy is consistent with the NCAA policies and current medical standards, which state:

- A trans male (female to male) student-athlete who has received a medical exception for treatment with testosterone for gender transition may compete on a men’s team but is no longer eligible to compete on a women’s team without changing the team status to a mixed team. A mixed team is eligible only for men’s championships.

- A trans female (male to female) student-athlete being treated with testosterone suppression medication for gender transition may continue to compete on a men’s team but may not compete on a women’s team without changing it to a mixed team status until completing one calendar year of documented testosterone-suppression treatment.


**Cal**

Intercollegiate Athletics

The Transgender Student-Athlete Participation at UC Berkeley policy institutes a process for approval of Transgender Student-Athletes participation in UC Berkeley’s intercollegiate athletic teams, mandates education about Transgender Student-Athletes, and institutes measures inclusive of the needs of Transgender Student-Athletes. The policy is based heavily on ‘On the Team: Equal Opportunity for Transgender Student Athletes’ released by the National Center for Lesbian Rights, the Women’s Sports Foundation, and the It Takes a Team Education Campaign for LGBTQ Issues in Sports in October 2010. For questions contact Ryan Cobb and Foti Mellis at [email redacted].
STANFORD
Trans Policy

The following policies clarify participation of transgender student-athletes undergoing hormonal treatment for gender transition:

1. A trans male (FTM) student-athlete who has received a medical exception for treatment with testosterone for diagnosed Gender Identity Disorder or gender dysphoria and/or Transsexualism, for purposes of NCAA competition may compete on a men’s team, but is no longer eligible to compete on a women’s team without changing that team status to a mixed team.

2. A trans female (MTF) student-athlete being treated with testosterone suppression medication for Gender Identity Disorder or gender dysphoria and/or Transsexualism, for the purposes of NCAA competition may continue to compete on a men’s team but may not compete on a women’s team until completing one calendar year of testosterone suppression treatment.

Any transgender student-athlete who is not taking hormone treatment related to gender transition may participate in sex-separated sports activities in accordance with his or her assigned birth gender.

• A trans male (FTM) student-athlete who is not taking testosterone related to gender transition may participate on a men’s or women’s team.

• A trans female (MTF) transgender student-athlete who is not taking hormone treatments related to gender transition may not compete on a women’s team.

LOUISVILLE
Inclusive Code of Conduct

Sportsmanlike Conduct:

Student Athletes, Coaching Staff, Administrative, Support Staff and Support Groups:

Unacceptable behavior will not be tolerated and will be appropriately penalized based on Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), NCAA and University policies. As representatives of the University of Louisville, it is necessary to establish a Code of Conduct for these support groups and their advisors. To emphasize the importance of good sportsmanship, providing and identifying examples of inappropriate behavior are as follows, but are not limited to: inappropriate celebrations during competition.

Use of obscene language, gestures, vulgarity, taunts, and/or ridicules at an athletic event directed towards officials, coaches, fans or other athletes:

“Disrespectful, discriminatory comments or gestures toward any participant, official, coach, administrator, or spectator including, but not limited to, any discriminatory act based on race, gender, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, socio-economic status, disability and/or national origin”

Use of physical abuse or throwing objects towards officials, coaches, fans or other athletes Lack of civility or defiling of an opponent’s name, symbols, and/or traditions Entering the competition area for an unsportsmanlike purpose, including leaving the participant area to participate in a fight.

ACC SPEAKS OUT AGAINST HB2:

“The Atlantic Coast Conference and its member institutions remain committed to equality, diversity and inclusion. Discrimination in any form has no place in higher education and college athletics, and the safe and respectful treatment of student-athletes, coaches and fans regardless of gender, will remain a priority. During the 2016 ACC Spring Meetings, the league’s faculty athletics representatives, athletic directors, senior women administrators and student-athlete representatives discussed North Carolina’s HB2 and its effects. The membership strongly supports the league continuing to engage at the highest levels regarding the effects of this law on its constituents as it evaluates current and future events and championships within the state of North Carolina. The league will also require commitments to provide safe and inclusive environments from sites for which there are current commitments for ACC Championships.”

“IT SHOULDN’T JUST BE ABOUT ATHLETIC EVENTS – THAT’S THE MOST IMPORTANT THING. IT SHOULD BE ABOUT WHAT’S RIGHT AND WRONG, AND WHAT WE HAVE NOW IS WRONG.”

“IT’S JUST NOT RIGHT, I’LL STAND UP AND SAY THAT ON ANY BUILDING ANYWHERE AS LONG AS YOU PROMISE NOT TO PUSH ... IT’S JUST NOT RIGHT. IT’S NOT JUST ABOUT ATHLETICS. IT IS JUST NOT RIGHT.”

- ROY WILLIAMS
UNC BASKETBALL COACH, SPEAKS OUT ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS AND HB2 COSTING THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA THE CHAMPIONSHIP EVENTS
About Athlete Ally/AEI Team Bios

Athletes and sports institutions are uniquely positioned to inspire other and impact societal attitudes. Athlete Ally believes that educating and activating allies within athletic communities—from professional sports teams to school physical education programs—will help eliminate homophobia, biphobia and transphobia from sports, and mitigate anti-LGBTQ prejudices at large.

Since its founding, Athlete Ally has attracted more than 150 professional athletes and Olympians, and teams at more than 50 US colleges and universities to champion the inclusion of LGBTQ athletes, coaches, fans, and officials. Moreover, we are leveraging our partnerships with individual athletes and teams to advance our impact on LGBTQ public policy in states that lag in LGBTQ-inclusive policies and practices. Through work in education, research, and policy—Athlete Ally works to foster a culture of athletic activism that harnesses the power of sport to make social change.

E-MAIL: info@athleteally.org
WEBSITE: athleteally.org
FACEBOOK: facebook.com/athleteally
TWITTER: @athleteally
INSTAGRAM: @athleteally

Liam is the Research and Program Manager at Athlete Ally who designed and spearheaded the Athletic Equality Index (AEI). Liam is also the author of the final report and responsible for the application and growth of the AEI as a resource and agent of change. Outside of the AEI, Liam manages a variety of research projects and programmatic efforts ranging from areas of education to policy reform in order to make athletics more inclusive at all levels.

Prior to Athlete Ally, Liam was a varsity athlete at Duke University where he studied psychology, neuroscience, and philosophy. He did a variety of research on moral judgements and attitudes formation, resilience in college students, and LGB coach-athlete dyads. Liam continues to work on multiple research projects outside of Athlete Ally that broaden understanding of how policies (or lack thereof) and societal climates affect the LGBTQ community.

EMAIL: info@athleteally.org
WEBSITE: athleteally.org
FACEBOOK: facebook.com/athleteally
TWITTER: @athleteally
INSTAGRAM: @athleteally

THE ATHLETIC EQUALITY TEAM INDEX

Liam is the Research and Program Manager at Athlete Ally who designed and spearheaded the Athletic Equality Index (AEI). Liam is also the author of the final report and responsible for the application and growth of the AEI as a resource and agent of change. Outside of the AEI, Liam manages a variety of research projects and programmatic efforts ranging from areas of education to policy reform in order to make athletics more inclusive at all levels.

Prior to Athlete Ally, Liam was a varsity athlete at Duke University where he studied psychology, neuroscience, and philosophy. He did a variety of research on moral judgements and attitudes formation, resilience in college students, and LGB coach-athlete dyads. Liam continues to work on multiple research projects outside of Athlete Ally that broaden understanding of how policies (or lack thereof) and societal climates affect the LGBTQ community.
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