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.”

FOREWORD

HUDSON TAYLOR
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FOUNDER OF ATHLETE ALLY

When we initially launched the Athletic Equality Index in 2017, our goal was to provide a benchmark for measuring and institutionalizing LGBTQ inclusion across the colleges and universities within the NCAA Power 5 conferences. For the first time, colleges had access to data and resources on exactly where and how to improve their inclusive policies and practices, from developing Fan Codes of Conduct so that LGBTQ fans are protected in the stands, to acknowledging out or allied coaches so that athletes know where to go for support.

The impact of this work has been undeniable. We worked with a number of these schools to raise their scores, and as a result, the number of schools with transgender-inclusive policies quadrupled, and more than 25 schools adopted non-discrimination policies.

As our policy and campus work has evolved and expanded, it’s become clear to us that beyond looking at whether or not policies and practices exist and are accessible, we also need to be looking at sustainability. Did a school hold a Pride Game in 2017, but none since? If so, that’s an indication of potential, but not progress. That’s why we updated our 2019 methodology to look at LGBTQ events hosted within the past year, not just if an event had ever occurred. We also looked at whether collaborations between athletic departments and campus LGBTQ groups actually occurred, and not just if there were opportunities for these collaborations.

Because we raised the bar on LGBTQ inclusion, some school scores went down. And yet, three times as many schools got perfect scores, and more than 15 schools saw a 20 point increase. Two-thirds of schools have Fan Codes of Conduct prohibiting homophobia and transphobia, and 95% of schools have comprehensive non-discrimination policies.

We are truly seeing a groundswell of support for LGBTQ student-athletes, and we need this support now more than ever. According to a 2019 Center for American Progress report, Department of Education complaints related to sexual orientation or gender identity are nine times less likely to be addressed under the current Administration. That means that colleges have a unique opportunity to step up and provide that safe space LGBTQ athletes need to thrive.

From the University of Michigan’s Pride Games to Ohio State University’s proud out faculty, I am tremendously inspired by the schools profiled in the AEI, and the work we’re doing together to champion inclusion. Thanks to these institutions’ commitment to continued growth and the benchmarks like the AEI that help us navigate a road to success, we’re on our way to building the kind of global sport community all LGBTQ athletes deserve.

By Hudson Taylor
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FOUNDER OF ATHLETE ALLY
As of 2019, nearly seven in ten [69%] Americans – across political parties, demographics, and geography – favor laws which protect lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) people from discrimination (Greenberg, Beyer, Najle, Bola, & Jones, 2019). Yet, as of 2019, people within the LGBTQ community remain a federally un-protected class of citizens; Indeed, only 19 states prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity (Human Rights Campaign, 2019) and only 15 states address discrimination against students based on sexual orientation and gender identity (Human Rights Campaign, 2019).

Perhaps more disturbing, in a 2019 study, Mirza and Bewkes found “the enforcement of civil rights for LGBTQ students has been drastically scaled back under the leadership” of United States Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos since February of 2017; “Complaints related to sexual orientation or gender identity were nine times less likely to result in corrective action to address alleged discrimination under the Trump Administration than under the Obama Administration” (para. 7).

In 2018, DeVos officially confirmed that the Department of Education was no longer investigating complaints from transgender students regarding access to bathrooms and locker rooms, as well as a range of other complaints of anti-transgender discrimination.

This is particularly concerning given data from GLSEN’s 2017 National School Climate Survey showing that more than 40 percent of transgender and gender-nonconforming students report being required to use the bathroom facilities corresponding to their legal sex, and about 40 percent of LGBTQ students avoid gender-segregated spaces in school altogether due to safety concerns. (para. 3)

LGBTQ students are legally protected against harassment under Title IX (as many state courts are accepting that discrimination and harassment based on sexual orientation or gender identity are inherently forms of sex discrimination), though the Department of Education is failing to enforce such protections.

Thus, while LGBTQ people are, arguably, culturally more accepted than ever, there is a serious need for comprehensive and systemic non-discrimination protections.

Colleges and Universities across the United States are not immune to such issues – in fact, many institutions, in spite of the seemingly accepting climates of colleges and Universities, are rampant with heterosexism (Woodford, Kulick, Garvey, Sinco, & Hong, 2018). Universities and colleges have become increasingly diverse and are often portrayed as spaces in which young adults are open and accepting of sexual minorities. Nevertheless, inhospitality and prejudice towards sexual minorities remains pervasive on college campuses (Hong, Woodford, Long, & Renn, 2016, p. 119).

This prejudice often manifests as heterosexism, harassment, intimidation, and violence. The inhospitable climate of Universities toward LGBTQ+ students is particularly significant, as research suggests young people are most likely to come out soon after graduating from high school (Savin-Williams & Diamond, 2000) — the period in which most young people are most likely to form their personal identities, establish goals, and develop behavior patterns which have lasting mental and physical effects (Arnett, 2000; Hong, Woodford, Long, & Renn, 2016). Recent studies have elucidated the many ways institutions are structurally and culturally heterosexist (Woodford, Kulick, Garvey, Sinco, and Hong, 2018; Hong, Woodford, Long, & Renn, 2016).

However, a 2016 study by Russell and Bohan introduced the hopeful concept of institutional allyship – a pro-LGBT culture amongst members of an institution [rather than individual allies] which leads to collective action on social inequality. Academic institutions have a unique opportunity to model what it means to move beyond “tolerating” the LGBTQ+ community to truly embracing them, and to provide LGBTQ+ students a safe space in which to thrive. In this iteration of the Athletic Equality Index, we pose the question: in spite of these disturbing national trends, which institutional allies have demonstrated their commitment to the LGBTQ+ community within collegiate athletics across the United States?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2017 Score</th>
<th>2019 Score</th>
<th>Score Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>-45.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>+32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>+39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>+17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>+27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>+20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>+25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University—Stillwater</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>+23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>+27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>+17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>+20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>+12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>+5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>+22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>+22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Boulder</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>+39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>+5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>+17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>+20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska–Lincoln</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>-15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>+47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>+5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>+15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Madison</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>+5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>+22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>+17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About the Athletic Equality Index**

The second iteration of the Athletic Equality Index was conducted in 2019 to measure LGBTQ+ inclusion policies in collegiate athletics. This report provides a comprehensive look at how member institutions of the NCAA Power 5 conferences (Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pac-12 Conference, and Southeastern Conference) are utilizing policies to support LGBTQ+ student-athletes, coaches, administrators, staff, and fans. To do so, a scale was developed to score the accessibility of an NCAA Division-I school athletic department’s commitment to providing and publicizing:

1. **Comprehensive Nondiscrimination Policies**
2. **LGBTQ+ Resources and Educational Materials**
3. **An Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**
4. **Policies for Transgender Student-Athlete Inclusion**
5. **Student-Athlete Initiatives Relative to LGBTQ+ Inclusion**
6. **Out or Ally-Trained Athletics Staff Members**
7. **A Co-Hosted Event supporting LGBTQ+ Inclusion**
8. **A Recurring LGBTQ+ Inclusive Initiative or Campaign**
Data for this study was collected between July 1, 2019 and November 1, 2019. As was the case in 2017, our team of researchers performed a comprehensive audit of institutions’ handbooks, policy manuals, and websites to identify the policies of every NCAA Division-I (1D-I) institution within the Power Five. The Power Five is an unsanctioned group of athletic competitions within the Football Bowl Subdivision. The dataset included information from 65 institutions within the ACC [Atlantic Coast Conference], the Big Ten, the Big 12, the Pac-12 [Pacific-12 Conference], and the SEC [Southeastern Conference] (see Table 1).

During a 4-week feedback period from October 1 and November 1, 2019, our researchers took information regarding or allied staff members from each individual institution. At minimum, three individuals from each institution (including, but not exclusive to, the Athletic Director, Senior Woman Administrator, and highest-level Athletic staff member for Compliance) were contacted via email three times, and via phone twice. Best efforts were made to contact each institution to verify the scores in the above categories above for each institution.

Consistent with Carmines and Zeller (1979), scoring for each institution was conducted by three independent scholars and checked for inter-rater reliability. Scoring for each institution was sent then to the Athletic Director, senior-most Athletics Compliance Administrator, and Senior Woman Administrator / Title IX Coordinator, to begin a dialogue with schools about their assigned score. School representatives were asked to make the research team aware of any policies or efforts that were not previously identified. From that outreach, we were able to connect with 84.6% (n = 55) of the institutions in our sample to confirm the accuracy of their scores.

Scoring for the 2019 AEI, consistent with the report conducted in 2017, consisted of the following eight research questions, aimed at determining the best policies to connect with 84.6% (n = 55) of the institutions in our sample to confirm the accuracy of their scores.

DOES THE SCHOOL HAVE NONDISCRIMINATION POLICIES WHICH EXPLICITLY PROTECT THE SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, AND GENDER EXPRESSION OF LGBTQ+ FACULTY/STAFF, STUDENTS, AND VARSITY STUDENT-ATHLETES?

35 POINTS

Research suggests nondiscrimination policies which explicitly protect the LGBTQ+ community can provide the protections students lack and foster climates which reduce heterosexism (Woodford, Joslin, & Renn, 2016; Garvey, Sanders, & Flint, 2017). Woodford, Kulick, Garvey, Sinco, and Hong (2018) found a statistically significant correlation between more comprehensive nondiscrimination policies and decreased LGBTQ interpersonal and environmental microaggressions, decreased perceived anxiety and stress among LGBTQ students, increased self-esteem among LGBTQ students, and increased LGBTQ pride on campuses. As Hatzenbuehler and Keyes (2013) noted, policies related to gender identity and heterosexism underscore the “symbolic value” of these types of protections, which may exert protective effects on the mental health of the LGBTQ community in particular. Still, the experiences of those in the LGBTQ+ and ally communities are not monolithic; a 2014 study by Woodford, Kulick, Sinco, and Hong found cisgender LGBTQ+ students whose gender identity and gender expression matched their sex at birth felt more protected against heterosexist discrimination than individuals who did not identify as cisgender (Woodford, Kulick, Sinco, & Hong, 2014).

In this sense, more research is necessary regarding the ways people with varying gender identities and sexualities experience heterosexism in collegiate spaces, and in collegiate sport in particular. As Payne and Smith (2012) aptly noted, policies may or may not reflect how inclusive a school climate is as policies are “limited in their capacity to change school climate” (p. 191). Thus, to design effective strategies for changing cultures and developing more inclusive spaces, we must also examine how nondiscrimination policies intersect with experiences.

SCORING: Institutions with a nondiscrimination policy that did not mention sexual orientation, gender / gender identity, or gender expression (these policies only protected sex - the anatomical differences between males and females at birth) were awarded 0 points. Institutions that protected sexual orientation, one’s sexual identity / the gender to which they are attracted, were awarded 14 points. Policies that protected sexual orientation and gender identity (the gender with which an individual identifies which does not necessarily match their sex at birth) were awarded 28 points. Institutions that protected sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression (the way in which one expresses their gender) were awarded a full 35 points.

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

20 POINTS

Another way to reduce heterosexism on campuses, according to Woodford, Kulick, Garvey, Sinco, and Hong (2018), is to offer educational resources around LGBTQ issues, which may decrease microaggressions against LGBTQ students while improving their self-esteem. A study by Hong, Woodford, Long, and Renn (2016) found that the ways students perceive the support of LGBTQ people at their Universities and colleges acts as a buffer against three forms of ambient heterosexism: interpersonal microaggressions, avoidance behaviors, and verbal threats. We suggest offering LGBTQ+ educational resources at an institution may not reduce prejudice directly, but may, in the least, influence the ways others interact with LGBTQ+ student-athletes and perceive the support of LGBTQ people, buffering against certain types of heterosexism and microaggressions.

SCORING: Schools were awarded 0 points for lacking any LGBTQ resources, 10 points for a lack of publicly accessible LGBTQ resources, and 20 points for having LGBTQ resources which were accessible and available to student-athletes. Notably, the quantity, quality, and typology of those resources are not considered within the scoring process currently.

**“IT MAKES A WORLD OF DIFFERENCE FOR LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETES TO KNOW THEY ARE VALUED AND PROTECTED FROM DISCRIMINATION ON AND OFF THE PLAYING FIELD. DURING MY TIME AT DUKE, I LEARNED WHAT IT TRULY MEANS TO BE AN ALLY, AND HOW AN INCLUSIVE ENVIRONMENT CAN BRING PEOPLE TOGETHER AND MAKE OUR COMMUNITY STRONGER. AS AN ALLY AND A DUKE ALUM, I'M SO PROUD TO SEE MY ALMA MATER STANDING UP FOR THE LGBTQ COMMUNITY THROUGH COMPREHENSIVE NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICIES, ON-CAMPUS RESOURCES, AND AN OVERALL COMMITMENT TO INCLUSION.”**

IMANI DORSEY

PROFESSIONAL SOCCER PLAYER, SKY BLUE FC
DO SCHOOLS HAVE A FAN CODE OF CONDUCT THAT EXPLICITLY PROTECTS LGBTQ+ COACHES, ATHLETICS STAFF, REFEREES, VARSITY STUDENT-ATHLETES, AND SPECTATORS?

10 POINTS

A 2015 study by Denison and Kitchen found that only 1% of over 9,000 sport fans think that LGBTQ+ people are completely accepted in athletics. Moreover, participants in the study believed spectator stands were the most dangerous and unwelcoming of all places for LGBTQ+ people in sport, including the locker room. A 2012 study on semi-professional soccer fandom, however, found, “contrary to assumptions of homophobia, there is evidence of rapidly decreasing homophobia within the culture of... fandom” (Cashmore & Cleland, p. 370). In fact, 93% of fans surveyed (of all ages and genders) stated there was “no place for homophobia within football” (p. 370). The connections between aggressive fan behavior and socially discriminatory fan behavior (such as, yelling anti-LGBTQ+ epithets) have yet to be examined in the literature.

In an effort to shift fans toward a series of behaviors and language which more closely aligns with their views on LGBTQ+ athletes, we examine whether policies around homophobic fan behavior exist at different institutions. Many schools offer fan codes of conduct but do not explicitly outline which behaviors are appropriate and expected during a competition, and which are not. Further, because research has yet to examine whether policies impact fan behaviors, it remains unclear whether fan codes of conduct mitigate homophobic language or gestures. Many institutions have fan codes of conduct for a limited number of competitions (namely, only football contests in the stadium). Overall, collegiate athletics fandom remains wholly unexplored.

SCORING: Athletic departments without a fan code of conduct of any kind were awarded 0 points. Athletic departments that had a fan code of conduct that addressed discrimination and harassment, but didn’t explicitly address homophobic or transphobic language / actions, were awarded 5 points. Athletic departments with a publicly accessible fan code of conduct that explicitly addressed homophobic or transphobic language were awarded a full 10 points. In 2017, the NCAA [2017] curated sample language for LGBTQ inclusive fan codes of conduct.

“WITH THE NEW FAN CODE OF CONDUCT, THERE NOW EXISTS WRITTEN PROOF THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN WILL NOT PERMIT HOMOPHOBIC OR TRANSPHOBIC LANGUAGE, GESTURES, OR CONTENT. THIS MEANS THAT THERE IS A COLLECTIVE AND PUBLIC AGREEMENT THAT HOMOPHOBIC AND TRANSPHOBIC ACTIONS WILL NOT BE TOLERATED, BEYOND THAT, SHOULD ANY ATHLETE, COACH, OR FAN BE THE TARGET OF SUCH CONTENT, THERE ARE NOW MORE GROUNDS AND A BETTER PROCESS FOR REPORTING AND RESOLVING SUCH ISSUES.”

G RYAN (THEY/THEM/THEIRS)
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN ALUMNI AND FORMER SWIMMER

HAVE SCHOOLS ADOPTED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE A WRITTEN POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER VARSITY STUDENT-ATHLETES?

10 POINTS

While there is a burgeoning body of research on transgender students’ experiences in U.S. colleges (Beemyn, 2003; Effrig, Bieschke, & Locke, 2011; Beemyn, Curtis, Davis, & Tubbs, 2005), little research exists on the experiences of transgender varsity, collegiate student-athletes exists (Lucas-Carr & Kraner, 2011). Within the discipline of sport psychology, in a 2010 review of the history of research on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender issues, Krane, Tambor, Kauer, and Semerjian (2010) found no articles focused on transgender athletes. The limited research on trans students, however, suggests young trans people consistently and collectively perceive campus climates differently than their LGB and cis-gender peers (Dugan, Kusel, & Simounet, 2012; McKinney, 2005; Rankin, 2005). As Dugan, Kusel, and Simounet (2012) articulated: Empirical research examining transgender students’ perceptions of campus climate generally suggests increased harassment and experiences with discrimination (McKinney, 2005; Rankin & Beemyn, 2011; Rankin, 2003). A multi-institutional study by Rankin and Beemyn (2011) found students fear for their safety due to their gender identity while transgender students “frequently experienced institutional discrimination through campus policies. Furthermore, respondents commonly expressed that faculty and staff were not adequately educated... and therefore not prepared to support transgender students” (p. 721).

Positing the same may be true within athletics departments — with student-athletes feeling unsafe, experiencing institutional discrimination through policies and feeling faculty and staff are not appropriately educated — it is imperative to examine how policies impact access to sport participation for transgender varsity-athletes.

SCORING: Athletic departments without a transgender inclusion policy specific to varsity athletes, or a mention of trans varsity athletes of any kind (including, but not exclusive to: their general Athletics website, compliance page, digital student-athlete handbook, or sports medicine page), were awarded zero points. Notably, many schools utilized the NCAA’s curated sample language for a trans-inclusive varsity student-athlete policy [National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2011]. Athletic departments with an accessible and specific trans inclusion policy for varsity student-athletes were awarded 10 points.

"IT’S HARD FOR TRANS ATHLETES TO KNOW IN ADVANCE EXACTLY WHAT KIND OF EXPERIENCE THEY’LL HAVE AT THEIR SCHOOL, WHICH CAN MAKE THE COLLEGE SELECTION PROCESS EVEN MORE STRESSFUL. THROUGH THE AEI, STUDENTS CAN SEE IF THE SCHOOLS THEY’RE CONSIDERING HAVE THE POLICIES AND RESOURCES IN PLACE TO MAKE THEM FEEL WELCOME FOR WHO THEY ARE."

JUNE EASTWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
DO SCHOOLS HAVE LGBTQ-FOCUSED STUDENT GROUPS THAT INTERSECTS WITH ATHLETICS?

10 POINTS

Recent research from Woodford, Kulick, Garvey, Sinco, and Hong (2018) suggests LGBTQ students who attend institutions with a higher ratio of LGBTQ student organizations report lower levels of distress and higher levels of self-acceptance. A higher ratio of LGBTQ student organizations to the student population was negatively correlated with victimization, interpersonal microaggressions, environmental microaggressions, and perceived stress; “affirmative policies and resources [were positively] associated with lower experiential heterosexism and with greater psychological well-being” (p. 7). Moreover, a 2013 study by Wernick, Kulick, and Inglehart found that when students were educated around LGBTQ inclusion and intervened when they saw discriminatory behaviors from peers, it empowered other students to stand up when they saw discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community. Having educational groups that empower students to stand up for their beliefs created more effective allies across the board.

SCORING: Institutions with no LGBTQ-focused student group that intersected with athletics were awarded 0 points. Institutions with a student-athlete group or initiative that engages in work around diversity, inclusion, or respect but are not explicitly LGBTQ focused, were awarded 5 points. Institutions with an LGBTQ-focused student group that intersected with athletics / sport or had at least one varsity student-athlete member were awarded 10 points.

DO SCHOOLS HAVE LGBTQ OR ALLIED COACHES/ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS WHO ARE PUBLICLY OUT, OPEN, AND/OR VOCAL?

5 POINTS

While the relationship between LGBTQ+ collegiate student athletes and coaches / athletic administrators has yet to be examined, some research has found that out, or allied, faculty members positively influence college students’ experiences. In 2016, Linley, Nguyen, Brazelton, Becker, Renn, and Woodford found LGBTQ students felt mostly supported by faculty “through informal interactions, such as visibility on campus and participation in on-campus events in support of students. These activities fall outside the purview of formal faculty work but play an important role in furthering the connection with the broader campus community” (p. 5). Similarly, a 2015 study by Woodford and Kulik found faculty and staff relations were positively associated with sexual minority college students’ academic and social integration on campus (Woodford & Kulick, 2015). While LGBTQ+ students experience more discrimination on campus than their cisgender and heterosexual peers (Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, & Frazer, 2010; Woodford, Long, & Renn, 2016, p. 127). This is true for LGBTQ students who interact with faculty and staff “through informal interactions, such as visibility on campus and participation in on-campus events in support of students. These activities fall outside the purview of formal faculty work but play an important role in furthering the connection with the broader campus community” (Linley et al., 2016, p. 5). Hosting less formal events in which students, varsity student-athletes, faculty, staff, coaches, and administrators might interact, could foster more inclusive climates.

SCORING: Athletic departments who had not participated in a LGBTQ+ event within the past year were awarded 0 points. Institutions who utilized athletic department resources to host an event around diversity, inclusion, or respect, but not the LGBTQ community explicitly, were awarded 2.5 points. Institutions who utilized athletic department resources to collaborate around a one-time LGBTQ-focused event (for instance, a Pride Night), even if it was not department-wide, were awarded 5 points.

CHANGES IN SCORING FROM 2017: In 2017, if our researchers found accessible places to submit requests for partnership on either the athletic department or campus identity center’s websites, institutions were awarded points. In 2019, we felt it necessary for Athletic Departments to have had actually hosted an event in collaboration with another campus group.

Role modeling may also influence whether athletes feel comfortable coming out to peers. Research suggests that when athletes perceive a space to be accepting — especially if they have teammates who are out — they are more likely to come out (Fink, Burton, Farrell, & Parker, 2012). According to Kroger and White (1981), having just one supportive person (whether it is a coach, administrator, or teammate), significantly increases an athletes’ likelihood of coming out.

SCORING: During a 4-week feedback period, our researchers requested information regarding out or allied staff members from each institution. If a staff member identified as openly LGBTQ, or ally trained, to our research team (even if they could not be found through an online search), the institution was awarded full points. While we feel accessibility of information is paramount in LGBTQ+ spaces, we felt this standard could be inappropriately applied in this category. In an effort to protect any individuals who did not want to be publicly outed, we accepted responses at face value.

HAVE SCHOOLS PARTICIPATED IN A PRIDE NIGHT OR OTHER NON-RECURRING LGBTQ CAMPAIGN/EVENT?

5 POINTS

Little research on collaborations between LGBTQ+ campus groups / events hosted to celebrate the LGBTQ+ community and the experiences of LGBTQ+ students exists. Still, when LGBTQ+ students feel supported, possibly through specific events and initiatives, they are protected from experiencing higher rates of ambient heterosexism, both subtle and blatant (Hong, Woodford, Long, & Renn, 2016, p. 127). This is true for LGBTQ students who interact with faculty and staff “through informal interactions, such as visibility on campus and participation in on-campus events in support of students. These activities fall outside the purview of formal faculty work but play an important role in furthering the connection with the broader campus community” (Linley et al., 2016, p. 5). Hosting less formal events in which students, varsity student-athletes, faculty, staff, coaches, and administrators might interact, could foster more inclusive climates.

SCORING: Athletic departments who had not participated in a LGBTQ+ event within the past year were awarded 0 points. Institutions who utilized athletic department resources to host an event around diversity, inclusion, or respect, but not the LGBTQ community explicitly, were awarded 2.5 points. Institutions who utilized athletic department resources to collaborate around a one-time LGBTQ-focused event (for instance, a Pride Night), even if it was not department-wide, were awarded 5 points.

As Linley et al. (2016) further found, while faculty and people in positions of power at institutions can offer significant support to LGBTQ college students in hostile climates, few institutions reward them. It also provides a new support system that wasn’t there before. Not having this can make a student feel incredibly isolated, even within other groups they are a part of.”

ANNA CONNER
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY STUDENT AND VP OF UNOFFICIAL LGBTQ STUDENT GROUP GAMMA ALPHA UPSILON

"AN OFFICIAL LGBTQ STUDENT GROUP LETS LGBTQ STUDENTS KNOW THEY’RE NOT ALONE AND THAT THE UNIVERSITY IS WILLING TO STAND BY THEM. IT ALSO PROVIDES A NEW SUPPORT SYSTEM THAT WASN’T THERE BEFORE. NOT HAVING THIS CAN MAKE A STUDENT FEEL INCREDIBLY ISOLATED, EVEN WITHIN OTHER GROUPS THEY ARE A PART OF."
DO SCHOOLS HAVE A FRAMEWORK FOR, OR HISTORY OF, PARTNERING WITH OTHER LGBTQ+ CAMPUS GROUPS FOR RECURRING EVENTS?

5 POINTS

Extending the understanding that LGBTQ+ students might feel supported through specific events and initiatives (Hong, Woodford, Long, & Renn, 2016), we posit that institutions hosting less formal events in which students, varsity student-athletes, faculty, staff, coaches, and administrators might interact, likely foster more inclusive climates. This is particularly true of institutions which show a sustained commitment to such events and LGBTQ+ inclusion. While more research needs to be conducted on the ways recurring initiatives support LGBTQ+ student-athletes, we suggest a continued commitment to inclusive events or campaigns over time demonstrates an institutional climate in which LGBTQ+ inclusion is valued.

SCORING: Athletic departments that offered no LGBTQ-focused recurring events or campaigns over the past two years were awarded 0 points. Institutions with a group or initiative within Athletics (such as a task force) that engages in work around diversity or inclusion, but not explicitly LGBTQ issues, were awarded 2.5 points. Institutions who had participated in a recurring LGBTQ+ event or campaign for at least the past two years were awarded 5 points.

CHANGES IN SCORING FROM 2017: In 2017, if our researchers found any action initiated by the Athletics Department regarding LGBTQ issues, no matter when the event occurred, they were awarded full points. In 2019, we felt it necessary for Athletic Departments to have hosted an event within the timeframe of the previous report (since the 2017). If the institution had not hosted an event in the last two years, they were awarded zero points.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ON AVERAGE, SCORES FOR ALL 65 SCHOOLS INCREASED BY 10.3 POINTS. THERE WERE MAJOR UPTICKS IN SCORES IN THE BIG12 (AN AVERAGE INCREASE OF 11.0 POINTS) AND THE SEC (AN AVERAGE OF 8.7 POINTS).


53 SCHOOLS (OVER 81%) HAVE AN OUT OR ALLY-TRAINED STAFF MEMBER IN THEIR ATHLETICS DEPARTMENT.

AS OF 2019, 12 SCHOOLS (UP FROM 5) HAVE A FULL FAN CODE OF CONDUCT THAT PROTECTS AGAINST HOMOPHOBIC AND TRANSPHOBIC LANGUAGE, WHILE 52 SCHOOLS (NEARLY 80%) HAVE A FAN CODE OF CONDUCT THAT PROTECTS AGAINST HARMFUL OR DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS.

48 INSTITUTIONS’ ATHLETIC DEPARTMENTS (NEARLY 75%) HAVE HOSTED OR COLLABORATED ON A ONE-TIME EVENT, A RECURRING INITIATIVE, OR SOME SORT OF CAMPAIGN IN SUPPORT OF THE LGBTQ+ COMMUNITY.

OVER HALF OF THE SCHOOLS - A 378% INCREASE FROM 2017 - NOW FOLLOW THE NCAA’S POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER VARSITY STUDENT-ATHLETE INCLUSION.

OUR MOST IMPROVED SCORE CAME FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, WHO WENT FROM A SCORE OF 48 IN 2017 TO A 95 IN 2019 (AN INCREASE OF 47 POINTS).

“LGBTQ STUDENT ATHLETES AT MY SCHOOL MIGHT FEEL MORE COMFORTABLE COMING OUT IF WE HAD LGBTQ RESOURCES OR INCLUSIVE POLICIES. IT’S HARD BEING THE ONLY OUT ATHLETE, AND I THINK THIS WILL ONLY CHANGE IF BYU PRIORITIZES MAKING LGBTQ STUDENTS FEEL SAFE AND WELcomed.”

EMMA GEE, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

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: 0/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 0/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 0/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Total: 65.6

Final Score: 60/100

ATHLETE ALLY

ATHLETIC EQUALITY INDEX

2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>University of Florida</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>University of Missouri</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-discrimination policy</td>
<td>35/35</td>
<td></td>
<td>35/35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible resource</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken or Allied Staff</td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Campus Group</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Athlete Ally**

**Final Score: 62.5/100**

**Final Score: 75/100**
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-LGBT Campaign or Statement**: 5/5

*Final Score: 85/100*

TEXAS A&M 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**: 5/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 5/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 5/5
- **Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement**: 5/5

*Final Score: 73/100*
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

- **Non-Discrimination Policy**: 35/35
- **Accessible Resource**: 20/20
- **LGBT-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**: 2.5/5
- **Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement**: 2.5/5

**Final Score**: 80/100

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

- **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
- **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
## UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Score:</strong> 70/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATHLETE ALLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>LGBT-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT</strong></td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOLLOWS NCAA POLICY FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION</strong></td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBT STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF</strong></td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP</strong></td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRO-LGBT CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT</strong></td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<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>5/10</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>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:**
- University of South Carolina: 63/100
- Auburn University: 55/100
<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>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:** 55/100
BIG 12

SCORE: 69.8

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

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY: 30.8
OUT OR ALLIED STAFF: 2.5
ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES: 5
COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP: 2.5
LGBTQ STUDENT-ATHLETE GROUP OR INITIATIVE: 2.5
PRO-LGBTQ EQUALITY CAMPAIGN/STATEMENT: 2.75
LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT: 5
FOLLOWS NCAA GUIDELINES FOR TRANSGENDER INCLUSION: 5

TOTAL: 69.8

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

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: 0/10

OUTSPOKEN OR ALLIED STAFF: 2.5/5

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP: 0/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT: 2.5/5

TOTAL: 65/100

ATHLETE ALLY

FINAL SCORE: 65/100
## IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-discrimination 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>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 85/100

## KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-discrimination 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>5/10</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>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>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 65.5/100
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscrimination Policy</td>
<td>0/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Resource</td>
<td>0/20</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: 0/100

ATHLETE ALLY

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

<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>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: 60/100

ATHLETE ALLY
**Texas Christian University**

- **Non-Discrimination 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**: 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

---

**University of Oklahoma**

- **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**: 0/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 0/5
- **Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement**: 0/5

**Final Score**: 55/100
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

**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

**Athlete Ally**

**Final Score:** 100/100

---

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

**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:** 5/10

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

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

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

**Athlete Ally**

**Final Score:** 90/100
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

<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>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINAL SCORE: 87.5/100
ACC

SCORE: 79.4

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

Nondiscrimination Policy: 29.9
Out or Allied Staff: 4.7
Accessible Resources: 20
Collaboration with Campus Group: 3.5
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 6.7
Pro LGBTQ Equality Campaign/Statement: 2.3
LGBTQ Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5
Follows NCAA Guidelines for Transgender Inclusion: 7.3
Total: 79.4

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Nondiscrimination Policy: 0/35

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: 5/5

Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5

FINAL SCORE: 30/100
**BOSTON COLLEGE**

- **Nondiscrimination Policy**: 14/35
- **Accessible Resource**: 20/20
- **LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 5/10
- **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**: 2.5/5
- **Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement**: 0/5

*Final Score: 66.5/100*

---

**CLEMSON UNIVERSITY**

- **Nondiscrimination Policy**: 28/35
- **Accessible Resource**: 20/20
- **LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct**: 0/10
- **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-LGBT Campaign or Statement**: 5/5

*Final Score: 83/100*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
<th>アクセス</th>
<th>非差別政策</th>
<th>LGBTQ包含的观众守则</th>
<th>同性愛者学生選手集団</th>
<th>同性愛者を擁護するスタッフ</th>
<th>プロ・LGBTQキャンペーン/声明</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA TECH</td>
<td>90/100</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35/35</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH</td>
<td>95/100</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35/35</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Georgia Institute of Technology

<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>5/10</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>5/10</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>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 68/100

### North Carolina State University

<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>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 85/100
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

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: 10/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 5/5

Final Score: 95/100

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY

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: 5/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 2.5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 2.5/5

Final Score: 85/100
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA  
ACC  

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY  28/35  

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  0/5  

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT  0/5  

ATHLETE ALLY  FINAL SCORE: 78/100  

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY  
ACC  

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  5/5  

OUTSPoken OR ALLIED STAFF  5/5  

COLLABORATION WITH CAMPUS GROUP  5/5  

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT  5/5  

ATHLETE ALLY  FINAL SCORE: 85/100
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

- **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**: 0/10
- **Outspoken or Allied Staff**: 0/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 0/5
- **Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement**: 0/5

Final Score: 60/100

ATHLETE ALLEY

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

- **Non-Discrimination 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

ATHLETE ALLEY
DUKE 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
- **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**: 100/100

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

- **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**: 0/5
- **Collaboration with Campus Group**: 5/5
- **Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement**: 0/5

- **Final Score**: 70/100
BIG 10

SCORE: 83.3

DIVISION: Division I FBS
SPORTS FIELD: 28 (men's: 14; women's: 14)
COMMISSIONER: Jim Delany
MEMBERS: 14

Nondiscrimination Policy: 34
Out or Allied Staff: 4.5
Accessible Resources: 20
Collaboration with Campus Group: 4.3
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 6.1
Pro LGBTQ Equality Campaign/Statement: 3.0
LGBTQ Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5.7
Follows NCAA Guidelines for Transgender Inclusion: 5.7

TOTAL: 83.3

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

<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>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Campus Group</td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINAL SCORE: 53/100

ATHLETE ALLY
INDIANA UNIVERSITY AT BLOOMINGTON

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 ILLINOIS

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 IOWA

**Final Score:** 95/100

- **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:** 0/5

**ATHLETE ALLY**

---

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

**Final Score:** 67.5/100

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

**ATHLETE ALLY**
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

FINAL SCORE: 80/100

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE 20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT 10/10

FOLLOWING 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 5/5

ATHLETE ALLY

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY 35/35

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

FINAL SCORE: 100/100

ACCESSIBLE RESOURCE 20/20

LGBTQ-INCLUSIVE FAN CODE OF CONDUCT 10/10

FOLLOWING 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

ATHLETE ALLY

NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY 35/35
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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: 10/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 5/5

Final Score: 85/100

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

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: 5/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 2.5/5

Final Score: 65.5/100
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

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-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 2.5/5

Final Score: 72.5/100

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

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: 5/5

Pro-LGBT Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Final Score: 90/100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purdue University</th>
<th>University of Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Discrimination Policy</td>
<td>35/35</td>
<td>35/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Resource</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows NCAA Policy for Transgender Inclusion</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken or Allied Staff</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Campus Group</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO-LGBT Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Athlete Ally Final Score: **Purdue University: 95/100**

Athlete Ally Final Score: **University of Wisconsin: 67.5/100**
<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>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score:** 95/100
PAC 12

SCORE: 83.5

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: 3.5
LGBTQ Student-Athlete Group or Initiative: 6.7
Pro LGBTQ Equality Campaign/Statement: 3.5
LGBTQ Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5.4
Follows NCAA Guidelines for Transgender inclusion: 5.8
Total: 83.5

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Final Score: 53/100

Athlete Ally

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: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 0/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY  PAC 12

Nondiscrimination Policy  28/35

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-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement  0/5

Final Score: 53/100

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  PAC 12

Nondiscrimination Policy  35/35

Accessible Resource  20/20

LGBT-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  5/5

Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement  5/5

Final Score: 95/100
Oregon State University

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35

Accessible Resource: 20/20

LGBTQ-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 0/10

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

Athlete Ally Final Score: 90/100

University of Utah

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: 0/10

Outspoken or Allied Staff: 0/5

Collaboration with Campus Group: 0/5

Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 0/5

Athlete Ally Final Score: 65/100
WASHINGTON STATE 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: 10/10
Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5
Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 5/5

Athlete Ally Final Score: 85/100

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Nondiscrimination Policy: 35/35
Accessible Resource: 20/20
LGBT-Inclusive Fan Code of Conduct: 5/10
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: 2.5/5
Pro-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 2.5/5

Athlete Ally Final Score: 90/100
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LA

PAC 12

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

ATHLETE ALLY FINAL SCORE: 85/100

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER

PAC 12

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 5/5

PRO-LGBTQ CAMPAIGN OR STATEMENT 5/5

ATHLETE ALLY FINAL SCORE: 95/100
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

PAC 12

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: 0/10

Outspoken or Allied Staff: 5/5

Collaboration with Campus Group: 5/5

PRO-LGBTQ Campaign or Statement: 5/5

Athlete Ally: FINAL SCORE: 90/100

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

PAC 12

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

Athlete Ally: FINAL SCORE: 100/100
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY | PAC 12

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

Athlete Ally
WHILE SCHOLARS AND ADVOCATES ALIKE HAVE MADE CALLS TO TAKE LGBTQ+ INCLUSION MORE SERIOUSLY IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SETTINGS, THERE ARE STILL MAJOR DISCREPANCIES IN THE RESEARCH BEING CONDUCTED ON THE EXPERIENCES OF THE LGBTQ+ (AND CIS-GENDER, HETEROSEXUAL) COMMUNITIES EXPERIENCES IN SPORT SETTINGS.

Our aim is to continue to utilize the AEI to further these research endeavors, while also providing feedback to institutions on how their policies compare to others, to offer resources to institutions hoping to implement or update their inclusion policies, and to give clear examples of model policies from institutions across the nation. Still, much like the ways the LGBTQ+ community and cause have evolved over the past few decades, we aim to evolve the AEI to best suit the needs of Athletic Departments in years to come.

One of the ways we aim to do so, in our next iteration of the AEI, is to consider whether athletic departments have public accommodations (gender-neutral bathrooms and private locker room spaces) for LGBTQ staff, students, community members, spectators, and varsity student-athletes.

We are heartened by the initiatives many schools are undertaking to make athletics more inclusive to all people who enter those spaces, not just LGBTQ+ student-athletes, and look forward to sharing some of those initiatives in our forthcoming 2018-19 AEI. We encourage our colleagues to continue these efforts and to give clear examples of model policies from institutions across the nation. Still, our aim is to continue to utilize the AEI to further these research endeavors, while also providing feedback to institutions on how their policies compare to others, to offer resources to institutions hoping to implement or update their inclusion policies, and to give clear examples of model policies from institutions across the nation.
MODEL POLICY: 
TRANSGENDER AND NONBINARY ATHLETE INCLUSION

This model policy was adapted from Lewis & Clark College Athletics and was created in partnership between Athlete Ally and Out in Athletics. It is important to note that policies on transgender and nonbinary participation in sport are constantly changing. U Sports — the national sport governing body of university sport in Canada — released a groundbreaking policy in 2018 that allows transgender athletes to compete on teams that correspond with their gender identity, no hormone treatment needed. What U Sports leadership found was that there was a serious lack of scientific evidence that hormones significantly impact athletic performance. Below is a model policy.

Introduction

[COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY] and the Department of Physical Education and Athletics prohibits discrimination on the basis of gender identity and gender expression. In accordance with the principles of equity and inclusion, [COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY ATHLETICS] maintains the following policies to facilitate and encourage the participation of transgender and nonbinary students, staff, faculty, and visitors. These policies cover: participation in intercollegiate athletics, intramural sports; physical education; and accommodation for trans and nonbinary people who attend and participate in athletic activities that take place at [COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY].

NCAA Guiding Principles

- Participation in intercollegiate athletics is a valuable part of the education experience for all students.
- Transgender student-athletes should have equal opportunity to participate in sports.
- The integrity of women's sports should be preserved.
- Policies governing sports should be based on sound medical knowledge and scientific validity.
- Policies governing sports should be objective, workable, and practicable; they should also be written, available and equitably enforced.
- The legitimate privacy interests of all student-athletes should be protected.
- The medical privacy of transgender students should be preserved.
- Athletics administrators, staff, parents of athletes, and student-athletes should have access to sound and effective educational resources and training related to the participation of transgender and gender-variant students in athletics.
- Policies governing the participation of transgender students in athletics should comply with state and federal laws protecting students from discrimination based on sex, disability, and gender identity and expression.

NCAA Bylaws Related to Transgender Student-Athlete Participation

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

- 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 Transsexuality, 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.
- A trans female (MTF) student-athlete being treated with testosterone suppression medication for Gender Identity Disorder or gender dysphoria and/or Transsexuality, for the purposes of NCAA competition 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 on calendar year of testosterone suppression treatment.

The following policies clarify participation of transgender student-athletes who are NOT undergoing hormonal treatment for gender transition:

- 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.

Banned Substances – NCAA Bylaw 3.1.2.3 identifies testosterone as a banned substance and provides for medical exception review for a demonstrated need for use of a banned medication. It is the responsibility of the NCAA institution to submit the request for a medical exception (see www.ncaa.org/drugtesting) for testosterone treatment prior to the student-athlete competing while undergoing treatment. In the case of testosterone suppression, the institution must submit written documentation to the NCAA of the year of treatment and ongoing monitoring of testosterone suppression.

Language

- Preferred Names – Teammates, coaches, and institutional personnel should refer to transgender and nonbinary student-athletes by a student’s preferred name.
- Pronouns – Pronouns references to transgender and nonbinary student-athletes should reflect the student’s gender and pronoun preferences.

Dress Codes and Team Uniforms

- Dress Codes – Transgender and nonbinary student-athletes should be permitted to dress consistently with their gender identity.
- Dress Codes when Traveling – Policies should be gender neutral; clean, neat, well cared for, and professional.
- Team Uniforms – Official team uniforms that are sport specific, ideally, should not conflict with a student-athlete’s gender identity.

Education

- (COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY) Athletics – All members of the athletics department shall receive information and education about transgender and nonbinary identities, institutional and conference non-discrimination policies, the use of preferred names and pronouns, and expectations for creating a respectful team and institutional climate for all students, including transgender and nonbinary students.
- Opposing Teams/Institutions – In consultation with the transgender and/or nonbinary student-athlete, athletics administrators and coaches will develop a plan for communication with their counterparts at other institutions and officials prior to competitions in which a transgender and/or nonbinary student-athlete is participating. This is a best practice rooted in establishing expectations for treatment of transgender and/or nonbinary student-athletes on and off the field. This does not require “outing” or otherwise identifying a particular student-athlete as transgender and/or nonbinary, but rather establishing general expectations for the treatment of all student-athletes, including those who may be transgender and/or nonbinary.

MEACHAM, ZIMMER, BAKER HONORED FOR LGTBQA+ SUPPORTS

ONE-TIME EVENT, A RECURRING INITIATIVE, OR SOME SORT OF CAMPAIGN IN SUPPORT OF THE LGTBQA+ COMMUNITY

Nebraska’s (from left) Kai Meacham, Keith Zimmer and DaWon Baker will receive the 2019 Chancellor’s Award for Outstanding Contributions to the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Community.

Three Huskers — a student and two staff employees — have been named winners of the Chancellor’s Award for Outstanding Contributions to the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Community.

Winners are Kai Meacham, a junior biological systems engineering major, along with Keith Zimmer and DaWon Baker, both with Athletics.

The annual award, recognizes individuals and organizations who create an inclusive, respectful and safe climate for members of the LGBTQ community at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. The recipients will be honored during the Lavender Graduation on April 18.

Zimmer and Baker will be honored for consistently working to improve the climate within Husker athletics for LGTBQA+ identified student athletes. Nominators praised both for being instrumental in the success of the Husker Athletics Diversity and Inclusion Committee, implementing the Diversity and Inclusion Summit that unites 1,000 student-athletes and staff members to establish a shared vision; working with staff to post visible signs of inclusion for all students; and hosting programming with LGTB-identified athletes and allies.

Zimmer is a senior associate athletics director and oversees Nebraska’s Life Skills program and the N Club. Baker is the diversity and inclusion director for athletics.
ABOUT ATHLETE ALLY

Sports remains one of the greatest socialization mechanisms in the world — it communicates values without relying on any one language, and its most successful participants are known and respected globally. And yet, an entire community of people remains systematically excluded from sport. Athlete Ally believes that everyone should have equal access, opportunity, and experience in sports — regardless of your sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression.

OUR MISSION IS TO END THE RAMPANT HOMOPHOBIA AND TRANSPHOBIA IN SPORT AND TO ACTIVATE THE ATHLETIC COMMUNITY TO EXERCISE THEIR LEADERSHIP TO CHAMPION LGBTQ EQUALITY.

WE EDUCATE

Athlete Ally educates athletic communities at all levels — sport governing bodies, teams, and individual athletes — to understand obstacles to inclusion for LGBTQ people in sports and how they can build inclusive communities on their teams or within their organizations. We hold trainings across the country on college campuses, with front office staff of major sports leagues and institutions like the NBA, NCAA and the MLB and with individual athletes. We have partnered with teams in major cities like Seattle, New York, and Washington D.C., to host Pride Nights and raise awareness about LGBTQ issues. In 2018, we launched Champions of Inclusion, an online curriculum providing coaches and athletic departments with education and resources around critical issues facing LGBTQ athletes and tools for creating an inclusive environment for all.

WE CHANGE SPORT POLICY

Athlete Ally works to ensure athletic communities are as LGBTQ inclusive as they should be. We work closely with teams and institutions like the NCAA to develop clear and accessible policies around LGBTQ inclusion. In 2012, we co-authored with Dr. Pat Griffin the NCAA’s first LGBTQ equality guide — Champions for Equality — for college coaches, athletes, and administrators. In 2017, we launched the Athletic Equality Index (AEI) to measure LGBTQ inclusion policies and practices in the NCAA’s Power Five conferences. With plans to update the AEI every year and add 90 additional schools in 2018, the AEI provides an invaluable baseline so we can continue to push for LGBTQ inclusive policies at all colleges and universities across the nation.

We also apply pressure to global sport governing bodies to ensure their policies around LGBTQ inclusion are excellent and consistent. In 2017, we launched an ongoing campaign demanding that World Rugby adopt transgender-inclusive policies. In 2015, we joined the #WomenInFIFA movement to push FIFA Congress to enact proposed reforms for women in soccer.

WE ADVOCATE FOR LGBTQ RIGHTS

At Athlete Ally, we believe athlete activism should be expected and accepted. We incubate athlete activism through our Ambassador Program and organize platforms for athletes and sports institutions to advance LGBTQ civil rights, including mobilizing athletes and teams to voice their opposition to laws and policies that discriminate against LGBTQ people. For example, in 2016, we organized Boston sports teams to support the Mass Public Accommodations Bill and worked with the NBA, NCAA, and ACC to move games and championships out of North Carolina over HB2’s passage.

EMAIL: INFO@ATHLETEALLY.ORG
WEBSITE: ATHLETEALLY.ORG
FACEBOOK: FACEBOOK.COM/ATHLETEALLY
TWITTER: @ATHLETEALLY
INSTAGRAM: @ATHLETEALLY

OUR TEAM

ANNA BAETH is a critical feminist scholar and a cultural studies practitioner of sport. Her research centers on the gendering of sport spaces, the eternally moving body, and social movements and sport. A native of Frederick, MD, Baeth is a PhD candidate at the University of Minnesota in the Department of Kinesiology. Beyond her scholarly pursuits, Baeth is a perennial coach and advocate for cultural awareness in sport spaces.

LEANNE GAN is a Brooklyn-based illustrator and graphic designer. She’s designed for a number of non-profits, including the American Civil Liberties Union, the Peter G. Peterson Foundation, LEAP, and the American Arbitration Association.

OUR RESEARCH

At Athlete Ally, our research and programmatic analyses are dedicated to the dignity and liberty for people of every sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression in all societies around the world, and in sport in particular. As a non-profit organization, we accept government funding, public donations, and corporate sponsorships. We never will accept funding that will force us to compromise our core values as an organization. We do not allow the sources of funding to dictate the scope and angle of our research. We strive to use our research in two ways. First, we aim to support people within the LGBTQ+ community and those who identify, or might identify, as allies to the LGBTQ+ community to understand how to best aid in our mission of ending homophobia and transphobia in sport. Second, we aim to use our research to extend the knowledge of and research on the LGBTQ+ experience.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THE ATHLETIC EQUALITY INDEX AND THE WORK OF ATHLETE ALLY WOULD NOT BE POSSIBLE WITHOUT THE GENEROUS SUPPORT OF UNDER ARMOUR. THIS ATHLETIC EQUALITY INDEX WAS ALSO MADE POSSIBLE WITH THE SUPPORT OF OUR VOLUNTEER RESEARCHERS: DYLAN STEINERT, KELLEY HUBBELL, AND MARNIE KINNAIRD.

AS ALWAYS, WE GIVE OUR UTMOST GRATITUDE TO THE ATHLETE ALLY BOARD FOR THEIR ONGOING SUPPORT OF AND COMMITMENT TO THE MISSION OF THE ORGANIZATION.

FINALLY, WE WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE AND CELEBRATE THE ONGOING WORK OF ALL UNIVERSITY, CONFERENCE, AND NCAA STAFF COMMITTED TO MAKING ATHLETICS A MORE INCLUSIVE SPACE. THE ATHLETIC EQUALITY INDEX WOULD LOOK VERY DIFFERENT WITHOUT YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS, AND WE HOPE IT SERVES AS A RESOURCE THAT ASSISTS YOU IN YOUR WORK FOR EQUALITY.

"THROUGHOUT MY CAREER, I’VE SEEN TIME AND TIME AGAIN THE POWER OF SPORT TO DRIVE SOCIAL CHANGE. I’VE ALSO SEEN THE TREMENDOUS IMPACT COLLEGE STUDENT-ATHLETES HAVE WHEN THEY’RE TAUGHT THAT BEING A CHAMPION IS JUST AS MUCH ABOUT WHO YOU ARE OFF THE FIELD THAN HOW MANY POINTS YOU SCORE ON IT. THE INSTITUTE FOR DIVERSITY AND ETHICS IN SPORT (TIDES) HAS BEEN DOING RESEARCH ON RACE AND GENDER IN SPORT SINCE THE 1980S. WE ARE GRATEFUL FOR THE PARTNERSHIP WITH ATHLETE ALLY. THANKS TO THE AEI, WE NOW HAVE DATA ON LGBTQ INCLUSION. WE NEED TO HONOR SCHOOLS THAT EXEMPLIFY A NEW KIND OF ACADEMIC STANDARD — ONE WHERE EVERY ATHLETE CAN BE THE BEST VERSION OF THEMSELVES.”

RICHARD LAPCHICK
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