

Report and Recommendations
of the
Bowling Green State University
Task Force on
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Student Concerns
2003-2004

Task Force Members:

Camille Consolvo, Chair

Ellen Broido

Shelia Burkhalter

Bailey Garvin

James Jackson

Kent Hansen

Barbara Hoffman

Chuck Hoy

Maria Kitsinis

Kevin Konecny

Anthony Papini

David Payne

Jane Rosser

Tony Schwab

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
INTRODUCTION	6
TERMINOLOGY	7
METHODS	8
STRUCTURE AND APPROACH OF TASKFORCE.....	8
DATA COLLECTION.....	8
<i>Interviews</i>	8
<i>Focus Groups</i>	9
<i>Survey</i>	9
<i>Benchmarking</i>	9
DATA ANALYSIS.....	10
KEY FINDINGS	10
GENERAL CAMPUS CLIMATE	10
<i>Climate as a whole</i>	10
<i>Physical safety and harassment</i>	11
<i>Comfort being out</i>	11
RESIDENCE LIFE AND RESIDENCE HALLS	12
OTHER AREAS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS	13
<i>Staff perceptions</i>	13
<i>Student perceptions</i>	14
<i>Counseling Center</i>	14
<i>Student Health Service</i>	15
<i>Athletics</i>	15
TRANSGENDER ISSUES AND CONCERNS	15
ACADEMICS: CLASSROOMS, COURSE CONTENT, AND FACULTY.....	16
VISION	17
CAMPUS LEADERSHIP	19
TRAINING ISSUES	19
POLICY ISSUES.....	20
BGSU RELATIVE TO COMPARATIVE INSTITUTIONS	21
RESPONSE TO CHARGE	21
WHAT CURRENT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE ON CAMPUS FOR LGBT STUDENTS?.....	21
WHAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS ARE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS WISHING TO LEARN MORE ABOUT LGBT ISSUES AND CONCERNS?.....	21
WHAT ARE THE NEEDS OF LGBT STUDENTS AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY?.....	22
WHAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE AT OTHER COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES THAT ARE SIMILAR IN SIZE AND SCOPE TO BGSU?.....	22
WHAT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ARE RECOMMENDED BY THE CAS STANDARDS FOR LGBT SERVICES?.....	22
WHAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS ARE NEEDED FOR LGBT ALLIES AND OTHER STRAIGHT STUDENTS?.....	23

RECOMMENDATIONS	23
CONCLUSION: GOOD ATTITUDES, POOR SUPPORT, UNSAFE STUDENTS	24
APPENDIX A: ON-LINE LGBT SURVEY FOR STUDENTS	26
APPENDIX B: MAJOR TABLES REGARDING THE NON-LGBT AND LGBT STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF THE CAMPUS CLIMATE FOR LGBT STUDENTS AT BGSU: FINDINGS OBTAINED FROM THE GENERAL SURVEY	32
TABLE 1: RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS.....	32
<i>Table 1a: Gender</i>	32
<i>Table 1b: Age</i>	32
<i>Table 1c: Housing</i>	32
<i>Table 1d: Class standing</i>	32
<i>Table 1e: College of enrollment</i>	33
<i>Table 1f: Race</i>	33
<i>Table 1g: Sexual orientation</i>	33
TABLE 2: SAFETY ISSUES	33
<i>Table 2a: Feared for physical safety</i>	33
<i>Table 2b: Places physically unsafe</i>	33
<i>Table 2c: Hate crimes</i>	34
<i>Table 2d: Safety displaying affection</i>	34
<i>Table 2e: Comfort being out</i>	34
TABLE 3: ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENTS	34
<i>Table 3a: Perceived classroom environment for LGBT students</i>	34
<i>Table 3b: Mentors</i>	35
TABLE 4: RESIDENCE LIFE.....	35
<i>Table 4a: Roommates</i>	35
<i>Table 4b: Residence hall environment</i>	36
<i>Table 4c: Awareness of LGBT residents</i>	36
<i>Table 4d: Resident advisor attitudes</i>	37
<i>Table 4e: Professional staff attitudes</i>	37
<i>Table 4f: LGBT RAs</i>	37
TABLE 5: GENERAL CLIMATE.....	37
<i>Table 5a: Visual communication</i>	37
<i>Table 5b: Fear of labeling</i>	38
<i>Table 5c: Anti-LGBT graffiti</i>	38
<i>Table 5d: LGBT flyers</i>	38
<i>Table 5e: Derogatory language</i>	38
<i>Table 5f: Challenging derogatory language</i>	39
<i>Table 5g: Witness same-sex affection</i>	39
<i>Table 5h: Recognition of and programming for LGBT issues</i>	39
<i>Table 5i: Willingness to recommend BGSU</i>	39
<i>Table 5j: Continued enrollment</i>	39
<i>Table 5k: Affirmation from faculty and staff</i>	40
TABLE 6: VISION.....	40
TABLE 7: SAFE ZONE.....	40

APPENDIX C: LGBT BENCHMARKING STUDY41

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In October, 2002, Dr. Bettina Shuford, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Director, Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives (CMAI) convened a task force to investigate the campus climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students at Bowling Green State University and make recommendations on how to improve the climate for these students. The Task Force's charge was to identify program and service needs of students as they relate to LGBT issues.

The Task Force used a variety of approaches to assess and develop recommendations regarding the campus climate for LGBT student issue: Interviews with faculty, non-student affairs administrators, and Student Affairs unit heads; focus groups with students; an online survey of the BGSU student population; and a benchmarking study comparing BGSU's LGBT programs and services to 12 other institutions.

LGBT students and non-LGBT students appear to have very different perceptions of what the campus is like regarding LGBT issues. On portions of the survey that were answered by both LGBT and non-LGBT students, their answers were different on almost all non-demographic items, with LGBT students holding more negative views of, and experiences with, the general climate. In interviews and focus groups these differences were even more evident. Participants who identified themselves as LGBT had very harsh characterizations of the campus climate and administrative support, while participants who identified themselves as heterosexual generally characterized the environment as more mixed – reporting a climate that had both elements of support and elements of challenge. LGBT students indicated that, with few exceptions, they found the campus an unsafe place to be “out.” On average, they felt uncomfortable mentioning their sexual orientation in almost all settings on campus. LGBT students reported that they lack sufficient LGBT role models among faculty, administration, and graduate assistants, and they fear for their physical safety on campus.

Student Affairs directors felt their units were open to, and accepting of, students who were LGBT. They often felt that they and their staffs did not know what the specific needs of LGBT students were, and that they might lack the knowledge to provide those services once they knew their needs.

In the benchmarking study, it was found that eight of the 12 institutions surveyed have an office that addresses LGBT issues. Of the seven institutions that currently have an LGBT office, four are staffed by full-time employees. All 12 of the institutions have a student organization for LGBT students. All 12 institutions sponsor the same sort of basic LGBT programming and funding for LGBT offices comes from a variety of sources.

Based on the data collected, the Task Force makes the following recommendations to the Division of Student Affairs at Bowling Green State University:

- Develop a LGBT resource center at BGSU staffed by a full-time person trained in sexuality and gender issues, with a budget for programming and operations comparable with other programming units on campus, and a dedicated physical space for the center.

- Ensure that campus policies are equitable for all students, faculty, and staff (e.g., overnight guest policies should treat male and female guests similarly; employment benefits - health insurance, pension, bereavement leave, counseling - should be extended to domestic partners as well as spouses; staff living in residence hall apartments should be able to live with same or other-gendered partners; gender identity and gender expression should be included in the University's non-discrimination policy).
- Make mandatory for all BGSU employees, LGBT education and training including, but not limited to, Safe Zone training. Staff should receive additional training specific to LGBT issues in their functional areas.
- Include at least one gender-neutral restroom in all campus buildings.
- Update campus forms to allow for variant gender identities.
- Hire faculty and staff of all sexual orientations and gender identities who are able to create a supportive, understanding environment for LGBT students.
- Provide educational and social programming relevant to LGBT students and programming on LGBT issues designed for the campus community as a whole. This programming should be provided by both university programming bodies and specific functional areas within Student Affairs.
- Implement a clear reporting system for acts of harassment or intolerance based on sexual orientation, gender expression, or gender identity.
- Provide identified and visible "safe" persons for LGBT victims of harassment, within campus police, Residence Life, Student Life, Intercollegiate Athletics, and other departments, to alleviate fear of re-victimization.
- Include issues of sexual orientation and gender identity in new student orientation and GradSTEP.
- Train resident assistants (RAs) to respond effectively to roommate conflicts based on sexual orientation, to recognize acts of harassment based on sexual orientation and gender identity, and to respond appropriately. Assist RAs in increasing the amount of programming they provide on issues of sexual orientation and gender identity.
- Create a standing committee to advise campus leadership on LGBT issues and concerns.
- Evaluate progress of implementing these recommendations and reassess the climate in two to three years.

While curricular concerns are outside the charge of this Task Force, a number of issues related to academics were evident in the data collected by the Task Force. The following recommendations should be forwarded to the Provost for consideration:

- Offer courses that address LGBT issues and incorporate LGBT topics into courses where appropriate. Courses with significant LGBT content should qualify as meeting the University's diversity requirement.
- Promote the use of inclusive language in the classroom.

The Task Force suggests that the recommendations generated from this report be used to determine short-term and long-term goals for the Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives and the Division of Student Affairs in addressing LGBT student concerns.

**LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, TRANSGENDER TASK FORCE REPORT
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
2003-2004**

INTRODUCTION

The Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives assumed administrative support for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) issues on campus in FY 2003. The scope of this new charge is to provide support services to LGBT students and educational programs that are inclusive of LGBT students, their allies, and other non-LGBT students on campus. In October, 2002, Dr. Bettina Shuford, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Director, Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives (CMAI) convened a task force to investigate the campus climate for LGBT students at Bowling Green State University and make recommendations on how to improve the climate for these students.

The Task Force's charge was to identify program and service needs of students as they relate to LGBT issues. The questions listed below served as a guide for assessing the needs of students on campus:

1. What current programs and services are available on campus for LGBT students?
2. What educational programs are currently available to students wishing to learn more about LGBT issues and concerns?
3. What are the needs of LGBT students at Bowling Green State University?
4. What educational programs and services are available at other colleges and universities that are similar in size and scope to BGSU?
5. What programs and services are recommended by the CAS Standards for LGBT Services?
6. What educational programs are needed for LGBT allies and other straight students?

The Task Force suggests that the recommendations generated from this report be used to determine short-term and long-term goals for the Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives and the Division of Student Affairs in addressing LGBT student concerns.

Members of the Task members were:

Camille Consolvo, Chair
Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs

Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives:
James Jackson, Coordinator of Multicultural Services, CMAI
Anthony Papini, Graduate Assistant, CMAI

Faculty Representatives:
Ellen Broido, Assistant Professor, College Student Personnel and Higher Education Administration Programs
Chuck Hoy, Assistant Professor, Telecommunications

Office of Campus Involvement:
Shelia Burkhalter, Assistant Dean of Students

Office of Residence Life:

Kevin Konecny, Interim Associate Director of Residence Life for Greek Affairs

Student Health Services:

Barbara Hoffman, Coordinator, Wellness Connection

Student Representatives:

Kent Hansen, Diversity Chair, USG

David Payne, Vice President for Student Concerns, RSA

Maria Kitsinis, Historian, Vision

Tony Schwab, Vision Member

Bailey Garvin

Jane Rosser, Higher Education Administration Ph.D. program

TERMINOLOGY

In this report, we have retained the definitions of categories of sexual orientation and gender identity that we utilized in the survey that went out to the student population of BGSU, as defined below. In this report, we use the abbreviation LGBT to refer to people who are lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgendered, when their concerns are common as a group. It is important to remember that issues of gender identity in many ways are distinct from those of sexual orientation, and that people who are transgendered may be of any sexual orientation (including heterosexual); thus, their issues do not always correspond with those of people who are LGB.

Bisexual: A sexual orientation term applied to men and women who are physically and emotionally attracted to people of both genders.

Gay: A sexual orientation term applied to men who are physically and emotionally attracted to other men.

Heterosexual: A sexual orientation term applied to men and women who are physically and emotionally attracted to someone who is of the opposite gender. (The term “straight” is used as a synonym for heterosexual in this report).

Lesbian: A sexual orientation term applied to women who are physically and emotionally attracted to other women.

Transgender: Refers to people who reassign the sex they were labeled with at birth and/or those whose gender expression is considered inappropriate for their sex.

LGBT/non-LGBT: When survey data are reported separately for LGBT and non-LGBT students, *non-LGBT* includes all (and only) students who indicated their sexual orientation as heterosexual. None of these students indicated their gender identity as transgender, however.

Students marking “other” were asked to complete an open-ended question describing their gender. While it is not possible to match the open-ended response to the question on gender with particular responses to the question on sexual orientation, several of the comments to the open-ended section indicate that the respondents marking “other” considered the question ridiculous, self evident, or that they otherwise did not recognize that there might be more than two genders. None of these students completed the section of the survey that was specifically for LGBT students. Therefore, it is likely that at least some, and probably all, of the four respondents had

conventional gender definitions. Thus, we feel reasonably confident no one in the non-LGBT group identifies as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender.

LGBT includes all students who indicated their sexual orientation as lesbian, bisexual, gay, or other. Within this group, most indicated their gender as either male or female, but two identified as transgendered, and four of those responding to the open-ended response gave answers that were consistent with the definition of transgender given above.

Come out/be out/out: To publicly disclose one's sexual orientation or gender identity.

METHODS

The Task Force used a variety of approaches to assess and develop recommendations regarding the campus climate for LGBT student issues. We drew on the expertise of Institutional Research, doctoral students in the Higher Education Administration program, consulted comparable studies done at campuses across the U.S., and utilized the skills of Task Force members.

STRUCTURE AND APPROACH OF TASKFORCE

After initial meetings to determine the overall direction of the taskforce, the group broke into sub-committees, each focusing on a different aspect of the charge. Subcommittees were formed to develop a survey of the student body, to conduct benchmarking, and to assess how student affairs units were meeting the needs of LGBT students.

Additionally, the Task Force worked with Dr. Carolyn Palmer, associate professor in the Division of Higher Education and Student Affairs, and her HIED 752 Applied Inquiry in Higher Education course to gather information from the campus community about their perceptions of the climate on campus regarding LGBT issues. The class, composed of five doctoral students in Higher Education Administration and two master's students in College Student Personnel, conducted interviews with faculty and staff, focus groups of students, and did preliminary data analysis on the survey of BGSU students that was designed by one of the task force's sub-committees.

DATA COLLECTION

Interviews

Faculty and Non-Student Affairs Administrators

Fourteen administrators and faculty who were known to have extensive knowledge of the BGSU LGBT community were recruited to serve as "key informants." Of these, 10 were interviewed about their perceptions. Participants engaged in face-to-face interviews that lasted 30 to 60 minutes and were asked three questions: (1) What do you feel the climate at BGSU is like for LGBT students?; (2) How can that climate be improved?; and (3) What kind of programs and services would enhance students' learning, growth, and development related to this issue? Participants were shown summarized transcripts, asked to correct any errors, and allowed to eliminate any or all data they did not wish used in this report.

The interviewers asked participants to answer, as best they could, how they would describe the campus climate for LGBT students, what challenges and supports the institution

provided, and how they would describe their own departments/staff/division in terms of knowledge about LGBT issues, training in the area, and support for the LGBT student. The interviews were analyzed by at least two researchers for predominant concepts and themes. Each participant was then asked to check the findings to verify the accuracy of the analysis and to clarify or edit any findings. None of the participants chose to revise or otherwise edit the findings.

Student Affairs Unit Heads

The Task Force interviewed eleven student affairs directors about their perceptions of the climate in their office and services offered for LGBT students. Interviews were conducted via e-mail, phone, or in person. The following questions were asked of all Student Affairs administrators interviewed:

- 1) What are you doing to meet the needs of LGBT students?
- 2) What are you doing to meet the needs of those wanting to learn more about LGBT issues?
- 3) What would you like to do to address their needs?
- 4) What would help you and your staff address the needs of these students?

Focus Groups

Six focus groups were conducted, each with four to six student participants. Focus groups included, but were not limited to, fraternity and sorority members, athletes, self-identified LGBT undergraduate and graduate students, and students from the larger campus population including those in UNIV 100 courses and those who lived in a residence hall. Participants were asked about their perception of the campus climate for LGBT students. While the focus groups were selected for both convenience and purposeful reasons, attempts were made to include a variety of student voices.

Survey

An on-line survey was designed and piloted by the Task Force members to assess the campus climate for LGBT students and concerns. After piloting the survey, the survey went “live” on the BGSU web site for several weeks during the spring semester of 2003. An e-mail was sent to all students asking them to participate in the study. All respondents answered the first 40 questions. An additional set of 15 questions was asked of lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgendered students. These questions addressed levels of fear and comfort for LGBT students within the BGSU community as well as levels of support by various BGSU offices and personnel. Of the students surveyed, there were 594 responses (3.2%). (See Appendix A for a copy of the survey).

Benchmarking

During the spring semester 2003, 12 institutions were contacted and asked about the services and programs provided to their LGBT population. We selected institutions that were similar to BGSU in size, mission, or focus, because they might serve as models for LGBT student services or because one of the Task Force members had a contact there. The following institutions were contacted:

- Ball State University
- Central Michigan University
- Ohio State University
- Ohio University

- Eastern Michigan University
- Indiana University
- Kent State University
- Miami University
- University of Akron
- University of Maine at Farmington
- University of Toledo
- Western Michigan University

During the interviews with these schools, staff were asked:

1. Is there an administrative office responsible for providing programs and services to the LGBT population on your campus?
2. When was the office/department created?
3. What is the office/department staffing pattern?
4. Where does the office/department fall in the college/university structure?
5. Where does the funding for the office/department/student organization come from?
6. What is the level or amount of funding received?
7. What on-going services or programs are provided to support LGBT students or to educate the campus about LGBT issues?
8. What role does the LGBT student organization fulfill on campus?

DATA ANALYSIS

Survey data were analyzed primarily through simple descriptive statistics, although LGBT and non-LGBT students' responses were compared using t-tests. Missing data were deleted before data analysis occurred. Descriptive analyses (frequencies) were used to describe the percentage of respondents who checked a certain response. T-tests were utilized to determine the significance of differences between heterosexual males and females on selected variables. Assuming that a difference might exist between non-LGBT and LGBT responses, separate analyses for non-LGBT and LGBT respondents were conducted and comparisons were made on almost all variables.

The data from each data source (survey, interviews, focus groups, and benchmarking) were first analyzed separately. Then, the Task Force examined the findings across each method to understand the overall climate for, and needs of, the campus community. Findings are discussed below, grouped into the following themes: general campus climate, residence life and residence halls, other areas of student affairs, transgender issues and concerns, academics, Vision student organization, campus leadership, training issues, and policy issues.

KEY FINDINGS

GENERAL CAMPUS CLIMATE

There is little consensus regarding the overall campus climate regarding LGBT issues, in part because of the large differences between LGBT and non-LGBT students' perceptions, and because there are no formal standards by which to measure what a supportive and inclusive campus would look like. What constitutes an acceptable level of safety? What percentage of students should feel safe being out to various audiences? While the campus community as a whole will need to answer those questions, this section presents an overall summary, along with a more specific description based around the themes of physical safety, role models, and comfort level being out.

Climate as a whole

LGBT students and non-LGBT students appear to have very different perceptions of what the campus is like regarding LGBT issues. On portions of the survey that were answered by both

LGBT and non-LGBT students, their answers were different (statistically significant differences at $p < 0.05$) on almost all non-demographic items, with LGBT students holding more negative views of, and experiences with, the general climate. In interviews and focus groups these differences were even more obvious – participants who identified themselves as LGBT had very harsh characterizations of the campus climate and administrative support while participants who identified themselves as heterosexual generally characterized the environment as more mixed – reporting a climate that had both elements of support and elements of challenge.

Responses to survey questions that were asked of only LGBT students indicated that, with very few exceptions, students found the campus an unsafe place to be out. On average, they felt uncomfortable mentioning their sexual orientation in almost all settings on campus. LGBT students reported that they lack sufficient LGBT role models among faculty, administration, and graduate students (table 3c), they fear for their physical safety on campus (table 2a), and few LGBT students feel affirmed by the university as LGBT people on even a monthly basis (table 5k). What is most surprising in light of those responses is their answers to two questions that more globally assess the experience of LGBT students, one that asks if they would recommend BGSU to prospective LGBT students (table 5i) and one that asks how the climate at BGSU for LGBT students impacts their decision to remain enrolled as a student here (table 5j). On average, LGBT students gave responses on the positive side of neutral (2.70, and 2.43, respectively, both on a 5 point scale) to these two questions. It is useful to note, while recognizing that these figures cannot be directly compared, that a survey (www.bgsu.edu/offices/ir/studies/alumni/2001/satisfaction.htm) indicated that 94% of alumni indicated they would recommend BGSU to prospective students. Forty-four percent of LGBT survey respondents gave affirmative answers to this question while an additional 34% gave a neutral response, which was not an option on the alumni survey.

Physical safety and harassment

Although not a majority, many of BGSU's LGBT students do not feel safe on campus, nor in the town of Bowling Green. When asked if there were places on campus where they fear for their physical safety because of their sexual orientation/gender identity, just over 30% responded "yes." The same question asked about the city of Bowling Green received almost the same percentage of affirmative responses. When asked to identify specific places they felt unsafe, most indicated the campus in general, although the areas outside fraternities, the recreation center and athletic facilities, and the residence halls all were mentioned several times. Fortunately, the rate of LGBT students who reported being victims of a hate crime was much lower – 9 of 90 respondents, or 10% which is a large percentage (see table 2a). Moreover, only 23.4% of LGBT students indicated they would feel safe displaying affection for a same-sex person on our campus, and just over two-thirds of respondents (67.9%) disagreed or strongly disagreed (see table 2d).

Comfort being out

There appears to be few campus settings in which LGBT students feel safe discussing their sexual orientation or gender identity, or "being out" (see table 2e). Students were asked to respond only about settings they had experience with, thus, these values are not hypothetical levels of comfort or discomfort, but reflect actual experiences. Of the 19 settings asked about in the survey, in only two did the majority of respondents feel safe being out: with close friends and at the Counseling Center. In 14 of the 19 settings, 50% or more of the LGBT respondents indicated they felt uncomfortable or very uncomfortable discussing their sexual orientation/gender identity. These settings included the following places and people (in

descending order of comfort): acquaintances, the Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives (CMAI), student groups they were involved with, their on-campus jobs, faculty, the Career Center, campus police, their academic advisors, the classroom, residence halls, financial aid, the recreation center, their sororities or fraternities, and their intercollegiate athletic teams (see table 2e for specific figures).

Of particular note, more than two-thirds of respondents felt uncomfortable or very uncomfortable discussing their sexual orientation/gender identity in the classroom (68.5%), with financial aid staff (67.8%), at the recreation center (68.3%), and more than three-quarters felt uncomfortable in their sorority or fraternity (76.9%) and with their intercollegiate athletic team (76.9%). This indicates that the campus is failing to meet the basic safety and security needs of its LGBT students.

RESIDENCE LIFE AND RESIDENCE HALLS

(Note that data for survey questions dealing with residence hall issues reflect the responses only of those students who indicated they have at some point lived in the residence halls.)

Survey, interview, and focus group respondents all identified residence halls as one of, if not the most, hostile places on campus for LGBT students. More than 50% of LGBT students reported hearing derogatory remarks about LGBT people in residence halls at least weekly, more than a quarter of them daily (see table 3b). More than a third of non-LGBT students said they would be uncomfortable having a LGB roommate, and this was a source of concern for almost 30% of them even before they came to BGSU (see table 3a).

LGBT students were asked to indicate whether or not they had been able to find adequate and comfortable on-campus housing. Of the 37 LGBT students who lived off-campus, only 9 indicated that they had found comfortable on-campus housing. Those indicating they had not were asked to explain why. Comments reflected a general disapproval from peers and Resident Assistants (RAs), verbal and physical harassment, and confusion regarding bathrooms for transgendered students.

LGBT students responding to the survey indicated a high level of discomfort discussing their sexual orientation in the residence halls (table 3b). Only 17.2% of respondents indicated they felt comfortable or very comfortable discussing this topic, while 32.8% reported being uncomfortable with an additional 34.5% being very uncomfortable.

What appears to be a hostile peer culture is somewhat ameliorated by support from professional and paraprofessional staff, although some significant qualifications to that statement are merited for Resident Assistants (see subsequent paragraph). Relatively few LGBT students (18%) who had lived in residence halls indicated their RA was homophobic (table 3d), and about two-thirds of both LGBT (60.7%) and non-LGBT (63.8%) residents felt their RA was sensitive to LGBT issues. While this should be true of all RAs, it does indicate a general base of support for LGBT residents. Similar, though more polarized, responses were given to a question asking if professional staff (hall director and other residence life staff) were supportive of LGBT issues. LGBT students were both more likely to agree or strongly agree with the statement (57.3% for LGBT students vs. 53.9% for non-LGBT students) and to disagree or strongly disagree (16.4% vs. 3.0%), due in part to the many non-LGBT respondents giving neutral answers.

Significant concerns were raised about RAs with regard to their ability to appropriately respond to incidents of harassment of LGBT students and roommate conflicts when one of the roommates was lesbian, bisexual, gay, or transgendered. During interviews, focus groups, and

open forums held with members of the campus community, stories were shared of LGBT residents not feeling supported by their RAs when they had conflicts with their roommates once the roommate learned the person was not heterosexual. Also common were stories of LGB residents having the dry-erase boards on their doors covered with anti-LGB graffiti, slanderous, or otherwise malicious comments, and the situation not being appropriately handled by the RA, usually because the RA had not been trained on how to respond appropriately.

Both LGBT and non-LGBT survey respondents indicated a significant lack of programming on LGBT issues, with only 18.9% of non-LGBT respondents and 11.5 % of LGBT respondents indicating that their RAs conduct(ed) adequate amounts of programs on Bisexual/Gay issues (see table 3d).

Non-transgendered, heterosexual students generally expressed great discomfort with the idea of having a transgendered student as a roommate, with 53.8% of them indicating that they would be uncomfortable or very uncomfortable with a transgendered roommate (see table 3f). Generally speaking, this would not be as much of an issue for LGBT students, although 24.2% of them indicated they would be uncomfortable or very uncomfortable in this situation. While neither group (non-LGBT or LGBT) of students was particularly concerned with having a transgendered roommate before they came to BGSU, this may reflect their unawareness that this might occur.

Generally, students who had lived in residence halls gave responses indicating they were open to the idea of having LGBT RAs or house staff. Only 16.6% of non-LGBT students indicated they would be uncomfortable or very uncomfortable with an LGBT RA or house staff, while no LGBT students felt this way. While this question does not address the issue of professional residence life staff, this finding raises questions about the administration's stated rationale for prohibiting LGB hall directors from sharing their apartments with their same-sex partners. This policy was raised in many interviews and community forums, summarized by one faculty member who said that "*[this policy] sends a clear message to LGBT students that LGBT students AND staff are not welcome in the residence halls.*"

OTHER AREAS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

Staff Perceptions

Interviews (in person, over the phone, or by email) were conducted with the directors of most Student Affairs units. The majority of directors felt that their offices provided a safe space for LGBT students, although they could not provide concrete examples of why they believed this. Several directors felt that their offices were unaware of the needs and issues facing LGBT students and wanted more resources and data on the subject to better meet the needs of LGBT students and increase their staff's awareness and acceptance level. The majority of directors believe that they treated all students equally and that issues of sexual orientation did not affect the delivery of services they offered. Many of the directors agreed that further review and discussion with staff members was needed to ensure that LGBT students felt safe and welcome.

The majority of directors stated that they and their staffs largely were unaware of LGBT services and programs offered in other areas of student affairs and felt Student Affairs should publicize those services more widely. Some directors were concerned that because of their staffs' lack of knowledge about LGBT issues, they might offend some LGBT people unintentionally. Generally, directors of Student Affairs units believed that they and their staffs need greater awareness of issues on coming out, LGBT-affirming language, and homophobic attitudes,

values, and beliefs. However, they were not aware of resources they could draw upon to provide this type of training.

A few units have provided programs specifically for LGBT students. Those who have said that they would like to continue doing so. One director said an offer had been sent to Vision to do a program the previous semester but no response was ever received.

Overall, Student Affairs directors felt their units were open to and accepting of students who were LGBT, but often felt that they and their staffs did not know what the specific needs of LGBT students were, and that they might lack the knowledge to provide those services once they knew what they were.

Student Perceptions

On the survey, LGBT students were asked to indicate their level of comfort disclosing their sexual orientation in several student affairs settings that have been noted in the literature on LGBT college students either as particularly important to students' retention, or as places likely to have particularly hostile climates: the counseling center, health services, the career center, multicultural affairs, the recreation center, and financial aid (see table 2e). Responses to the questions about the counseling center and health services are discussed below. That more than 50% of students felt uncomfortable disclosing their sexual orientation or gender identity in the majority of settings is an indicator that most LGBT students do not find this campus generally, and most student affairs units in particular, a safe space.

When LGBT students were asked an open-ended question about what units on campus had treated them in a positive way, knowing they were LGBT, survey respondents listed only six non-academic units/organizations more than twice: Vision, Office of Residence Life (usually specific residence hall staff members were named rather than the office as a whole), CMAI, Student Health Service, the Counseling Center, and the Women's Center. Two academic programs were mentioned three times each: College Student Personnel and Popular Culture. Students also were asked to list places they had been treated negatively because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Only two places were named more than once: Residence Life and Student Health Service, both mentioned four times. Finally, students were asked to list places that were providing outreach to LGBT students. Eleven places were named once. Named three or more times were Vision (21), the Women's Center (9), the Counseling Center (6), and Women's Studies (3).

In the survey and focus group interviews, four areas of Student Affairs elicited the greatest number and intensity of commentary: Residence Life, the Counseling Center, Student Health Service, and Athletics. Residence Life has been discussed above; the other three are discussed below. Note particularly that the Counseling Center and Student Health Service stood out in the survey as being notably more supportive environments than any other we asked about. However, in the focus groups, they also received the most intense criticism. These also are the areas that received the fewest "not applicable" responses, indicating that they are utilized, or are at least seen as most significant, by LGBT students. Thus the fact they elicited some of the strongest responses is not surprising. Finally, LGBT students reported having insufficient "out" role models among the faculty and staff (see table 3c).

Counseling Center

Overall students found the Counseling Center to be the most affirming administrative office on campus for LGBT issues. Of the LGBT survey participants who responded, 78.5% gave neutral to positive answers when asked if they felt comfortable discussing their sexual orientation or gender identity in this setting. This response is appreciably more positive than that

received by any other office specifically addressed in this question (Student Health Service, CMAI, Career Center, Recreation Center, Financial Aid, and Public Safety). As indicated above, the Counseling Center was the response given most often to the question asking LGBT students to identify units where they were treated positively. It was among the strongest unit doing outreach to LGBT students. Several students in focus groups commented that their interaction with staff in the Counseling Center has been very positive. However, one student expressed just the opposite, *“the Counseling Center also needs to go through training. I am tired of being told my sexual orientation is wrong and that it is the sole reason I am depressed.”* According to one administrator, while there are no LGBT counselors in the Counseling Center, they do address those concerns with students. However, they would consider hiring an LGBT counselor should that be an identified need.

Student Health Service

Similar comments were made about the Student Health Service (SHS). Most students expressed having had good care, within the women’s clinic in particular. SHS also was among the units most often listed in response to the question asking LGBT students which units provided affirmative service, knowing they were LGBT. The survey data indicated that 52 % of LGBT respondents who found the question applicable felt comfortable disclosing their sexual orientation or gender identity in that setting. A gay student stated: *“I think the Health Center is discriminatory. I am tired of being told I need an AIDS test every time I go in for a cold. I feel that because I told the doctor I was gay, that the doctor made the assumption I had AIDS.”* One transgendered student had a strongly negative experience, and stated that staff need to *“wake up regarding transgender/transsexual people...they don’t realize that it is insulting to be referred to as he when I identify as a she.”* Several students indicated that SHS staff did not use the correct gender pronoun with them.

Athletics

Participants reported that the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics provided a particularly “chilly” climate for LGBT student-athletes. One participant commented that *“athletes in particular are not open to LGBT issues at BGSU.”* Only 11.5% of LGBT athletes who responded to the survey said they felt comfortable or very comfortable discussing their sexual orientation or gender identity with their intercollegiate athletic team. The stigma of being labeled a gay male within athletics, whether the male self-identified as homosexual or heterosexual, appeared to carry a heavy burden. The level of comfort for self-identified lesbian athletes seemed to vary from team to team. Some teams were reported to be open and accepting of lesbian athletes while others were not. One staff member suggested that specific attention be given to the Intercollegiate Athletics staff with regard to training on LGBT issues. Also, it was suggested several times that a *“safe environment”* be created for BGSU’s LGBT athletes that would provide them with the resources needed to deal with the compounded stresses of being a sexual minority athlete.

TRANSGENDER ISSUES AND CONCERNS

This campus seems to be unaware of the presence and issues of transgender students. Survey respondents generally did not indicate that before they arrived at BGSU they had concerns their roommates might be transgendered, but they did indicate discomfort when asked how they would respond if their roommates were transgender (see table 4a). LGB and non-LGBT students shared these feelings similarly, as did men and women. Responses from

interviews of student affairs units generally did not address transgender issues, again indicating their absence from campus discourse.

The transgender students who participated in focus groups related disturbing stories of overt hostility from some faculty and numerous instances of disrespect, inappropriate treatment, and lack of support from administrators. Particular concerns were raised in focus groups about the absence of “gender-neutral” bathrooms and locker rooms for transgender students. They felt that this campus has not yet begun to address the issues of transgender students in any meaningful manner.

ACADEMICS: CLASSROOMS, COURSE CONTENT, AND FACULTY

While the classroom does not appear to be an overtly hostile place for LGBT students at BGSU, it does seem to be a place where LGBT issues are not as visible as they could be. Of LGBT respondents, 39.6%, and 11.5% of non-LGBT respondents felt that instructors had omitted discussion about varying sexual orientations even when appropriate (table 3a). Discussion with faculty and students in focus groups indicated that even a single negative remark from faculty could have a powerful effect. For example, one respondent heard a faculty member refer to the *Laramie Project* as “the book about the faggot that died.” Consequently, it is not surprising that 31.1% of LGBT survey respondents indicated they felt comfortable being out in the classroom (table 2e).

Faculty interviewed for this study indicated that their departments had provided no training on LGBT issues or on working with the LGBT community. Faculty and staff both indicated that BGSU offered insufficient courses that addressed LGBT topics, that the field of queer studies is increasingly recognized on many campuses, and that BGSU would be well served by the addition of this academic area. One faculty member stated that he offered a course last spring that dealt with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender topics in his subject area. However, the course was offered under a “topics” course designation rather than with a title that was descriptive of its content. Thus, students who might have been interested in the course had they known its focus missed the chance to take the course.

Student participants agreed with the opinions of administration and faculty that BGSU should offer courses that include LGBT issues. One undergraduate student commented, “*Very few if any of those [undergraduate courses] address LGBT issues at all.*” The participant added that sexual orientation and identity issues come out in many courses currently offered; however, there is not much substance in them. A graduate student suggested that BGSU incorporate courses on LGBT issues into the general education curriculum and hire faculty who are experts on LGBT issues to teach the courses. She emphasized that the instructors do not necessarily have to be LGBT themselves. “*We do have LGBT faculty [but] just because we are lesbian or gay does not mean that we [LGBT faculty] have to teach and research on such issues. Many straight people are interested in teaching such issues or courses.*”

More positively, non-LGBT and LGBT survey respondents disagreed that they had avoided or changed a project on issues of sexual orientation because an instructor discouraged it. It was not common for students to hear instructors make demeaning remarks of those whose sexual orientation is different from others, although 23.7% of LGBT respondents had heard this (as had 12.6% of non-LGBT respondents).

VISION

Vision is a BGSU student group that serves members who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, queer, intersex, questioning, and straight supportive (LGBTQIQSS). Vision is an active group on campus and has been acting as the University's primary provider of educational efforts pertaining to sexual diversity. Vision:

- Has a primary membership of LGBT undergraduate students at BGSU, although meetings and events are attended by some graduate students, staff members, students from nearby colleges, and community members;
- Serves as the official voice of LGBT students on the campus;
- Provides a social network of support for LGBT students through meetings, coming out peer support group, organized events, and conferences;
- Provides resources for BGSU students through a website and a library that is housed in the Vision office in the Union;
- Provides educational outreach to the campus community through "panels" comprised of students; and
- Helps promote a more inclusive community on campus by providing Safe Zone training that educates participants about LGBT issues and how to be supportive of issues related to sexual diversity

While the majority of both non-LGBT (80%) and LGBT (88.1%) survey respondents reported being aware of Vision, the percentage of non-LGBT students who reported participating in Vision meetings, events, or panel training is comparatively small (21.3%) (see table 6). Moreover, 38.4% of LGBT students also did not participate in Vision events. The percentage of respondents reporting having attended a Vision panel training is even lower (7.8% of non-LGBT students and 19% of LGBT students).

The majority of the students, faculty, and staff interviewed believed that Vision was one of the primary sources of support for LGBT issues and people on campus, although the above numbers indicate that it is not meeting the needs of all LGBT students. Vision was seen as the primary resource for students who decide to "come out" because it provides a space and events for LGBT and straight supportive students to mingle with others who understand their experiences. While most comments about LGBT student organizations focused on Vision, Chosen, a student group that looks at religious issues as they relate to LGBT students, also was mentioned by one participant as a positive influence on campus.

One student affairs professional described Vision as the "*one stop shop*" for LGBT students. Several of the participants commented on the positive value of the range of functions served by Vision. Vision was perceived by the participants as a political organization, a student group, a peer support resource, an education and awareness raising group, and a provider of student activities. Several participants felt that the combined functions of Vision allowed for a supportive LGBT community to be formed within Vision. One campus administrator however felt that Vision primarily served political purposes, and that person was not sure if Vision alone could serve as the central purpose of creating a community. This comment demonstrates that there is some need for raising staff awareness about the various functions played by Vision and the community that exists within the group.

Student perceptions of Vision varied in a number of respects. As noted above, the vast majority of survey respondents were aware of Vision or its purpose. Some students reported a very positive attitude towards the work Vision does while others felt that Vision promotes the

“immoral,” “gay agenda.” However, most interview and focus group respondents felt that Vision provided important support and advocacy services to the BGSU community.

A large proportion of heterosexual students reported indifference toward getting involved with Vision because they felt that Vision did not pertain to them and that Vision’s membership was exclusive to the LGBT student community. Some students stated that they would like to get involved with Vision but were limited because of time commitments. Some students responded that they would not want to be mistaken as an LGBT person simply because they chose to attend a Vision sponsored event: *“Although I personally do not have a problem with people that are LGBT, I think some people still do, and I don’t want to be assumed to be gay because I go to the meetings. It may not be right, but it’s the truth.”*

There were limited data available about the experience of students who were part of Vision. The majority of Vision members reported satisfaction with the group and saw it as an avenue of support and advocacy. One focus group member reported the stigma of being associated with Vision when she claimed that others *“looked at her really funny”* when she announced in a campus-wide organizations’ meeting that she was representing Vision.

Some participants felt that Vision had been the driving force behind positive change regarding LGBT issues that had occurred on the BGSU campus. The Vision office vandalism incident in Fall 2002 was discussed as a case in point. Vision members were perceived to not only be engaged in general proactive educational efforts, but also to be serving as advocates for themselves. There was variability in the participant responses about how Vision’s efforts were being received by the University community.

Several participants perceived Vision to be BGSU’s primary source of education about LGBT issues and the primary, if not sole, source of advocacy for the LGBT campus community. The participants identified the “panels” and “Safe Zone training” offered by Vision as key components of the awareness efforts provided by the group. The panels were reported to be important for classroom discussions in courses that addressed LGBT issues within the curriculum. Safe Zone training was seen as an educational resource for faculty and staff to help train them in working with students. Student leaders interviewed felt that more programs and training, such as the ones offered by Vision, should be required at BGSU. The majority of campus administrators interviewed felt that the responsibility for the advocacy and educational needs of the campus community should lie with professional staff members at the University.

Several participants were frustrated that the responsibility for training, education and advocacy rested mostly on Vision. Participants noted that students who offer to volunteer on panels often are burdened by the work involved therein. Currently Vision offers panel training for students to serve as panel members, and trained members serve as panelists on a regular basis. Students perform this work on a voluntary basis and are not provided support or reward for their participation. One participant felt that students involved with panels could be offered classroom credit to make this a more worthwhile endeavor.

There was a difference in the perceptions of participants regarding the support that the University offered to Vision. Some participants felt that Vision was completely unsupported by the University administration, while others felt that the vandalism incident Fall 2002 brought concerns to the forefront, and several BGSU community members showed their care towards the group. Participants from some offices reported that Vision was actively supported by their office as much as any other student group. Several others, however, felt that there was a marked lack of support not only for Vision, but also for any educational and programmatic efforts regarding LGBT issues on the part of the University administration. One participant commented, *“We have*

not moved quickly enough to provide them with administrative support by having an office to address LGBT issues.”

CAMPUS LEADERSHIP

“*We’re not where we need to be*” generally summarizes the existing perception among participants in the interviews and focus groups regarding the responsiveness of the campus leadership (defined as administrators and administrative staff) regarding LGBT issues on Bowling Green’s campus. Participants believed that the university leaders have avoided their responsibility to address LGBT issues by relying on Vision to educate the campus community about the LGBT concerns and by ignoring the needs of university staff for training on LGBT issues, particularly residence hall staff, the Counseling Center staff, and the Student Health Service staff.

Additionally, many respondents commented on the lack of equity within campus policies, and believe many campus administrators, particularly those at the highest levels, see no problem with this inequity, or at least are unwilling to assume the political risks that might result from implementation of more equitable policies.

The Division of Student Affairs and the Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives created a half-time graduate assistant position dealing with LGBT student issues in the CMAI in the fall of 2002. Until this time, there was no office or staff designated to work with LGBT students or champion LGBT issues within the campus community. While the creation of this position was regarded by most as a positive move, many also commented that it is only a start and that there remains a great deal more to do.

TRAINING ISSUES

Despite the progression of LGBT awareness on campus, many administrators, faculty, staff, and students think there are still too few educational and training opportunities to learn about LGBT issues. The one educational and training opportunity that is available is Safe Zone training conducted by the Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives and Vision, a student organization. However, BGSU personnel and students are not required to attend Safe Zone training or any other training that addresses LGBT issues. A common theme among students and administrators interviewed was that more emphasis needs to be placed on training staff and faculty to work with LGBT students. Students have mixed reactions to the existing services in the residence halls, Counseling Center, and Student Health Service, and repeatedly called for staff in these areas to receive training to better provide services.

Some department personnel are taking initiative to educate and train their staff about LGBT issues. The Counseling Center promotes an active message of acceptance; therefore, the staff participates in Safe Zone training. There are also informal sessions concerning safe space and sensitivity training workshops for the staff. The Office of Student Life has regular conversations about incorporating LGBT issues as part of its training for new graduate students in the office. Student Health Service has had several professionally facilitated in-service workshops geared toward LGBT issues and more are planned. They have also considered asking a student who has made complaints against the Student Health Service staff to serve as a facilitator. A staff member with the campus police has attended Safe Zone training; she noted that training on LGBT issues cannot be a one-time thing; training needs to be ongoing for staff to stay in touch with a constantly changing campus climate. The social sciences department trains its graduates in multicultural issues and teaches them how to teach about multicultural issues,

which presumably include LGBT issues. The Division of Student Affairs has started offering Safe Zone training through its staff development program.

Although some BGSU faculty and staff are trying to educate themselves about LGBT issues, many participants in the study felt that more still needs to be done in the area of diversity initiatives and course offerings: *“We do mandatory training for employees on sexual harassment. I think we need to add diversity education as a part of that. I would add more than just racial diversity to that training.”*

When asked if they were interested in LGBT awareness training opportunities, the majority of directors of student affairs units said they would be interested in such a program for their staff. Most offices had no plan for professional development on this topic at the time of the interview because they had not previously considered such an option. All the directors said they would consider LGBT awareness training and other educational programs. A small number of the directors said that their offices had worked with Vision in the past to create programs or do seminars during staff meetings.

A group of resident assistants said that BGSU should be more proactive in building awareness and incorporating LGBT issues as part of diversity training; however, BGSU should do it without setting LGBT students apart, as a different or separate group.

There has been some progress by BGSU to bring LGBT awareness to administrators, faculty, staff, and students. However, many participants think there are still too few educational and training opportunities on campus. They recommended education in the form of mandatory training for administrators, faculty, and staff, course offerings for students, and the establishment of an LGBT Center on campus.

POLICY ISSUES

Participants in the interviews and focus groups raised several issues about university policies as they apply to LGBT people, namely, the absence of domestic partnership benefits for faculty and staff, residence life policies regarding live-in staff, the absence of gender identity protection for any members of the university community, the overnight guest policy in the residence halls, and the need to incorporate unisex bathrooms throughout campus.

Several participants discussed the current residence hall policy that forbids residence hall directors who are in same-sex relationships from living with their partners. One respondent said, *“... if you are a residence hall director and you are married, your spouse can live with you. But if you are gay, lesbian, bisexual, you cannot have a same-sex partner living with you because the rules say that you have to be married. It puts those people in a catch-22.”* A student noted that if policies such as the live-in residential requirement for hall directors were changed, it would send a message to students that LGBT relationships are more “normal” than they once thought.

Several self-identified straight students expressed displeasure with the overnight guest policy in the residence halls, as it is seemed to offer advantages to same-sex couples. One student stated, *“The University needs to look at the overnight guest policy in the residence halls. Opposite sex partners are not allowed to stay overnight in the dorms; however, same sex partners can.”*

Students commented on the lack of unisex bathrooms and the troubles that transgendered students faced using bathrooms and locker rooms on campus. They recommended that gender-free bathrooms be incorporated throughout campus, including the residence halls and recreational and athletic facilities.

Overall, the general consensus was that these policies are heterosexist (presuming that only heterosexual relationships are normal or appropriate). Participants were clear that these policies should be rewritten to be inclusive and affirmative of LGBT students.

BGSU RELATIVE TO COMPARATIVE INSTITUTIONS (See Appendix C: LGBT Benchmarking Study)

- Eight of the 12 institutions surveyed have an office or will have an office by fall 2003 that addresses LGBT issues.
- Of the seven institutions that currently have an LGBT office, four (Central Michigan, Eastern Michigan, Indiana University and Ohio State University) are staffed by full-time employees.
- All 12 of the institutions have a student organization for LGBT students.
- All the institutions contacted sponsor the same sort of basic programming, through an office or student organization, such as “Coming Out Day/Week,” LGBT awareness programs, LGBT resource center, National Pride Week, and speaker presentations.
- Funding for LGBT offices comes from a variety of sources including the university’s general budget, student fees, the university’s foundation, alumni, friends of the university, residence life, and the division of student affairs.

RESPONSE TO CHARGE

WHAT CURRENT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE ON CAMPUS FOR LGBT STUDENTS?

Almost no programs and services are offered at BGSU specifically for LGBT students, with two notable exceptions. Vision, the LGBTQIQSS student organization provides an extensive amount of programming for the LGBT student community, and serves as the primary support structure for LGBTQIQSS students. Additionally, the Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives has hired a half-time graduate assistant to work with this community and to provide educational programming on LGBT issues, among other responsibilities. In the spring of 2003 University Police appointed an officer to be a liaison to Vision. Otherwise, we were able to identify no programs or services that were designed for or specifically marketed to this community.

WHAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS ARE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS WISHING TO LEARN MORE ABOUT LGBT ISSUES AND CONCERNS?

A few academic courses include LGBT content; and very few focus specifically on LGBT issues. Vision provides “panels” to numerous academic courses and non-academic audiences. These panels, usually hour-long experiences, focus on providing general information about LGBT issues and answering participants’ questions. The Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives runs the Safe Space program, that trains faculty, staff, and students to increase awareness of homophobia and heterosexism, help participants understand how to support LGBT students, faculty, and staff; begin to develop strategies to recognize and counter homophobia and heterosexism, and to create a network of supportive allies. The Women’s

Center often includes issues of sexual orientation in its programming. Student Affairs, as a Division, provides no systematic educational activities regarding LGBT issues.

WHAT ARE THE NEEDS OF LGBT STUDENTS AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY?

LGBT students at BGSU need:

- To be treated with respect.
- A student affairs staff that is aware of the specific needs and issues of LGBT students in their respective functional areas.
- Targeted programming and services that meet their needs in specific functional areas.
- Resident assistants who respond appropriately to acts of harassment and vandalism targeted at LGBT students.
- Access to gender-neutral bathrooms and locker room facilities.
- Educational and cultural programs of interest to/inclusive of the LGBT population provided by major campus programming bodies.
- Psychological support services for students dealing with coming out and gender-identity issues.
- More “out” staff and faculty who can act as role models.
- Courses that address LGBT issues.

WHAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE AT OTHER COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES THAT ARE SIMILAR IN SIZE AND SCOPE TO BGSU? (SEE PAGE 16)

- BGSU, like 8 of the 12 institutions contacted, has a staff member responsible for addressing issues that affect LGBT students.
- BGSU is similar to the 12 institutions surveyed in the types of LGBT programming sponsored on campus, specifically, “Coming Out Day/Week,” National Pride Day/Week, and LGBT awareness programs.
- BGSU does not have a large offering of programs and services compared to at least 4 institutions (Central Michigan, Eastern Michigan, Indiana University and Ohio State University) that all have at least one full-time staff person responsible for LGBT programs and services.
- Although the funding sources varied from institution to institution, BGSU funds its LGBT student organization through student fees, similar to many of the 12 institutions surveyed.

WHAT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ARE RECOMMENDED BY THE CAS STANDARDS FOR LGBT SERVICES?

The Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for LGBT programs and services states:

The mission of LGBT programs and services must promote academic and personal growth and development of LGBT students, assure unrestricted access to and full involvement in all aspects of the institution, and serve as a catalyst of the creation of a campus environment free from prejudice, bigotry, harassment and violence and hospitable for all students. To accomplish this mission, the goals of the program must be

based on assessment of the needs of and campus climate for LGBT students. LGBT programs and services must select priorities among those needs and respond to the extent that resources permit.

Implementation of the Task Force's recommendations (below) would bring the university into congruence with the CAS Standards.

WHAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS ARE NEEDED FOR LGBT ALLIES AND OTHER STRAIGHT STUDENTS?

Fewer than 19% of non-LGBT residents indicated that their RAs were doing enough programming on LGBT issues. This would imply that these students have some interest in learning more about LGBT issues. Currently, the only place for straight students to learn about LGBT issues is through the programming provided by Vision, supplemented by the new efforts of the CMAI. The campus community as a whole needs far more opportunities to learn about LGBT issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the data collected, the Task Force makes the following recommendations to the Division of Student Affairs at Bowling Green State University:

- Develop a LGBT resource center at BGSU staffed by a full-time person trained in sexuality and gender issues, with a budget for programming and operations comparable with other programming units on campus, and a dedicated physical space for the center.
- Ensure that campus policies are equitable for all students, faculty, and staff (e.g., overnight guest policies should treat male and female guests similarly, employment benefits - health insurance, pension, bereavement leave, counseling - should be extended to domestic partners as well as spouses, staff living in residence hall apartments should be able to live with same or other-gendered partners, gender identity and gender expression should be included in the University's non-discrimination policy).
- Make mandatory for all BGSU employees, LGBT education and training including, but not limited to, Safe Zone training. Staff should receive additional training specific to LGBT issues in their functional areas.
- Include at least one gender-neutral restroom in all campus buildings.
- Update campus forms to allow for variant gender identities.
- Hire faculty and staff of all sexual orientations and gender identities who are able to create a supportive, understanding environment for LGBT students.
- Provide educational and social programming relevant to LGBT students and programming on LGBT issues designed for the campus community as a whole. This programming should be provided by both university programming bodies (e.g., UAO could invite performers that deal with LGBT material, show films that include LGBT issues) and specific functional areas within student affairs (e.g., the Career Center could

do programming on being “out” in the job search process, the campus could advertise LGBT-inclusive athletic competitions, CMAI could host speakers deal with the lives of Latina lesbians, or Intercollegiate Athletics might host a workshop on addressing homophobia in sports).

- Implement a clear reporting system for acts of harassment or intolerance based on sexual orientation, gender expression, or gender identity.
- Provide identified and visible “safe” persons for LGBT victims of harassment, within campus police, Residence Life, Student Life, Intercollegiate Athletics, and other departments, to alleviate fear of re-victimization.
- Include issues of sexual orientation and gender identity in new student orientation and GradSTEP.
- Train resident assistants to respond effectively to roommate conflicts based on sexual orientation, to recognize acts of harassment based on sexual orientation and gender identity, and to respond appropriately. Assist resident assistants in increasing the amount of programming they conduct on issues of sexual orientation and gender identity.
- Create a standing advisory committee to advise campus leadership on LGBT issues and concerns.
- Evaluate progress of implementing these recommendations and reassess the climate in two to three years.

While curricular concerns are outside the charge of this Task Force, a number of issues related to academics were evident in the data collected by the Task Force. The following recommendations should be forwarded to the Provost for consideration:

- Offer courses that address LGBT issues and incorporate LGBT topics into courses where appropriate. Courses with significant LGBT content should qualify as meeting the university’s diversity requirement.
- Promote the use of inclusive language in the classroom.

CONCLUSION: GOOD ATTITUDES, POOR SUPPORT, UNSAFE STUDENTS

In 1992, D’Augelli wrote about the college environment: “At a time when accurate information and supportive experiences are critical to their development, young lesbians and gay men find few, if any, affirming experiences in higher educational settings” (p. 214). We seem to have made some progress in the last 10 years. The results of this study indicate that there are places on this campus where lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender students feel safe, affirmed, and appropriately served. Unfortunately, this still is not true of our campus as a whole, or even the majority of the campus. Even in places where staff indicate that they are accepting of people of all sexual orientations and gender identities, they often lack the knowledge and skills to appropriately serve them. Indeed, this seems to be the primary conclusion that can be drawn from the data we collected: Many people on campus are willing to be supportive, but they don’t know how. In some places the peer culture is overtly hostile (residence halls, fraternities and sororities, and intercollegiate athletics in particular); in other areas the environment is “merely” covertly threatening; elsewhere there is an absence of any affirmation for LGBT students. Many

faculty, professional, and paraprofessional staff lack the knowledge and skills to provide appropriate services, to challenge the homophobia of other students, to provide educational programming, and to actively affirm the presence, contributions, and value of LGBT students, and to educate all students regarding LGBT issues.

It is clear that BGSU is not living up to its vision and values with respect to LGBT students. Most LGBT students do not experience this as a civil campus, do not feel respected by the campus community as a whole, and do not feel they matter to the institution. If we are to live up to our espoused values, we need to make a concerted, visible effort to change this through the recommendations of this Task Force.

APPENDIX A: ON-LINE LGBT SURVEY FOR STUDENTS

1. Since coming to Bowling Green State University I changed or avoided an academic project having to do with issues of sexual orientation and/or gender identity because a faculty member or teaching assistant discouraged such a project.

Strongly agree (SA)

Agree (A)

Neither agree or disagree (N)

Disagree (D)

Strongly disagree (SD)

2. Since coming to Bowling Green State University I have been in classes where the professor or teaching assistant has made remarks demeaning of those whose sexual orientation or gender identity or expression differs from others.

SA A N D SD

3. Since coming to Bowling Green State University I have taken classes where it seemed that the instructor omitted or did not discuss varying sexual orientations and gender identities even when appropriate.

SA A N D SD

4. The art, posters, and other visual communications of the university represent a variety of sexual orientations.

SA A N D SD

5. I see anti-gay, lesbian and/or bisexual graffiti:

Daily

Weekly

More than once a month

Once a month

Less than once a month

Never

6. I challenge others' derogatory comments or behaviors regarding sexual orientation.

SA A N D SD

7. Before coming to BGSU I had concerns my roommate might be gay, lesbian, or bisexual.

SA A N D SD do/did not live in residence halls

8. Before coming to BGSU I had concerns my roommate might be transgender.

SA A N D SD do/did not live in residence halls

9. If my roommate were lesbian, gay, or bisexual I would feel.

Very comfortable (VC)

Comfortable (C)

Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable (N)

Uncomfortable (UC)

Very uncomfortable (VUC)

Do/did not live in residence halls

10. If my roommate were transgender I would feel.

VC C N UC VUC do/did not live in residence halls

11. I hear/heard derogatory remarks about lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender people in a residence hall.

Daily

Weekly

More than once a month

Once a month

Less than once a month

Never

Have never lived in a residence hall

12. I hear derogatory remarks on campus about lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender people.

Daily

Weekly

More than once a month

Once a month

Less than once a month

Never

13. I am/was aware of lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender persons in my residence hall.

Yes No Not Sure I have never lived in residence hall

14. I feel/felt my resident advisor (please mark all that apply).

Is/was homophobic

Is/was sensitive to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender issues

Conducts/conducted an adequate amount of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender programs

Holds/held beliefs which conflict with supporting lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender programs.

I have never lived in a residence hall.

15. If I found out my resident advisor and/or house staff were gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender I would feel.

VC C N UC VUC do/did not live in residence halls

16. I feel/felt my hall directors/house staff and other residence life staff are supportive of lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender issues.

SA A N D SD do/did not live in residence halls

17. I have witnessed displays of affection between same-gender couples on-campus.

Yes No If your answer is Yes, please state how it made you feel:

18. I see flyers for lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender services or activities.

Daily

Weekly

More than once a month

Once a month

Less than once a month

Never

19. I have heard about the "Safe Zone" program.

Yes No

20. I have participated in a "Safe Zone" training session.

Yes No

21. I have seen a "Safe Zone" sticker on campus.

Yes (if so how many): No

22. I am aware of the undergraduate student organization known as Vision.

Yes No

23. I have attended a Vision meeting or event.

Yes No (if no please state why):

24. I have attended a lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender event on campus sponsored by a student organization other than Vision

Yes No

25. I have seen or attended a Vision panel training.

Yes No

26. Lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender issues on this campus receive an adequate amount of recognition and programming.

SA A N D SD

27. From the list below please check the campus media organizations that provide adequate coverage of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender issues. (Mark all that apply).

BG News

BG24 News

The Gavel

Obsidian

WBGU-FM

WBGU-TV

WFAL-AM

I am not familiar with any of these media organizations.

28. Please list all the offices, organizations and services on-campus which you have had contact with that you believe know the issues specific to gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered students.

29. Please list all the offices, organizations and services on-campus which you have had contact with that you believe provide respectful treatment to gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered students.

30. Please list all the offices, organizations and services on-campus which you have had contact with that you believe should undergo awareness/sensitivity training about gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered issues.

31. Since coming to Bowling Green State University I have feared being labeled as gay, lesbian, or bisexual.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree or disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

32. My perception of the on-campus climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students is

33. My current student status is:

Full-time undergraduate (12 or more credits per semester)

Part-time undergraduate (11 or fewer credits per semester)

Full-time graduate (9 or more credits per semester)

Part-time graduate (8 or fewer credits per semester)

Other (Please specify):

34. I currently reside in:

On-campus residence hall

On-campus sorority/fraternity house

Off-campus housing

With family and/or relatives

Other (Please specify):

35. My current class status is:

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior
 Graduate student - Master's level
 Graduate student - Doctoral level
 Other (Please specify):

36. I am currently enrolled in the following college:

Pre advising
 College of Arts and Sciences
 College of Education and Human Development
 College of Business Administration
 College of Health and Human Services
 College of Musical Arts
 College of Technology
 Firelands College

37. My current age in years is:

38. My primary race/ethnicity is:

American Indian/Alaskan Native
 Asian/Pacific Islander
 Black
 Hispanic/Latino
 White
 Biracial
 Multiracial
 Other (please specify):

39. I consider my sexual orientation to be:

Heterosexual/straight
 Gay
 Lesbian
 Bisexual
 Other (Please specify):

40. I consider my gender/sex to be:

Male
 Female
 Transgender (male-to-female)
 Transgender (female-to-male)
 Intersex
 Other (Please specify):

41. To what extent would you agree with the following?

SA A Neither A nor D D SD NA

I have feared for my physical safety as a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender person at Bowling Green State University.

As a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender person I feel/felt uncomfortable disclosing my sexual orientation and/or gender identity at B.G.S.U. due to a fear of negative consequences or discrimination.

As a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender person I feel/felt comfortable discussing my sexual orientation and/or gender identity with a close friend at B.G.S.U.

As a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender person I feel/felt comfortable discussing my sexual orientation and/or gender identity with a faculty member at B.G.S.U.

As a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender person I feel/felt comfortable discussing my sexual orientation and/or gender identity with a staff or administrator at B.G.S.U.

While on campus I feel safe publicly expressing affection (i.e., holding hands, walking arm-in-arm, hugging, kissing) with a same-sex partner.

In the town of Bowling Green (off-campus) I feel safe publicly expressing affection (i.e., holding hands, walking arm-in-arm, hugging, kissing) with a same sex partner.

I have a sufficient number of faculty who are openly gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender willing to act as mentors and role models at B.G.S.U.

I have a sufficient number of openly gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender staff/administrators who are willing to act as mentors and role models at B.G.S.U.

I have a sufficient number of openly gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender graduate students, including graduate teaching assistants, who are willing to act as mentors and role models at B.G.S.U.

42. As a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender person I have been a victim of a hate crime on Bowling Green State University's campus

Yes No

43. As a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender person, disclosing my sexual orientation/gender identity to the people around me is:

Very important

Important

Neither important nor unimportant

Unimportant

Very unimportant

44. Please rate how comfortable you feel discussing your sexual orientation/gender identity with the following

VC C N UC VUC Not Applicable

Acquaintances

Close friends

Faculty

Student groups in which you are involved

Your roommates

The residence halls

The classroom

Your intercollegiate athletic team

Your academic advisor

Your sorority or fraternity

Health Services

The counseling center

Career Center

Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiative

On-campus job

Recreation Center

Financial Aid

Public Safety

45. As a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender student at Bowling Green State University I have been able to find adequate and comfortable on-campus housing.

Yes No (Please explain why not): Have not searched for on-campus housing.

46. As a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender student at Bowling Green State University, I have been able to find adequate and comfortable off-campus housing.

Yes No (Please explain why not): Have not searched for off-campus housing

47. There are places on campus where I fear for my physical safety because of my sexual orientation/gender identity.

Yes (please list): No

48. In the town of Bowling Green (off-campus) there are places where I fear for my physical safety because of my sexual orientation/gender identity.

Yes (please list): No

49. As a lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender person, I feel affirmed by the faculty and staff of this university:

Daily

Weekly

More than once a month

Once a month

Less than once a month

Never

50. I would recommend B.G.S.U. to a prospective student who was lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender.

Would recommend strongly

Would recommend

Neither recommend nor not recommend

Would not recommend

Would strongly not recommend

51. The climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender students at BGSU makes it:

Very likely I will remain enrolled as a student here

Likely I will remain enrolled as a student here

Neither likely or unlikely I will remain enrolled as a student here

Unlikely I will remain enrolled as a student here

Very unlikely I will remain enrolled as a student here

52. Thinking about your overall experiences at BGSU, including those influenced by your sexual orientation/gender identity, how likely are you to donate money to the institution as a graduate of BGSU.

Very likely

Likely

Neither likely nor unlikely

Unlikely

Very unlikely

53. Please list those offices, organizations and services on-campus with which you have had contact that treated you in a positive way knowing you were gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender.

54 Please list those offices, organizations and services on-campus with which you have had contact that treated you in a negative way because they knew you were gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender

55. Please list those offices, organizations and services on-campus with which you have had contact that you know are providing outreach to gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender students.

APPENDIX B: MAJOR TABLES REGARDING THE NON-LGBT AND LGBT STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CAMPUS CLIMATE FOR LGBT STUDENTS AT BGSU: FINDINGS OBTAINED FROM THE GENERAL SURVEY

TABLE 1: RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

There were 594 responses to the survey out of a student population of 18,773 on the main campus of BGSU or a 3.2% response rate. In all categories of demographic information, percentages frequently do not add up to 100% because of the “Other” option.

Table 1a: Gender

	Sample total	LGBT sample
Male	35.3%	48%
Female	62.7%	44%
M-F	0.34%	2.0%
Other	1.68%	6.0%

Table 1b: Age

	Sample total	LGBT sample
Range:	16 to 55	17 to 55
Mean	22.4 years	25.15
Under 18	0.7%	1.0%
18-22	73.0%	54.4%
23-25	15.1%	18.8%
26-34	6.2%	10.9%
35-55	5.0%	14.9%

Table 1c: Housing

	Sample Total	LGBT sample
On-campus housing	42.5%	39.6%
Greek housing	5.4%	4.0%
Off-campus housing	40.5%	47.5%
Family/relatives	8.5%	4.0%
Other	3.1%	5.0%

Table 1d: Class standing

	Sample total	LGBT sample
Freshman	19.8% %	15.8%
Sophomore	17.4%	12.9%
Junior	19.5%	19.8%
Senior	22.8%	19.8%
Graduate—masters	13.4%	19.8%
Graduate—doctoral	4.9%	7.9%
Other	2.2%	4.0%

Table 1e: College of enrollment

	Sample total	LGBT sample
Pre-advising	3.4%	4.0%
College of Arts and Sciences	39.6%	49.5%
College of Education and Human Development	29.7%	24.8%
College of Business Administration	10.3%	5.9%
College of Health and Human Services	5.3%	5.9%
College of Musical Arts	3.9%	5.0%
College of Technology	6.7%	4.0%
Firelands College	1.0%	1.0%

Table 1f: Race

	Sample total	LGBT sample
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.7%	1.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.0%
Black	2.1%	1.0%
Hispanic/Latino	1.0%	2.0%
White	88.2%	80.0%
Biracial	0.7%	1.0%
Multiracial	1.4%	5.0%
Other	4.8%	9.0%

Table 1g: Sexual orientation

There is no institutional record of BGSU student population's sexual orientation with which to compare the respondents. Generally accepted estimates are that LGBT people make up between 5% and 10% of the general population.

I consider my sexual orientation to be:	Sample total	LGBT sample
Heterosexual/straight	82.9%	--
Gay	5.8%	33.7%
Lesbian	3.0%	17.8%
Bisexual	5.2%	30.7%
Other	3.0%	17.8%

TABLE 2: SAFETY ISSUES

Table 2a: Feared for physical safety

I have feared for my physical safety as a lesbian, gay, bisexual, and/or transgender person at BGSU: (n=90)

Mean = 3.30	1=strongly agree	2=agree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=disagree	5=strongly disagree
	7.8%	26.7%	15.6%	27.8%	22.2%

Table 2b: Places physically unsafe

There are places on campus where I fear for my physical safety because of my sexual orientation/gender identity: (n=90)	Yes: 30.0%	No: 70.0%

Table 2c: Hate crimes

As a gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender person I have been a victim of a hate crime on BGSU's campus: (n=90)	Yes: 10.0%	No: 90.0%
--	------------	-----------

Table 2d: Safety displaying affection

While on campus, I feel safe publicly expressing affection (i.e., holding hands, walking arm-in arm, hugging, kissing) with a same-sex partner. (n=81)

Mean = 3.79	1=strongly agree	2=agree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=disagree	5=strongly disagree
	4.9%	18.5%	8.6%	28.4%	39.5%

Table 2e: Comfort being out

How comfortable do you feel discussing your sexual orientation/gender identity with:

(1=Very comfortable, 5=Very uncomfortable, "NA" responses excluded)

	Mean	% very comfortable or comfortable	% neither comfortable nor uncomfortable	% uncomfortable or very uncomfortable
close friends	1.74	82.2	6.7	11.1
counseling center	2.46	67.7	10.8	21.5
your roommate	2.89	46	12.7	41.3
health services	3.22	35.7	16.4	47.9
acquaintances	3.34	30.7	19.3	50.0
staff/admin	3.34	26.7	25.6	47.6
CMAI	3.35	17.1	20.8	52.1
student groups you are involved in	3.41	25.6	18.6	55.8
on-campus job	3.46	25.4	20.3	54.2
faculty	3.53	21.1	27.8	51.1
career center	3.65	15.2	23.9	60.9
public safety	3.73	20.6	15.9	63.5
your academic advisor	3.76	27.2	13.6	59.3
classroom	3.82	13.5	18.0	68.5
residence halls	3.83	17.2	15.5	67.3
financial aid	3.84	11.3	21.0	67.8
recreation center	3.88	10.0	21.7	68.3
your sorority or fraternity	3.96	10.5	11.5	76.9
your intercollegiate athletic team	4.0	7.6	15.4	76.9

TABLE 3: ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENTS

Table 3a: Perceived classroom environment for LGBT students

I have changed or avoided a project related to LGBT issues because faculty or TA discouraged such projects		
	Non-LGBT (n=490)	LGBT (n=101)
Mean*	4.25	4.17
Strongly agree/Agree	2.2%	6%
Neither agree nor disagree	21.4%	18.8%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	76.3%	75.2%

* $p < .05$

I have been in classes where faculty or TA make demeaning remarks of those whose sexual orientation is different from usual
--

I have been in classes where faculty or TA make demeaning remarks of those whose sexual orientation is different from usual		
	Non-LGBT (n=490)	LGBT (n=101)
<i>Mean***</i>	4.11	3.58
Strongly agree/Agree	12.6%	23.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	7.3%	12.9%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	80%	63.3%

*** $p=0.00$

I HAVE TAKEN CLASSES WHERE THE INSTRUCTOR OMITTED OR DID NOT DISCUSS VARYING SEXUAL ORIENTATIONS EVEN WHEN APPROPRIATE		
	Non-LGBT (n=490)	LGBT (n=101)
<i>Mean***</i>	3.86	2.99
Strongly agree/Agree	11.5%	39.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	20.4%	18.8%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	68.1%	41.6%

*** $p=0.00$

Table 3b: Mentors

	As an LGBT student, I have sufficient LGBT faculty for mentors (n=84)	As an LGBT student, I have sufficient LGBT staff/administrators for mentors (n=84)	As an LGBT student, I have sufficient LGBT graduate students for mentors (n=82)
<i>Mean</i>	3.85	3.85	3.61
Strongly agree	4.7%	3.6%	4.9%
Agree	20.0%	8.3%	12.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	23.5%	26.2%	29.3%
Disagree	23.5%	23.8%	24.4%
Strongly disagree	28.2%	38.1%	29.3%

TABLE 4: RESIDENCE LIFE

Table 4a: Roommates

Before coming to BGSU, I had concerns my roommate might be LGB.		
	Non-LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=382)	LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=62)
<i>Mean***</i>	4.06	4.88
Strongly agree/Agree	29.3%	9.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	12%	11.3%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	58.6%	79%

*** $p=0.00$

Before coming to BGSU, I had concerns my roommate might be transgender.		
	Non-LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=384)	LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=62)
<i>Mean**</i>	4.42	4.23
Strongly agree/Agree	11.4%	24.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	16.9%	8.1%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	71.6%	67.8%

** $p=0.01$

If my roommate were LGB, I would feel		
	Non-LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=383)	LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=62)
<i>Mean***</i>	3.54	2.53
Very comfortable/Comfortable	35.8%	83.9%
Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable	27.2%	14.5%
Uncomfortable/Very uncomfortable	37.1%	1.6%

*** p=0.00

If my roommate were transgender, I would feel		
	Non-LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=383)	LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=62)
<i>Mean**</i>	3.86	3.18
Very comfortable/Comfortable	22.4%	59.7%
Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable	23.8%	16.1%
Uncomfortable/Very uncomfortable	53.8%	24.2%

**p=0.01

Table 4b: Residence hall environment

I hear/heard derogatory remarks about LGBT people in a residence hall		
	Non-LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=380)	LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=61)
<i>Mean***</i>	3.62	2.59
Daily	10.8%	26.2%
Weekly	20.5%	29.5%
More than once a month	16.3%	19.7%
Once a month	12.9%	11.5%
Less than once a month	26.8%	6.6%
Never	12.6%	6.6%

***p=0.00

Please rate how comfortable you are discussing sexual orientation in/with (asked only of LGBT students)			
	Roommate (n=63)	Residence Hall (n=58)	Sorority/Fraternity (n=26)
<i>Mean</i>	2.89	3.83	3.96
Very comfortable	22.2%	1.7%	3.8%
Comfortable	23.8%	15.5%	7.7%
Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable	12.7%	15.5%	11.5%
Uncomfortable	25.4%	32.8%	42.3%
Very uncomfortable	15.9%	34.5%	34.6%

Table 4c: Awareness of LGBT residents

I am/was aware of LGBT persons in my residence hall.		
	Non-LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=376)	LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=61)
Yes	64.9%	85.2%
No	12.2%	3.3%
Not sure	22.9%	11.5%

Table 4d: Resident advisor attitudes

I feel/felt my residence advisor (please mark all that apply)		
	Non-LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=370)	LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=61)
Is/was homophobic*	4.1%	18.0%
Is/was sensitive to LGBT issues*	63.2%	60.7%
Conduct/conducted an adequate amount of LGBT programs*	17.0%	11.5%
Holds/held beliefs which conflict with supporting LGBT programs	14.1%	18.0%

* $p < 0.05$

Table 4e: Professional staff attitudes

I feel my hall director and other residence life staff are supportive of LGBT issues		
	Non-LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=372)	LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=64)
Mean*	2.35	2.36
Strongly agree/Agree	53.9%	57.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	43.1%	26.2%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	3.0%	16.4%

* $p < 0.05$

Table 4f: LGBT RAs

If I found out my RA or house staff was LGBT, I would feel....		
	Non-LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=383)	LGBT students who have lived in a residence hall (n=61)
Mean***	2.57	1.54
Very comfortable/Comfortable	49.6%	85.2%
Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable	33.8%	14.8%
Uncomfortable/Very uncomfortable	16.6%	0.0%

*** $p = 0.00$

TABLE 5: GENERAL CLIMATE

Table 5a: Visual communication

Visual communications of the university represent a variety of sexual orientations		
	Non-LGBT (n=489)	LGBT (n=101)
Mean***	2.87	3.46
Strongly agree/Agree	39.9%	21.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	32.7%	26.7%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	27.4%	51.5%

*** $p = 0.00$

Table 5b: Fear of labeling

I have feared being labeled as LGBT		
	Non-LGBT (n=483)	LGBT (n=101)
<i>Mean***</i>	4.82	3.14
Strongly agree/Agree	7.8%	33.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	17.6%	23.8%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	74.6%	42.6%

*** $p=0.00$

Table 5c: Anti-LGBT graffiti

I see anti-gay, lesbian, and/or bisexual graffiti		
	Non-LGBT (n=483)	LGBT (n=101)
<i>Mean***</i>	5.12	4.31
Daily	1.0%	5.9%
Weekly	3.5%	8.9%
More than once a month	7.0%	10.9%
Once a month	9.8%	19.8%
Less than once a month	29.9%	31.7%
Never	48.9%	22.8%

*** $p = 0.00$

Table 5d: LGBT flyers

I see flyers for lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender services or activities		
	Non-LGBT (n=489)	LGBT (n=100)
<i>Mean</i>	3.08	3.33
Daily	11.2%	9.9%
Weekly	29%	21.8%
More than once a month	24.9%	26.7%
Once a month	16.2%	13.9%
Less than once a month	12.7%	19.8%
Never	5.9%	6.9%

Table 5e: Derogatory language

I hear derogatory remarks on campus about LGBT people		
	Non-LGBT (n= 490)	LGBT (n=101)
<i>Mean***</i>	3.82	3.34
Daily	8.6%	21.8%
Weekly	16.9%	26.7%
More than once a month	17.6%	13.9%
Once a month	15.3%	9.9%
Less than once a month	24.3%	18.8%
Never	17.3%	8.9%

*** $p=0.00$

Table 5f: Challenging derogatory language

I challenge others' derogatory comments or behaviors regarding sexual orientation		
	Non-LGBT (n=490)	LGBT (n=101)
Mean***	2.69	2.10
Strongly agree/Agree	50.9%	73.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	25.5%	19.8%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	23.7%	6.9%

*** $p=0.00$

Table 5g: Witness same-sex affection

(Response options were "yes" or "no")

I have witnessed displays of affection between same-gender couples on campus		
	Non-LGBT (n=489)	LGBT (n=101)
Yes	61.6%	66.3%

Table 5h: Recognition of and programming for LGBT issues

LGBT issues on this campus receive an adequate amount of recognition and programming		
	Non-LGBT (n=488)	LGBT (n=101)
Mean***	2.81	3.46
Strongly agree/Agree	35.6%	21.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	41.8%	23.8%
Disagree/Strongly disagree	22.6%	54.4%

*** $p=0.00$

Table 5i: Willingness to recommend BGSU

I would recommend BGSU to a prospective student who was lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender (asked only of LGBT students, n=90)	
Mean	2.70
Would recommend strongly/Would recommend	44.4%
Neither recommend nor not recommend	34.4%
Would not recommend/Would strongly not recommend	21.1%

Table 5j: Continued enrollment

The climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender students at BGSU makes it: (asked only of LGBT students, n=88)	
Mean	2.43
Very likely/Likely I will remain enrolled as a student here	42.0%
Neither likely or unlikely I will remain enrolled as a student here	52.3%
Unlikely/Very unlikely I will remain enrolled as a student here	5.7%

Table 5k: Affirmation from faculty and staff

As a lesbian, gay, bisexual, and/or transgender person, I feel affirmed by the faculty and staff of this university: (asked only of LGBT students, n=88)	
Mean	4.24
Daily	4.5%
Weekly	10.2%
More than once a month	22.7%
Once a month	10.2%
Less than once a month	23.9%
Never	28.4%

TABLE 6: VISION

(Response options were “yes” or “no”)

I am aware of Vision		
	Non-LGBT (n=486)	LGBT (n=101)
Yes*	80.0%	88.1%

* $p < 0.05$

I have attended a Vision meeting or event		
	Non-LGBT (n=489)	LGBT (n=101)
Yes***	13.5%	42.6%

*** $p = 0.00$

I have seen or attended a Vision panel training		
	Non-LGBT (n=489)	LGBT (n=100)
Yes**	7.8%	19.0%

** $p < 0.01$

I have attended a LGBT event on campus sponsored by a student organization other than Vision		
	Non-LGBT (n=489)	LGBT (n=100)
Yes***	6.7%	25.0%

*** $p = 0.00$

TABLE 7: SAFE ZONE

(Response options were “yes” or “no”)

I have heard about the “Safe Zone” program		
	Non-LGBT (n=487)	LGBT (n=101)
Yes*	35.5%	48.5%

* $p < 0.05$

I have participated in a “Safe Zone” training session		
	Non-LGBT (n=488)	LGBT (n=99)
Yes**	7.2%	17.2%

** $p < 0.01$

I have seen a “Safe Zone” sticker on campus		
	Non-LGBT (n=489)	LGBT (n=101)
Yes**	28.2%	43.6%

** $p < 0.01$

APPENDIX C: LGBT BENCHMARKING STUDY

Benchmarking Sub-Committee
Members: Shelia Burkhalter, James T. Jackson Sr., and Kevin Konecny

	When was office/dept./group created?	What is the office/dept. staffing pattern?	Where does the office/dept. fall in college/university structure?	Office/dept./student organization funding source	Annual budget	What on-going services, programs are provided?	What role does the student organization fulfill on campus?
Ball State University: <i>student group</i>	Officially recognized in 1990	Advised by an Assistant Director of Student Activities	Student Activities	Student budget process	\$6,000	Not specified	Co-program with other student groups, provide awareness programming for National Coming Out Day
Central Michigan University: <i>office</i>	Office of Gay & Lesbian Programs 1991	Director reports to Asst. Vice President for the Office of Institutional Diversity	Office of Institutional Diversity	University	\$4,500 (supplies and expenses)	National Coming Out Day, National Pride Week, Gay and Lesbian History Month, Gay and Lesbian Programs, speaker panel presentations, sensitivity training, referrals, resources; assistance with scholarships & financial aid, recruiting and retention; mentoring and role modeling, promote visibility, assist the Association of Lesbian and Gay Faculty and Staff, assist with policy issues (domestic partner benefits, etc.) and provide a safe space	Provides visibility for campus gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender communities and support for coming out process. Office formerly served as advisor to the groups, but now groups are free to choose their own advisor.

	When was office/dept./ group created?	What is the office/dept. staffing pattern?	Where does the office/dept. fall in college/ university structure?	Office/dept./ student organization funding source	Annual budget	What on-going services, programs are provided?	What role does the student organization fulfill on campus?
Eastern Michigan University: <i>office</i>	LGBT Resource Center 1993	One full-time staff member and one half-time graduate assistant	Dean of Students Office	General budget & student fees	Unknown	Educational support groups, campus-wide Speakers' Bureau, student advocacy, campus/community referrals, Welcome Center for LGBTQA and Questioning people, role models and mentors, LGBT people and allies working together, programming, campus-wide trainings regarding LGBT needs and inclusion	Multiple student groups exist; organizational relationship to the office unknown. Groups include GLSEN-EMY, Project Yes Players, INDIGO, Tri-Pride, LGBTQA Graduate Network, Sisters of Sappho, Men in Conversation

	When was office/dept./ group created?	What is the office/dept. staffing pattern?	Where does the office/dept. fall in college/ university structure?	Office/dept./ student organization funding source	Annual budget	What on-going services, programs are provided?	What role does the student organization fulfill on campus?
Indiana University <i>office</i>	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual & Transgender Services Office 1994	Full – time Coordinator, Asst. Coordinator, Library Coordinator, Programming Coordinator, five part-time student staff	Unit within Dean of Students Office	Funding from IU Foundation – donations from alumni & friends	\$5,000-8,000	Acts as resource center for University community, supplying educational resources on GLBT issues and offering information, support, and referral for GLBT individuals. Peer Counseling & referral for women & men who are coming out or dealing with family concerns, relationships, or religious matters, a lending library with books, CDs, newspapers, periodicals, and videos, resource list of community professionals sensitive to GLBT issues in areas including health, law, psychology, and religion. Provides personal support to s who have been harassed because of their sexual orientation.	Relationship to office is unknown. Student GLBT organizations include: OUT & the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Speakers Bureau

	When was office/dept./ group created?	What is the office/dept. staffing pattern?	Where does the office/dept. fall in college/ university structure?	Office/dept./ student organization funding source	Annual budget	What on-going services, programs are provided?	What role does the student organization fulfill on campus?
Kent State University: <i>Student group</i>	unknown	Advisor to student group, PRIDE KENT, is a volunteer .	Student Activities	Student Activities Office	KSU allocates money per program request	PRIDE KENT sponsors Pride Week programming and annual Drag Show	PRIDEKENT provides most of the LGBT programming and education for the Kent State University campus. Delta Lambda Phi provides some additional programming on issues related to Greek Life.
Miami University: <i>office</i>	1984 (student group); office begins in Fall 2003	1/2 time GLBT coordinator starting Fall 2003. This person may become student organization advisor	Staff member will report directly to Vice President for Student Affairs	Associated Student Government group allocations; Dean of Students; student fundraising	\$10,334 (Student Government), \$14,720 (Dean of Students), \$5,000 (raised by students): total budget = \$30,054	Resource library (500 books), LGBT awareness week, brings in outside speakers, conducts monthly programs, holds discussion panels	Support group and a visible presence for GLBT students and allies on campus.

	When was office/dept./ group created?	What is the office/dept. staffing pattern?	Where does the office/dept. fall in college/ university structure?	Office/dept./ student organization funding source	Annual budget	What on-going services, programs are provided?	What role does the student organization fulfill on campus?
Ohio State University <i>office</i>	Gay, Lesbian, Bi-Sexual and Transgender Student Services 1990	Fulltime Coordinator, three half-time graduate students	Housed in Multicultural Center which reports to both Academic and Student Affairs	General Budget (GB) & Diversity Action Plan (DAP)	\$60,000 (GB); \$31,000 from DAP for HERO program (see next column)	GLBT resource fair, GLBTIA History Month (October), National Coming Out Day, Creating Change Conference (scholarships offered to defer cost to attend), GLBTIA Awareness Weeks, Speaker's Bureau, Mentoring Program, "Out at Lunch" brownbag series, HERO Program (initiative to improve climate for OSU's GLBT community)	Three organizations are directly advised by the GLBT Student Services; others are loosely affiliated. Colours, Common Ground, FUSION, Gay and Bi-sexual Men's Support Group, GLBT Law Association, GLB Issues in Medicine Interest Group, GLBTIA Career Discussion Group at Ohio State, Grad Queers, Jewish Queers, Lavender Connection, Lesbian and Gay Veterinary Medicine Association, Out in Business, Queer Christians, TransMission.

	When was office/dept./ group created?	What is the office/dept. staffing pattern?	Where does the office/dept. fall in college/ university structure?	Office/dept./ student organization funding source	Annual budget	What on-going services, programs are provided?	What role does the student organization fulfill on campus?
Ohio University <i>office</i>	Office established in 1998.	Quarter-time coordinator for GLBT Programs through a collateral assignment with Residence Life	Student Affairs Division; reports to VPSA	Residence Life provides 75% of the salary for the staff member and 25% comes from the VPSA. The general budget is allocated as an annual budget line (not part of student budget process)	\$10,000	The office provides numerous programs including "Coming Out Week," "GLBT Pride Week," and co-sponsorship of lectures and performances open to the public	Unknown
University of Akron: <i>Student group</i>	Unknown	Student organization advisor is volunteer who is a full-time administrator	Not applicable	Student funding allocation group	\$3,000	The Vice President for Student Affairs' office sponsors an Ally SafeZone project that conducts training.	LGBT Union provides most of the education and intervention programs on campus
University of Maine at Farmington: <i>Student group</i>	Student group recognized some time in 1980s	A faculty member advises the student organization.	Unknown	Student Senate/ student activities fee	\$3,455	Student group provides variety of campus education programs (Drag-shows, "coming out day," etc.). A faculty member also offers a support group for students who are in the process of "coming out."	Provide support for GLBT students

	When was office/dept./ group created?	What is the office/dept. staffing pattern?	Where does the office/dept. fall in college/ university structure?	Office/dept./ student organization funding source	Annual budget	What on-going services, programs are provided?	What role does the student organization fulfill on campus?
University of Toledo: <i>Student group</i>	No office, but as of Fall 2003 the Office of Multicultural Affairs will begin offering campus programs for LGBT issues.	Office staffing pattern is undetermined as of yet.	The Multicultural Affairs office reports to the Vice President for Student Affairs.	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available