

Campus Climate Assessment For Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, & Transgender Persons

University Of Missouri
May, 2002

Executive Summary

- In an effort to identify lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals at University, participation in the assessment project was requested via an e-mail to the entire population of undergraduate students, faculty, staff, and administrators and to the LGBT listserv. individuals completed surveys. One hundred eighteen students, 30 faculty members, 73 staff members, and 2 administrators submitted surveys.
- The majority of respondents were Caucasian (88%), U.S. born citizens (92%), 22 years old and under (35%), and full-time students or employees (96%). Thirty-six percent identified as bisexual, 25 percent as gay, 23 percent as lesbian, and 13 percent identified as transgender. Thirty-one percent indicated that they were “out to everyone.”
- Thirteen percent of the respondents reported they feared for their physical safety because of their sexual orientation/gender identity and 58 percent concealed their sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid intimidation.
- Forty-seven respondents indicated they were the victims of harassment on campus. The harassment experienced was most often in the form of derogatory remarks (85%) and experienced more often by lesbians (37%), women (23%), faculty (30%), and professional students (33%). Respondents also reported that harassment occurred in public spaces on campus (55%), while working at a University job (43%), and while walking on campus (40%).
- The majority of respondents believed LGBT persons were likely to be harassed on campus and 20 percent feared for their personal safety due to their sexual orientation/gender identity.
- Fifty-five percent of the respondents rated the overall campus climate as homophobic and significant correlations were found between ratings of campus homophobia and the likelihood of 1) harassment of gay men, lesbians, and transgender persons and 2) concealing one’s sexual orientation to avoid discrimination and harassment.
- Only 14 percent of the respondents believed the University thoroughly addresses issues related to sexual orientation/gender identity, while 62 percent disagreed. Forty-nine percent felt that the curriculum does not adequately represents the contributions of LGBT people. About half of the respondents reported their classrooms or job sites accepted them as LGBT persons.
- Few respondents (11%) felt the University has visible leadership regarding sexual orientation/gender identity, while 63 percent disagreed. A majority of the respondents indicated that they were uncertain about whether the University has a rapid response system for incidents of LGBT harassment (69%) or LGBT discrimination (64%).

Campus Climate Assessment for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Persons

Institutions of higher education seek to create an environment characterized by equal access for all students, faculty and staff regardless of cultural differences, and where individuals are not just tolerated but valued. A welcoming and inclusive climate is grounded in respect, nurtured by dialogue and evidenced by a pattern of civil interaction. I believe that the first step in creating such an environment is to assess the current campus climate in order to identify issues and challenges and then to create ways for individuals, departments and the university to address them.

This report is an analysis of the data that was collected at the University of Missouri, assessing the climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender members of the academic community. I am grateful to the University community for your participation and support. In particular, I would like to thank Roger Worthington for his dedication and commitment to this project. I also would like to thank the Research Team members listed below for their work on the project:

Dale Musser	Sean Clouse
Laura Hacquard	Katherine Spencer
Raeona Nichols	Charlotte McCloskey
Michael Loewy	Rachel Navarro
Noor Azizan-Gardner	Stephanie Logan
Pablo Mendoza	

Finally, I would like to thank the following institutional funding sources for providing the resources to make this project a reality:

Dean of the College of Education; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; Vice Provost's Office of Minority Affairs and Faculty Development; MU Alumni Association; Division of Enrollment Management; Dean of The Graduate School; Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology; Center for Multicultural Research, Training and Consultation; Office of Multicultural Student Affairs; MU Libraries; Student Health Services; Dean of the School of Nursing; Dean of the School of Veterinary Sciences; Dean of the College of Business; MU LGBT Resource Center; The Women's Center; The Research Council.

I am hopeful that the results of this assessment will assist the University community in creating and maintaining an environment that respects individual needs, abilities, and potential. It is very important for all of us that a positive climate exists on our campuses, one that encourages attention to fairness and discourages expressions of injustice.

Respectfully,

Susan R. Rankin, Ph.D.
Primary Investigator
Senior Diversity Planning Analyst
328 Grange Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-8415
sxr2@psu.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	i
Introduction.....	1-2
Procedures.....	2-3
Description of the Sample.....	4
Campus Experiences.....	5-7
Feelings about Campus Climate.....	8
Campus Responses.....	9
References.....	10
Appendix A - Survey.....	11-13
Appendix B – Data Tables.....	14-23
Appendix C – Comments / Content Analysis.....	24-43

Introduction

One of the primary missions of higher education institutions is unearthing and disseminating knowledge. Academic communities expend a great deal of effort fostering an environment where this mission is nurtured, with the understanding that institutional climate has a profound effect on the academic community's ability to excel in research and scholarship (Bauer, 1998, Boyer, 1990; Peterson, 1990; Rankin, 1994, 1998; Tierney & Dilley, 1996). Recent investigations suggest that the climate on college campuses, not only effects the creation of knowledge, but also has a significant impact on members of the academic community who, in turn, contribute to the creation of the campus environment (Bauer, 1998, Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Peterson, 1990; Rankin, 1994, 1998, 1999; Tierney, 1990). Therefore, preserving a climate that offers equal learning opportunities for all students and academic freedom for all faculty - an environment free from discrimination - should be one of the primary responsibilities of educational institutions. Yet, the climate on many college campuses is not equally supportive of all of its members.

In response, the University of Missouri-Columbia participated in an investigation to examine the climate on campus. The internal assessment will help to lay the groundwork for future initiatives¹. This report is organized to correspond with the survey questions (see Appendix A) with the exception of *Part 3 (Background Information)*, which is presented in the *Description of the Sample*.

¹ This report reflects only the data collected in Phase I of a 5-phase study at the University of Missouri. Additional reports will be created and distributed by the Research Team.

appearing to be homosexual. Like racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression, heterosexism is manifested in societal customs and individual attitudes and behaviors.

Heterosexism is prevalent in our educational institutions and thwarts creativity.

According to Harry (1995), anti-gay incidents “have a greater impact on its victim than do other forms of victimization. These include higher levels of depression and withdrawal, increase in sleep difficulties, anxiety, and loss of confidence” (p. 353).

Therefore, there is a vital need for the reduction of anti-gay discrimination prevalent in educational institutions in order to foster maximum creativity and productivity by students and faculty.

In response, the University of Missouri participated in an investigation to examine the climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender members of the campus community.

The internal assessment will help to lay the groundwork for future initiatives.¹ The report is organized to correspond with the survey questions (see Appendix A) with the exception of *Part 4* of the questionnaire (*Background Information*), which is presented in the *Description of the Sample*.

Procedures

Due to the difficulty in identifying members of the LGBT community, the following methods were used to solicit participation in the study during the spring semester, 2001.

- An advance letter was sent to all faculty, staff and students from the Chancellor and Provost of the University announcing the study, noting its importance, establishing the support of the

¹ This report reflects only the data collected in Phase I of a 5-phase study at the University of Missouri. Additional reports will be created and distributed by the Research Team.

University Administration and encouraging participation (see attached). A press release was sent to local print and broadcast media (four print stories regarding the climate study appeared in three separate newspapers (two university-based and one community) and three broadcast media interviews were conducted.

- Emails soliciting participation were sent to a random sample of the UMC student population. All faculty and staff (with access to email) received an email requesting participation. Targeted groups, such as racial/ethnic minorities, LGBT individuals and persons with disabilities were also sent an email participation request. All emails included a URL to a web-based version of the Campus Climate Study. The web address was only available to those who received the email requests.
- A single mass e-mail containing information about the study and request for target group participation was sent. Only contact information for the climate study team and locations of lock boxes were provided (not the URL for the web-based survey in order to reduce the possibility of malicious responding).
- Meetings of campus student organizations serving the target groups were attended by research team members to solicit participation. Paper-and-pencil surveys were distributed (approximately 30) at these meetings and leaflets containing the URL for the online survey were also distributed.
- Paper and pencil surveys were distributed at various locations across campus with lock-boxes for participants to also deposit completed surveys (e.g., Black Culture Center, Women's Center, LGBT Resource Center, International Center, Office of Multicultural Affairs, Disability Services, University Bookstore, Center for Multicultural Research, Training and Consultation, and the Student Success Center).
- Additionally, blue-collar staff were approached in staff meetings to request participation. Paper-and-pencil surveys were distributed to these staff (approximately 50).

Eighty undergraduate students, 38 graduate/professional students, 30 faculty members, 73 staff members, and 2 administrators submitted surveys. One respondent did not identify their position. All surveys were completed either on-line via a web based survey, or through a paper and pencil survey which was machine scanned and tabulated for appropriate analysis. Confidentiality of individual respondents was insured by the anonymous nature of the survey.

Description of the Sample

The majority of respondents were Caucasian (88%, n = 198); 6 percent identified as African American/Black (n = 13), 5 percent as Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 10), and 4 percent as Chicano/Latino/Hispanic (n = 9) (see Table 1 in Appendix B). The majority of participants identified as U.S. born citizens (92%) (Table 2), and 22 years old and under (35%) (Table 5). Thirty-six percent of the respondents were undergraduate students, 17 percent were graduate/professional students, 13 percent were faculty, and 34 percent were staff/administrators (Table 6). Ninety-six percent of the respondents indicated that they were full-time students or employees (Table 7) and 12 people reported the presence of a disability (Table 8). Of the students who responded to the survey, 33 percent (n = 39) lived in the residence halls and 71 percent (n = 84) lived off campus (Table 9).

Thirty-six percent (n = 80) identified as bisexual, 25 percent (n = 55) identified as gay, 23 percent (n = 51) identified as lesbian, 4 percent (n = 8) identified as heterosexual, and 13 percent (n = 30) were uncertain of their sexual orientation (Table 3). Fifty-two percent of the respondents were female (n = 116), 42 percent were male (n = 95), and 6 percent were transgender (n = 17) (Table 4). In response to the question regarding the extent of how “out” one was personally and professionally, 31 percent (n = 69) indicated that they were out to everyone, 19 percent (n = 43) were out to family and/or friends, 39 percent (n = 86) were out to a few close friends/family members, and 8 percent reported that they were totally closeted (n = 17) (Table 10). Forty-two percent indicated that they were most attracted to men, 39 percent were most attracted to women, and 18 percent were attracted to both men and women (Table 11).

Campus Experiences

Thirteen percent of the respondents reported that, during the past year, they feared for their physical safety because of their sexual orientation/gender identity and 58 percent concealed their sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid intimidation (Table 12). Five respondents acknowledged they had been denied employment due to their sexual orientation/gender identity. Due to a fear of negative consequences, harassment, and/or discrimination, 41 percent of the respondents avoided disclosing their sexual orientation/gender identity to an instructor, teaching assistant, administrator, or supervisor during the last year (Table 12).

Experiences with Harassment

Twenty-one percent of the respondents (n = 47) indicated they had been harassed due to their sexual orientation/gender identity (Table 13). Further analysis examined the positive responses (participants who indicated they had personally experienced harassment) by demographic categories (see following tables).

Relationship Between Experienced Harassment and Position

Experienced Harassment	Position					
	Undergraduate Student	Professional Student	Graduate Student	Staff	Administrator	Faculty
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Yes	18.8 (15)	33.3 (3)	10.3 (3)	21.9 (16)	0.0 (0)	30.0 (9)
No	81.3 (65)	66.7 (6)	89.7 (26)	78.1 (57)	100.0 (2)	70.0 (21)

Relationship Between Experienced Harassment and Race/Ethnicity

Experienced Harassment	Race/Ethnicity					
	African American or Black	Asian or Pacific Islander	Middle Easterner	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Chicano or Latino or Hispanic	White or Caucasian
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Yes	7.7 (1)	10.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	60.0 (3)	22.2 (2)	23.2 (46)
No	92.3 (12)	90.0 (9)	75.0 (3)	40.0 (2)	77.8 (7)	76.8 (152)

Relationship Between Experienced Harassment and Sexual Identity

Experienced Harassment	Sexual Identity				
	Bisexual	Gay	Lesbian	Heterosexual	Uncertain
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Yes	15.0 (12)	23.6 (13)	37.3 (19)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (3)
No	85.0 (68)	76.4 (42)	62.7 (32)	100.0 (8)	90.0 (27)

Relationship Between Experienced Harassment and Gender

Experienced Harassment	Gender		
	Female	Male	Transgender
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Yes	23.3 (27)	18.9 (18)	15.4 (2)
No	76.7 (89)	81.1 (77)	84.6 (11)

Relationship Between Experienced Harassment and Disclosure of Sexual Identity

Experienced Harassment	Sexual Identity				
	Totally Closeted	Out to a few close friends	Out to a few friends/family members	Out to family and friends	Out to Everyone
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Yes	11.8 (2)	12.5 (5)	21.7 (10)	30.2 (13)	23.2 (16)
No	88.2 (15)	87.5 (35)	78.3 (36)	69.8 (30)	76.8 (53)

Among the sample of students, 19 percent (n = 15) of undergraduates and 32 percent of graduate/professional students (n = 6) indicated they experienced harassment. Twenty-

two percent (n = 16) of the staff members who responded reported they had experienced harassment and 30 percent of the faculty members (n =9) admitted they were the victims of harassment. In terms of race/ethnicity, one of the 13 African Americans, one of the 10 Asian/Pacific Islanders, one of the four Middle Easterners, two of the 9 Chicano/Latino/Hispanic respondents, and three of the five American Indians/Native Alaskans were harassed due their sexual orientation/gender identity. Twenty-three percent of Whites/Caucasians were harassed. Among the responses by individuals of various sexual identities, a higher percentage of lesbians (37%) experienced harassment than did bisexual persons (15%) or gay men (24%). In regard to gender, women experienced more harassment (23%) than did men (19%) or transgender persons (15%). Additional analyses regarding experienced harassment and degree of “outness” indicated the majority of the respondents who experienced harassment were “out to family and friends” (30%, n = 13).

Derogatory remarks were the most common form of harassment (85%). Other types of harassment included verbal harassment or threats (40%), graffiti (38%), pressure to conceal one’s sexual orientation/gender identity (36%), and written comments (26%). respondents reported that they had been physically assaulted (Table 14).

The most common locations where harassment occurred were in public spaces on campus (55%), while working at a University job (43%), and while walking on campus (40%) (Table 15). Fifty-seven percent of the respondents identified students as the source of the harassment (Table 16).

Feelings about Campus Climate

The majority of respondents felt that gay men (66%), lesbians (57%), and transgender persons (71%) were likely to be harassed on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity. Twenty percent of the respondents (n = 44) admitted they feared for their personal safety due to their sexual orientation/gender identity.

Respondents also acknowledged concealing their sexual orientations/gender identities to avoid harassment (47%) and discrimination (46%). Twenty-one percent of respondents indicated that they avoided areas of campus where LGBT persons congregated for fear of being labeled (Table 17). These responses are consistent with the findings from question 3-8 in which percent of the respondents rated the overall campus climate as homophobic (Table 19). Further analysis yielded significant correlations, suggesting a moderately strong, positive relationship between ratings of campus homophobia and the likelihood of harassment of gay men ($r = .501$), lesbians ($r = .551$), bisexual ($r = .492$) and transgender persons ($r = .480$). Analyses also revealed a moderately strong, positive relationship between ratings of campus homophobia and the likelihood of concealing one's sexual orientation to avoid discrimination ($r = .409$) and harassment ($r = .392$). Selected correlation coefficients are provided in the following table.

Correlations Between Feelings About Campus & Ratings of Campus Homophobia Climate

Feelings About Campus	Rating of Campus Homophobia
Harassment of gay men	.501 ¹
Harassment of lesbians	.551 ¹
Harassment of bisexual persons	.492 ¹
Harassment of transgender persons	.480 ¹
Conceal sexual ID to avoid harassment	.392 ¹
Conceal sexual ID to avoid discrimination	.409 ¹

¹p= .05

Campus Responses

Participants were also asked to respond to several questions about the University's response to issues and concerns of the LGBT community (Table 18). Respondents were divided on the whether or not the University was addressing issues related to sexual orientation/gender identity. Fourteen percent agreed that the University addresses these concerns, while 62 percent disagreed. Eleven percent of the respondents believed the University has visible leadership regarding sexual orientation/gender identity; 63 percent disagreed. Forty-three percent (n = 97) were unsure if the curriculum adequately represents the contributions of LGBT people, while 49 percent (n = 109) felt the curriculum does not represent the contributions of LGBT people. Just over half of the respondents believed others in their classrooms or at their job sites accepted them as LGBT persons. The majority of respondents were uncertain about whether the University has a rapid response system for incidents of LGBT harassment (69%) or LGBT discrimination (64%).

References

- Bauer, K. (1998). Campus Climate: Understanding the Critical Components of Today's Colleges and Universities. New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. (1990). Campus life: In search of community. Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Gross, L. & Aurand, S. (1999). Commonwealth of Pennsylvania LGBT Discrimination Survey. A Project of the Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force.
- Kuh, G. & Whitt, E.J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Harry, J. (1990). Conceptualizing anti-gay violence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5 (3), 350-358.
- Peterson, M. & Spencer, M. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate, in W. Tierney (Ed.), Assessing academic climates and cultures. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Rankin, S. (1999). Queering campus: Understanding and transforming climate. Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 9, (4): 29-38.
- Rankin, S. (1998). Campus climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered students, faculty, and staff: Assessment and strategies for change. In R. Sanlo (Ed.). Working with lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students: A guide for administrators and faculty (p. 277-284). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Company.
- Rankin, S. (1994). The perceptions of heterosexual faculty and administrators toward gay men and lesbians. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and the lesbian existence. Signs, 5 (4),631-650.
- Tierney, W.G. & Dilley, P. (1996). Constructing knowledge: Educational research and gay and lesbian studies. In W. Pinar (Ed.). Queer theory in education. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishing.
- Tierney, W.G. (Ed.). (1990). Assessing academic climates and cultures. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Appendix A
Survey Instrument

Appendix B

Data Tables¹

¹Questions are restated and the number of the question on the survey is repeated after the question in parentheses.

Missouri LGBT Tables

Table 1
With what racial/ethnic group do you identify? (4-7)

Race/ethnic identification	%	(n)
African American/Black	5.8	(13)
Asian/Pacific Islander	4.5	(10)
Middle Eastern	1.8	(4)
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2.2	(5)
Chicano/Latino/Hispanic	4.0	(9)
White/Caucasian	88.4	(198)

Table 2
What is your citizenship status? (4-8)

Citizenship status	%	(n)
U.S. citizen—born in the United States	92.0	(206)
U.S. citizen—naturalized	.9	(2)
Immigrant	1.8	(4)
International	5.4	(12)

Table 3
What is your sexual identity? (4-2)

Sexual Identity	%	(n)
Bisexual	35.7	(80)
Gay	24.6	(55)
Lesbian	22.8	(51)
Heterosexual	3.6	(8)
uncertain	13.4	(30)

Table 4
What is your gender? (4-1)

Gender	%	(n)
Female	51.8	(116)
Male	42.4	(95)
Transgender	5.8	(13)

Table 5
What is your age? (4-3)

Age	%	(n)
22 or under	35.3	(79)
23 to 32	26.3	(59)
33 to 42	19.6	(44)
43 to 52	16.1	(36)
53 or over	2.7	(6)

Table 6
What is your position? (4-4)

Position	%	(n)
Undergraduate student	35.7	(80)
Professional Student	4.0	(9)
Graduate Student	12.9	(29)
Staff	32.6	(73)
Administrator	.9	(2)
Faculty	13.4	(30)

Table 7
Are you full-time or part-time? (4-5)

<u>Status</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>(n)</u>
Full-time	95.5	(214)
Part-time	4.5	(10)

Table 8
Do you have a disability that substantially limits a major life activity such as seeing, hearing, learning, and/or walking? (4-6)

<u>Disability</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>(n)</u>
Yes	5.4	(12)
No	94.6	(212)

Table 9
If you are a student, where do you live? (4-11)

<u>Residence</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>(n)</u>
Residence hall	33.1	(39)
Other campus housing	2.5	(3)
Off campus	71.2	(84)
Family student housing	1.6	(2)
Fraternity/sorority house	1.6	(2)

Table 10

To what extent are you out, personally and professionally? (4-9)

Continuum of being out	%	(n)
Closeted	7.6	(17)
Out to a few close friends	17.9	(40)
Out to a few friends/family members	20.5	(46)
Out to family and friends	19.2	(43)
Out to everyone personally and professionally	30.8	(69)

Table 11

To whom are you most attracted? (4-10)

Attraction	%	(n)
Women	38.8	(87)
Men	42.0	(94)
Both men and women	18.3	(41)

Table 12

Within the last year, have you experienced the following? (1-1 through 1-4)

Event	Yes		No	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Feared for my physical safety because of sexual orientation/gender identity	13.4	(30)	86.2	(193)
Concealed my sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid intimidation	57.6	(129)	42.0	(94)
Avoided disclosing my sexual orientation/gender identity to an instructor, TA, administrator, or supervisor due to fear of negative consequences, harassment, or discrimination	41.1	(92)	58.0	(130)
Been denied University/College employment or promotion due to my sexual orientation/gender identity	2.2	(5)	96.4	(216)

Table 13

Within the last year, were you a victim of harassment due to your sexual orientation/gender identity? (1-5)

Harassment	%	(n)
Yes	21.0	(47)
No	79.0	(177)

Table 14

In what form was this harassment? (1-6)

Form	%	(n)
Derogatory remarks	85.1	(40)
Threats of exposure of sexual orientation/gender ID	2.1	(1)
Pressure to be silent about sexual orientation/gender ID	36.2	(17)
Verbal harassment or threats	40.4	(19)
Denial of services	10.6	(5)
Written comments	25.5	(12)
Graffiti	38.2	(18)
Physical threat	8.5	(4)
Physical assault	0.0	(0)
other	30.0	(14)

Table 15
Where did this harassment occur? (1-7)

Location	%	(n)
Classroom	23.4	(11)
Residence hall	21.3	(10)
Campus office	17.0	(8)
Public space on campus	55.3	(26)
While working at a College/University job	42.5	(20)
While walking on campus	40.4	(19)
Campus event	15.0	(7)

Table 16
Who was the source of this harassment? (1-8)

Source	%	(n)
Student	57.4	(27)
Faculty	21.3	(10)
Teaching assistant	2.1	(1)
Resident assistant	0.0	(0)
Administrator	17.0	(8)
Staff member	30.0	(14)
Campus police	4.3	(2)
don't know	42.5	(20)

Table 17

In your opinion, how likely are these events? (2-1 through 2-8)

Event	Very unlikely		unlikely		Uncertain		likely		Very likely	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Harassment of gay men on campus	1.8	(4)	9.8	(22)	22.3	(50)	42.9	(96)	22.8	(51)
Harassment of lesbians on campus	2.2	(5)	13.8	(31)	26.3	(59)	42.9	(96)	14.3	(32)
Harassment of bisexual persons on campus	4.9	(11)	15.6	(35)	37.5	(84)	29.9	(67)	12.1	(27)
Harassment of transgender persons on campus	1.8	(4)	3.6	(8)	22.8	(51)	29.5	(66)	41.1	(92)
Fear for my personal safety due to sexual orientation/gender identity	30.4	(68)	33.5	(75)	15.2	(34)	18.3	(41)	1.3	(3)
Conceal my sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid harassment	19.6	(44)	23.7	(53)	8.9	(20)	27.7	(62)	18.8	(42)
Conceal my sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid discrimination	19.2	(43)	22.3	(50)	10.3	(23)	27.2	(61)	19.2	(43)
Avoid areas of campus where LGBT persons congregate for fear of being labeled	42.9	(96)	28.1	(63)	7.1	(16)	13.8	(31)	6.7	(15)

Table 18
Attitudes about College/University (3-14 through 3-7)

Issue	Strongly agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
The College/University thoroughly addresses campus issues related to sexual orientation/gender identity	1.8	(4)	12.1	(27)	23.2	(52)	35.3	(79)	26.8	(60)
The College/University has visible administrative leadership regarding sexual orientation/gender ID issues	.4	(1)	10.7	(24)	25.0	(56)	34.4	(77)	28.6	(64)
The curriculum adequately represents the contributions of LGBT persons	.9	(2)	6.3	(14)	43.3	(97)	31.7	(71)	17.0	(38)
The classroom climate or my job site is accepting of LGBT persons	8.0	(18)	43.3	(97)	24.1	(54)	18.8	(42)	4.9	(11)
The College/University provides visible resources on LGBT issues and concerns	3.6	(8)	46.4	(104)	19.2	(43)	23.7	(53)	6.3	(14)
The College/University has a rapid response system for incidents of LGBT harassment	.9	(2)	4.9	(11)	69.2	(155)	16.1	(36)	8.0	(18)
The College/University has a rapid response system for incidents of LGBT discrimination	1.3	(3)	4.9	(11)	64.3	(144)	14.3	(32)	13.4	(30)

Table 19

Rate the general campus climate using the following scale: (3-8)

Characteristic	1		2		3		4		5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Friendly/Hostile	14.3	(32)	45.1	(101)	31.3	(70)	8.5	(19)	0.0	(0)
Communicative/ Reserved	7.1	(16)	33.9	(76)	28.1	(63)	22.3	(50)	7.6	(17)
Concerned/Indifferent	6.3	(14)	22.8	(51)	36.2	(81)	22.3	(50)	11.2	(25)
Respectful/Disrespectful	10.3	(23)	32.6	(73)	37.9	(85)	13.4	(30)	4.9	(11)
Cooperative/Uncooperative	8.9	(20)	32.1	(72)	34.8	(78)	18.3	(41)	4.0	(9)
Competitive/Noncompetitive	11.6	(26)	35.3	(79)	40.2	(90)	8.9	(20)	2.7	(6)
Improving/Worsening	8.0	(18)	37.5	(84)	44.6	(100)	7.6	(17)	.9	(2)
Accessible to persons with disabilities/Inaccessible to persons with disabilities	20.1	(45)	36.2	(81)	26.3	(59)	11.2	(25)	3.6	(8)
Non-racist/Racist	8.5	(19)	20.5	(46)	34.4	(77)	27.7	(62)	7.6	(17)
Non-sexist/Sexist	6.7	(15)	20.1	(45)	34.8	(78)	28.1	(63)	9.4	(21)
Non-homophobic/ Homophobic	3.1	(7)	12.1	(27)	29.0	(65)	38.8	(87)	16.1	(36)

Appendix C

Survey Comments – Content Analysis

The State of the University of Missouri's LGBT Campus Climate

More than 65 respondents commented about the state of and ways to improve the University of Missouri's climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) persons at the Columbia campus. The remarks indicated that respondents feel the University is beginning to address LGBT issues and concerns and in instituting policies to eradicate discriminatory practices. Respondents, however, also noted that the University has a long way to go before LGBT employees and students feel truly understood, accepted, and supported on campus. The following quote illustrates both sentiments: "The atmosphere on campus is much improved over what it was 25 to 30 years ago - when there were mirrors in restrooms and people were threatened with expulsion on the basis of gossip and rumors -- however - homophobia is still alive and well here."

Respondents provided a few examples of instances where the University of Missouri Columbia has demonstrated its commitment to inclusivity. For example, one individual wrote, "There have been efforts to provide support and increase understanding of some of the issues. Residential Life has gone out of their way to provide sensitivity training for staff and students - and to hire openly gay staff members. Several departments have asked GLBT student panels to do presentations in their classrooms. The counseling center also provides good, objective support for those seeking counseling. The University even provides a small space for a LGBT Resource Center." Others commended the University for beginning to address LGBT issues by soliciting their feedback in the assessment associated with this survey.

Almost every respondent wanted to see the University reinstate sexual orientation as part of its anti-discrimination policy, which has excluded sexual orientation since 1999. Some respondents – both employees and students – felt betrayed when sexual orientation was removed from the policy statement. Many of those individuals came to UMC knowing that LGBT people were protected under the anti-discrimination policy, but now feel

vulnerable to the notions of homophobic supervisors, students, and peers. One such person commented, “First thing this campus could do to move forward would be to include sexual orientation/identity to the non-discrimination clause. When students, faculty, and staff arrive on this campus they scan the horizon for signs of acceptance and validation. When they see that sexual orientation is blatantly not present in our statement of whom we protect, it speaks volumes to GLBT folks as well as to heterosexuals. It implies that GLBT folks are not legitimate! It also leaves us disempowered to speak out against policies, practices, and procedures that disenfranchise us.” Several respondents discounted the administration’s alternative to including sexual orientation in the non-discrimination policy, and believed “The University should scrap executive order #3, the ambiguous language of which offers neither safety or comfort to anyone. Executive Order #3 is both hateful and insulting to the GLBT members of the University Community.”

Some respondents were dismayed about UMC’s LGBT climate and quite critical of the administration, Board of Curators, and policies. Many individuals called for the provision of domestic partner benefits, including spousal accommodation for new hires, health benefits, “married” student housing, bereavement leave, and survivor benefits. For example, one respondent reflecting the majority of opinions remarked, “I think that same-sex partner benefits should be offered. I believe that if you truly want to create a positive environment where discrimination based upon sex, race, gender, identification, or sexual orientation is minimized, then you should treat everyone as equals.” Likewise, another person believed current policies have been “...essentially discounting our existence and ignoring our need for health insurance or survivor benefits for our partners – benefits that you readily offer your heterosexual employees. While this form of discrimination is indeed sanctioned by the Federal Government, any institution which is serious about being completely inclusive of sexual minorities, needs to address the issue on a civil rights/minority rights level, not a majority rule level.”

Several people reported experiencing or observing harassment or discrimination on campus based on sexual identity. For instance, an instructor wrote, “Even though I have

not been directly harassed on this campus I know many undergraduates who have.” More than a few respondents said they conceal their sexual identities to avoid the backlash of homophobic students, staff, administrators, and faculty. Said one respondent, “...I am somewhat closeted as an instructor. Students may guess or wonder about by sexual orientation based upon my appearance but I haven't outted myself. I fear exposure because of student evaluations. I have seen and heard first hand the conservative ideology of many of our students and I fear reprisals in the form of bad course evaluations.” Another explained, “... the climate here is something like being in the military -- it's 'don't ask don't tell' and PLEASE, DON'T TELL.... While I have no desire to hide anything, I can see that some of my coworkers are extremely uncomfortable if I say something like "on Saturday my partner and I went to the movies." So I do 'hide' myself. I find this to be extremely oppressive, marginalizing and chilling.” Many respondents identified the lack of domestic partner benefits as the primary mechanism by which the University has discriminated against LGBT employees and students.

Others agreed that LGBT issues and queer people in general were marginalized on campus. Some respondents noted that the University ought to support the LGBT Resource Office as it does other campus offices. To that end, one person wrote, “Maybe if the LGBT Resource Center had an office that was bigger than a closet, then I would feel as though it were more a part of the campus.”

In addition, a few individuals commented on the survey itself. While all who provided feedback on the instrument appreciated the University soliciting their input, some respondents made suggestions for rewriting particular questions or addressing additional topics.

Improving the Campus Climate

Several ideas were presented to improve UMC's campus climate for LGBT students and employees, the foremost of which was including sexual orientation in the University's anti-discrimination statement. Respondents also advocated for more financial support and resources dedicated to LGBT issues, domestic partner benefits, educational workshops and speakers, social programming, equitable housing, and curriculum development. Many individuals called for the administration to take a more active, vocal, and supportive stance on diversity and LGBT issues.

Overwhelmingly, the respondents called for the University to extend benefits to partners of LGBT faculty and staff and students (e.g., health insurance, bereavement leave, tuition courtesy, gym privileges). Although individuals in favor of domestic partner benefits were interested in the tangible advantages of such benefits, the respondents also argued that the lack of benefits for LGBT partners reflects the discriminatory nature of the University and its policies. In contrast, approving domestic partner benefits would demonstrate that the administration and Board of Curators are truly in favor of diversity and equity. For example, one person wrote, "We could begin at least by getting rid of those things that most clearly structurally exclude and discriminate against LGBT. Most obvious to me is that the University should include all employees in the benefits package in an egalitarian way."

To increase visibility of queer people on campus, respondents suggested recruiting and providing outreach to LGBT faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Many people are reluctant or afraid to come out on campus and would like to see more visible support services, clear anti-discrimination policies, and swift responses to reports of discrimination or harassment. In addition, some individuals thought the LGBT Resource Center should receive University funding and/or larger, more equitable quarters. In addition to clear and equitable policies, an often-cited proposal was to provide diversity/sensitivity training for the University's different academic and administrative

units and the student population. Respondents also sought to incorporate LGBT-related issues into the general curriculum.

University of Missouri-Columbia LGBT Survey Comments

- This is my first semester at MU, I haven't met many people, & those I have met are unaware of my orientation. I haven't noticed any overt discrimination, but I don't know what the climate is for those who are out, whether any covert discrimination takes place or not.
- This university should quit behaving as if having LGBT students, faculty and staff is some sort of dirty little secret. Our administration should grow a spine and join the dozens of other universities and private corporations who have added sexual orientation to their policies of nondiscrimination, not just because its the right thing to do but because they understand that employees/students who feel safe, secure, supported and valued are more productive, have lower absentee rates, are less likely to leave their jobs or quit school, and are less likely to have emotional problems or problems with substance abuse. Two words: **INCLUSION NOW!**
- The University system discriminates against people with same, sex partners by not allowing University employees to cover their partners in the University insurance policies. My partner and I have been together for 13 years and have made a life commitment to one another, yet we have less rights in the UM system than others I know who have been together less time. When I sought employment here, the posters I saw had "sexual orientation" in the list of items that MU does not discriminate against which is the primary reason I applied; however, in recent years, this has been removed. Shameful. I am so very, very tired of the discrimination I face....that I can't take care of MY family by providing insurance to cover MY partner. I am MY family's breadwinner, yet MU's discrimination hinders MY ability to provide for all the needs of MY family.
- There a number of other professionals who provide psychotherapy. Clinical social workers provide more mental health care in this country than psychologists, psychiatrists, and psychiatric nurses combined. When I think of "psychologists" I think of psychological testing, and focusing on the intrapsychic issues. LGBT's may need counseling to address some of the environmental issues they are faced with. I would be more inclined to recommend they seek help from clinical social workers. There were no questions regarding the dilemmas of LGBT faculty regarding whether they felt safe to be "out" to their students. Or how their sexual orientation may affect their tenure review? Another problem with this survey is that it does not recognize that "coming out" is a process. LGBT people must make decisions daily on who to be out to and who not to be. Many of those decisions have to do with safety issues. I do not choose to be "out" with everyone I meet or work with. Nor is it appropriate either for heterosexual or LGBT people to discuss their sexual orientations all the time. I also found the questions about professional help seeking troubling because it had an unspoken assumption that LGBT people need counseling. Some of the most well adjusted people I know are LGBT. All campuses should fund a full, time LGBT coordinator for support and awareness programs for students, faculty and staff.
- I think that same, sex partner benefits should be offered. I believe that if you truly want to create a positive environment where discrimination based upon sex, race, gender, identification, or sexual orientation is minimized, then you should treat everyone as

equals. Homosexuals do not have the luxury of "marriage"; we cannot go into the courthouse and get a little certificate saying that we are now, officially, a government-recognized couple. That does not mean that GLBT people are any less committed to their life-partner; it just means that I cannot officially call my partner my "wife".

- An explicate policy of inclusion would be helpful. LGBT faculty, staff, students and prospective faculty, staff and students need to know that UMC is a supportive and protective educational and occupational environment. Required classes in diversity sensitivity should be required. Resources should be readily available and funding for inclusive programs should be provided at a level that will provide adequately for the LGBT members of our university community.
- As a bisexual person, I feel that I am not a part of the LGBT community at times as lesbians and gays often ostracize bisexual persons for not being fully committed to same, sex, only relationships. Bisexual persons are often thought of as promiscuous and a poor risk for relationships. Because I do not exhibit stereotypical traits of someone who IS queer (we all know the stereotypes), I tend to hear homophobic people's negative comments about queer, identified persons or people who are even thought to be non, heterosexual. Having this behind, the, scenes view amongst staff and students is UGLY and frustrating. I keep my mouth shut usually so that I do not lose ground either personally or professionally.
- When I came to this campus I was encouraged that sexual orientation was protected in the nondiscrimination statement. I believed the campus to be a progressive, safe environment where administration was supportive. Clearly this is not the case. Statements made by top administrators on this campus show that LGBT concerns are not taken seriously. We no longer have protection and I personally feel betrayed. Even though I have not been directly harassed on this campus I know many undergraduates who have. The administration has sent a message to the entire campus that LGBT people don't deserve protection. This is an outrage. I am in a unique position on campus. I am a graduate student and an instructor. While I am openly nonheterosexual as a student I am somewhat closeted as an instructor. Students may guess or wonder about by sexual orientation based upon my appearance but I haven't outted myself. I fear exposure because of student evaluations. I have seen and heard first hand the conservative ideology of many of our students and I fear reprisals in the form of bad course evaluations. I have had a few students come to me for support/counseling on LGBT issues. It is important that we have visibly open faculty/instructors for students to not only relate to but for consultation as well. But, faculty and instructors need protection and support from administration on this campus. We don't have this now. Another key issue for me personally is lack of quality health care. My partner of 13 years is a staff employee on this campus. If our relationship were recognized by this campus (such as domestic partner benefits) I could get health care coverage through her employment. As it is I have been without major coverage for 5 years. This is a terrible risk and one that could be easily avoided if my relationship was afforded the protection that heterosexual couple's have. Lastly, I believe campus administration is limiting the quality of applicants and employees (faculty and staff) on this campus by not affording protection through inclusion of sexual orientation in the nondiscrimination statement and by denying domestic partner benefits. I am currently on the job market and these issues will have an impact on where I take a job. The University of Missouri cannot afford to fall behind other universities. We must stay competitive. There are things this campus can do to improve the climate of the campus. But it has to start from the top. I know that most of

the colleges, faculty and staff support inclusion. Campus administrators could take an important first step in showing support/concern for LGBT students/workers by reinstating "sexual orientation" as a protected status in the nondiscrimination statement. Thank you

- Include "sexual orientation" in the non-discrimination language for the campus and the system. Include same, sex partners as equal to heterosexual partners in negotiations for spousal accommodation and insurance coverage / benefits.
- The campus doesn't acknowledge the LGBT population. That is evident by the differences in resources distributed to the different minority population centers. Since this is a hidden minority, it's even more important to create programs which reach out to those students who are struggling with this issue. The lack of inclusion in the non-discrimination policy is a moral and religious statement which condemns and marginalizes the LGBT population. I am very proud of my affiliation with Mizzou outside of this area. As a member of this institution of higher education I am embarrassed to speak with other colleagues about these issues. Sometimes the administration needs to look beyond the money that alumni are donating or other political pressures and do the right thing. Please reconsider the stance on these issues. We're here, in fear, get through to us!
- The non-discrimination policy really needs to include sexual orientation. I don't believe there would be much of a change in enforcing policy, but that inclusion makes a strong statement about who should feel welcome on this campus. Years ago, sexual orientation was included in the UMC policy and then they took it back out to match the rest of the University of Missouri. What kind of a message does that show? Students applying to this university actually look for that clause, at least I know I did when I applied. The university could strongly benefit from offering LGBT culture oriented classes and having faculty positions in this area. Thank you for offering this climate survey opportunity. I hope it can help to bring about some needed changes.
- My sophomore year (two years ago) the LGBT society had social events that I went to...and they were wonderful. I don't know if they still have those, but it seems to me that the University support of such offerings have dwindled. The best "coming, out" experience for me, was a support group offered by the counseling center, that brought a number of us together each week to discuss our lives. That really helped me! If that would be offered again, I think our "climate" would improve. And if we could bring in a really good speaker or two, that would be great.
- The questions that begin with 'recently' threw me. I've been aware of my orientation for years so nothing is recent. Even if the sentiment is true, I did not choose 'agree' due to the recently time frame. I am relatively new to this campus (<1 year) so did not know the answers to some of the questions about openness of the climate. The fact of this survey is positive. Perhaps if I read about gay/lesbians issues on a routine basis I'd be more aware that the issue was being considered at all times.
- Just promote diversity in every sense of the word, and make sure you have staff members supporting diversity as well. Also, a UM system with sexual orientation included in its nondiscrimination acts would be nice. I think that this campus has done a pretty good job of at least providing an LGBT center, as well as organizations for those who are out enough to take part in these types of activities. Also, having "safe places" for those who

are LGBT to turn, for instances CA's and other campus staff is very encouraging and shows that there are places that LGBT community can go in a time of need, or questioning.

- The last section is too narrow in that it seems to focus on undergrads (18, 23 years) and does not allow other perceptions/attitudes to come through, thus, while I have always know that I am bi, I did not feel safe until the last few years (moving to Columbia) and it was then that I should have answered such a survey. Now it is not as pertinent. Further, when it comes to questions re: professors, etc., some are ok with it & some are not. So I leave it on a "need to know" basis, or with whom am I speaking. Otherwise, it is simply none of their business how I am living my life. It may be noteworthy to ask about addictions/mental health issues in conjunction with this, further, the part about who does know, I could not do a mother & father box, only one would leave a check in it & there were 2 extended family boxes. I have a hard time grouping these things as my father died (but would have been sooooo supportive) when I was 20 & my stepfather is too narrow to need to know...still, we have a good relationship so he probably does, I just choose to not put him on the spot. Especially since I am too busy right now to choose to engage in a relationship. I have found that professors often 'profess' their open, mindedness but are quite sexist in general behavior/attitude and close, minded in many areas of social import. Patriarchal would be a good descriptor. There is more, like history of & discovery that need to be addressed. Feel free to contact me...since this is a confidential survey, my email address is [address].
- I think the campus is doing a lot of positive things and would like to see them continue to do so. I think anti, discrimination clauses are critical campus wide. Visibility is also important, but a slow process. The more the better. Students have a lot of energy and creativity. Supporting that resource is very important as well. Giving those minorities of any sort leadership is also helpful.
- We are just everyday people, like everybody else.
- Just a quick note about the survey questions, as I'm sure they are thoroughly researched, etc. for wording, but I marked several statements as "strongly disagree" simply because of the qualifiers "recently" or "lately", as someone who has accepted/embraced his homosexuality for nearly 10 years, the "recently" or "lately" qualifier didn't seem to apply, although the rest of the statement did. There was also a mistake in the survey/html coding on the page that asks about the scale of 1, 7 mother/father knowledge, it appears that clicking a radio button for mother or father disabled the radio button for the other person. There are two things in particular that I think the campus could do to facilitate the security and fair treatment of gays and lesbians:, to include GLB in university protected status (specifically) and include/acknowledge such relationships with regard to employment benefits., to somehow interface with the "town and gown" community better with regard to GLB issues. It isn't simply a 'campus' issue when the campus is so well, integrated with the city (physically).
- Put sexual orientation back into the University's nondiscrimination statement. Include partner or significant other in statements that mention spouse or husband/wife. Get the in the religious community that are supportive of gays like the pastor of First Baptist Church to talk to University Administrators and their homophobia.

- Your survey contained many questions for the NEWLY discovered LGBT person and unfortunately the wording occasionally made the answers more difficult. In response to questions about intimacy with a woman, those that led with "I only recently", "I am now beginning" or "I just discovered" statements negated my response. I saw a lack of questions that said "I have an ongoing, satisfying intimate relationship with a woman"
- The most obvious is to add the "sexual orientation" clause to the nondiscrimination policy. The argument that the policy should not contain special status for any specific group is false. What is a veteran of the Vietnam era?
- Comment: As a professor, I have a limited view of what goes on. But, I think it is too bad that there is little visible support for lesbians & gays in some settings. Here at the law school we have no gay and lesbian student organization. I am sure we must have gay and lesbian students, and I am also sure that many do not feel comfortable here. Although I think I am an out lesbian (I don't announce it in class, but I also don't hide it) students do not even come out to me. Maybe there are none? I doubt it. Instead, I assume they are afraid, in this conservative environment.
- This survey doesn't do a good job with bisexual men. Most questions assume that gay/bisexual means that the gay aspect is a large part of one's psyche, it can also simply be another aspect of one's life while still having a committed female partner. Also, much of the phrasing is "I now feel..." which makes it difficult to answer since one doesn't know if the answer is supposed to reflect how my views have recently changed or simply my current views. With many bisexual men in primarily heterosexual relationships the stigma with any gayness isn't as strong. Perhaps there should be a separate section for bi and for gay. With bi one can still have the security (emotionally and from a societal point of view) that "purely" gay people will not.
- In the first section, question 4 is identical to question 11. Also, the form would not accept separate answers for 'mother' and 'father.' I tried to answer '7' for each one, but it would only accept an answer for one of those two items.
- Benefits for same sex partners
- I think the campus climate is positive overall for gay men, but there are definitely parts of campus that are less positive. I have friends in the athletic department and ROTC programs that have experienced discrimination due to their sexual orientation. The area that I have experienced the most discrimination (mainly verbal comments and threats) is the residence hall. At the same time, I enjoy the university and feel safe being openly gay on campus.
- One of the largest improvements that could be made, would be to have domestic partner benefits available for faculty/staff (health insurance, etc).
- Make sexual orientation a category of persons listed in the nondiscrimination clause, as Vietnam veterans were added appropriately. Quit hiding behind all those executive orders that say in effect "we love everybody here, cumbiyah" as though that lip service were the same as legal protection. Join the majority of Research I universities who are aware of this need for legal inclusion. Administrators, get your heads out of the sand! Ensure that coward Pacheco's replacement is willing to include protection for LGBT persons on all 4

campuses immediately upon taking office. Don't wait for a majority of brave curators to pass such an order; we'd all be dead by then. Laws don't change behavior, but the inclusion of sexual orientation as a protected status gives a strong message of support that this ridiculously behind the times campus so sorely needs. We are protected within the city of Columbia, but not on campus. That is so wrong, and we have lost excellent faculty to other schools because of this conservative administration's homophobia. Next you'll lose students.

- First thing this campus could do to move forward would be to include sexual orientation/identity to the non-discrimination clause. When students, faculty, and staff arrive on this campus they scan the horizon for signs of acceptance and validation. When they see that sexual orientation is blatantly not present in our statement of whom we protect, it speaks volumes to GLBT folks as well as to heterosexuals. It implies that GLBT folks are not legitimate! It also leaves us disempowered to speak out against policies, practices, and procedures that disenfranchise us. MU has a long history of discrimination towards LGBT folks. In the 1970's the gay student organization had to fight all the way to the Supreme Court for the right to meet on campus! In the late 1990's the board of curators elected to remove sexual orientation from the Universities non-discrimination clause, and refused to re, instate it in spite of campus wide demonstrations in support of it's inclusion! As a result several well respected MU faculty and staff elected to leave MU rather than continue to stay at a University that undervalues them. Several close friends of mine were among those that left! The University also funds 100 leadership grants each year. Forty Eight percent of these grants are earmarked specifically for ROTC students. This overt support of the military (which overtly discriminates against LGBT folks) further disenfranchises LGBT folks on campus. It also re, enforces the perspective that LGBT students' issues are not important. I attempted at one time to speak out about this issue and had my job threatened if I didn't keep my mouth shut! I literally had to meet with the Dean of Student Affairs over the issue and was told I could not be a public voice on this issue. I have seen literally over 100 LGBT students drop out of school. Once they started realizing they were gay and exploring those feelings, their parents cut off funds and they had no where to turn for emotional or financial support. So they drop out. This is a scenario I have seen played out over and over again. I know of at least one student who completed suicide on MU's campus two weeks after his parents found out he was gay, and I know of numerous other students who have attempted suicide as a result of internalizing homophobia. I do have to give some credit to our university. There have been efforts to provide support and increase understanding of some of the issues. Residential Life has gone out of their way to provide sensitivity training for staff and students, and to hire openly gay staff members. Several departments have asked GLBT student panels to do presentations in their classrooms. The counseling center also provides good, objective support for those seeking counseling. The University even provides a small space for a LGBT Resource Center, (Although this was only after it became apparent that many on campus were upset about the removal of sexual orientation from the non-discrimination clause). However, the upper levels of administration at MU have remained homophobic, unwilling to listen to reason, and inflexible about truly addressing the ways GLBT are disenfranchised from the top down. Arguments the Board of Curators used to support their decision to not re, instate sexual orientation into the non-discrimination clause, reflected ignorance and misinformation on their part. To date, LGBT couples are denied access to married student housing, LGBT staff & faculty are denied spousal benefits, if we do speak out our jobs can be held over our heads since we are not protected from discrimination. In the spring of 2001 an MU ROTC student was dismissed for being gay, and now is being forced to pay back \$16,

000.00 worth of scholarships. Yet the community has not heard one word from the MU administration denouncing the military's actions as discriminatory or unfair! In fact we continue to funnel University money to the Military in the form of the leadership grants!!! I ask you, what kind of message does this send to our LGBT students, faculty, and staff? I'm signing my submittal, because I am mad. I am tired. And I am frustrated. I have worked at MU for 15 years in a variety of capacities. I wrote my master thesis on the campus climate towards LBGT folks here at MU for the past 50 years! Time and time again I have seen the university claim to make steps towards unity and support, only to do nothing with it. In the early 1990 Provost KC Morrison made a gallant effort to address disparities on campus with the formation of a Taskforce who's purpose it was to make recommendations to the Board of Curators and the campus at large. Yet I am not aware of any of those recommendations being moved on. More recently, when the Board of Curators removed sexual orientation for the non-discrimination clause, and replaced it with EO#3, they promised to implement a campus wide sensitive training. However it's been two years now and we have seen nothing of the sort! Just more empty promises while LGBT students, staff, & faculty pay the price. I would currently give the MU campus a D+ for its efforts (or lack thereof) to promote a safe, supportive, living, learning, environment were LGBT folks feel integral to the community [department, address, telephone, and email address].

- I find these questions focused very oddly. I can't quite imagine what all the temporal references will tell you. You've also got the mother and father radio buttons messed up so that you can only choose one or the other. I tried, unsuccessfully, to choose a '6' for my mother, and a '5' for my father. But when I make a selection in the father line, it removes the choice in the mother line. I think we have a long way to go at Mizzou to integrate LGBT persons.
- I would feel more comfortable talking to someone that is trained in psychology and who is gay because I could get so much more than just talking to some "Dr." who may not understand where I am coming from. Also, I think that counseling is good overall but if there was someone who is gay that I could talk to, I'd feel so much more relaxed talking and could get some info and advice from someone who has maybe experienced some of the same things.
- I see you lie to your country see you forcing them out see you blaming each other and I love you still and I love you still
- I am international student. I feel there is somewhat racial discrimination not only among this campus but also among this society. Especially, to some extent, from well, educated people. I don't know why is that. Maybe the more knowledge one have, the more one think he/she was on top of others, the worse the situation.
- A better representation of the diversity of the students would benefit the climate. That is to say, hire more gay, lesbian, bi, and transexual¹ professors.
- I would like for sexual orientation to be a protected part of the anti, discrimination clause on our campus. I would like to know that I will not be punished for my private life by a homophobic and/or insecure supervisor. On my second day of work in my first day working on this campus 3 years ago, my supervisor told me during a break that she hated

¹ Misspellings and grammatical errors occur in the original comments.

gay people, and she thought that bisexuals were the worst because they just f#cked everyone. Uncomfortable place to be. I didn't want to lie, but I also knew that I still had 5 month and 28 days of probation, so I took the "politically correct" middle route of talking about LGBT people in the third person. I tried to combat her ignorance & hate without sacrificing myself. It was a painful place to work. In addition to her homophobia, she was racist, afraid of any spiritual belief other than Christianity and a severe micromanager. Some days, it was hard to breath at work. Luckily, another job came along that was a promotion for me, but I have often wished that there had been some avenue through human resources where I could have addressed all the ways that she was discriminatory, but, because I was afraid of losing my job because of my sexual orientation I didn't pursue ANY of it. Sexual orientation in the non-discrimination clause would be a good step in the right direction for this campus.

- It is imperative that MU includes the sexual orientation clause in its anti, discriminatory statement. I can speak for myself in addition to others when I say that we (members of the GLBT community) would feel so much more confident at our jobs here if we could have that "insurance" of not being discriminated against for having love in our lives just like the heterosexuals on campus. Times are changing, and MU is quickly going to find itself behind the others one day if it chooses to not accept what is really happening in the world.
- It would be nice to have an anti, discrimination policy in place at the University. I find it negligent on the part of the curators for not having enacted a policy by now. Besides the fact that it ensures basic human decency, it also would help out student recruitment, in that prospective LGBT students could be ensured that their rights would be protected. Also, I think a lot of the current students, myself included, would feel a lot more comfortable in coming out to faculty, staff, administration, employers, etc. if we had a "safety net" to fall back upon. That way we could rest securely in the knowledge that we couldn't be legally fired or discriminated against by such people in a position of power over us.
- The University has institutionalized the denial that GLBT community even exists. As an example, when new employees are given the presentation as to HR benefits, it is made clear that only relationships with marriage certificates are recognized. To know that my long term partnership does not make the cut while the 25 year old next to me on her third marriage does qualify and is thus extended medical coverage, is insulting. Another example has to do with excused leave of absence do to "death in the family". Again, while my relationship doesn't rate in the eyes of the University, a laundry list of other, arguably more removed relationships do so qualify. Institutionally sanctioned illegitimacy. This lack of parity extends to even the ability to contribute back to the institution. Gift clubs to the wide variety of Alumni associations make it possible for "couples" to jointly contribute. Again, so long as you have a legally sanctioned relationship, (a marriage certificate).Until the University of Missouri , Columbia sets up to the plate and welcomes its GLBT community members as full partners by recognizing our partnerships , LEGALLY, UMC will restrict itself to a second rate institution. I pray that it won't take another Mathew Shepard for the Board of Curators to see the light.
- I think that something as simple as including the phrase "sexual orientation" under the non-discrimination policy would help improve the climate for the 4, 10% of us who are homosexual. Also, showing gay couples on more of the posters, rather than just

heterosexual ones. Maybe if the LGBT Resource Center had an office that was bigger than a closet, then I would feel as though it were more a part of the campus than something shoved in.

- I am very new to this campus so I am not sure my responses reflect very much to do with what it is like here. Overall, the city of Columbia has been very warm and accepting of me and my partner. Also, some of the questions on this survey seem to assume (perhaps rightfully for many respondents) that the person is just coming out. My partner and I have been together for more than 10 years. Coming out to ourselves and others is no longer a big issue in our lives. It is pretty obvious when two women in their 30's have been together this long that something is up, right?
- I strongly feel that LGBT should be included in the University's official statement of non-discrimination. Having the letter of campus law behind us would make it easier for LGBT folks to be comfortable reporting problems and harassment.
- The fact is that I am very happy with who I am. I have become a successful man. I never want to equate my person as "BECAUSE I AM GAY" I do not allow my sexual identity to control who I am. I am a man and that is what matters. I have always been a good person. I can not blame any of my failures or successes on my sexual identity. I must only say I am where I am because of decisions that I have made. We need to not focus on the issues but rather focus on what we can do to become better citizens.
- Include sexual orientation in the anti, discrimination clause.
- The atmosphere on campus is much improved over what it was 25 to 30 years ago, when there were mirrors in restrooms and people were threatened with expulsion on the basis of gossip and rumors, however, homophobia is still alive and well here as it is many other places. It is a hard prejudice to root out. Rules against homophobic remarks and actions must be as clearly articulated and as ardently enforced as those against racism. There also need to be some changes made to the human resources forms so that those of us who don't fit the standard "single married or divorced "categories have something accurate to check. That may seem petty, but failure to make such changes is essentially discounting our existence and ignoring our need for health insurance or survivor benefits for our partners – benefits that you readily offer your heterosexual employees. While this form of discrimination is indeed sanctioned by the Federal Government, any institution which is serious about being completely inclusive of sexual minorities, needs to address the issue on a civil rights/minority rights level, not a majority rule level.
- I don't understand exactly how this part of the survey relates well to someone who is bisexual...I don't consider myself lesbian/gay and have issues with thinking of myself as so. I have no problems or issues seeing myself as bisexual. I DO feel it is separate from being lesbian or gay so have trouble relating the questions to my life
- Actually I just want to share that my life is going well in general, but I have been sad lately because I just had a death in my family.
- The inclusion of sexual orientation into the nondiscrimination clause would speak volumes as to how the MU administration supports the GLBT community.

- I think it would be a good idea if, during the next coming out week, the LGBT Resource Center did not decide to couple HIV Testing with it. Supporting HIV Testing for everyone is a great idea, but having people in the middle of Speakers Circle who are basically saying, "we're gay, and gays are diseased" is not. AID's is not strongest or fastest growing within the gay population, it's actually growing the fastest among women of color. And I am hard pressed to think that if it were Black History Month, and someone in the middle of Speakers Circle grabbed a black woman and said, "here's a ribbon to support the blacks, oh, and you'd better get tested" that they would not be offended. I don't mean to sound hostile, but it really got me worked up when I was walking through the area and was similarly insulted. [email address]
- Thank you for allowing me to participate!
- I thought that some of the questions on the survey left me little room to answer. I am not "closeted", as you so prettily put it, but I do not feel that my personal life, especially my sexuality, is an appropriate topic of workplace conversation *in any way*. It is no one's business. That is what I did not have a chance to convey when answering your questions. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to do so now.
- Due to the September 11, 2001 tragedy, there is a lot of stress and fear on campus. I know that it has caused me many a sleepless night and I do have a constant feeling of doom. I think the University should keep a well aware of what it is doing to protect us and to help us through this time.
- University needs an inclusion statement for nondiscrimination on campus.
- The University should hire more gay faculty and staff. The University should offer more courses in LGBT subjects and also incorporate such materials into more widely defined courses. The University should make such courses standard fare for students, , that is all students should learn to understand gay and lesbian people, just as they should have a familiarity with people of other races, ethnicities, nationalities, abilities, classes, , this should be part of their initial general education here, , that is when they are fresh people they should all take such courses. I will say though that the younger student generation, the product of MTV, etc, is light years ahead of the rest of the University community in this regard, at least on gay issues. What we really need is something to get the rest of the University into the 21st century with regard to LGBT people. We could begin at least by getting rid of those things that most clearly structurally exclude and discriminate against LGBT. Most obvious to me is that the University should include all employees in the benefits package in an egalitarian way. What I am thinking of in the first instance is health benefits. Until you give us equal benefits, stop talking about the "university family." There is only one family that is recognized here and it isn't mine. Finally, this survey seems to be premised in a strange way. In the first place, I am completely "out." I mean I don't go around with a flashing sign on my head that reads, "gay, " but as far as I'm concerned, everyone knows here at work (and as an aside, the choice between being "gay" and "lesbian" is an interesting one. I would say that I am gay and I am a lesbian. I don't like only being able to chose one and I don't like gay being only male). But the climate here is something like being in the military, , it's "don't ask don't tell" and PLEASE, DON'T TELL. So the strange premise of this survey seems to be that if you are "out, " then you aren't hiding anything. While I have no desire to hide anything, I can see that some of my coworkers are extremely uncomfortable if I say something like "on

Saturday my partner and I went to the movies." So I do "hide" myself. I find this to be extremely oppressive, marginalizing and chilling. You have two series of questions that I imagine you read as working together, eg, are you out?, and how out and how much are you hiding? Or, another way to put this is the survey does not necessarily get at where the problem for many people is. They are completely out and yet they are (forced) into hiding. I mean I am glad that you are concerned about whether LGBT people are getting beat up and whether we are about to slit our throats. I think, however, that there is a whole world that you aren't really getting to here. Sometimes I think that to get any reform, LGBT people have to claim that their lives are imperiled, either from physical violence or self destruction. We shouldn't have to do that. Despite my critical comments, I appreciate the University's willingness to do this survey. I would interest in the results.

- Add sexual orientation to the University's non-discrimination statement. I was deeply saddened and disappointed by the Board of Curators 6-2 approval vote made on January 29, 1999 to a new university- wide non- discrimination policy. Executive order #3 is a joke. It's a sugar coated fluffed up toothless policy....looks nice, sounds nice, but useless. Overwhelming campus, wide support existed amongst faculty, staff, and students to add sexual orientation to the non-discrimination statement. Even University Extension issued a letter to the Board of Curators in support of amending the policy to add sexual orientation if the non-discrimination statement were to be used. Despite all this support, the Board of Curators, and other upper level administrators, snubbed the entire University of Missouri. Why are the BOC and President so fearful of two words? That's exactly the reason why sexual orientation needs to be included. It's 2 1/2 years later and I still have a bad taste in my mouth. Sincerely, [name]
- Rape education/prevention classes could be made part of the freshman curriculum. There are a lot of young women and men on campus who need to hear that no one deserves to be raped, that it is not the victim's fault, and that it will not be tolerated. And there are a lot of people who come to college not knowing those things. Young men need to be taught to discourage it in their peers, and young women need to be taught to drink responsibly and take care of themselves, and be able to defend themselves.
- The survey, although a good one, misses something very important to gay, lesbian and transgendered individuals, , we don't live in a black and white world. As a gay man, I am always and in every way possible, aware of my surroundings. In some situations, I feel very comfortable and in others I may feel more of a need to protect my identify. You see, I live in a world that is not always friendly to my sexual orientation and I know that. I don't hide who I am, but I do guard it depending on the people I'm around and the situation. I don't feel the need to wear a sign saying I'm gay, but if asked or the conversation approaches the issue, I won't hide it. In the GLT community we walk a tenuous rope. Among ourselves, there's acceptance for who we are, but we know that outside that circle we must be cautious. My main issue with the University of Missouri, Columbia is the lack of acknowledgement that we exist when it comes to the realm of staff benefits. As a man in a long, term relationship, I feel prejudicial bias that I cannot give my partner medical, dental, and prescription benefits on my insurance. My family medical leave, sick leave, and leave upon a death, does not take into consideration my partner or his family. A heterosexual marriage does not guarantee longevity or commitment to a relationship. I feel very fortunate that where I work there are other individuals who are members of the GLT community. I know other individuals on campus who are gay and we all are cautious to who we come "out" to. However, none of

the people I know would hide if confronted. I feel supported by my co, workers and for the most part, it's never mentioned. The campus atmosphere seems a lot like the U.S. Government, "don't ask, don't tell" mentality. The last issue of the "Advocate" magazine listed the major companies/corporations in the U.S. who provided benefits to same sex relationships. Believe me, folks, the number is growing my leaps and bounds. There is no group on campus made up of GLT faculty/staff/administrators to address our issues and concerns. If I were every harassed or felt prejudice in my job, I would not hesitate to take the necessary steps to bring it to the attention of the appropriate administrators. However, I am not naive enough, after a very long time at the University of Missouri, to believe that it would necessarily result in anything being done. I've seen situations dismissed with a slap on the hand, especially when it involved faculty and/or administrators as the perpetrators.

- This past month has produced so many heartfelt and/or emotional discussions about 'what makes people different' surrounding the Sept 11 WTC attacks that 'accepting diversity' and 'promoting tolerance' are very important issues for society at large , and thus, also for our campus climate. I believe that this applies to discriminations and ignorance, based prejudices of any kind. If a conservative Republican president can speak about tolerance and diversity, then maybe its time for people around the world to start realizing that its not our differences that harm us as a species , its intolerance of these differences. One of my favorite quotes is: We need to stop paying so much attention to who people love, and start paying more attention to who people hate. My kids even know this. They are 12 and 15. Thank you for doing this survey. I was happy to see it in my mailbox. I regret that I did not have the time to complete it until today.
- Add sexual orientation to non-discrimination clause.
- Campus administration, the president, the Board of Curators must take stronger stands and initiatives for LGBT individuals. Presently campus administrators are totally out of touch with students. They only care about campus elites (like athletes) students who can bring in money to the university. It is abhorrent that more attention is given to building a new basketball arena than including sexual orientation into the university's non-discrimination policy. In Executive order 3 President Parcheco made sexual orientation into a non-issue. Ideally it should be but it's not. Maybe if Parcheco or the curators were called "fucking dykes" or repeatedly called "sir" (as an insult) at the Subway in Brady Commons or felt afraid to reveal their partners names at their University jobs...maybe then they would realize that sexual orientation and the discrimination/hassasment resulting from it is a very real issue to students, faculty and staff. Does the President Chancellor Curators regularly visit the tiny room that is the LGBT Resource Center? Have they ever attended an OUT reach panel or Safe Space Training? Do they even know that such things exist? Do they regularly have conversations with LGBT students? Do they even have an idea of what it is to be an LGBT student? Do they even care? The message that I get from campus administrators is "we don't care" If I had know about this when I was apply for schools, Mizzou would not have been on my list at all. Campus administrators don't have to care about LGBT students faculty staff personally but they should care about us, academically and or professionally. Unfortunately they do not and that is totally unacceptable.

- The University needs to actually take a solid stand behind the rights of LGBTQ. This means inclusion money visibility and support. They so needed to do this like 40 years ago. Get with it MU.
- Classes for all minority students of Race Gender Sexual Orientation need to be better publicized and there must be more. Funding is a major issue, especially within student life. It is always the dept, that gets its budget cut. Since it takes the largest hit so few programs and organizations are able to tap the Department.
- Have a clearly activated non-discrimination policy for sexual orientation.
- I think sexual orientation should be included in the University's non-discrimination policy.
- Add LGBT to the non-discrimination clause for the University system. Until this happens there are no grants for making other necessary changes.
- The University should scrap executive order #3 the ambiguous language of which offers neither safety or comfort to anyone. Executive Order #3 is both hateful and insulting to the GLBT members of the University Community. By refusing to adopt language protecting GLBT peoples the University effectively denies GLBT people any recourse against harassment and prejudices. The refusal to adopt protective language specific to GLBT people sends the message that the University does not care about the security safety well being or success of ALL students faculty and staff. Executive Orders #3 is essentially anti, student the majority of the student body has seen the need for specific language protecting the rights of sexual minorities on campus. The University curators have failed to respond to the voice of the student body there by sending the message they are more concerned with politics. Than with social, justice and the assurance of a safe productive educational and environment for all. Most other big 12 research universities have added language specific the GLBT people into their non-discrimination policies. The University of Missouri looks faddish ignorant and backward for its unwillingness to recognize the need for its unwillingness to recognize the need for inclusion of sexual orientation in it's non discrimination clause.
- This is not something, I have noticed with regard to my school in particular however as an issue I have noticed elsewhere I would imagine that it extends to many campuses. There is noticeable intolerance of bisexual persons within the queer community itself. Dubious and disrespectful attitudes are what I and many of my bisexual friends and acquaintances have met upon revealing our orientation to other gay and straights. The stereotype of bisexuals as untrustworthy or worse simply as confused homo or hetero has led many of my friends and I to adopt the alternate term "non, gender specific". This seems to have a different semantically impact and doesn't carry the Studio Cohe orgy. This should be considered and discussed. Another trouble is the mobility for many heterosexual people to accept the idea of gay relationships despite having accepting the abstract concept of homosexuality. Gays etc to these people effeminate hairdressers decorators or some other stereotypical activity. Lesbians are less easily stereotyped outside of the insulting Butch imagery. The common idea though is that the women are nuns. Until popular media and the populous itself change the Will and Grace or As Good As It Gets portrays of gay men simple affection will still be venomously labeled flaunting and there will not be true acceptance of queer people.

- I think the biggest problem is visibility, Unless you make an effort to find the Few LGBT related resources on campus, you could spend 4 years here and not know a single gay person exists. I think it would make it easier on those just coming out if the LGBT community was something largely present and taken for granted on campus.