

2010 STATE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender People



CAMPUS PRIDE
2010 National College Climate Survey

National Study by the Q Research Institute for Higher Education



2010
**STATE OF
HIGHER EDUCATION**

for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender People

Written by

Susan (Sue) Rankin

Genevieve Weber

Warren Blumenfeld

Somjen Frazer

Campus 
Pride
Charlotte, North Carolina

**2010 State of Higher Education
For Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual
& Transgender People**

Susan (Sue) Rankin
Genevieve Weber
Warren Blumenfeld
Somjen Frazer

ISBN: 978-0-9830176-0-8
Library of Congress Control Number

Copyright © 2010 Campus Pride
All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopied, recorded, or otherwise, without the prior written approval of the publisher.

Campus Pride
Post Office Box 240473
Charlotte, NC 28224
www.campuspride.org

Telephone: 704-277-6710
Facsimile: 704-553-1639

Printed in the United States of America.

Table of Contents

Foreword	p. 1
by Dr. George D. Kuh, Chancellor’s Professor Emeritus at Indiana University and Director of the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment	
The State of Higher Education	p. 5
Letter from Shane L. Windmeyer, Executive Director/Founder, Campus Pride	
Executive Summary	p. 8
Participants.....	8
Experiences with Campus Climate.....	9
Perceptions of Campus Climate	11
Individual and Institutional Responses to Campus Climate	14
Potential Best Practices.....	15
The Relevance of Campus Climate for LGBTQQ People: Seeing through a Lavender Lens	p. 20
Providing a Context Through a Review of the Literature	p. 25
What is Campus Climate?	25
Effects of Campus Climate on Personal, Educational and Professional Success	27
Campus Climate: Focusing on Racial Identity & Gender Identity	28
Campus Climate: Focusing on Sexual Identity	30
Campus Climate: Outside the Gender Binary	33
The Impact of a Negative Campus Climate.....	33
The Influence of Campus Climate on Sexual Identity Development.....	34
The Influence of Campus Climate on LGBT Student Development	34
The Influence of Campus Climate on LGBT Employee Satisfaction	35
Summary of Project Methods	p. 38
Purpose of Project	38
Conceptual Framework.....	39
Survey Instrument.....	39
Sampling Procedure	41
Limitations	42
Data Analysis	42

The Results: Selected Demographics of Participants	p. 45
Troubling Terminology: Sexual Identity, Gender Identity, Gender Expression	45
Other Selected Characteristics of the Respondents.....	50
Campus Position.....	50
Racial Identity	52
Disclosure.....	53
The Results: The Experiences of Students, Faculty & Staff	p. 55
Summary of Findings	55
Sexual Identity: The Experiences of LGBQ Respondents.....	56
The Voices of Respondents	61
Gender Identity: The Experiences of Transmasculine, Transfeminine & Gender Non-Conforming Respondents....	61
The Voices of Respondents	66
Racial Identity: The Experience of Respondents of Color	66
The Voices of Respondents	72
Institutional Position: The Experiences of Students, Faculty & Staff.....	73
The Voices of Respondents	76
The Results: The Perceptions of Campus Climate by Students, Faculty, & Staff	p. 81
Summary of Findings	82
Sexual Identity: The Perceptions of LGBQ Respondents	84
Comfort Level with Classroom and Workplace Climate	84
The Voices of Respondents	89
Gender Identity: The Perceptions of Transmasculine, Transfeminine & Gender Non-Conforming Respondents	90
Comfort Level with Classroom and Workplace Climate	90
The Voices of Respondents	94
Racial Identity: The Perceptions of Respondents of Color	95
Comfort Level with Classroom and Workplace Climate	95
The Voices of Respondents	104
Institutional Position: The Perceptions of Students, Faculty & Staff.....	105
Comfort Level with Classroom and Workplace Climate	105
The Voices of Respondents	109
The Results: Individual and Institutional Responses to Campus Climate	p. 116
Summary of Findings	116
Individual Responses.....	118
Response Behaviors by LGBQ Respondents	118
Response Behaviors by Transmasculine, Transfeminine & Gender Non-Conforming Respondents	122
Response Behaviors by Respondents of Color.....	124
The Voices of Respondents	125
Response Behaviors by Position.....	127
The Voices of Respondents	138

Institutional Responses	141
Institutional Actions by LGBTQ Respondents	141
The Voices of Respondents	145
Institutional Actions by Transmasculine, Transfeminine & Gender Non-Conforming Respondents	146
Institutional Actions by Respondents of Color	147
Institutional Actions by Position	148
Institutional Responses: Curricular Actions	153
Curricular Actions: LGBTQ Respondents	153
Curricular Actions: Transmasculine, Transfeminine & Gender Non-Conforming Respondents	157
Beyond the Rainbow: Creating Campus Communities of Difference.....	p. 166
Creating a Community of Difference	167
Potential Best Practices: The Power of Language	168
Develop Inclusive Policies	169
Demonstrate Institutional Commitment	170
Integrate LGBTQ Issues & Concerns in Curricular & Co-Curricular Education.....	171
Respond to LGBTQ Bias Incidents	172
Considerations for On-Campus Housing.....	172
Offer Comprehensive Counseling & Healthcare	173
Improve Access & Retention Efforts	174
References	p. 175
Acknowledgments	p. 187
About Campus Pride.....	p. 188
About QRIHE	p. 190
About QRIHE Research Team	p. 192
About QRIHE Coalition Partners & Funders.....	p. 193

Foreword

by
George D. Kuh

In the midst of writing this, The Chronicle of Higher Education released its 2010 annual report of “Great Colleges to Work For.” It’s not known how many of those responding to the survey who self-identified as LGBT were from the institutions that made the cut. Perhaps at Great Colleges, LGBT people feel as safe and secure and satisfied as their straight colleagues. But as the uniformly disappointing results from Campus Pride’s *2010 State of Higher Education for LGBT People* report plainly show, this is not the case across campuses. While circumstances have improved somewhat over the past two decades for the LGBT community, there is still a long way to go to even the playing field for all students, faculty, and staff members, their sexual identity and gender identity notwithstanding. Every educator committed to creating optimal conditions for learning and personal development should find disconcerting the findings from this report for several reasons.

First, Maslow’s (1943) well-known and widely-cited needs hierarchy emphasizes the importance of meeting basic human needs that are theorized to be essential to growth, development, and overall well being. While some have questioned the validity of the hierarchical ordering of human needs, few dispute that feeling safe, being affirmed, and being comfortable with one’s self are linked with a high level of personal or professional performance. The data about harassment in this report suggest that LGBT people differ in undesirable ways from others on a college campus in terms of their well-being.

Second, one of the cornerstones of student development theory is that growth, development, and learning are mediated by challenge and support (Chickering, 1969; Evans, 2003; Sanford, 1962). That is, realizing one’s potential almost always requires contending with novel situations and tasks that demand experimenting with and expanding one’s behavioral repertoire in order to accomplish more complex, difficult tasks. Ideally, teachers, student support staff, and others are available to offer support and guidance for how to successfully manage the challenges. But if the nature of a challenge is too great with too little support forthcoming, development may be stunted or slowed, which can lead to frustration and disappointment in oneself, dissatisfaction with the setting, and ultimately departure for another more congenial situation. The responses of many LGBT students, staff, and faculty summarized in this report indicate that they find the environments in which they study and work to be personally challenging and perceive a lack of support from many of those around them.

Finally, while the research about student development and college impact yields few unequivocal conclusions, one that is difficult to dispute is that the campus environment matters to a host of desired outcomes of college (Astin, 1993; Kuh et al., 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Much of this research is based on perceptual data; that is, students and faculty or staff are asked how they feel or view certain aspects of their living, learning, and working circumstances. For example, how students perceive their campus environment is linked with student engagement in a number of educationally purposeful activities (Carini, Kuh, & Klein, 2006; Kuh, 2001a, 2001b, 2003).

The aforementioned Chronicle of Higher Education “Great Colleges to Work For” survey is predicated on a similar proposition pertaining to faculty. In this context, it is particularly troubling that this report shows that LGBT students as well as faculty and staff were much more likely than their counterparts to consider leaving their institution because of experiencing or fearing physical and psychological harassment, discrimination, and violence related to their sexual identity.

Given these conditions, it is a wonder that so many LGBT students and employees persevere and – according to some other evidence – survive and appear to thrive on college campuses.

Bob Gonyea and John Moore (2007) provide some instructive insights about the experiences of LGBT students by summarizing the findings from a version of the 2006 National Survey of Student Engagement. Their study draws on information provided by 14,629 randomly sampled first-year (51%) and senior students (49%) from 31 four-year colleges and universities in the United States. Two-thirds of respondents were women and 93% were full-time students. Students who identified as GLBT numbered 839, or about 6% of all respondents approximately equally divided between first-year and senior students. Added to the core NSSE questionnaire were three items that asked students to self-report their sexual orientation, how open they are about their sexual orientation, and whether or not they are transgender. Forty-nine percent of the GLBT students indicated they were “more out” and 51% were “less out.”

As with most other studies of student engagement and college impact, after controlling for student and institutional characteristics, the results of the effect of GLBT status on student engagement were somewhat mixed. For example:

- GLBT students did not differ from their ‘straight’ or ‘more out’ peers in the degree of academic challenge they reported.
- The “more out” GLBT students reported more active and collaborative learning than their “straight” and “less out” peers;
- Whether “more out” or “less out,” GLBT students had more contact with their faculty members than their straight peers;
- GLBT students who were ‘more out’ were more likely to engage in what NSSE calls enriching educational experiences – experiencing diversity, studying foreign languages, studying abroad, working with faculty on research and so forth.
- Consistent with the overall findings from this 2010 Campus Pride survey, all GLBT students rated their campus environment less positively than did “straight” students. At the same time, the average “less out” GLBT students perceived the campus environment to be less supportive compared with their “more out” GLBT and “straight” counterparts.

Last Words

The all-too-thin knowledge base about GLBT students, staff, and faculty consistently describes worrisome, unacceptable differences between how they and their straight peers experience the college campus (Rankin, 2003; Sherill & Hardesty, 1994). With this sobering report, Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld and Frazer have done American higher

education a great service by empirically demonstrating where and how we still are falling short in providing affirming, supportive learning and working environments for populations of students and faculty that have historically been disadvantaged and suffer from century old biases. The NSSE data suggest that while some GLBT students apparently are able to compensate and overcome what are on average inhospitable circumstances, those who are less open about their sexual identity continue to struggle in environments that they perceive to be unsupportive of their social and non-academic needs.

Let Campus Pride's *2010 State of Higher Education for LGBT People* report be a clarion call to re-double efforts to create the conditions whereby all students and faculty – no matter their sexual identity, gender identity or other defining human characteristic – can flourish on college campuses.

George D. Kuh is Chancellor's Professor Emeritus at Indiana University and director of the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment co-located at Indiana University Bloomington and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.



2010
**STATE OF
HIGHER EDUCATION**
for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender People



The State of Higher Education

Letter from

Shane L. Windmeyer

Executive Director/Founder, Campus Pride

“Professors have pathologized my experiences as a member of the LGBT community by claiming that participating in activism within the LGBT community is indicative of mental illness,” a student told us.

Another said their campus had recently been subject to multiple attacks against the LGBTQQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning, & Queer) community. “My safety is a serious concern for me,” they wrote.

For women, students of color and those who present outside of stereotypical and so-called traditional gender roles and expectations, anti-LGBTQQ hostility - as well as racism and other prejudices - are felt with double power. One student was called a “tranny freak” and physically assaulted in public while on campus, yet university officials there were “less than responsive,” the student said.

Another reported: “A distinguished professor made demeaning comments about women and people of color, and I didn't think anything would get done if I reported it.”

At an off-campus work-study program, one student was fired and refused pay for work completed all because “my supervisor thought that 'Latinos steal things' and didn't like Native Americans,” they said. What did university officials do? “The school said I 'caused' the problem, and wouldn't help me.”

The words you read are neither fairy tale nor exaggeration. For many students - indeed, for the students whose voices are represented above -- it is reality, everyday life on many U.S. college and university campuses. It is a reality often shared by the LGBT faculty and staff.

“I had students who wrote derogatory things on my evaluations and made reference to my sexual orientation,” one faculty person said. “The chair pretty much ignored it.”

Another noted: “My department included me as long as I never mentioned my life or my partner. As soon as I did (like everyone else), people shut down, walked away, became uncomfortable.”

It is said that we learn the best when we are able to open up and truly listen to others. Through the stories, voices and experiences of others, we find truth - the kind of truth that exposes raw, uncensored emotion and reality. In return, others learn when we do the same. Creating safe, welcoming places for students to learn and for faculty and staff to professionally succeed is the purpose of a college or university.

Campus Pride's *2010 State of Higher Education for LGBT People* does just that - by giving "voice" to LGBT students, faculty and staff experiences, we can for the first time listen and learn the *truth* from the real experiences in this report. The research conveyed may assist and support colleges and universities in becoming safer, more welcoming and supportive environments for LGBTQQ faculty, staff and students.

Colleges and universities have made significant strides over the last decade in creating a welcoming, safe learning environment to address LGBTQ issues and concerns. Campus Pride applauds these efforts and this report shares potential best practices and recommendations to further progress. But what does the research tell us -- what is the true *State of Higher Education* for LGBTQQ people today?

What you hold in your hand now is a first- and one-of-its-kind achievement - a landmark research study years overdue. The results are sobering and real - and mandate that action be taken nationally by students, faculty, staff, administrators and elected officials to address LGBTQQ issues in higher education. Key findings of the report indicate that the overwhelming majority of LGBTQQ students, of every race, color and ethnicity, report harassment, isolation and fear on campus. Transmasculine, transfeminine and gender non-conforming students are the most likely to experience overt and blatant oppression and hostility.

Colleges and universities are failing to provide LGBTQQ people with an environment that research suggests is necessary for learning and scholarship: Less than eight percent of accredited U.S. institutions of higher education offer protective policies inclusive of sexual identity; and approximately three percent include gender identity and expression. While the availability of LGBTQQ services and programs have improved, far fewer institutions offer them - safe space/ally programming, LGBTQQ faculty advisors and staff positions and LGBTQQ student centers or facilities.

Campus Pride's national report provides a glimpse into the real *State of Higher Education* for LGBTQQ students, faculty and staff. Most telling is the research indicating that LGBTQQ students are more likely to have seriously considered leaving their college or university. While the likelihood of leaving for all students, regardless of sexual identity, decreased with each year of study, the differences between LGBTQQ and heterosexual students widened, with LGBTQQ students considering leaving more often.

For years, college administrators and other officials have been paralyzed by a combination of invisibility and a lack of credible data to address LGBTQQ concerns. The *2010 State of Higher Education for LGBT People* is a wake up call - a **loud** reminder that we still have work to do. It is a chance for higher education to take responsibility for creating a welcoming, safe learning environment for everyone, regardless of sexual identity, gender identity or gender expression.

With this report, and the recommendations contained herein, we can begin taking action to mobilize and address the needs of LGBTQQ people in higher education. We can foster safe and supportive educational environments for those to whom we have entrusted the future of our communities, nation and world.



Shane L. Windmeyer,
Executive Director/Founder
Campus Pride
September 2010



2010
**STATE OF
HIGHER EDUCATION**
for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender People

Executive Summary

Although the settings of college campuses have improved for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) students, faculty and staff over the years, practically all research studies examining the perceptions and experiences of LGBT campus community members underscore negative experiences from subtle to extreme forms of discrimination. Multiple campus climate studies have been conducted but most occurred with only a single institution, a small number of campuses, a small group of individuals on a number of campuses, or a larger pool of respondents. Our report, *The State of Higher Education for LGBT People*, is the most comprehensive national research study of its kind to date. It documents experiences of over 5,000 students, faculty members, staff members, and administrators who identify as LGBTQQ¹ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning, & Queer) at colleges and universities across the United States.

We explored how LGBTQQ people experience campus climate, we reviewed their perceptions of campus climate, and we presented behavioral (personal) and institutional (campus) responses to LGBTQQ issues and concerns. In order to capture the complexity of campus climate, we paid particular attention to the intersections of racial identity and sexual identity, the intersections of racial identity and gender identity, and how such intersections impacted the experiences and perceptions of those who encounter multiple forms of oppressions. We also considered institutional position to examine any differences in the experiences of students, faculty members, and staff members, and again reviewed these differences as they intersect with sexual identity, gender identity, and racial identity. Recommendations and findings from this national study provide the means for campus advocates, program planners, and policy makers to implement strategic initiatives that address the needs and concerns of their LGBTQQ students and employees. Comparisons to a smaller-scale study conducted by Rankin (2003) were made within the document to identify if and how aspects of the campus climate have changed over the last decade.

Participants

Since we greatly value and desire to understand the true current identities of our respondents, as opposed to placing them into socially-constructed, fixed categories of sexual identity, gender identity, and racial identity, we applied Renn's (2010) queer theoretical approach to our demographic analysis. To this end, our research team created identity categories that we hope accurately reflects the voices and experiences of our respondents. Below we include a shortened summary of these categories, but we strongly encourage you to read the methods section of this monograph for a detailed explanation of the process of defining identities for what we refer to as “troubling terminology.”

In spring 2009, 5,149 surveys were returned by students, staff members, faculty members, and administrators representing all 50 states and all Carnegie Basic Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education. Thirty-eight percent of

¹ We use LGBTQQ throughout the narrative recognizing that “LGBTQQ” does not represent the fluid spectrum of sexual and gender identities offered by the respondents or used in our community. We use it as a means of simplifying the narrative.

respondents indicated their gender identity as man, 48 percent as woman, 3 percent as transmasculine, 2 percent as transfeminine, and 8 percent as “other.” Responses for gender expression were split between masculine (42%) and feminine (44%), while 14 percent indicated “other.” With regard to sexual identity, one third (33%) of respondents indicated gay or similar, 20 percent lesbian or similar, 12 percent bisexual, not lesbian, gay or bisexual, 16 percent queer, 16 percent heterosexual, and two percent asexual. Undergraduate students (46%, n = 2384) were the largest cohort responding to the survey, and substantial numbers of graduate students (17%, n = 863), faculty members (10%, n = 498), staff members (21%, n = 1071) and administrators (7%, n = 333) also participated in the project.

Diversity in terms of racial identity was also represented in our sample. Although the majority of respondents chose White (n = 4194) as part of their identity, 1335 respondents chose a “People of Color” category as part of their identity. Specific racial identification included: White (77%), Multiracial (8%), Latino(a)/Hispanic (5%), Asian/Pacific Islander/Asian American (5%), Black/African American/African/Caribbean (4%), Middle Eastern (1%), and American Indian/Alaska Native/Native American (1%).

The majority of respondents (approximately 75%) reported that they were “out” to their friends in terms of their sexual identity. Undergraduate students were least likely to be “out” to their nuclear family (46% as compared to 70% of graduate students/employees). Respondents indicated that they were least likely to be “out” to their extended families. Eighty-seven percent of faculty respondents, 88 percent of staff respondents, and 92 percent of administrators indicated they were “out” professionally to their colleagues.

The vast majority of participants identified as U.S.-born citizens (95%). Nine percent reported the presence of a disability that substantially limited a major life activity. Among those respondents, 57 percent indicated a psychological disability, 33 percent indicated a physical disability, and 32 percent indicated a learning disability. With regard to religiosity/spirituality, 42 percent identified as “other than Christian” and 31 percent as having “no affiliation.”

Experiences with Campus Climate

Experiences with Conduct that Interfered with the Ability to Live, Work and/or Learn²

Previous research suggests that LGBT individuals often face a chilly campus climate (Dolan, 1998; Noack, 2004; Rankin, 2001, 2003, 2009). Most of these studies underscore LGBT individuals as the least accepted group when compared with other under-served populations and, consequently, more likely to indicate deleterious experiences and less than welcoming campus climates based on sexual identity. Our findings not only support the aforementioned findings, but they also add further detail to our understanding of how LGBTQQ students, faculty members, and staff members experience the campus climate.

² Under the United States Code Title 18 Subsection 1514(c)1, harassment is defined as “a course of conduct directed at a specific person that causes substantial emotional distress in such a person and serves no legitimate purpose” (<http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/vii.html>). In higher education institutions, legal issues discussions define harassment as any conduct that has unreasonably interfered with one’s ability to work or learn on campus. The questions used in this survey to uncover participants’ personal and observed experiences with harassment were designed using these definitions.

! CHALLENGE: LGBQ respondents experienced significantly greater harassment and discrimination than their heterosexual allies and were more likely to indicate the harassment was based on sexual identity.

- LGBQ respondents (23%) were significantly more likely to experience harassment when compared with their heterosexual counterparts (12%) and were seven times more likely to indicate the harassment was based on their sexual identity (83%, 12%, respectively). Additional analyses indicated that those who identified as queer (33%) were significantly more likely to experience harassment than other sexual minority identities.
- LGBQ respondents were twice as likely to be targets of derogatory remarks (61%), stared at (37%), and singled out as “resident authority” regarding LGBT issues due to their identity (36%) when compared with their heterosexual counterparts (29%, 17%, and 18%, respectively).
- Respondents who identified as gay or similar were most often targets of derogatory remarks (66%), while lesbians or similar were most likely ignored deliberately or excluded (53%). Queer respondents were most often stared at (44%) or singled out as resident authority due to their identity (45%).

Clearly, harassment and discrimination continue to be concerns for many people who do not conform to the socially-constructed and enforced gender binary (i.e., man or woman). Despite the growing number of states, municipalities, colleges, and corporations that have added “gender identity/expression” to their nondiscrimination laws and policies (Human Rights Campaign, 2010; National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, 2010; Transgender Law and Policy Institute, 2010a), more than one-fourth of the respondents in a recent project indicated they had experienced harassment in the past year, and 19 percent of respondents have sometimes or often been denied employment or advancement because of their gender identity/expression. Many other participants sometimes or often concealed their gender identity in an attempt to avoid mistreatment (Beemyn & Rankin, in press 2011). In our study, respondents who identified as transmasculine, transfeminine, and gender non-conforming experienced harassment and discrimination at higher rates than those who identified as man or woman.

! CHALLENGE: Respondents who identified as transmasculine, transfeminine, and gender non-conforming (GNC) experienced higher rates of harassment than men and women and were more likely to indicate gender identity as the basis.

- Thirty-nine percent of transmasculine respondents, 38 percent of transfeminine respondents, and 31 percent of gender non-conforming (GNC) respondents reported experiencing harassment compared with 20 percent of men and 19 percent of women.
- Men were significantly less likely to indicate the harassment was based on gender identity (12%) compared with 62 percent of transfeminine respondents, 57 percent of transmasculine respondents, 38 percent of GNC respondents, and 34 percent of women.
- A significant number of transmasculine respondents (87%) and transfeminine respondents (82%) indicated their gender expression was the basis for harassment compared to 20 percent of men and 24 percent of women.
- Respondents who identified as transfeminine were most likely to feel deliberately ignored or excluded (69%) and isolated or left out (62%), while respondents who identified as transmasculine were most likely to be stared at (59%) or singled out as resident authority due to their identity (54%).

The extant literature finds that Students of Color report lower levels of satisfaction with racial climates and perceive differential treatment on the basis of race more frequently than White students (see, e.g., Harper & Hurtado, 2008). Similar experiences for Faculty of Color are reported in the literature (see, e.g., Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano & Cuellar 2008).

Furthermore, the development of racial identity can impact the development of other identities such as sexual identity and gender identity, therefore causing challenges for “multiple-identity minority students” (Poynter & Washington, 2005, p. 45). Given the range of experiences for People of Color, particularly for those who also identify as LGBQ, we reviewed the differences in experience for LGBQ Respondents of Color and LGBQ White Respondents as well as Transmasculine, Transfeminine, and GNC Respondents of Color.

! CHALLENGE: Multiple minoritized identities (e.g., racial identity and sexual identity; racial identity and gender identity) lead to encounters of multiple forms of oppression.

- Respondents of Color (20%) were 10 times more likely to indicate racial profiling as a form of harassment when compared with White Respondents (2%).
- LGBQ Respondents of Color were more likely than their LGBQ White counterparts to indicate race as the basis for harassment. Sexual identity, however, was the primary risk factor for harassment for both groups.
- Transmasculine, Transfeminine, and GNC Respondents of Color were more likely than Men and Women of Color to experience harassment

Students, faculty members, and staff members of every identity category are all impacted by a negative campus climate (Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward, 2008; Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Silverschanz, et al., 2007). For students, academic performance, educational outcomes, social adjustment, and interpersonal skill development are negatively influenced by a less than welcoming campus climate; for faculty members and staff members, personal and professional development and subsequent retention and productivity are negatively influenced by a non-affirming campus climate.

! CHALLENGE: The results of this study supported these findings. In particular, the analyses indicate that students are at the highest risk for experiencing conduct that interferes with their ability to live and learn on campus.

- LGBTQ students experienced higher rates of harassment and more often attributed that harassment to sexual identity when compared to LGBTQ faculty and LGBTQ staff respondents.
- LGBTQ faculty respondents were most likely to attribute the harassment to gender identity.

Perceptions of Campus Climate

Comfort Level with Overall Campus Climate, Department/Work Unit Climate and Classroom Climate

Perceptions with campus climate are often tied to experiences of campus climate; therefore, much of the literature discussed in the previous section also found perceptions of negative campus climates for LGBT students, faculty members, and staff members. Perceptions of campus climate can have important implications on personal, emotional, academic, and professional development. LGBT students are impacted in the areas of university Greek systems, student athletic programs, student religious groups (Rankin, 2007; Wolf-Wendel, Toma, & Morphew, 2001), and academic achievement (Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005). LGB faculty members who assess campus climate more positively are correspondingly more likely to feel personally supported and to identify their work site as more supportive of personnel decisions than those who view the climate more negatively (Sears, 2002).

❗ CHALLENGE: LGBQ respondents have more negative perceptions of campus climate than their heterosexual counterparts.

- LGBQ respondents (70%, 76%, 64%) were significantly less likely than their allies to feel very comfortable or comfortable with the overall campus climate, their department/work unit climate, and classroom climate than their heterosexual counterparts (78%, 85%, 76%).
- Among LGBQ respondents, queer respondents (63%) were least likely to feel very comfortable or comfortable with their overall campus climate; both bisexual (71%) and queer respondents (71%) were least likely to feel very comfortable or comfortable in their department/work unit climate; and lesbians or similar (59%) and queer (59%) respondents were least likely to feel very comfortable or comfortable in their classroom climate.
- LGBQ respondents (55%) were significantly more likely to perceive or observe harassment when compared with heterosexual respondents (47%) and also more likely to indicate the perceived harassment was based on sexual identity (78%, 65%, respectively).
- Among LGBQ respondents, those who identified as queer (70%) were significantly more likely to observe harassment than respondents who identified as gay or similar, lesbian or similar, or bisexual.
- LGBQ respondents were more likely to observe others being the targets of derogatory comments (77%), being stared at (41%), deliberately ignored or excluded (38%), and intimidated or bullied (30%). LGBQ respondents were twice as likely as heterosexual respondents to report they perceived physical violence in their campus environment (10%, 5%, respectively).
- Queer respondents were more likely to observe others staring, someone being deliberately ignored or excluded, and racial/ethnic profiling than other sexual minority identities.

While a minority of respondents perceived a relatively positive climate for gender variant members of the campus community, an emerging theme within the study revealed the perception that, while heterosexism may at times surface in some subtle ways on campus, transgender oppression is often manifested in overt and blatant ways. Transgender oppression was indicated throughout the quantitative data as well as the qualitative data where commentary was provided.

❗ CHALLENGE: Respondents who identified as transmasculine, transfeminine, and GNC have more negative perceptions of campus climate when compared with those who identify within the gender binary (i.e., men and women).

- Transmasculine, transfeminine, and GNC respondents were significantly less likely than their men and women counterparts to feel very comfortable or comfortable with the overall campus climate, department/work unit climate, and classroom climate.
- Respondents who identified as transmasculine were least likely to feel very comfortable or comfortable with their overall campus climate (56%), department/work unit (61%), and classroom climate (45%).
- There were significant differences in the rates of observations of harassment between respondents who identified within a gender binary and those who did not. Approximately two-thirds of transmasculine respondents (67%), GNC respondents (67%), and transfeminine respondents (63%) observed harassment, compared with 52 percent of women and 50 percent of men.
- Transfeminine and transmasculine respondents were significantly more likely to attribute the observed harassment to gender identity and gender expression when compared with other gender identity groups.
- Transmasculine (53%) and transfeminine (52%) respondents were both most likely to observe others staring, while transfeminine respondents (51%) were most likely to observe someone being deliberately ignored or excluded.

- Transmasculine (36%) and GNC (36%) respondents were equally likely to observe racial/ethnic profiling.
- GNC respondents (38%) were most likely to observe someone being intimidate or bullied.

Rankin (2003) found that more LGBT People of Color (32%) reported being the victims of harassment on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity as compared to their LGBT White people counterparts. Among the individuals surveyed in the Beemyn and Rankin (in press 2011) study, a significantly larger percentage of transgender people of color (33%) reported experiencing harassment because of their gender identity/expression than did transgender White people (27%). These findings suggest that the intersection of racism, heterosexism, and transgender oppression may increase bias crimes against LGBT People of Color. The findings from our study partially support this proposition.

❗ CHALLENGE: The intersection of multiple cultural and social identities increases the risk for negative perceptions of campus climate.

- Respondents of Color were slightly less likely to feel very comfortable or comfortable with their department/work unit climate (75%) and classroom climate (62%) than their White counterparts (78%, 66%, respectively).
- Differences in comfort levels for LGBQ Respondents of Color and LGBQ White respondents emerged when both racial identity and sexual identity were considered.
- LGBQ Respondents of Color were significantly less likely than LGBQ White respondents to feel very comfortable or comfortable in their classes (60%, 65%, respectively).
- Although not statistically significant, LGBQ Respondents of Color were also less likely than their LGBQ White counterparts to feel very comfortable or comfortable with the climate in their department/work unit (74%, 77%, respectively).
- Transmasculine Respondents of Color (63%) and Transfeminine Respondents of Color (70%) were significantly more likely to feel very comfortable or comfortable with the overall campus climate than their White Transmasculine (54%) and White Transfeminine (59%) counterparts.
- Transmasculine Respondents of Color were significantly more likely to feel very comfortable or comfortable with their classroom climate when compared with White Transmasculine respondents
- White Respondents (54%) were significantly more likely than Respondents of Color (51%) to perceive harassment.
- Respondents of Color were more likely to attribute the perceived harassment to racial identity. Sexual identity, however, was indicated as the primary basis for observed harassment for both Respondents of Color (75%) and White Respondents (76%).
- LGBQ Respondents of Color (44%) were significantly more likely than LGBQ White Respondents (52%) to observe harassment.
- Transmasculine (65%), Transfeminine (68%), and GNC (65%) Respondents of Color were significantly more likely than Men (45%) and Women (50%) of Color to perceive harassment and more than twice as likely to attribute that perceived harassment to gender identity.
- Respondents of Color were more likely than White Respondents to indicate racial profiling (37%, 29%, respectively) as the form for the perceived harassment, while White Respondents were more likely to indicate intimidation or bullying (24%, 31%, respectively).

Several research studies underscore the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments in achieving positive educational outcomes for students (Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Whitt et al., 2001). Settles et al. (2006) propose that the personal and professional development of employees is impacted by campus climate, yet there is very limited research that examines perceptions with campus climate for LGBQ students, faculty members, and staff members. As such, perceptions with campus climate by institutional position (students, faculty members, and staff members) for LGBQ respondents were examined in this research study. We also report differences in perceptions for students, faculty members, and staff members by racial identity and gender identity when statistical differences were found.

! CHALLENGE: LGBQ faculty members had more negative perceptions of campus climate than their LGBQ student and staff counterparts.

- LGBQ faculty respondents (60%) were significantly less likely than LGBQ student respondents (70%) and LGBQ staff respondents (73%) to feel very comfortable or comfortable with the overall campus climate.
- LGBQ faculty respondents (76%) were significantly less likely than LGBQ staff respondents (83%) to feel very comfortable or comfortable with their department/work unit climate.
- LGBQ faculty respondents (60%) were significantly more likely than LGBQ student (54%) and staff (54%) respondents to observe harassment.
- LGBQ faculty respondents and students were most likely to indicate sexual identity as the basis for the perceived harassment.
- LGBQ student respondents were more likely than LGBQ faculty and LGBQ staff respondents to indicate derogatory remarks, stares, and racial/ethnic profiling as the form of perceived harassment.

Individual and Institutional Responses to Campus Climate

This study analyzed respondents' individual responses to the campus climate via their personal experiences and perceptions as well as their understanding of their institution's response to challenging campus climates. Individual responses include behaviors such as seriously considered leaving the institution or staying away from areas on campus where LGBTQ people congregate for fear of being labeled. Institutional responses include behaviors such as departmental curriculum representing the contributions of LGBTQ people and the ways the University/College responds to issues of LGBTQ harassment, concerns, and issues. This examination of individual and institutional responses provided us with a glimpse into the influence of campus climate on LGBTQ respondents and validated the need for recommendations that improve the campus climate for individuals who identify as LGBQ, transmasculine, transfeminine, and gender non-conforming and who have been identified as most at-risk (Bilodeau & Renn, 2005; Rankin, 2003).

! CHALLENGE: LGBQ, transmasculine, transfeminine, and GNC respondents were most likely to demonstrate individual behaviors that were responses to a negative campus climate.

- LGBQ respondents more often seriously considered leaving their institution, avoided LGBTQ areas of campus, feared for their physical safety due to sexual identity, and avoided disclosure of sexual identity due to intimidation and fear of negative consequences.
- LGBQ faculty respondents were more likely than LGBQ students and staff respondents to have seriously considered leaving their institution.

- LGBQ students were more likely to have seriously considered leaving their institution. The likelihood of leaving for all students, regardless of sexual identity, decreased with each year of study, but the differences between LGBQ and heterosexual students widened, with LGBQ students considering leaving more often.
- Respondents who identified as transmasculine, transfeminine, and GNC were more likely to seriously consider leaving their institution, avoid LGBTQQ areas of campus, fear for their physical safety due to gender identity, and avoid disclosure of gender identity due to intimidation and fear of negative consequences.

❗ CHALLENGE: LGBQ, transmasculine, transfeminine, and GNC respondents were most likely to disagree with their institution's response through its policies, procedures, programs and curriculum.

- LGBQ, transmasculine, transfeminine, and GNC respondents were less likely to agree that the University/ College provides adequate resources on LGBTQQ issues and concerns, positively responds to incidents of LGBTQQ harassment, provides adequate support to LGBTQQ employees and their partners, and provides adequate resources on LGBTQQ issues and concerns.
- LGBQ faculty and staff respondents as well as faculty and staff respondents who did not identify with socially-constructed gender binaries more often experienced discriminatory employment practices.
- LGBQ students and faculty respondents were less likely to agree that their general education requirements and departmental curriculum represent the contributions of people who are LGBT.

Potential Best Practices³

From the findings in our project and based on the literature suggesting that campus climate influences student and employee success, we developed the following potential best practices for creating positive climates for LGBTQQ people. We posit that LGBTQQ students who experience positive campus climates have more positive educational experiences and experience healthy identity development. Further, we contend that LGBTQQ faculty members and staff members who experience positive campus climates are more productive and experience positive work environments. Given these positive experiences, students and employees are more likely to persist and flourish at their institution.

In the demographic section of the monograph we discuss the power of language in the LGBTQQ community and, therefore, encourage the use of language that extends beyond the binaries in all of the recommended potential best practices. As reflected in the results, many participants did not fit the socially-constructed definitions of gender identity, sexual identity, and gender expression. Their comments suggested they are either pathologized or forced to develop a “different” sense of identity. In shaping our outlook, language instills and reinforces cultural values, thereby helping to maintain social hierarchies. While definitions facilitate discussion and the sharing of information, terminology remains subject to both cultural contexts and individual interpretation. As a result, the terminology that people use to describe themselves and their communities is often not universally accepted by everyone within these communities. Therefore, our overall recommendation is that we value the voices of those within our campus communities and use language that reflects their unique experiences.

³ Many of the potential best practices reflect those offered in Blumenfeld (1993), Rankin (2003), and Windmeyer, Rankin, & Beemyn (2009; <http://www.campusclimateindex.org>) and are supported by the findings of this project. Further, an excellent resource for many of the recommended programs is available on the LGBTQQ Architect at <http://architect.lgbtcampus.org/>

The potential best practices that we suggest fall under the following broad categories and are presented more fully in the last section of the monograph.

Develop Inclusive Policies

Policies that explicitly welcome LGBTQQ employees and students powerfully express the commitment of a college or university in building a community of difference. Individuals will be more likely to be open about their sexual identity or gender identity knowing that the institution is supportive. When individuals do not have to expend energy hiding aspects of their identity, they, in turn, tend to be more satisfied and productive.

Demonstrate Institutional Commitment

Integrating LGBTQQ concerns into all aspects of the institution acknowledges the existence of LGBTQQ members of the community. Even the simplest steps, such as creating inclusive wording on documents, creates brave space in which LGBTQQ individuals are free to be themselves. Due to the high rate of harassment/discrimination experienced by people who do not fit the socially constructed categories of sexual identity, gender identity, and gender expression, procedures that directly respond to acts of intolerance are especially needed.

Integrate LGBTQQ Issues and Concerns in Curricular and Co-Curricular Education

As both LGBTQQ and non-LGBTQQ individuals are socialized into a homophobic and heterosexist society, campus community members need the space to question and examine unfounded attitudes and beliefs. Exposure to new ideas and sources of knowledge, along with a rich and dynamic dialogue concerning a range of issues, is precisely what the university/college should encourage in the campus community. Acknowledging the contributions of LGBTQQ individuals to all areas of scholarship, in addition to creating the space for gender/sexuality-specific studies, is important to the full integration of LGBTQQ concerns and experiences into the academic community. The omission of such topics from the academic realm dehistoricizes LGBTQQ experiences and paints a false picture of the world in which we live.

Respond Appropriately to Anti-LGBTQQ Incidents/Bias

As long as anti-LGBTQQ bias persists on campus, as evidenced in the results of this project, LGBTQQ individuals will need to feel safe and supported by their institutions when acts of anti-LGBTQQ intolerance occur. LGBTQQ people should be able to speak and act without fear of homophobic reprisal.

Create Brave Spaces for Student Dialogues in On-Campus Housing

In order to encourage greater understanding across differences and model such interactions for the larger campus community, brave spaces should be created for civil dialogue between LGBTQQ and non-LGBTQQ people. Much of this dialogue for students occurs in residence halls on campus. While we understand that many institutions do not offer on-campus residences, those who do may find the potential best practices useful.

Offer Comprehensive Counseling & Healthcare

The literature reviewed earlier in the monograph suggested that respondents who experienced both ambient and personal heterosexist harassment had the lowest overall well-being than respondents who experienced only ambient heterosexist harassment and those who did not experience any heterosexist harassment. Given that our results

indicate many LGBTQQ students and employees experience heterosexist climates, the need for counseling support is evident. Further, more students are coming “out” as transgender on college campuses across the country. Although this growing population has unique needs related to physical and mental health care, most colleges and universities offer little or no support for this population (Beemyn et al., 2005). We offer here recommended potential best practices for addressing the counseling and health care needs of LGBTQQ students, faculty members, and staff members.

Improve Recruitment & Retention Efforts

As critical members of the campus community, both students and employees, in turn, shape the campus climate. For example, a diverse student body and student groups that form around social identities facilitate inter- and intra-group relationships, which promote learning and the development of multicultural skills (Rankin & Reason, 2008). Interpersonal learning and multicultural skills continue to positively impact the lives of students beyond their collegiate experience. Furthermore, faculty scholarship that includes diverse perspectives, methodologies, and centers around issues of social justice and advocacy not only supports the mission of higher education, but also “sends an important message to students” about the importance of these constructs (Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 266). As a result of these actions, students and faculty members effect change on personal, interpersonal, and institutional levels, thus impacting the campus climate.

What People are Saying...

"Let Campus Pride's 2010 *State of Higher Education for LGBT People* report be a clarion call to re-double efforts to create the conditions whereby all students and faculty - no matter their sexual identify or other defining human characteristic - can flourish on college campuses."

*Dr. George D. Kuh, Chancellor's Professor Emeritus, Indiana University
& Director of the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment,
Indiana University Bloomington & University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

"Finally. A comprehensive report on the state of LGBTQQ students, faculty, staff and administrators that also includes recommendations for strategic assessment and program/policy development that will assist campuses in supporting the academic and developmental success of this student population. ACPA - College Student Educators International is proud to partner with Campus Pride to provide this historic publication for the higher education community."

*Vernon A. Wall, Director of Educational Programs & Publications,
ACPA - College Student Educators International*

"What Campus Pride's report really shows is the importance of students being honest about not only their identities, but about whether their schools are keeping them safe and creating an inclusive community. People being willing to tell their personal stories not only replaces abstract hate and bias with personal understanding, but also gives us useful statistics that should grasp the attention of college administrators across the country. The potential for violence and hurtful discrimination against sexual minorities is still too great, and institutions should use this report to make sure they are doing everything they can to reduce it."

*Judy Shepard, Mother of Matthew Shepard,
Founder & Chairperson of Matthew Shepard Foundation*



BELIEVE IN -- Campus Pride is the leading national nonprofit organization 501(c)(3) for student leaders and campus organizations working to create safer, more LGBT-friendly colleges and universities. It exists to give "voice and action" in building future LGBT and ally leaders.

\$24.95
Campus Pride
www.campuspride.org
Printed in the U.S.A.