

**REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION III
LGBTQ WORKING GROUP
NOVEMBER 14, 2017, MEETING**

ACTION ITEMS.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- 1. Welcome and roster.** The NCAA Division III LGBTQ Working Group commenced business at 8 a.m. Eastern time Tuesday, November 14. Working group chair Neil Virtue welcomed the group and NCAA staff conducted a roll call.
- 2. Report of October 4 teleconference report.** The working group reviewed and approved the teleconference report.
- 3. Mission statement.** The working group reviewed its mission statement. The mission statement is a living document and henceforth may be modified at any time.
- 4. LGBTQ membership surveys.** In preparation for the NCAA research staff's executive summary presentation, the working group reviewed the content and structure of the LGBTQ Division III-wide membership surveys distributed to the following demographic groups:
 - a. Presidents and athletics direct reports;
 - b. Athletics administrators and coaches;
 - c. Commissioners; and
 - d. Student-athletes.
- 5. LGBTQ survey executive summary.** The research staff presented an executive summary of the LGBTQ Division III-wide membership surveys, detailing quantitative findings in four categories. Below are the key takeaways from each of the four categories. [Attachment]
 - a. Landscape and culture in Division III.
 - (1) Most respondents felt their athletics departments and conferences were free from LGBTQ discrimination; however, the working group noted there were notable differences of opinion between LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ student-athlete respondents.

- (2) While a small percentage of LGBTQ athletics administrator and student-athlete respondents feared losing their jobs or roster spots, respectively, the working group discussed the need to eliminate the existing fear amongst male LGBTQ student-athletes and coaches.
- (3) Nearly all respondents felt LGBTQ spectators would be safe at their athletics events. The working group noted that this positive response aligned with Division III's initiative to create a positive game environment via the "Game Day the DIII Way" sportsmanship plan.
- (4) The working group noted a student-athlete knowledge gap of LGBTQ people and issues. Non-LGBTQ student-athletes were less likely to agree that institutions and athletics departments should provide support and fewer identified as allies. The working group suggested that the NCAA Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, as well as campus and conference SAACs could potentially serve resources to close the awareness and knowledge gap.
- (5) Many LGBTQ respondents do not feel it is safe to communicate about their sexuality and/or gender identity. The working group acknowledged this reflects a continued fear of being "out" at institutions and within intercollegiate athletics.
- (6) LGBTQ respondents were considerably less likely to rate their conference's support of the LGBTQ community as welcoming. The working group pondered if the data reflect a lack of awareness of what happens at the conference level.

b. Education/resources.

- (1) Most respondents agreed that guest speakers and regularly scheduled open dialogue sessions would be the most helpful types of LGBTQ programming, while they noted not using the existing NCAA Office of Inclusion LGBTQ resources. The working group discussed the possibility that many individuals do not know where to locate existing resources or have forgotten and/or are not aware that the resources exist.
- (2) Lack of alignment with institutional values and lack of financial resources were the most commonly cited reasons for lack of LGBTQ staff training. The working group noted that there may be several religiously affiliated institutions who may not support LGBTQ initiatives. A Division III version of the NCAA Common Ground initiative was suggested as a way to begin dialogue with faith-based Division III institutions. The working group also

noted the possibility of offering funding to institutions that do not have the financial means to conduct trainings on LGBTQ issues.

c. Visibility and recognition.

- (1) Nearly half of the LGBTQ respondents indicated that they were comfortable with national, conference or institutional recognition for their contributions to intercollegiate athletics and celebrating them for their LGBTQ identity; however, a substantial percentage of respondents were undecided. The working group pondered whether for those undecided, there were concerns about being "outed," being singled out and/or being treated differently by others.
- (2) Respondents were evenly split on supporting the establishment of a national award. The working group, once again, speculated on potential reasons why a respondent might not support a national award that recognizes contributions to intercollegiate athletics and celebrating the LGBTQ identity.

d. Policies.

- (1) Most athletics departments do not have a written LGBTQ nondiscrimination policy. Further, many athletics department handbooks and student-athlete handbooks do not reference supporting or promoting an inclusive, respectful environment for student-athletes and colleagues of the LGBTQ community. The working group noted that policy language should be a focal area for resource development.
- (2) More than half of respondents did not know if their athletics department or conference had a transgender student-athlete participation policy. The working group suggested the low number of institutions with such a policy may be a result of few institutions having disclosed transgender student-athletes.
- (3) LGBTQ coaches and administrators were considerably more likely to believe coaches use the identity of LGBTQ coaches as a negative recruiting tool with prospective student-athletes. LGBTQ female administrators and coaches were almost twice as likely to fear losing prospective student-athletes because of their identity compared to LGBTQ male administrators and coaches; however, the working group noted that a substantial percentage from both demographic groups feared losing prospective student-athletes because of their identity.

- (4) Student-athlete respondents noted that negative recruiting against LGBTQ coaches at other institutions was virtually nonexistent.

6. Subgroup discussion of survey results and NCAA Convention presentation. The working group divided into three subgroups (i.e., Education/Resources; Visibility and Recognition; and Communication) to discuss the survey results within the context of the following three questions relevant to the specific subgroup:

- a. What survey findings should be presented during the Division III business session at the 2018 NCAA Convention?
- b. Should the working group develop a resource to be distributed during the Division III business session to support the survey feedback?
- c. Relevant to your subgroup, what polling questions should be asked during the Division III business session to continue guiding the working group?

7. Working group discussion of survey results and Convention. Each subgroup reported its discussion including recommendations regarding the presentation of survey results, development of resources and possible polling questions for the Division III business session.

- a. Education/Resources: The subgroup reported that the survey results reflected a critical need in Division III to engage in deeper conversations about LGBTQ issues. Consequently, the subgroup recommended that the presentation of survey results at the Division III business session highlight the following findings:
 - (1) Overall, survey respondents ranked guest speakers and regularly scheduled open dialogue sessions as the most helpful types of LGBTQ programming.
 - (2) Forty-eight (48) percent of survey respondents cited lack of financial resources as the primary reason why LGBTQ trainings do not occur (or occur as frequently as preferred).

The subgroup also recommended creating a one-page, Division III-specific resource of LGBTQ terminology to distribute at the Convention. Specifically, the subgroup noted that to engage in meaningful conversations about LGBTQ issues, it is important to equip individuals with fundamental language. Staff will collaborate with the NCAA Office of Inclusion and the author of an existing glossary of terms on ncaa.org to develop an updated, abridged version for Division III members. The subgroup also suggested the following polling questions:

- (1) What educational resources would most assist your LGBTQ programming efforts?
 - (a) Written educational guide.
 - (b) Facilitator training (e.g., train the trainer).
 - (c) NCAA-facilitated trainings.
- (2) If you do not use existing LGBTQ resources from the NCAA Office of Inclusion and Division III webpages, what is the reason?
 - (a) Was not aware they existed.
 - (b) Do not know where to find them.
 - (c) They are not relevant to my needs.
 - (d) They are not helpful.
- (3) How do you prefer to receive LGBTQ resources?
 - (a) In-person small dialogue.
 - (b) In-person large group presentation.
 - (c) Email.
 - (d) Webinar/web-based resources.

b. Visibility and recognition: The subgroup reported that the survey results reflected a relatively even distribution of opinion about whether to publicly celebrate and recognize LGBTQ individuals within the context of intercollegiate athletics. The working group expressed concern that besides the NCAA Woman of the Year Award, there is no precedent for publicly awarding underrepresented populations in intercollegiate athletics. Consequently, the subgroup recommended that the presentation of survey results at the Division III business session highlight the following findings:

- (1) Of the survey respondents who identified as LGBTQ, nearly half indicated that they were comfortable with the NCAA, Division III, their conference

or their institution recognizing them for their contributions to intercollegiate athletics and celebrating them for their LGBTQ identity. More than one-fourth were undecided.

- (2) On the issue of the NCAA and Division III establishing a national award to recognize individuals, institutions or conferences for their contributions to LGBTQ inclusion, more than one-third of survey respondents across groups reported being unsure, while a similar percentage agreed.

Lastly, the subgroup suggested the following polling questions:

- (1) If the NCAA were to commit resources toward LGBTQ programming (e.g., train the trainer), recognition event (e.g., Division III reception), or promotional materials (e.g., banners/poster campaign), which would you prefer?
 - (a) Programming.
 - (b) Recognition event.
 - (c) Promotional materials
- (2) If you chose programming in the previous question, which constituent group should be the initial target for programming?
 - (a) Athletics administrators.
 - (b) Coaches.
 - (c) Student-athletes.
- (3) If made available, would you publicly display a Division III specific LGBTQ-inclusive poster/banner in your athletics facilities?

- c. Communication: The subgroup reported that the survey results reflected an information gap regarding LGBTQ policies. Specifically, there is more understanding and awareness of policies at the institutional-level compared to the athletics department. Similarly, athletics departments have a greater awareness and inclusion of policies than conferences. However, the least informed survey respondents were coaches and student-athletes. Consequently, the subgroup recommended that the presentation of survey results at the Division III business session highlight the following findings:

- (1) Sixty-two (62) percent of survey respondents either did not know if their athletics department had, or did not have, a written LGBTQ nondiscrimination policy.
- (2) Seventy-six (76) percent of conference administrator respondents indicated that their conference does not have a written LGBTQ nondiscrimination policy.
- (3) Less than half of conferences and athletics departments have policies to address anti-LGBTQ slurs, jokes, comments, actions or behaviors.
- (4) Only 29 percent of athletics departments and conferences have a transgender student-athlete participation policy.
- (5) One in four LGBTQ administrator and coach respondents strongly agree or agree that some coaches use the identity of LGBTQ coaches as a negative recruiting tool with prospective student-athletes or their parents. Only nine percent of non-LGBTQ administrator and coach respondents strongly agreed or agreed.
- (6) Forty percent (40) of female LGBTQ administrator and coach respondents strongly agreed or agree with the statement, "I fear losing prospective student-athletes because of my LGBTQ identity". Twenty-five (25) percent of male LGBTQ administrator respondents strongly agreed or agreed with that statement.

The subgroup also noted that most athletics departments and conferences lack policies that include references to LGBTQ, sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression. Consequently, the subgroup recommended that the presentation of survey results at the Division III business session highlight the following findings:

- (1) Thirty-eight (38) percent of survey respondents indicated that their athletics department has a written LGBTQ nondiscrimination policy.
- (2) Less than 50 percent of survey respondents indicated that their athletics department handbook included the support and promotion of an inclusive, respectful environment for the LGBTQ community.
- (3) One-fourth of survey respondents indicated that their athletics department's communications and recruiting materials includes a nondiscrimination clause. Of those with nondiscrimination clauses, 41 percent indicated the clause references LGBTQ.

The subgroup also recommended distributing the Office of Inclusion's "Five Ways to Have an LGBTQ-inclusive Athletics Department" as a resource to supplement the presentation of findings at Convention and to encourage the Division III membership to access the resource online for a more interactive experience. Further, the subgroup recommended that the presentation of findings call attention to the LGBT SportSafe Inclusion Program as well as all resources available on the Office of Inclusion's LGBTQ webpage.

Lastly, the subgroup suggested the following polling question:

- If made available, would you use template language to develop policy statements, inclusion statements and nondiscrimination clauses?

8. Next steps after Convention. The working group discussed potential next steps after the Convention regarding the development of Division III-specific LGBTQ resources, initiatives and programming. Specifically, the working group discussed the following possibilities:

- a. Develop a Division III "train the trainer" program.
- b. Develop template language for policy statements, inclusion statements and nondiscrimination clauses for conferences and athletics departments, including exemplary examples from Division III conferences and institutions.
- c. Sponsor a Division III LGBTQ reception at an NCAA-sponsored event.
- d. Design a Division III LGBTQ poster/banner/decal campaign.
- e. Develop a Division III LGBTQ certification program (comparable to the LGBT SportSafe Inclusion Program).
- f. Design an NCAA-inclusion template for Division III institutions and conferences to co-brand. Create a Division III SAAC facilitation guide for student-to-student dialogue.
- g. Update existing resources on the Office of Inclusion's LGBTQ webpage in consultation with internal and external constituents.
- h. Launch Division III LGBTQ video campaign.
- i. Encourage Division III conferences and institutions to nominate student-athlete advocates for LGBTQ issues as part of their respective SAAC governance structures.

- j. Design follow-up Division III membership survey to solicit additional information.
- 9. Future teleconferences.** Staff noted a Doodle request to determine availability for the January 2018 teleconference is forthcoming. On the teleconference, the working group will review the draft Convention presentation and straw poll questions.
- 10. Other business.** Staff shared an email from a Division III transgender student. The trans-male student was a field hockey prospective student-athlete; however, once the student enrolled at the Division III institution and began medically transitioning to male, he was no longer eligible for participation. The student, who now serves as the student manager for the Division III institution's field hockey team, expressed interested in the Division III LGBTQ membership survey and offered to assist the working group in whatever manner necessary. Staff asked the working group if they would like to offer the student to join the working group, in part, to add another student perspective as well as to add a transgender perspective. The working group unanimously supported extending an invitation to the student.
- 11. Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

*Staff Support: Louise McCleary, Division III Governance
Jean Orr, Academic and Membership Affairs*

NCAA Division III LGBTQ Working Group November 14, 2017, In-person Meeting	
Attendees:	
Malcolm Huggins, State University of New York at Oswego; State University of New York.	
R. Brit Katz, Millsaps College; Southern Athletic Association.	
Christopher Kimball, California Lutheran University; Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (<i>via teleconference</i>).	
Kyrstin Krist, Methodist University; USA South Athletic Conference.	
Donna Ledwin, Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference.	
Rosamaria Riccobono, Eastern Connecticut State University; Little East Conference.	
Julie Shaw, Women's Sports Foundation.	
Michael Vienna, Emory University; University Athletic Association.	
Neil Virtue, Mills College; Independent.	
Absentees:	
Christopher Deddo, State University of New York Maritime College; Skyline Conference.	
Margaret Drugovich, Hartwick College; Empire 8.	
NCAA Staff in Attendance:	
Lydia Bell, Louise McCleary, Jean Orr and Amy Wilson.	