LGBTQ WORKING GROUP UPDATE
Working Group Mission

• Ensure Division III is safe for, inclusive of and welcoming to the LGBTQ community and its allies.

• Increase engagement, education and understanding of LGBTQ issues at all levels of Division III.

• Examine current resources and areas of unmet need and create opportunities.
Working Group Roster

• Christopher Deddo, student-athlete, SUNY Maritime
• Margaret Drugovich, president, Hartwick College
• Malcolm Huggins, assistant AD, SUNY Oswego
• Brit Katz, VP and dean of student life, Millsaps College
• Christopher Kimball, president, California Lutheran University
Working Group Roster

- Kyrstin Krist, FAR, Methodist University
- Donna Ledwin, commissioner, AMCC
- Emet Marwell, student representative, Mount Holyoke College
- Julie Shaw, director of education, Women’s Sports Foundation
- Michael Vienna, AD, Emory University
- Neil Virtue, coach, Mills College
Working Group Survey

• Developed to better understand the current landscape and climate in Division III.

• Sub-divided into four surveys:
  o Presidents and athletics direct reports.
  o Athletics administrators and coaches.
  o Student-athletes.
  o Commissioners.
Working Group Survey

• Focused on four areas:
  o Landscape and culture in Division III.
  o Education and resources.
  o Visibility and recognition.
  o Policies.
Landscape and Culture in Division III

• Overall, athletics departments and conferences were seen as welcoming and free from discrimination toward the LGBTQ community.

• LGBTQ respondents considered their athletics departments and conferences to be less welcoming.
Landscape and Culture in Division III

• Less than 5% of LGBTQ athletics administrator and student-athlete respondents feared losing their job or roster spot.

• Male LGBTQ respondents were most likely to take a neutral position, which may indicate uncertainty with this constituent group.
Landscape and Culture in Division III

- Nearly all respondents indicated LGBTQ individuals would be safe as spectators.
- Aligns with Division III philosophy and “Game Day the DIII Way” sportsmanship initiative.
Student-Athlete Knowledge Gaps

• Student-athlete knowledge gap of LGBTQ people and issues.
  
  o Non-LGBTQ student-athlete respondents were less likely to agree that institutions and athletics departments should provide support.

  o Fewer identified as allies.
Communication of LGBTQ Identity

• More than 80% of LGBTQ respondents felt safe communicating about sexuality and/or gender identity.

• Almost 20% of LGBTQ respondents feared being “out” at institutions and within intercollegiate athletics.
Conference Landscape and Culture

• More than half of respondents believed their conference was welcoming.

• Approximately a quarter of respondents were not sure.

• LGBTQ respondents were considerably less likely to rate their conference as welcoming.
Education and Resources

• Guest speakers and open dialogue sessions would be the most helpful types of LGBTQ programming.

• Most respondents do not use NCAA Office of Inclusion resources.
Education and Resources

• More than half of respondents indicated their athletics department or conference provides LGBTQ-related staff trainings at least once per year.

• Nearly 30% of respondents reported staff trainings never take place.
  o Lack of alignment with institutional values.
  o Lack of financial resources.
Visibility and Recognition

• Nearly half of LGBTQ respondents felt comfortable with a national, conference or institutional recognition for their contributions to intercollegiate athletics and to celebrate their LGBTQ identity.

• More than one quarter of LGBTQ respondents were undecided.

• Respondents were evenly split on supporting the establishment of a related national award.
Handbook Policies

• Most athletics departments do not have a written LGBTQ nondiscrimination policy.

• Handbooks (staff and student-athlete) do not reference an LGBTQ inclusive, respectful environment.

• Lack of knowledge regarding transgender student-athlete participation policies.
Recruiting Policies

• LGBTQ coaches and administrators believed negative recruiting occurs and fear losing recruits.

• LGBTQ female coaches and administrators twice as likely to fear losing prospective student-athletes (PSAs) because of their identity.

• In contrast, student-athlete respondents noted negative recruiting was virtually nonexistent.
Next Steps

Division III-specific LGBTQ resources, initiatives and programming:

• “Train the trainer” educational program.
• LGBTQ-inclusive template language for policies and procedures.
• Certification program for LGBTQ-inclusive institutions.
• LGBTQ celebratory reception.
• Co-branded NCAA inclusion materials.
• SAAC facilitation guide.
Straw Poll Questions

What educational resources would most assist your LGBTQ programming efforts?

1 = Written educational guide.

2 = Facilitator training (e.g., train the trainer).

3 = NCAA-facilitated training.
Straw Poll Questions

If you do not use existing LGBTQ resources from the NCAA Office of Inclusion and Division III webpages, what is the primary reason?

1 = I am not aware they existed.

2 = I do not know where to find them.

3 = They are not relevant to my needs.

4 = They are not helpful.
Straw Poll Questions

If the NCAA were to commit resources toward LGBTQ programming (e.g., train the trainer), recognition events (e.g., Division III reception) or promotional materials (e.g., banner/poster campaign), which would you prefer?

1 = Programming (e.g., train the trainer).
2 = Recognition event (e.g., Division III reception).
3 = Promotional materials (e.g., banner/poster campaign).
Straw Poll Questions

Which constituent group should be the initial target for programming?

1 = Athletics administrators.

2 = Coaches.

3 = Student-athletes.
Straw Poll Questions

If made available, would you publicly display a Division III-specific, LGBTQ-inclusive poster/banner in your athletics facilities?

1 = Yes.

2 = No.

3 = I don’t know.
Straw Poll Questions

If made available, would you use template language to develop LGBTQ-inclusive policy statements, inclusion statements and nondiscrimination clauses for your handbooks?

1 = Yes.
2 = No.
3 = I don’t know.
THANK YOU