

9/22

**Report on the Experience of Lesbian and Gay Law Students
in the New York Metropolitan Area Law Schools**

Prepared by the Committee on Lesbians and Gay Men in the Legal Profession
Association of the Bar of the City of New York

Introduction

In 1990, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York established the Special Committee on Lesbians and Gay Men in the Legal Profession ("the Committee") to identify and help eliminate the barriers that lesbians and gay men face in the practice of law in the New York metropolitan area. The Committee's first report, published in 1993, provided an overview of the experience of gay and lesbian attorneys in the metropolitan area, and made recommendations to legal employers concerning steps that can be taken to eliminate sexual orientation bias in the workplace.¹ The Committee recently completed its second report, which discussed the treatment of lesbian and gay attorneys and litigants in the New York State courts.

This report documents the law school experience of lesbians and gay men who are students in New York metropolitan area law schools, and who responded to a survey drafted by the Committee.² The report, in conjunction with the Committee's previous studies, shows the continuing

¹ See Preliminary Report on the Experience of Lesbians and Gay Men in the Legal Profession, The Record, Vol. 48, No. 7 (Nov. 1993) (hereafter "Preliminary Report").

² The Report is based on some 69 completed questionnaires from students at 10 New York area law schools. Forty-six respondents (67%) were men and 23 respondents (33%) were women. Fifteen of the women defined themselves as lesbians and 4 of the women defined themselves as bisexuals. All of the male respondents defined themselves as gay. Twenty-eight of the respondents (40%) were 25 to 30 years of age, 16 respondents (23%) were 22 to 25 years old, 15 respondents (22%) were 30 to 40 years of age, 8 respondents (11%) were over 40 years old and 2 respondents (3%) were less than 22 years old. Fifty-three respondents were white/Caucasian, 6 were Latino/Latina, 4 were African American, 4 were Asian American, 1 was Native American, and 1 was other (not specified). Respondents included 20 first year day students, 16 second year day students, 20 third year day students, 5 first year evening students, 1

need for education and action to address inequality and discrimination against lesbian and gay individuals in the legal environment.

The questionnaire which provides the basis for this report was distributed to law students in metropolitan area law schools during the 1993-94 academic year.³ A complete copy of the questionnaire is included in the appendix. Although we were not able to distribute the questionnaire to every student at local law schools, we believe that the responses reflect the range of experiences and problems encountered by lesbians and gay men who apply to and enroll in law schools in the metropolitan area. We hope that this report will provide a basis for future action and discussion within the legal and academic communities.

I. The Application Process

Many of the students surveyed believed they were initially welcomed into law schools. Nearly a third believed that self-identification as gay or lesbian on their law school application had a positive impact on their acceptance. Thirty-eight per cent indicated that during the application process, statements were made by school representatives which specifically encouraged gay and lesbian applicants. This "encouragement" included mention of a school's gay and lesbian student organization or its non-discrimination policy, and recruitment phone calls from gay students.

second year evening student, 2 third year evening students, 3 fourth year evening students, and 2 LLM candidates.

³ In all, some 500 questionnaires were distributed in the following manner. Copies of the survey were distributed at a September 1993 social event for law students held at New York University Law School sponsored by the Lesbian and Gay Law Association of Greater New York ("LeGaL") attended by approximately 100 students. (LeGaL is a professional association of the lesbian and gay legal community in the New York metropolitan area with well over 500 members. Law student membership of LeGaL is approximately 15% or about 75 members.) In addition, lesbians and gay men who were known to the Committee members were asked to distribute copies of the questionnaires to other gay students at their schools.

Comments indicated that some students chose to apply to schools in the New York City area because of the City's reputation as a friendly place for lesbians and gay men. Some students chose not to apply or to refuse acceptance to schools that did not include sexual orientation in their anti-discrimination policy, or that had a reputation of intolerance towards lesbian and gay students. The refusal of the school to fund a lesbian and gay student organization was one factor identified by students as an indication of intolerance.

Most of the survey respondents believed that law schools should do more to encourage gay and lesbian applicants. Eighty-one per cent felt that law schools should make an effort to recruit lesbian and gay students. Only 16% of the students indicated that they were aware of active recruitment of gay and lesbian law students by their law schools. Even among the minority of students who felt that no efforts to recruit should be made, there was sentiment that schools "should make efforts to assure that the administration is not hostile ... [to gay and lesbian students], i.e., that complaints of harassment etc. will be treated seriously."

II. Impact of Sexual Orientation on Ability to Succeed in Law School

Many students felt that their law school experience would be more constructive if the school took affirmative steps to welcome lesbians and gay men. 40% of all first year students believed that their sexual orientation would have an impact on their ability to succeed in law school. The same conclusion was reached by 35% of the second year survey respondents, and 24% of the third and fourth (part-time) years.

Students indicated that being lesbian or gay can have a negative impact for both those who are openly gay or lesbian ("out"), and for those who are not open about their sexual orientation ("closeted"). Those in the closet experienced stress relating to their efforts to conceal their identity,

which, in some cases, impacted on their law school performance and their enjoyment of their law school experience. For example, one student commented that sexual orientation affects the ability to succeed in law school "to the extent that being furtive about who you date, or why you don't date, makes you miserable." For some students who were out, their efforts to combat discriminatory attitudes and actions (homophobia) took time away from law school studies.

Many students, regardless of whether they were out or closeted, believed that opportunities to participate in law school activities were restricted because of their sexual orientation. One student said sexual orientation "impedes my ability to network with others and take an active role in the majority of campus activities and organizations which are comprised of homophobic people." The majority of students had not brought a same sex partner or date to a law school event. One student stated that if he did bring such a date, "I would be afraid of being bashed in a school newspaper, as was permitted in previous years." Another student noted that she did not belong to any study groups because of her sexual orientation. Responses indicated that some students, who were out, felt that other gay and lesbian students and gay faculty, who were not as public about their identity, avoided them.

Student comments suggest that examples of overt heterosexism and homophobia exist at local law schools.⁴ For many students, the most blatant example of heterosexism in law school was the different treatment of gay and lesbian people with respect to various benefits. Many students commented that spousal/family insurance, housing, and gym privileges were not available to their same sex partners. Another indicia of heterosexism reported by the students was the fact that

⁴ Heterosexism was defined in the survey as "the notion that the heterosexual lifestyle is inherently preferable and is the norm by which other lifestyles are judged."

hypothetical and exam questions rarely included lesbian and gay people. At one school, there was a report of belittlement of gay and lesbian students by a professor and, at another, a student performed "Law Revue" sketch was blatantly homophobic. Finally, students reported that informational materials posted at school concerning gay issues or events had been defaced or torn down.

The survey results also suggest that men and women experience different barriers, may have distinct concerns and may perceive bias in law schools in different ways. For example, a greater percentage of male than female respondents were aware of incidents of anti-gay or lesbian violence. In addition a higher percentage of men than women reported that they were counseled by school officials to conceal their sexual orientation.

Women seemed to believe that there was more institutional bias in the application process. While 43% of the male respondents felt that gay and lesbian applicants specifically were encouraged to apply, only 26% of the women expressed the same opinion. Thirty-five per cent of the women felt that there was heterosexism in professors' hypothetical and exam questions, while only 15% of the men so believed. In addition, 43% of the woman felt that their textbooks were heterosexist, while only 22% of the men shared this perception. In addition, a larger percentage of women than men felt that discrimination against them was compounded by factors other than sexual orientation. We cannot identify the reasons for the different responses based on gender. However, they do point out the need for sensitivity to the different experiences encountered by lesbians and gay men in law school. Any efforts to address these problems must take into account not only sexual orientation, but other diversity factors such as gender, race and ethnic origin.

Finally, it is important to highlight the comments which suggest that lesbian or gay sexual orientation can have a positive impact on success in school. Students involved in a network of other gay and lesbian law students explained that they drew both emotional and academic support from this involvement. Other comments suggested that the experience of having to come to terms with their sexual orientation gave lesbian and gay students the strength and the ability to handle complex life situations.

III. Lesbian and Gay Law Student Groups

All but one student indicated that they were aware of lesbian and gay student groups at their law school. Nearly all of the students stated that the group at their school was officially recognized, received student bar association or other school related funding, met at school, had a bulletin board, posted notices in the school, sponsored programs and events and had a mailbox. Most of the students also indicated that these groups had a law professor or staff person serving formally or informally as a liaison or advisor. In addition, almost all of the students stated that there was a place where announcements could be posted about lesbian or gay issues or organizations. Though student groups undoubtedly increase gay and lesbian students' level of comfort in law school, it is apparent from the survey results that the creation of such organizations is not sufficient, by themselves, to address all of the problems and discriminatory treatment encountered by lesbian and gay law students.

IV. Law Students' Perception of Sexual Orientation's Impact on Ability to Succeed Professionally

Based on the foregoing, it is not surprising that the law school environment leads students to believe that their sexual orientation will effect their ability to succeed professionally. The survey showed that 68% of first year students believed this, while 84% of the third and fourth year students

so believed. Some students indicated that sexual orientation would have an effect both on where they decided to practice law and the type of law they would practice. Some students planned to focus their practice on gay and lesbian clients and others commented that they perceived government and public interest to be a friendly environment.

Many students reported that they were counseled by their placement office that it would be more difficult for them to find employment if they were "out" during the job search. Of note, 44% of third and fourth year students responded that they were comfortable being open during their search for post law school employment. 47% of the second year students and 36% of the first year students indicated that they would be comfortable being open in their employment search. One factor which may account for this statistical difference is that a higher percentage of second, third and fourth year students were at schools that barred employers who discriminated on the basis of sexual orientation. Thus, it would seem that law schools which bar such employers send a message to students that it is valuable to be open about their orientation and encourage students to believe that they will find employment in a non-discriminatory work environment. However, students' comments indicated that even when placement offices barred employers that discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation (20% of the students reported that their school had such a ban), the policy is not absolute. For example, one student commented that his/her school prohibited the Judge Advocate General's Office (JAG) from recruiting on campus, but sponsored an "informational" dinner for JAG.

In addition to enacting policies regarding law school recruiting, students noted that their schools had taken other steps to recognize lesbian and gay issues and to create a supportive environment. Such steps included sponsoring a conference on lesbians and gays in the law, including a gay panelist in a symposia on life after law school, creating a fellowship on lesbian and gay law, and

honoring a student and professor for meritorious achievement and community service. Twenty percent of the students knew that their school sponsored events relating to lesbian and gay students. Many students reported that their school either had or was forming a lesbian and gay alumni association.

Recommendations

1. Encourage students to include relevant information about sexual orientation or lesbian/gay activities in their application to law school.

This sends the message to students from the beginning of their law school experience that sexual orientation is not a barrier to advancement within the law school setting. Schools should state in brochures and recruitment materials that they do not discriminate based on sexual orientation. Students should be encouraged to include involvement in lesbian/gay college or community organizations in the portion of their application which lists personal achievements or volunteer activity.

Recruitment or informational brochures should mention the existence of any lesbian/gay student organizations. If the recruitment materials feature profiles of faculty, an effort should be made to include openly lesbian or gay professors.

2. Schools should make an effort to hire openly gay faculty and encourage gay and lesbian professors, staff and administrators to be open about their sexual orientation.

64% of the students felt that lesbian or gay professors, administrators or staff have a responsibility to identify as lesbian or gay and serve as mentors to lesbian and gay students. 86% of the survey respondents felt that law schools should make an effort to hire openly gay and lesbian people and 84% were aware of such efforts at their schools. We do not know if such efforts existed

at all local law schools during the period surveyed. However, even if schools were seeking openly gay faculty members, our survey results suggest that there is a need for better communication between the law school administration and the lesbian and gay student population. Schools also should publicize their non-discrimination policy, which would help create an environment in which students and employees feel they can be open about their identity.

3. Schools should take other steps to provide lesbian and gay professional role models for students.

Examples of such efforts include encouraging the formation of lesbian and gay alumni networks whose members could serve as role models for current law students; publicizing the existence of the Lesbian and Gay Law Association; informing students about the work of this Committee and other bar groups concerned with diversity issues; inviting speakers from this Committee or other groups to discuss the post law school experiences of lesbian and gay attorneys; inviting openly lesbian and gay legal professionals to participate in school panels, moot court competitions and other school events; and honoring the achievements of lesbian and gay faculty, students and alumni.

4. Legal curricula should address lesbian and gay legal issues.

This includes not only courses on lesbian and gay issues, but inclusion of these concerns in other relevant courses such as employment law, family law and estates and trust law. Hypothetical and examination questions should include lesbian and gay issues.

5. Comparable benefits and privileges should be extended to the domestic partners and families of lesbian and gay students to the same extent that such benefits are extended to the spouses and families of heterosexual students.

Some schools provide married student or family housing, family insurance benefits or provide families access to law school services and facilities. These same benefits should be made available to lesbian and gay students who are in committed same sex relationships.

6. Complaint processes should be established to address incidents of discrimination, heterosexism and homophobia.

Schools also should provide training to the individuals handling these discrimination complaints to ensure that they are sensitive to the relevant issues. Schools should not assume that individuals are familiar with the complexity of lesbian and gay discrimination merely because they may handle other types of discrimination complaints.

7. The creation and maintenance of lesbian and gay law student organizations should be encouraged.

Schools should provide equal funding to these organizations and should ensure that their existence and activities are publicized. Law schools should also provide secure bulletin boards or other spaces where notices about lesbian and gay events can be posted.

8. Placement offices should insure that services offered to students are not affected by discriminatory attitudes.

Though it is true that employment discrimination against lesbians and gay men exists in the legal field,⁵ it is important to recognize that placement officers should be careful as to how this fact

⁵ See Preliminary Report.

is expressed to students. The information should be presented with sensitivity so that gay and lesbian students understand that their sexual orientation is not a defect, but rather that it is an unfortunate fact that homophobia exists within the legal profession. Placement officials should be prepared to advise students about the ramifications of being out or being closeted on a resume and should be sensitive to the fact that it is sometimes an advantage to be out on a resume. One student's comments indicated that if she had followed the Placement Office's advice and not included gay and lesbian activities on her resume, she would neither have secured a stipend nor received numerous internship offers.

Finally, placement officials should be aware that some students may choose to be open about their sexual orientation regardless of the impact of the decision on the students' job possibilities. Some students may not be interested in working for an employer who would discriminate against lesbian and gay applicants or who does not provide equal benefits for its gay attorneys.

CONCLUSION

Law schools play a critical role in shaping students' attitudes and future careers. Schools must take an active role in ensuring that lesbian and gay applicants and students feel welcome and are not subjected to discriminatory treatment. Law schools should encourage students, professors, staff and administrators to be open about their sexual orientation and should enact and enforce non-discrimination policies which protect these individuals. Schools should support their lesbian and gay student groups and work with them to create an atmosphere of tolerance, equality and acceptance. We believe that such action will not only improve the lives of lesbian and gay law students and law school employees, but ultimately will have a positive impact on the legal profession.

February 1996

**Committee on Lesbians and Gay Men
in the Legal Profession**

Rosalyn Richter, Committee Chair*

Carol Buell
Norris Case
Andrew Chapin
Jacqueline C. Charlesworth
Carmen Corrales***
Kathleen Conkey***
Elizabeth C. Cunningham
Jacqueline Deane
Betty Weinberg Ellerin
Faith Gay
Fredric Hannan Goldstein
Susan M. Halatyn
James Edward Hough

Linda S. Kagan
Aubrey Lees
Donald Maher
Charles McFaul
Tomas Medina**
Matthew Moore
Karen Moulding
Eric Rosenbaum
Peter Sherwin
Terry Smith
John Stackhouse
Allison Lee Turkel
James Williams**
Marc Wolinsky

* Robert LaMont was co-chair of this committee until January 1996.

** Co-chairs of the subcommittee that conducted this survey and prepared the report. The committee expresses its thanks to them for their work on this report even after their departure from the committee in June 1995.

*** Members of the subcommittee that conducted the survey. Ms. Corrales left the committee in 1995.

APPENDIX

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York
Special Committee on Lesbians and Gay Men in the Legal Profession

SURVEY ON EMPLOYMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Please circle the appropriate letter.

| | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|--|---------------|-------------------|
| BACKGROUND INFORMATION | | |
| 1. Are you: | | |
| a) Male | 151 | 65.94% |
| b) Female | 78 | 34.06% |
| c) Not Answered | 0 | 0.0% |
| 2. How do you define your sexual orientation or sexual preference? | | |
| a) Gay | 147 | 64.19% |
| b) Lesbian | 69 | 30.13% |
| c) Bisexual | 7 | 3.06% |
| d) Heterosexual | 6 | 2.62% |
| e) Not Answered | 0 | 0.0% |
| 3. How old are you: | | |
| a) under 30 years old | 39 | 17.03% |
| b) 30-40 years old | 145 | 63.32% |
| c) 41-50 years old | 38 | 16.59% |
| d) 51-60 years old | 7 | 3.06% |
| e) Over 60 years old | 0 | 0.0% |
| f) Not Answered | 0 | 0.0% |

4. Are you:

| | | | |
|----|------------------|-----|--------|
| a) | White | 212 | 95.58% |
| b) | African-American | 7 | 3.06% |
| c) | Latino/a | 5 | 2.18% |
| d) | Asian | 0 | 0.0% |
| e) | Other | 3 | 1.31% |
| f) | Not Answered | 2 | .87% |

5. Where do you work:

| | | | |
|----|---------------------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Firm | 114 | 49.78% |
| b) | Governmental agency | 25 | 10.92% |
| c) | Public interest/nonprofit | 35 | 15.28% |
| d) | Corporate in-house | 17 | 7.42% |
| e) | Court system | 4 | 1.75% |
| f) | Law school | 15 | 6.55% |
| g) | Other | 18 | 7.86% |
| h) | Not answered | 1 | 0.44% |

6. How many attorneys work in your workplace?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|----|--------|
| a) | 1-10 | 71 | 31.00% |
| b) | 11-50 | 55 | 24.02% |
| c) | 51-100 | 29 | 12.66% |
| d) | 101-200 | 14 | 6.11% |
| e) | Over 200 | 59 | 25.76% |
| f) | Not answered | 1 | 0.44% |

7. Are you a:

| | | | |
|----|---|-----|--------|
| a) | Staff attorney/associate | 114 | 49.78% |
| b) | Partner | 25 | 10.92% |
| c) | Director of organization, agency, office | 4 | 1.75% |
| d) | Supervisory attorney | 19 | 8.30% |
| e) | Support staff | 14 | 6.11% |
| f) | Self-employed | 18 | 7.86% |
| g) | Other | 32 | 13.97% |
| h) | Not answered | 3 | 1.31% |

8. How long have you worked in the legal profession?

| | | | |
|----|---------------|----|--------|
| a) | 0-2 years | 34 | 14.85% |
| b) | 3-5 | 57 | 24.89% |
| c) | 6-10 | 72 | 31.44% |
| d) | 11-20 | 57 | 24.89% |
| e) | Over 20 years | 8 | 3.49% |
| f) | Not answered | 1 | 0.44% |

YOUR CURRENT WORKPLACE'S HIRING AND RECRUITMENT PROCESS

9. Was there anything listed on your resume from which someone could conclude your sexual orientation or sexual preference *e.g.*, work for gay and lesbian social or political organizations, membership in gay and lesbian bar association?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 50 | 21.83% |
| b) | No | 159 | 69.43% |
| c) | Indirectly | 9 | 3.93% |
| d) | Not answered | 11 | 4.80% |

10. At any time during the hiring process, did an interviewer or employer's representative ever make statements or pursue lines of inquiry which had or could have had the effect of *excluding* gay and lesbian applicants?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 11 | 4.80% |
| b) | No | 201 | 87.77% |
| c) | Not answered | 17 | 7.42% |

11. At any time during the hiring process, did an interviewer or employer's representative ever make statements or pursue lines of inquiry which had or could have had the effect of *including* gay and lesbian applicants?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 33 | 14.41% |
| b) | No | 175 | 76.42% |
| c) | Not answered | 21 | 9.17% |

12. Are you aware of any effort on your employer's part actively to recruit lesbian or gay attorneys?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 34 | 14.85% |
| b) | No | 166 | 72.49% |
| c) | Don't Know | 12 | 5.24% |
| d) | Not answered | 17 | 7.42% |

VISIBILITY IN THE WORKPLACE

13. Who is aware of your sexual orientation or sexual preference at your job?

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Most people | 134 | 58.52% |
| b) | A limited number of people | 70 | 30.57% |
| c) | No one | 11 | 4.80% |
| d) | Don't know | 8 | 3.49% |
| e) | Not answered | 6 | 2.62% |

14. If you are not open about your sexual orientation or sexual preference, what best describes your reasons for not being so (circle all applicable):

| | | | |
|----|---|----|--------|
| a) | Fear of adverse professional consequences | 58 | 25.33% |
| b) | Fear of negative personal reactions | 46 | 20.09% |
| c) | Prefer not to share information about personal life | 57 | 24.89% |
| d) | Other | 10 | 4.37% |

15. If you are aware of negative attitudes or discriminatory treatment regarding sexual orientation or sexual preference, does it relate to (circle all applicable):

| | | | |
|----|-------------|----|--------|
| a) | Hiring | 24 | 10.48% |
| b) | Promotions | 33 | 14.41% |
| c) | Assignments | 25 | 10.92% |
| d) | Evaluations | 21 | 9.17% |
| e) | Other | 48 | 20.96% |

16. Are you aware of discriminatory attitudes or treatment from clients or others who work with your office regarding gay and lesbian attorneys or lesbians and gays generally?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 80 | 34.93% |
| b) | No | 135 | 58.95% |
| c) | Not answered | 14 | 6.11% |

17. Are you aware of discriminatory attitudes or treatment from judges regarding gay and lesbian attorneys or lesbians and gays generally?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 35 | 15.28% |
| b) | No | 161 | 70.31% |
| c) | Not answered | 33 | 14.41% |

18. Are you aware of discriminatory attitudes or treatment from court personnel regarding gay and lesbian attorneys or lesbians and gays generally?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 39 | 17.03% |
| b) | No | 160 | 69.87% |
| c) | Not answered | 30 | 13.10% |

19. If you were ever discriminated against at your firm on the basis of sexual orientation or sexual preference, what did you do? (circle all applicable)

| | | | |
|----|---|----|-------|
| a) | Report it to a superior | 20 | 8.73% |
| b) | Speak to a co-worker | 22 | 9.61% |
| c) | Speak to someone outside the workplace | 21 | 9.17% |
| d) | Take no action | 12 | 5.24% |
| e) | Quit | 7 | 3.06% |
| f) | Other | 11 | 4.80% |

20. What would you do if a co-worker was the subject of anti-gay or lesbian discrimination in the work-place? (circle all applicable)

| | | | |
|----|---|-----|--------|
| a) | Report it to a superior | 138 | 60.26% |
| b) | Speak to a co-worker | 121 | 52.84% |
| c) | Speak to someone outside the workplace | 82 | 35.81% |
| d) | Take no action | 5 | 2.18% |
| e) | Quit | 7 | 3.06% |
| f) | Other | 43 | 18.78% |

21. How has the management responded to reported incidents of discriminatory remarks or treatment of lesbians and gays? (circle all applicable)

| | | | |
|----|--|-----|--------|
| a) | Formal investigation and/ or discipline | 8 | 3.49% |
| b) | Informal investigation and/or warning | 25 | 10.92% |
| c) | No action | 16 | 6.99% |
| d) | Not aware of any incidents | 142 | 62.01% |
| e) | Other | 8 | 3.49% |

22. Have you ever been asked by anyone in the workplace to conceal your sexual orientation or sexual preference from co-workers?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 23 | 10.04% |
| b) | No | 191 | 83.41% |
| c) | Not answered | 15 | 6.55% |

23. Do you fee that the office dress code or conventions *e.g.*, earrings, jewelry, accessories, dresses or skirts only, if any, inhibit your freedom to express your gay or lesbian identity?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 22 | 9.61% |
| b) | No | 182 | 79.48% |
| c) | Not answered | 25 | 10.92% |

24. Have you felt welcome to invite your lover or domestic partner to office events open to spouses or opposite sex partners?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 115 | 50.22% |
| b) | No | 77 | 33.62% |
| c) | Not answered | 37 | 16.16% |

25. Do you feel comfortable displaying photographs of your lover or domestic partner in your office?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 115 | 50.22% |
| b) | No | 85 | 37.12% |
| c) | Not answered | 29 | 12.66% |

26. Do you feel comfortable displaying posters or other indicia of involvement in gay and lesbian issues or organizations in your office?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 98 | 42.79% |
| b) | No | 116 | 50.66% |
| c) | Not answered | 15 | 6.55% |

27. Are you aware of other gays and/or lesbians at your job?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 189 | 82.53% |
| b) | No | 35 | 15.28% |
| c) | Not answered | 5 | 2.18% |

28. If yes, are they:

| | | | |
|----|--|-----|--------|
| a) | Partners | 66 | 28.82% |
| b) | Directors of organization, agency, office | 25 | 10.92% |
| c) | Middle management | 55 | 24.02% |
| d) | Associates/staff attorneys | 130 | 56.77% |
| e) | Support staff member | 112 | 48.91% |
| f) | Other | 32 | 13.97% |

29. Do you believe that your sexual orientation or sexual preference affects your ability to succeed in your profession in any respect?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 124 | 54.15% |
| b) | No | 87 | 37.99% |
| c) | Not answered | 18 | 7.86% |

30. Do you believe that any discrimination that you have experienced is compounded by other factors, *e.g.* race, gender, HIV-status?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 57 | 24.89% |
| b) | No | 115 | 50.22% |
| c) | Not answered | 57 | 24.89% |

31. Do you believe that your sexual orientation or sexual preference affects your relationship with clients in any respect?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 80 | 34.93% |
| b) | No | 121 | 52.84% |
| c) | Not answered | 28 | 12.23% |

EMPLOYMENT POLICIES

32. Does your workplace include explicit prohibition in its formal policies and procedures of discrimination based on the following categories (circle all applicable):

| | | | |
|----|---|-----|--------|
| a) | Race | 155 | 67.69% |
| b) | Sex | 153 | 66.81% |
| c) | Sexual orientation or sexual preference | 119 | 51.97% |
| d) | Marital status | 112 | 48.91% |
| e) | Religion | 146 | 63.76% |
| f) | Creed | 126 | 55.02% |
| g) | Color | 138 | 60.26% |
| h) | Disability | 119 | 51.97% |
| i) | HIV-status | 39 | 17.03% |

33. Does your workplace conduct educational training programs and/or provide employees with written guidelines to educate all employees about sexual orientation or sexual preference issues, including HIV-related issues?

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 37 | 16.16% |
| b) | No | 150 | 65.50% |
| c) | Has been proposed | 9 | 3.93% |
| d) | Don't know | 15 | 6.55% |
| e) | Not answered | 18 | 7.86% |

34. Does your workplace have a formal grievance and disciplinary policy which includes responding to and redressing incidents of anti-lesbian and gay bias?

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 55 | 24.02% |
| b) | No | 106 | 46.29% |
| c) | Has been proposed | 5 | 2.18% |
| d) | Don't know | 45 | 19.65% |
| e) | Not answered | 18 | 7.86% |

35. If your workplace provides health care benefits to spouses, does your workplace provide health benefits to the domestic partners of lesbian and gay employees and to the children of the domestic partner?

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 6 | 2.62% |
| b) | No | 156 | 68.12% |
| c) | Has been proposed | 25 | 10.92% |
| d) | Don't know | 19 | 8.30% |
| e) | Not answered | 23 | 10.04% |

36. Does your workplace extend bereavement leave to the domestic partners of lesbian and gay employees and to the children of the domestic partners?

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 63 | 27.51% |
| b) | No | 66 | 28.82% |
| c) | Has been proposed | 7 | 3.06% |
| d) | Don't know | 66 | 28.82% |

37. Are your workplace's parental leave policies and part-time policies accommodating parenting gender-neutral?

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 93 | 40.61% |
| b) | No | 39 | 17.03% |
| c) | Has been proposed | 3 | 1.31% |
| d) | Don't know | 73 | 31.88% |
| e) | Not answered | 21 | 9.17% |

38. Are your workplace's parental leave policies and part-time policies accommodating parenting dependent on the biological relationship between the parent and the child?

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 26 | 11.35% |
| b) | No | 74 | 32.31% |
| c) | Has been proposed | 1 | 0.44% |
| d) | Don't know | 106 | 46.29% |
| e) | Not answered | 22 | 9.61% |

39. Are your workplace's policies regarding relocation benefits or other employee assistance programs which extend benefits to employees and their families (such as drug and alcohol counseling) extended to include domestic partners and non-biological children?

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 8 | 3.49% |
| b) | No | 84 | 36.68% |
| c) | Has been proposed | 4 | 1.75% |
| d) | Don't know | 92 | 40.17% |
| e) | Not answered | 41 | 17.90% |

40. Does your workplace support civic and charitable activities of concern to gay and lesbian employees (such as work with GMHC, Lambda Legal Defense), including pro bono work?

| | | | |
|----|--------------------------|----|--------|
| a) | Yes, extensively | 51 | 22.27% |
| b) | Yes, to a certain degree | 93 | 40.61% |
| c) | No, not at all | 22 | 9.61% |
| d) | No | 28 | 12.23% |
| e) | Don't know | 22 | 9.61% |
| f) | Not answered | 13 | 5.68% |

41. Has your workplace adopted express goals and timetables for the hiring and promotion of gays and lesbians?

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 5 | 2.18% |
| b) | No | 172 | 75.11% |
| c) | Has been proposed | 4 | 1.75% |
| d) | Don't know | 29 | 12.66% |
| e) | Not answered | 19 | 8.30% |

PRIOR WORKPLACE EXPERIENCE WITHIN THE PAST FIVE YEARS IN NYC

42. Did you experience any discriminatory treatment in a prior workplace within the last five years as a result of being identified as gay or lesbian or perceived to be gay or lesbian?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|-----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 33 | 14.41% |
| b) | No | 137 | 59.83% |
| c) | Not answered | 59 | 25.76% |

43. Were you aware of negative attitudes or discriminatory treatment of gay and lesbian attorneys or gays and lesbians generally within your workplace within the past five years?

| | | | |
|----|--------------|----|--------|
| a) | Yes | 74 | 32.31% |
| b) | No | 94 | 41.05% |
| c) | Not answered | 61 | 26.64% |