Interview Protocols for DADT Update

Private-Sector Organizations and Colleges/Universities

Agency Disclosure/Burden Notice:

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Executive Services Directorate, Information Management Division, 1155 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1155 (0704-TBD). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

RAND Update of 1993 Study on Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy

**Implementation Task
(Interviews with Private-Sector Organizations and Colleges/Universities)**

Cynthia Cook, Task Leader

Good morning (afternoon). My name is _____. I'm a researcher from the RAND Corporation, a non-profit research institution. The Department of Defense has asked us to conduct a study to inform policy decisions related to homosexual men and women serving in the U.S. military. This is an update to research we conducted in 1993.

ORGANIZATIONS As part of this effort, RAND is interviewing representatives from a variety of organizations. For each organization, we plan to talk to individuals responsible for diversity policy or managing diversity. These interviews are intended to provide information on how organizations approached integrating openly gay men and women into the workforce, how policies prohibiting discrimination or harassment based on sexual orientation were implemented and enforced, and what the results have been, including how any difficulties have been resolved.

UNIVERSITIES As part of this effort, RAND is interviewing representatives from a variety of colleges and universities regarding housing policies for students. These interviews are intended to provide information on how colleges and universities manage housing issues relating to a diverse student population that includes gay men and women, with the goal of developing lessons learned for the U.S. military, where barracks and other group housing arrangements are common.

You were selected to participate in an interview because you were identified as someone with knowledge of [organization] human resources/recruiting policies and practices. The interview should take approximately 1 hour, and your participation today is entirely voluntary. You may decline to participate or to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable with.

A report that summarizes the results of our interviews, along with other analysis efforts, will be provided to the Department of Defense to help inform decision making about integrating openly homosexual men and women into the military. In the report, we may discuss individual observations as well as patterns across our interviews.

We will not attribute comments to you by name or position, but we may associate findings with the type of organization you represent (for example, governmental agency, large university, popular retail company, etc.)

While we will treat this interview as confidential, it is possible that your identity could be determined by inference. However, when we write our report, we will take care to omit any details that could identify you.

Interview notes that do not contain your name, position, or other personal identifying information will be retained to inform future research on this topic.

That said, do you have any questions about the study or about the interview today? [Answer any questions]. Do you agree to participate? [If yes, proceed]

Please take one of my business cards [or give contact info if done over phone]. If you have any questions or concerns about the study later on, don't hesitate to contact me. If you would like, we'll also take your contact information so that we can notify you when the final report is publicly available.

RAND Update of 1993 Study on Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy
Interviews with Private-Sector Organizations (HR Diversity Directors) Protocol

1. How long have you worked at [Organization], and in what capacities?
   a. [Probe if needed]: How long have you worked in your current position? What are the main responsibilities of your current position?
2. As I noted earlier, the purpose of our visit is to learn about [Organization's] experience with openly gay employees. Please tell us about the policies or other protections that are in place that relate to openly gay employees, if any.
   a. Does [Organization] include expressly address sexual orientation in its non-discrimination policy?
   b. Does [Organization] include expressly address sexual orientation in its diversity training?
   c. Does [Organization] have a harassment prevention policy or harassment protection training?
   d. Are there affinity groups or employee networks for gay and lesbian employees?
   e. Do you actively recruit/reach out to the gay and lesbian community?
   f. Others?
   g. If there are no policies, why not?
3. Please tell us about the benefits, if any, that your organization provides to the same sex partners of employees. [probe re benefits parity]
   a. Health – medical/dental/vision
   b. Retirement/pension
   c. Leave for bereavement, emergency, family emergency relating to same sex partners.
   d. Relocation benefits (e.g., transportation, lodging for same sex partners on house hunting trips)
   e. Housing where corporate housing is a benefit
   f. International deployments – visas, in-country status, housing, travel
   g. Others?
   h. If none, why not?
4. Have there been changes in any of these policies or practices since they were first instituted? If yes, what were they?
   a. What motivated them? [Probe – is it that they took tentative first steps toward being inclusive, realized that no problems resulted, and then went further? Did they get a better sense of the demand from employees and decided the costs were not a major factor? Was it external pressure?]
5. We're also interested in learning about the steps [Organization] took when it initially implemented policies intended to afford protections to homosexual employees. Specifically, please describe how [Organization] announced the changes to its workforce and educated both leadership and rank-and-file employees about what it would mean for them.
   a. Were the changes implemented immediately? Or announced some time in advance of the implementation?

        b.   What resources were made available for leadership?
            1. [Probe] live training, on-line training, resource guides
            2. [probe] ask for copies of written material, if any
        c.   What resources were available for "rank and file" employees?

6. How did these policies correlate with gay/lesbian employees being "out" in your organization?
   a. To your knowledge, were any employees "out" before these policies were instituted?
      1. Did that have any affect on workgroup/team/organizational dynamics? If so, what were they? How were they resolved?
      2. Did that have any affect on workgroup/team/organizational performance? If so, please describe. [**Probe**, negative or positive?]
   b. Did any existing employees begin coming out after the policies were instituted? If so,
      1. What impact, if any, did that have on workgroup/team/organizational dynamics? Did any interpersonal issues relating to sexual orientation arise? What form did these take? How were they resolved? What impact did this have? Did any one ask to be transferred?
      2. What impact, if any, did that have on workgroup/team/organizational performance? If there was one, please describe. [**Probe**, negative or positive?]
   c. Were any team or organizational leaders "out" before these policies were instituted?
   d. Did any team or organizational leaders come out? If so,
      1. Did this have any different impact from other employees coming out? [Probe] Were there any problems? If so, what were they? How were they resolved? What did you do next? Did anyone asked to be transferred?
      2. What impact, if any, did leaders coming out have on team/organizational performance? If there was one, please describe. [**Probe**, negative or positive?]
   e. Did these policies have any affect on new employees being open regarding their sexual orientation?
      1. Is there any difference in how new employees are integrated on the team relating to their sexual orientation?
   f. Did these policies have any effect in the hiring process? [Probe] - more/less applications total, more/less applications from your traditional hiring base (if [Organization] has one) – and if so, how soon after the changes were made?

7. What effects, either positive or negative, have the policies and practices have?
   a. How does [Organization] measure their effectiveness?
   b. [Probe:] What changes, if any, in the behavior of homosexual employees has [Organization] observed?
   c. [Probe:] What changes, if any, in the behavior of heterosexual employees has [Organization] observed?
   d. [Probe:] Have there been changes in recruiting, such as more or fewer recruits, or changes in the types of people interested in working at [Organization]?
   e. [Probe:] What about employee performance? Has productivity or some other measure of performance been influenced by the policies?

     f.   [Probe:] What about employee morale? Has [Organization] observed changes in employee morale stemming from the policies?

     g.   [Probe:] What about work group/team performance? Has [Organization] observed any changes in team performance linked to the policies.

         1. Does a team's demographic or religious diversity influence team performance in any way? How is sexual orientation different or similar from other measures of diversity?

         2. Do you know if members of teams socialize together off duty? Is that a goal of corporate leadership?

         3. How do leaders respond when members of a workgroup or team don't like each other? [**Probe**: Is sexual orientation ever a factor in this?]

     h.   [Probe:] Have any employees requested to be transferred because of these policies or of having to work with a gay or lesbian co-worker? Has [Organization] lost any employees due to these policies?

8. What has been [Organization's] general experience with managing a diverse workforce?

     a.   How does diversity influence effectiveness?

     b.   Does demographic or religious diversity ever create management problems? If so, how do you deal with them?

9. What advice would you offer to other organizations that want to implement a non-discrimination policy or other guidelines intended to afford protections to openly gay employees?

     a.   What should organizations do to ensure such policies or guidelines are implemented as smoothly as possible?

     b.   [Probe if applicable:] What could they do to avoid some of the frictions or pitfalls that [Organization] encountered?

10. **[For companies with no policies]**

     a.   Are any non-supervisory/non-exempt employees "out" in your workplace?

         1. When did they first start coming "out?"

11. Does this have any effect on work group**[For companies that deploy people to austere living conditions, e.g. oil companies and defense contractors:]** Given this a situation that the U.S. military would need to address, we're interested in how [Organization] has handled living arrangements for openly gay employees in group living situations, for example in austere environments. What guidelines are there, if any, for openly gay and lesbian employees living among heterosexual co-workers?

     a.   Are there written policies? If so, can we have a copy?

     b.   Are there group living arrangements (i.e. dormitories or rooms that hold multiple individuals)? If so, do people have a choice in who they room with?

         1. [Probe] can they refuse to live with people? If yes, on what basis?

         2. Is homosexuality a problem or a reason why people won't live with others? What happens if there is a refusal to share living space with others because of this reason? How is this addressed?

     c.   Are their private bathrooms or shared bathrooms? If so, do homosexual or heterosexual employees ever express discomfort or refuse to use the facilities at the same time? How does [Organization] handle this?

12. **[For companies that deploy people to overseas military environments, e.g. defense contractors:]** Defense contractors often work hand in hand with members of

the military overseas, including in Iraq and Afghanistan. This next question asks the experience [Organization] with gay and lesbian employees working in these situations, separate from the question of living arrangements. What guidelines or policies are there for deploying gay or lesbian employees to war zones?

    a. Are there written policies? If so, can we have a copy?

    b. Do you have experience with gay or lesbian employees in warzones working closely with the military?

        1. Are these employees "out" to their civilian and military colleagues?

        2. If so, does this have any affect on team/organizational dynamics?

        3. Did that have any affect on team/organizational performance?

        4. Did this impact anyone's willingness to work with them?

    c. Are any team or organizational leaders working in warzones "out" to their civilian and military colleagues?

        1. Does this affect their performance?

        2. Did this have any affect on team/organizational dynamics

        3. Does this impact anyone's willingness to be assigned to their teams or work with them?

13. **[For companies that have had publicized issues with diversity. Note, some specifics about the change will be covered in Q 6 and elsewhere]** The Pentagon currently has a formal policy that does not allow gay and lesbian members to be open about or admit to their sexual orientation. There have been some publicly stated concerns about problems that might arise if gays and lesbians were allowed to serve openly. If this policy should change, lessons learned from organizations that have had public issues with managing this or other kinds of diversity may be among the most useful information that military can use. I will remind you that your company won't be publicly identified in this research.

    a. Did you have any concerns about gays or lesbians serving openly in your organization? If so, what were they?

    b. When you changed your diversity policy, were any of these concerns realized?

    c. Did any problems arise? If so, what were they? How did you manage them? How did you work with the employees involved?

    d. What lessons can you offer an organization making a public change about diversity policy?

College/University Protocol (Dean of Students)

14. How long have you worked at [X College/University], and in what capacities?
    a. [Probe if needed]: How long have you worked in your current position? What are the main responsibilities of your current position?
15. As I noted earlier, the purpose of our conversation is to learn about [College/University's] experience with openly gay students, most specifically with regards to housing policy. But we'd like to start talking more generally to understand the context for your housing policies. Please tell us about the policies or other protections that are in place that relate to openly gay students.
    a. For example, does [College/University] include sexual orientation in its non-discrimination policy or in any diversity training that may be offered to students? If so, is there separate training on sexual orientation or is it included in broader training?
    b. Does [College/University] have a harassment prevention policy or harassment protection training?
    c. Is there institutional support for student gay/lesbian affinity groups?
    d. Others?
    e. If there are no policies, why not?
16. Have there been any changes to these policies since they were initially put in place? If yes, what types of changes?
    a. What motivated those changes? [Probe – is it that they took tentative first steps toward being inclusive, realized that no problems resulted, and then went further? Did people object? Did they get a better sense of the demand from students? Was it external pressure?]
17. We're also interested in learning about the steps [College/University] took – or may still be taking – to carry them out. Let's start with how the College/University initially implemented policies intended to afford protections to homosexual students. Specifically, please describe how [College/University] announced the changes to its students and educated members of the community about what it would mean for them.
    a. Was the change implemented immediately? Or was it announced in advance of the change?
    b. What resources were made available for those in leadership roles, i.e. resident dormitory advisors? For students?
18. Given that this is a situation that the U.S. military would need to address these questions for a population that is similar in age to college students, we're interested in how [College/University] has handled living arrangements for openly gay students in group living situations.
    a. What kind of formal policies do you have regarding sexual orientation in student housing?
    b. What choices do students have in their housing?
        1. Are there reasons that students can refuse to live with others?
        2. What are these? [Probe] Smoking, homosexuality, others?

    c. What guidelines are there, if any, for openly gay and lesbian students living among heterosexual students? For heterosexuals living among openly gay and lesbian students?

19. Have any conflicts arisen regarding the housing policies?
    a. How does this vary by year? [Presumably, freshmen are more likely to be assigned to living with strangers.].
    b. For those who are assigned roommates by the university, how much choice to they have regarding living preferences? [Probe] Non smoking, quiet vs loud, etc.
    c. Are there reasons that students can refuse to live with others? What are these? [Probe] Smoking, homosexuality, others?

20. Have any conflicts arisen regarding the housing policies?
    a. Resistance to gays and lesbians living on same hall
    b. Resistance to sharing a bathroom with gays or lesbians
    c. Resistance to sharing a room with a gay or lesbian roommate

21. How were these problems addressed?
    a. [Probe] Through mediation, discussion, other?
    b. [Probe] By resident advisors, dorm advisors
    c. [Probe] How high a level are these raised to? (especially if they can't be addressed at a lower level.)
    d. Can students be reassigned rooms? What happens next?

22. How effective have the policies been? For example, has the number of grievances or complaints based on sexual orientation changed since they were implemented?
    a. How does [College/University] measure the policies' effectiveness?
    b. [Probe] Have there been changes in attracting students, student performance, student morale, or turnover? [Ensure responses to each are obtained]
    c. [Probe] Have there been any other friction points?

23. What advice would you offer to other College/Universities that want to implement a non-discrimination policy or other guidelines intended to afford protections to openly gay students?
    a. What should Colleges/Universities do to ensure such policies or guidelines are implemented as smoothly as possible?
    b. [Probe if applicable:] What could they do to avoid some of the frictions or pitfalls that [College/University] encountered?

Data Safeguarding Plan

RAND Update of 1993 Study on Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy

Implementation Task

Cynthia Cook, Task Leader

Project Description

At the request of the Department of Defense, RAND is conducting a study to inform policy decisions related to homosexual men and women serving in the U.S. military. This is an update to research we conducted in 1993. One part of RAND's research is to understand how non-governmental organizations (including companies who deploy employees to warzones or other austere environments, or who work with the military), manage employees with a range of sexual orientation, and how sexual orientation affects the housing policies of institutions of higher learning. Accordingly, RAND plans to interview representatives of private companies, likely to be their Human Resources department Directors of Diversity, and representatives of colleges/universities, likely to be individuals from the Dean of Students offices.

Responsibility for Data Safeguarding

- Cynthia Cook, the task leader, has overall responsibility for data safeguarding. Project team members involved in conducting and documenting the interviews will also have responsibility for data safeguarding.

- Project staff will comply with RAND policies and procedures to protect the privacy of the data at the "Limited Access" level (http://smdbsrv1.rand.org/DataProtection/Default.aspx?r=21,118,120,122,128,131). In others word, the project team will be advised that the interview data are not for open RAND viewership or public disclosure.

Data Sensitivity and Disclosure Risks

- Many of our interviews are intended as key informant interviews, with questions related to an individual's formal, official responsibilities. However, if an interview subject expresses controversial views or critical opinions about homosexuals in the workplace or in college/university settings, and these remarks become known to his/her employer, it may affect his/her employability. The subject may also feel embarrassment if this happens. Disclosure may result in moderate harm, and the probability of such an injury is minimal.

- We also expect some interviews addressing individuals experiences and attitudes regarding homosexuality in the military, in corporate organizations, or in universities. In these instances, if interview subjects express controversial views or critical opinions, and these remarks become known to their employer, it may affect his/her employability. The

subject may also experience embarrassment in such instances. Disclosure may result in moderate harm; the probability of such injury is minimal.

- During the course of our data collection efforts, lists of interview subjects will be developed and maintained. For logistical and analytical purposes, names and contact information for interview subjects will need to be retained, albeit temporarily. Further, subjects will be given the opportunity to include themselves on the distribution list for the report, if they so choose, but they will not be identified as interview subjects on this list (which includes many non-interviewees as well), and the distribution list is intended for internal RAND administrative purposes only.

Data Transmittal

- Only RAND project team members will be involved in the collection and transmission of data. The data from the RAND interviews will consist only of written notes.

- Interview notes without direct identifiers may be e-mailed between RAND project team members using the "RAND Sensitive" label.

- The client will not receive a copy of interview notes.

Respondent Agreements

- As suggested above, subjects will be selected based on their official capacity or organizational role. They likely will include corporate Directors of Diversity, responsible for managing these issues, and college/university Deans of Students' representatives, responsible for housing policy.

- An oral consent protocol has been provided under separate cover to the RAND Human Subjects Protection Committee and is appended herein.

Auditing and Monitoring Plans

- No special audit or monitoring plans.

Data Safeguarding Procedures

- During field work, laptop computers will be protected following procedures outlined at http://intranet.rand.org/computing/security.away.html. For instance, RAND project team members will keep their laptops in sight and will not include laptops with any checked baggage. Should it be necessary to leave a laptop in a car, it will be locked in the trunk.

- Soft copy interview notes will be stored on disks or CD-ROMs in a locked cabinet, or on personal RAND computers secured with password software. Hard copy interview notes will be kept in a locked cabinet prior to their destruction. Files will not be stored in a non-RAND location like an external hard drive or personal home computer.

- We will exclude direct identifiers when typing up interview notes (i.e., electronic interview notes will not contain direct identifiers like names or email addresses).

- We will work to ensure that it will not be possible from our written report to discern interview subjects' identities or their organizations, or which comments emerged from a particular interview.

- Hard copy interview notes will be destroyed when the project is completed. Electronic interview notes without direct identifiers will be retained in order to use them in subsequent, related research efforts.

- The RAND project team will adhere to additional RAND data safeguarding procedures as highlighted at http://intranet.rand.org/groups/hspc/dsp-template.html. Specifically,

    - We will train staff on data sensitivity and data safeguards being employed.

    - We will control by password files left on computers.

    - As noted above, after the project is complete, we will destroy hard copy interview notes and any lists of interview participants.

    - We will report all serious violations of the Data Safeguarding Plan in writing to the Principal Investigator, with a copy to the Privacy Resource Office.