


CORPORATE EQUALITY INDEX 2003



HUMAN
RIGHTS
CAMPAIGN
FOUNDATIONTM

Human Rights Campaign Foundation, 1640 Rhode Island Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036
phone 202/628-4160 *TTY* 202/216-1572 *fax* 202/347-5323 *website* www.hrc.org

© 2003 by the Human Rights Campaign Foundation. The HRC Foundation grants permission for the reproduction and redistribution of this publication only when reproduced in its entirety and distributed free of charge. The Human Rights Campaign name and the Equality logo are trademarks of the Human Rights Campaign.

INTRODUCTION

This marks the second year that the Human Rights Campaign Foundation's workplace project — HRC WorkNet — has rated major U.S. corporations on their records toward lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender employees, consumers and investors.

The initial publication of the HRC Corporate Equality Index in 2002 sparked strong public interest and caught the attention of corporate executives. Within a week of its release in August 2002, more than 30 companies called the Human Rights Campaign to inquire about how to obtain a rating or improve the one they had. The level of interest was borne out in the improved response rate to this year's survey and in the number of companies that told HRC they would begin implementing the policies measured in the index and plan to respond in 2004.

Companies have begun to cite their HRC Corporate Equality Index scores in advertisements and public forums, and employee groups are using the index to drive internal change. Thus, the onus is on the Human Rights Campaign Foundation to assess corporate performance against the index in a credible, consistent and fair manner.

The seven criteria that make up the index are broad measures of corporate behavior toward the GLBT community. The 2003 criteria are substantially unchanged from 2002. There are, however, some questions on the 2003 survey regarding practices that are not part of the criteria but are important indicators of how a company treats its gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender employees. (For example, we ask whether companies voluntarily extend family and medical leave to GLBT workers and their families, and whether they make COBRA coverage available to employees' domestic partners on the same basis as such coverage is available to opposite-sex spouses.) It is our goal to add some of those factors to future Corporate Equality Index ratings, with advance notice to rated employers so that they have ample opportunity to maintain their scores.

The Human Rights Campaign Foundation is committed to working with each of the companies that are listed in this report — and others that should be here — to improve their understanding of GLBT issues in the workplace and ultimately to improve their scores.

THE CRITERIA

The Human Rights Campaign Foundation's Corporate Equality Index is a simple and effective tool to rate large American businesses on how they are treating gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender employees, consumers and investors.

Companies were rated on a scale of 0 percent to 100 percent based on whether they:

- 1. Have a written non-discrimination policy covering sexual orientation in their employee handbook or manual.**
- 2. Have a written non-discrimination policy covering gender identity and/or expression in their employee handbook or manual.**
- 3. Offer health insurance coverage to employees' same-sex domestic partners.**
- 4. Officially recognize and support a gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender employee resource group; or would support employees' forming a GLBT employee resource group if some expressed interest by providing space and other resources; or have a firm-wide diversity council or working group whose mission specifically includes GLBT diversity.**
- 5. Offer diversity training that includes sexual orientation and/or gender identity and expression in the workplace.**
- 6. Engage in respectful and appropriate marketing to the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community and/or provide support through their corporate foundation or otherwise to GLBT or HIV/AIDS-related organizations or events.**
- 7. Engage in corporate action that would undermine the goal of equal rights for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people.¹**

Each of the seven factors was given equal weight in calculating the score. Only for criterion No. 4 was half credit awarded in some instances. Half credit was given if a company had neither a GLBT employee resource group nor a fully inclusive diversity council but would allow a GLBT resource group access to facilities, should one arise.

The index is guided in part by the Equality Principles, 10 benchmarks for companies seeking to demonstrate a commitment to equal treatment of GLBT employees, consumers and investors. The Equality Principles were developed in 1992 by the Equality Project, a New York-based group that monitors corporate policies and practices surrounding sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. (See Appendix 1 for the full Equality Principles.)

METHODOLOGY

The Human Rights Campaign Foundation surveyed the 2003 Fortune 500 companies and Forbes' list of the 200 largest privately held firms. Because of some overlap in the two lists, the total number of companies surveyed in 2003 was 697. The 2003 survey was mailed in March to the chief executive officer and the head of human resources. Reminder cards were mailed to companies that had not responded in April. Companies that still had not responded were telephoned by HRC and asked to complete the survey. (See Appendix 2 for the complete survey.)

A total of 120 companies returned surveys, for a response rate of 17 percent. (The response rate in 2002 was 10 percent.)

The HRC Foundation did not rely solely on self-reporting to rate companies, however. HRC employed a team of researchers to double-check corporate policies and investigate corporate practices. They scrutinized filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission to track connections between significant shareholders and board members of rated companies and any anti-gay organizations or activities. Case law and news accounts were also searched to ascertain whether allegations of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and/or gender identity and expression had been brought against any of these corporations.

Once preliminary scores were tabulated, letters were sent to all the companies informing them of their score and asking them to provide HRC with any additional information.

A total of 250 Fortune- or Forbes-listed companies are rated in this report. They are the focus of analyses covered here. (A total of 217 Fortune- or Forbes-listed companies were rated in 2002.) An additional 112 firms with at least 500 employees that are not on the Fortune 500 or Forbes lists were also rated. However, unlike the 2002 report, these firms were not tabulated in this report's analyses. The reason for that is to develop a comparison of the same universe

from year to year. Scores for all companies are presented at the end of this report. The HRC Foundation did not survey or rate colleges and universities, governments or non-profits.

These data were supplemented by HRC WorkNet, which since 1995 has collected information on U.S. employers and maintains the most accurate and extensive database of policies regarding the GLBT community. Finally, data were included from the former glvIndex and glvReports.com, which conducted similar annual surveys of the same set of corporations from 1993 until HRC acquired the index in 2001. News accounts, employee resource groups and individuals provide another level of data in determining corporate policies.

HRC WorkNet was aided in the development of the survey instrument and the index criteria by the HRC Business Council, an advisory group composed primarily of GLBT executives in a variety of disciplines from major U.S. corporations. The group provides substantial expertise and experience in corporate policy and decision-making to help ensure that the index is rigorous and fair. The HRC Business Council was not involved in the administration of the survey, tabulation of the data or calculation of any scores. (See Acknowledgements for a list of HRC Business Council members.)

Companies are not rated until all appropriate information has been gathered and verified. The data were also scrutinized by a panel of GLBT workplace advocates who are not employees of the HRC or the HRC Foundation or of any of the companies rated. They bring years of experience in observing corporate actions on each of the specific policy areas covered by the index. (See Acknowledgements for a list of the reviewers.)

The rating for each company should be viewed as a composite of corporate activity over the last several years. While some components of the index, such as non-discrimination policies, do not typically change from year to year, other aspects do, such as advertising and event sponsorship. A total of 149 — or 60 percent — of the 250 Fortune- and Forbes-listed companies that are rated have responded to HRC's survey in the last two years. For those companies that did not respond, historical data were used. As HRC WorkNet continues to expand its research capacity and as more companies take an interest in providing HRC with timely data, we will be able to report more precisely on annual fluctuations in these corporate practices.

Even after scrupulous data collection and careful consideration, assigning a grade to a corporation that may employ tens of thousands of people to measure how fairly it treats GLBT individuals is a matter that involves some degree of subjectivity. The Corporate Equality Index is a broad measure of corporate policies and practices toward the GLBT community. For more detailed explanations of corporate practices readers should consult HRC WorkNet (www.hrc.org/worknet).

FINDINGS

This report rates 250 companies from two respected lists: the Fortune 500 and Forbes 200 largest private companies. (See Appendices 3 and 4 for a list of these companies and their scores.) The median score for these companies was 71 percent. The median score for companies in 2002 was 57 percent. Because each factor on the index accounts for 14 percentage points, this rise in 2003 means that employers are generally meeting one additional criterion of the index compared to 2002.

Twenty-one companies received a score of 100 percent. (An asterisk indicates the company achieved 100 percent for the first time in 2003.) They are:

Aetna Inc.	J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.
American Airlines	Lehman Brothers
(AMR Corp.)	Holdings Inc.*
Apple Computer Inc.	Levi Strauss & Co.*
Avaya Inc.	Lucent Technologies Inc.
Bank One Corp.*	MetLife Inc.*
Capital One	NCR Corp.
Financial Corp.*	Nike Inc.
Eastman Kodak Co.	PG&E Corp.*
Hewlett-Packard Co.*	Prudential Financial Inc.*
IBM Corp.*	S.C. Johnson & Son Inc.*
Intel Corp.	Xerox Corp.

This represents a 91 percent increase over 2002 when 11 companies received a score of 100 percent. Eight of the 10 new companies to achieve a score of 100 percent did so by adding gender identity and/or expression to their equal employment opportunity policies. **MetLife Inc.**, which received a score of 71 percent in 2002, instituted a non-discrimination policy covering gender identity and expression and received credit for a diversity council that includes GLBT issues. **Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc.**, which had a score of 43 percent in 2002, reported four new practices in 2003: a gender identity and expression non-discrimina-

tion policy, diversity training, an employee resource group and financial support for GLBT community groups and events.

No companies scored zero percent in 2003. The lowest score achieved by companies rated in 2003 was 14 percent. Five companies received that score:

Aramark Corp.
Domino's Inc.
ExxonMobil Corp.
Meijer Inc.
National Gypsum

They stand in contrast to industry peers such as **Target Corp.** (86 percent), **Sears Roebuck & Co.** (86 percent), **Darden Restaurants** (86 percent) and **McDonald's Corp.** (57 percent).

Of the 2003 lowest-scorers, only **ExxonMobil Corp.** overtly resisted equal treatment for GLBT employees, consumer and investors by continuing to oppose a shareholder resolution asking it to add sexual orientation to its equal employment opportunity statement. The company stripped sexual orientation from Mobil's EEO policy when the two companies merged in 1999 and suspended enrollment in Mobil's domestic partner benefits program. Since 1999, the company's board of directors has opposed a shareholder resolution asking it to include sexual orientation in its EEO policy. The company received a score of 14 because it provides training for employees on sexual orientation issues in their workplace.

Given that it remains legal in 36 states to fire employees based on sexual orientation, and in 46 states based on gender identity and expression, non-discrimination policies that include sexual orientation and gender identity and expression are the bedrock of corporate commitment to GLBT employees.² ExxonMobil's lack of effort to foster a welcoming environment for GLBT employees contrasts sharply with such competitors as **ChevronTexaco Corp.** (86 percent) and a number of other oil and gas companies.

Each of the three companies that received zeroes in 2002 improved their scores in 2003. Those companies and their 2003 scores are: **Cracker Barrel Old Country Stores/CBRL Group Inc.** (29 percent), **Emerson Electric Co.** (29 percent) and **Lockheed Martin Corp.** (71 percent).³

Cracker Barrel improved its score by withdrawing its opposition to a shareholder proposal asking the company to include sexual orientation in its non-discrimination policy and subsequently adopting such a policy. **Emerson Electric Co.** began offering diversity training and support for a GLBT community group, but continued to oppose a shareholder resolution asking it to add sexual orientation to its non-discrimination policy.

The most-improved company was **Lockheed Martin**, whose score went from zero to 71 percent. **Lockheed Martin** — also the target of a shareholder resolution — added both a sexual orientation non-discrimination policy and domestic partner benefits. At this writing, the company was only lacking gender identity in its non-discrimination policy and a commitment to charitable contributions to the GLBT community.


Three of the six companies that scored 14 percent in 2002 improved their scores as well, albeit marginally. They are: **FedEx Corp.** (29 percent), **Wal-Mart Stores Inc.** (43 percent) and **MeadWestvaco Corp.** (29 percent). **Domino's Inc.**, **ExxonMobil Corp.** and **Meijer Inc.** remained at 14 percent. **FedEx Corp.** announced in April 2003 that it would include sexual orientation in its EEO policy. **MeadWestvaco Corp.** also added such a policy. And **Wal-Mart Stores Inc.**, the largest non-government employer in the United States, improved its score by instituting a non-discrimination policy covering sexual orientation and diversity training.

TRENDS

Eighty rated companies — or 32 percent — improved their scores in 2003 compared to 2002. The median score increase was 14 percentage points.

The total number of companies meeting each individual criterion grew from 2002. Sexual orientation non-discrimination policies continue to be the hallmark of most corporate efforts to treat GLBT employees fairly — 95 percent of companies rated had such policies, compared to 93 percent last year.

Fig. 1. Percent of Companies Meeting Each Index Component




The number of companies that met the diversity training criterion saw the biggest jump in 2003, up 19 percentage points from 2002. That was followed by companies meeting the criterion around employee resource groups. However, the growth in that arena is due almost exclusively to a modification in 2003 scoring that allowed companies to receive credit for having inclusive firm-wide diversity councils even when they do not have active employee resource groups. Thus, 86 percent of the new companies that met that indicator did so because of the existence of diversity councils that cover GLBT issues.

There were more companies advertising to the gay community as well.⁵ Seventy-one percent of companies rated by this report met that component of the index, compared to 61 percent in 2002. Seventy percent of employers rated provide domestic partner health insurance, up from 67 percent last year.

A total of 9 percent of rated companies include gender identity and/or expression in their EEO policies, up from 6 percent in 2002.

Fig. 2. Number of Companies Receiving Each Possible Score⁶



(Percentages in gray indicate that these scores were not available to companies in 2002. Allowing half credit on the employee resource group indicator created additional score possibilities.)

While the median score in 2003 was 71 percent, the most common score was 86 percent. A total of 85 of the rated companies received that score — meaning they missed only one of the affirmative criteria. For 83 of these companies, the factor they lacked was a policy prohibiting discrimination based on gender identity and expression. These policies are being implemented more rapidly at Fortune 500 companies. As of this writing, 21 Fortune 500 companies had such policies, compared to just five in 2001. In addition, state and local laws that protect individuals based on gender identity and expression are proliferating.⁷

INDUSTRY ANALYSIS

A review of scores based on industry revealed that some market sectors comprise companies that consistently scored above the median of 71 percent for Fortune and Forbes companies. These industries include:

Airlines

Median score: 86 percent

Banking and Financial Services

Median score: 86 percent

High-Tech/Equipment Manufacturers

Median Score: 86 percent

Telecommunications

Median Score: 86 percent

They included such high performers as **American Airlines** (100 percent), **Bank One Corp.** (100 percent), **Capital One Financial Corp.** (100 percent), **J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.** (100 percent), **Lehman Brothers Holdings** (100 percent), **Avaya Inc.** (100 percent), **Eastman Kodak Co.** (100 percent), **Intel Corp.** (100 percent), **Lucent Technologies** (100 percent), **AT&T** (86 percent), **BellSouth Corp.** (86 percent), **Qwest Communications** (86 percent), **SBC Communications** (86 percent) and **Verizon Communications** (86 percent).

Each of the industries also has members that are not on par with their peers, however. **Southwest Airlines** (43 percent), has refused to participate in the HRC Corporate Equality Index survey for two years. Its rating is based on reports from employees within the company who have communicated with HRC.

In the banking and financial services industry, **Marsh & McLellan** (43 percent) and **Bank of New York Co.** (29 percent) remain below their industry peers. High-tech/equipment manufacturing and telecommunications companies such as **Maytag Corp.** (29 percent), **Emerson Electric Co.** (29 percent) and **Sprint Corp.** (29 percent) all scored below their industry average.

Several industries contain companies that consistently score below the median average for Fortune and Forbes companies. These include:

Hotels, Resorts and Casinos

Median Score: 43 percent

Mail and Freight Delivery

Median Score: 29 percent

Retail and Consumer Products

Median Score: 57 percent

Major hotel chains such as **Marriott International** (43 percent) and **Hilton Hotels Corp.** (43 percent) stand in contrast to industry leaders **Hyatt Hotels Corp.** (86 percent) and **Starwood Hotels & Resorts** (86 percent).

In the mail and freight delivery sector, neither **FedEx Corp.** (29 percent) nor **United Parcel Service Inc.** (29 percent) offer domestic partner benefits.

The retail and consumer products industry contains some high performers, such as **S.C. Johnson & Son Inc.** (100 percent), **Sears Roebuck & Co.** (86 percent) and **Target Corp.** (86 percent), but also includes low performers: **Wal-Mart Stores Inc.** (43 percent), **Circuit City Stores Inc.** (29 percent), **Staples Inc.** (29 percent), **Toys 'R' Us Inc.** (43 percent) and **Office Depot Inc.** (43 percent).

EXCEEDING EXPECTATIONS

While more corporations across America are implementing policies and practices that are the hallmarks of equal treatment for GLBT employees, consumers and investors, a small subset have demonstrated a commitment to equality beyond their own work forces. Twenty-two Fortune and Forbes companies with HRC Corporate Equality Index ratings have endorsed the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, a federal bill that would ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.⁸ They are:

Agilent Technologies Inc. (86 percent)

Apple Computer Inc. (100 percent)

AT&T Corp. (86 percent)

Capital One Financial Corp. (100 percent)

Charles Schwab Corp. (86 percent)

Cisco Systems (86 percent)

Coors Brewing Co. (86 percent)

Eastman Kodak Co. (100 percent)

FleetBoston Financial Corp. (86 percent)

General Mills Inc. (86 percent)
Hewlett-Packard Co. (100 percent)
IBM Corp. (100 percent)
John Hancock Financial Services Inc. (86 percent)
J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. (100 percent)
Levi Strauss & Co. (100 percent)
Microsoft Corp. (86 percent)
Nationwide (86 percent)
Nike Inc. (100 percent)
Oracle Corp. (71 percent)
Prudential Financial Corp. (100 percent)
Verizon Communications (86 percent)
Xerox Corp. (100 percent)

In addition to sponsoring GLBT community groups and events, at least two companies also specifically prohibit contributions to organizations that actively discriminate against GLBT people. **Lucent Technologies Inc.** (100 percent) and **Levi Strauss & Co.** (100 percent) each require recipients of contributions from their corporate foundations to adhere to anti-discrimination guidelines, which precludes contributing to groups such as the Boy Scouts of America, which prohibits gay youth from entering their programs.

The Coca-Cola Co. (71 percent) beat back an attempt by a shareholder to remove sexual orientation from its non-discrimination policies. The company's board issued a strong statement against the resolution, which failed.

CONCLUSIONS

Since at least 1995, a majority of Fortune 500 companies have included sexual orientation in their non-discrimination policies. Today, 64 percent of Fortune companies have those policies. The HRC Corporate Equality Index reveals that many of those companies have gone further in defining their actions around GLBT diversity in the workplace. A majority of companies rated have taken other major steps toward creating an equal workplace, from diversity training to domestic partner benefits. And companies are moving forward rapidly on these issues. A third of the companies in this report increased their scores from last year. That signifies that a sizable portion have identified a continuum of practices that are important to GLBT Americans.

Most of the companies in this report can do more. Only 8 percent of companies rated received a score of 100 percent. Even fewer, 3 percent, received the lowest score assigned this year — 14 percent. What this tells us is there is still a large middle ground of companies that have taken some of the steps toward equality in the workplace for GLBT people, but have further to go. The HRC Corporate Equality Index is intended to be a road map for employers to identify best practices and benchmark their companies against their peers. HRC hopes that employees, consumers and investors will use the index as a tool to educate corporate leaders on the tenets of corporate responsibility toward the GLBT community and encourage them to do better.

NOTES

1. Companies with no known anti-GLBT activity automatically earned 14 percentage points. Otherwise, companies lost points based on such actions as: undue influence by a significant shareholder calculated to undermine a company's employment policies or practices related to its GLBT employees; or directing corporate charitable contributions in a manner calculated to undermine equality for GLBT people. Scores on this criterion may also be based on information related to a company's actions, such as: opposing shareholder resolutions reasonably aimed at encouraging the adoption of non-discrimination policies covering sexual orientation and/or gender identity; or directing resources from a majority-owned subsidiary to an institution(s) whose mission or goals undermine equality for GLBT people; or engaging in proven practices that are contrary to the company's written GLBT employment policies.
2. On July 24, 2003, California became the fourth state to prohibit employment discrimination based on gender identity. Its law takes effect Jan. 1, 2004.
3. Cracker Barrel Old Country Stores is not listed among the Fortune 500 or the Forbes 200 and thus is not among the companies analyzed in this 2003 Corporate Equality Index report. However, because it was one of three companies that received a zero in the 2002 report and because it did make a significant step forward, we mention it here.
4. This figure includes only those employers that received full credit for this indicator, either by having an officially sanctioned GLBT employee resource group or a firm-wide diversity council that specifically includes GLBT diversity issues.
5. This percentage represents the cumulative number of companies that have advertised or donated to the GLBT community over the last several years and not the number that advertised exclusively in 2002 or 2003.
6. This table compares only companies listed in the Fortune 500 and Forbes 200 for both 2002 and 2003, although the 2002 Corporate Equality Index report rated some companies outside those lists that had at least 500 employees. Those latter companies are excluded here in order to keep the analysis consistent.
7. Three states and 60 cities and counties currently prohibit workplace discrimination on the basis of gender identity and/or expression. On Jan. 1, 2004, California will become the fourth state to prohibit this type of discrimination. Visit www.hrc.org/worknet for the most up-to-date list of these jurisdictions.
8. For a complete list of corporations that have endorsed the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, see www.hrc.org/issues/federal_leg/enda/background/endacorp.asp.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

HRC WorkNet was aided in the development of the survey instrument and the index criteria by the HRC Business Council, an advisory group composed primarily of GLBT executives in a variety of disciplines from major U.S. corporations. The group provides their substantial expertise and experience in corporate policy and decision making to help ensure that the index is rigorous and fair. The HRC Business Council was not involved in the administration of the survey, tabulation of the data or calculation of any scores.

THE HRC BUSINESS COUNCIL

Selisse Berry, Out & Equal Workplace Advocates

Ellen Braun, Capital One Financial Corp.

Phil Burgess, Walgreen Co.

Kevin Cheng, ChevronTexaco Corp.

Wes Combs,

Witeck-Combs Communications Inc. (co-chair)

Scott Coors, Coors Brewing Co.

Kim Cromwell, Cromwell Consulting

Scottie Ginn, IBM Corp.

John Hassell, Hewlett-Packard Co.

Ronald Helaire, Zoopwizards Inc.

Emily Jones, Eastman Kodak Co.

Grant Lukenbill, Global Consumer Index

Cynthia Martin, Blue Shield of California (co-chair)

Sue McManus, Nationwide

Steve Mulligan, retired, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Mendes Napoli, Napoli Management Group

Rick Schroder, Shell Oil Co.

Rob Shook, IBM Corp.

Richard Spencer, Capitol One Financial Corp.

John Sullivan, Imation Corp.

David Taborelli, Prudential Financial Inc.

Brian Tremain, Merrill Lynch & Co.

Louise Young, Raytheon Co.

The data were scrutinized by a panel of GLBT workplace advocates who are not employees of HRC or the HRC Foundation or of any of the companies rated. They bring years of experience in observing corporate actions on each of the specific policy areas covered by the index.

Shelley Alpern, Trillium Asset Management

Selisse Berry, Out & Equal Workplace Advocates

Chris Daley, Transgender Law Center

Brian McNaught, author and trainer on workplace issues
of sexual orientation and gender identity and expression

David Medina, AFL-CIO

Janis Walworth, Center for Gender Sanity

Mike Wilke, Commercial Closet Association

APPENDIX 1. THE EQUALITY PRINCIPLES

(As amended by the Equality Project executive board, copyright 2001)

1. The company will prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender expression or gender identity as part of its written employment policy statement.
2. The company will disseminate its written employment policy statement company-wide.
3. The company will not tolerate discrimination on the basis of any employee's actual or perceived health condition, status or disability.
4. The company will offer equal health insurance and other benefits to employees to cover their domestic partners regardless of the employee's marital status, sexual orientation, gender expression or gender identity.
5. The company will include discussions of sexual orientation, gender expression and gender identity as part of its official employee diversity and sensitivity training communications.
6. The company will give employee groups equal standing, regardless of sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression.
7. The company advertising policy will avoid the use of negative stereotypes based on sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression.
8. The company will not discriminate in advertising, marketing or promoting events on the basis of sexual orientation, gender expression or gender identity.
9. The company will not discriminate in the sale of its goods or services based on sexual orientation, gender expression or gender identity.
10. The company will not bar charitable contributions to groups and organizations on the basis of sexual orientation, gender expression or gender identity.

APPENDIX 2. CORPORATE EQUALITY INDEX SURVEY

The questions in **bold** are directly used to compute each company's rating. Those questions that are not in **bold** collect information for research and will only be presented in aggregate form across all companies surveyed, if at all.

1. Does your firm have a written policy barring employment discrimination based on, and using the words, "sexual orientation?" (Please attach a copy of the policy.)

- ☐ **Yes, we have a company wide policy**
- ☐ **Only in one or more subsidiaries or labor agreements**
- ☐ **We do not have such a policy, but are working toward this in the next one year**
- ☐ **We do not have such a policy**

1a. If yes, does the policy apply to employees based outside the United States?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ We have no employees based outside the U.S.

2. Does your firm have a written policy barring employment discrimination based on, and using the words, "gender identity" or "gender expression?" (Please attach a copy of the policy.)

- ☐ **Yes, we have a company wide policy**
- ☐ **Only in one or more subsidiaries or labor agreements**
- ☐ **We do not have such a policy, but are working toward this in the next one year**
- ☐ **We do not have such a policy**

2a. If yes, does the policy apply to employees based outside the United States?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ We have no employees based outside the U.S.

3. Does your company offer health insurance coverage to your employees' domestic partners?

- ☐ **We do not offer domestic partner health benefits and have no plans to offer them**
- ☐ **We do not offer domestic partner health benefits, but plan to offer them in the next one year**
- ☐ **Yes, to same-sex partners only**
- ☐ **Yes, to opposite-sex partners only**
- ☐ **Yes, to same- and opposite-sex partners**

4. What year did same-sex domestic partner health insurance benefits become available at your company? _____

- ☐ We do not offer these benefits

5. What benefits does your company offer to domestic partners of U.S. employees?

Please place use "Y" or "N" depending on what your company offers:

	Available to legal spouses	Available to employees' domestic partners
Medical	_____	_____
Dental	_____	_____
Vision	_____	_____
Dependent medical coverage	_____	_____
COBRA/COBRA-like benefits	_____	_____
Bereavement leave	_____	_____
FMLA-like leave	_____	_____
Life insurance	_____	_____
Relocation/travel assistance	_____	_____

Adoption assistance	_____	_____
Beneficiary for pension/401(k)	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____

Please describe any other benefits offered to employees' domestic partners:

6. Does your company have an officially recognized lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender employee affinity group?

☐ Yes

Name of group:

Name/Phone/E-mail of primary contact: _____

☐ No

6a. If not, would your company allow LGBT employees to use its facilities and other resources to form a group if they expressed interest?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Does your company have a firm-wide diversity council or working group with a mission that specifically includes LGBT diversity?

☐ Yes, we have a diversity council or working group that includes LGBT issues

☐ No, we have a diversity council or working group, but LGBT issues are not covered

☐ No, we do not have a diversity council or working group

8. What topics are covered in your company's diversity awareness or employee training and who is required to attend?

Diversity Topic	All employees are required to attend	Some employees are required to attend	No employees are required to attend, but training is offered	Not offered
Sexual orientation	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gender identity	_____	_____	_____	_____
Religion	_____	_____	_____	_____
Race/ethnicity	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gender	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____	_____	_____

Describe the "other" training employees receive: _____

9. In the past year, has your company advertised its products or services in any lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender media (magazine, newspaper, television)?

☐ Yes

If so, please name the media outlet: _____

☐ No

10. In the past year, has your company sponsored a lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender community event?

☐ Yes

If so, please name the event: _____

☐ No

11. In the past year, has your company made a contribution to an HIV/AIDS or women's health organization or lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender community or political organization?

☐ Yes

If so, please name the organization: _____

☐ No

12. Please include any other information that would illustrate how your company views lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender employees, consumers or investors. (This could include information on innovative business practices that affect the gay community, further description of employee benefits, innovative products or services adapted for the gay community, etc.)

The following question is designed to collect information on the diversity of corporate boards. While researchers have for years focused on gender, racial and ethnic board diversity, none have looked into which boards have openly gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender members. This is an optional question and it will not be used in rating your company.

13. Are there any openly gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender members of your company's board of directors?

☐ Yes

☐ No

13a. If yes, how many are openly gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender? _____

APPENDIX 3. CORPORATE EQUALITY INDEX SCORES

for Fortune 500 and Forbes 200 Companies (sorted by score)

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
Aetna Inc.	Hartford	CT	100
American Airlines (AMR Corp.)	Dallas-Fort Worth Airport	TX	100
Apple Computer Inc.	Cupertino	CA	100
Avaya Inc.	Basking Ridge	NJ	100
Bank One Corp.	Chicago	IL	100
Capital One Financial Corp.	Falls Church	VA	100
Eastman Kodak Co.	Rochester	NY	100
Hewlett-Packard Co.	Palo Alto	CA	100
IBM (International Business Machines Corp.)	Armonk	NY	100
Intel Corp.	Santa Clara	CA	100
J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.	New York	NY	100
Lehman Brothers Holdings	New York	NY	100
Levi Strauss & Co.	San Francisco	CA	100
Lucent Technologies Inc.	Murray Hill	NJ	100
MetLife (Metropolitan Life Insurance)	New York	NY	100
NCR Corp.	Dayton	OH	100
Nike Inc.	Beaverton	OR	100
PG&E Corp.	San Francisco	CA	100
Prudential Financial Inc.	Newark	NJ	100
S.C. Johnson & Son Inc.	Racine	WI	100
Xerox Corp.	Stamford	CT	100
Agilent Technologies Inc.	Palo Alto	CA	86
Allstate (The Allstate Corp.)	Northbrook	IL	86
American Express Co.	New York	NY	86
AOL Time Warner Inc.	New York	NY	86
AT&T Corp.	New York	NY	86
Bank of America Corp.	Charlotte	NC	86
BellSouth Corp.	Atlanta	GA	86
Boeing (The Boeing Co.)	Seattle	WA	86
Booz Allen Hamilton Inc.	McLean	VA	86
Borders Group Inc.	Ann Arbor	MI	86
Cargill Inc.	Minneapolis	MN	86
Cendant Corp.	New York	NY	86
Charles Schwab (The Charles Schwab Corp.)	San Francisco	CA	86
ChevronTexaco Corp.	San Ramon	CA	86
Chubb Corp.	Warren	NJ	86
Cigna Corp.	Philadelphia	PA	86
Cisco Systems	San Jose	CA	86
Citigroup Inc.	New York	NY	86
Continental Airlines	Houston	TX	86
Coors Brewing (Adolph Coors Co.)*	Golden	CO	86
Darden Restaurants	Orlando	FL	86
Dow Chemical Co.	Midland	MI	86
Electronic Data Systems Corp. (EDS)	Plano	TX	86
Fannie Mae	Washington	DC	86
Federated Department Stores	Cincinnati	OH	86
FleetBoston Financial Corp.	Boston	MA	86
Ford Motor Co.	Dearborn	MI	86
Gannett Co. Inc.	Arlington	VA	86

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
General Electric Co.	Fairfield	CT	86
General Mills Inc.	Minneapolis	MN	86
General Motors Corp.	Detroit	MI	86
Gillette Co., The	Boston	MA	86
Goldman Sachs Investment Banking	New York	NY	86
Hartford Financial Services Co.	Hartford	CT	86
Honeywell International Inc.	Morristown	NJ	86
Hyatt Hotels Corp. (H Group Holding)	Chicago	IL	86
International Paper Co.	Purchase	NY	86
John Hancock Financial Services Inc.	Boston	MA	86
Lexmark International Inc.	Lexington	KY	86
Limited Brands Inc.	Columbus	OH	86
Lincoln National Corp.	Philadelphia	PA	86
McGraw-Hill (The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.)	New York	NY	86
McKinsey & Co. Inc.	New York	NY	86
Mellon Financial Corp.	Pittsburgh	PA	86
Merck & Co. Inc.	Whitehouse Station	NJ	86
Merrill Lynch & Co.	New York	NY	86
Microsoft Corp.	Redmond	WA	86
Morgan Stanley	New York	NY	86
Motorola Inc.	Schaumburg	IL	86
Nationwide	Columbus	OH	86
New York Times Co.	New York	NY	86
Nordstrom Inc.	Seattle	WA	86
Pfizer Inc.	New York	NY	86
Polaroid Corp.	Cambridge	MA	86
PricewaterhouseCoopers	New York	NY	86
Procter & Gamble (The Procter & Gamble Co.)	Cincinnati	OH	86
Quest Diagnostics	Teterboro	NJ	86
Qwest Communications International Inc.**	Englewood	CO	86
Raytheon Co.	Lexington	MA	86
RJ Reynolds Tobacco	Winston-Salem	NC	86
SAFECO Corp.	Seattle	WA	86
SBC Communications Inc.	San Antonio	TX	86
Schering-Plough Corp.	Madison	NJ	86
Sears, Roebuck and Co.	Hoffman Estates	IL	86
Sempra Energy	San Diego	CA	86
SLM Corp. (Sallie Mae)	Reston	VA	86
St. Paul Companies	St. Paul	MN	86
Starbucks Corp.	Seattle	WA	86
Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide	White Plains	NY	86
Sun Microsystems	Palo Alto	CA	86
Target Corp.	Minneapolis	MN	86
Texas Instruments Inc.	Dallas	TX	86
Unisys Corp.	Blue Bell	PA	86
United Airlines (UAL Corp.)	Elk Grove	IL	86
US Airways Group	Arlington	VA	86
US Bancorp	Minneapolis	MN	86
Verizon Communications	New York	NY	86
Visteon Corp.	Dearborn	MI	86
Wachovia Corp.	Charlotte	NC	86
Walgreen Co.	Deerfield	IL	86
Walt Disney Co.	Burbank	CA	86

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
Washington Mutual Savings Bank	Seattle	WA	86
Wellpoint Health Networks	Thousand Oaks	CA	86
Wells Fargo & Co.	San Francisco	CA	86
Xcel Energy	Minneapolis	MN	86
Anheuser-Busch	St. Louis	MO	79
Calpine Corp.	San Jose	CA	79
Colgate-Palmolive Co.	New York	NY	79
Ernst & Young	New York	NY	79
Northrop Grumman Corp.	Los Angeles	CA	79
Reebok International	Stoughton	MA	79
UnumProvident Corp.***	Portland	ME	79
3M (Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing)	St. Paul	MN	71
Abbott Laboratories	Abbot Park	IL	71
Air Products & Chemicals Inc.	Allentown	PA	71
Amazon.com	Seattle	WA	71
Amgen Inc.	Thousand Oaks	CA	71
Applied Materials Inc.	Santa Clara	CA	71
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.	New York	NY	71
Campbell Soup Co.	Camden	NJ	71
Cinergy Corp.	Cincinnati	OH	71
Coca-Cola (The Coca-Cola Co.)	Atlanta	GA	71
Consolidated Edison Co.	New York	NY	71
Cummins Inc.	Columbus	IN	71
Dell Computer Corp.	Austin	TX	71
Delphi Automotive	Troy	MI	71
Delta Airlines Inc.	Atlanta	GA	71
Dole Food Co. Inc.	Westlake Village	CA	71
DTE Energy Co	Detroit	MI	71
Duke Energy	Charlotte	NC	71
Edison International	Rosemead	CA	71
Eli Lilly & Co.	Indianapolis	IN	71
Freddie Mac	McLean	VA	71
Gateway Inc.	North Sioux City	SD	71
Georgia Pacific	Atlanta	GA	71
Interpublic Group of Companies Inc.	New York	NY	71
Johnson & Johnson	New Brunswick	NJ	71
Kellogg Co.	Battle Creek	MI	71
Kimberly-Clark	Dallas	TX	71
Lockheed Martin Corp.	Bethesda	MD	71
Northeast Utilities System	Berlin	CT	71
Northwest Airlines Corp.	Eagan	MN	71
Oracle Corp.	Redwood Shores	CA	71
PepsiCo Inc.	Purchase	NY	71
Pitney Bowes Inc.	Stamford	CT	71
PPG Industries	Pittsburgh	PA	71
Principal Financial Group	Des Moines	IA	71
Provident Financial Corp.	San Francisco	CA	71
QUALCOMM Inc.	San Diego	CA	71
Ryder System Inc.	Miami	FL	71
Sara Lee Corp.	Chicago	IL	71
SunTrust Banks Inc.	Atlanta	GA	71
Supervalu	Eden Prairie	MN	71
Tech Data Corp.	Clearwater	FL	71

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
Viacom Inc.	New York	NY	71
Whirlpool Corp.	Benton Harbor	MI	71
Baxter International Inc.	Deerfield	IL	64
ConocoPhillips	Houston	TX	64
Deere & Co.	Moline	IL	64
Illinois Tool Works Inc.	Glenview	IL	64
PNC Financial Services Group Inc.	Pittsburgh	PA	64
Allegheny Energy	Hagerstown	MD	57
Altria Group Inc. (Philip Morris Companies Inc.)	New York	NY	57
Avon Products	New York	NY	57
Barnes & Noble Inc.	New York	NY	57
Caterpillar	Peoria	IL	57
Clorox Co.	Oakland	CA	57
DPR Construction	Redwood City	CA	57
DuPont (E. I. du Pont de Nemours)	Wilmington	DE	57
EMC Corp.	Hopkinton	MA	57
Estee Lauder Companies	New York	NY	57
Gap Inc.	San Francisco	CA	57
General Dynamics Corp.	Falls Church	VA	57
Hallmark Cards Inc.	Kansas City	MO	57
Health Net Inc.	Woodland Hills	CA	57
Hilton Hotels Corp.	Beverly Hills	CA	57
Home Depot	Atlanta	GA	57
Host Marriott	Bethesda	MD	57
J.C. Penney Corp. Inc.	Plano	TX	57
Kmart Corp.	Troy	MI	57
Kroger Co., The	Cincinnati	OH	57
Liz Claiborne Inc.	New York	NY	57
MassMutual Life Insurance	Springfield	MA	57
Mattel Inc.	El Segundo	CA	57
MBNA Corp.	Wilmington	DE	57
McDonald's Corp.	Oakbrook	IL	57
Navistar International	Warrenville	IL	57
Nextel Communications	Reston	VA	57
Owens Corning	Toledo	OH	57
PPL Corp.	Allentown	PA	57
Progressive (The Progressive Corp.)	Mayfield Village	OH	57
Safeway Inc.	Oakland	CA	57
Software House International	Somerset	NJ	57
Williams Companies Inc.	Tulsa	OK	57
Pathmark Stores Inc.	Woodbridge	NJ	50
Anthem	Indianapolis	IN	43
AutoZone Inc.	Memphis	TN	43
Avnet Inc.	Great Neck	NY	43
Carlson Companies Inc.	Minneapolis	MN	43
Coca-Cola Enterprises	Atlanta	GA	43
Costco Wholesale Corp.	Issaquah	WA	43
Dana Corp.	Toledo	OH	43
H. E. Butt Grocery Co.	San Antonio	TX	43
Humana Inc.	Louisville	KY	43
KB Home	Los Angeles	CA	43
Marriott International	Bethesda	MD	43

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
Marsh & McLennan	New York	NY	43
Office Depot Inc.	Delray Beach	FL	43
Omnicom Group	New York	NY	43
PacifiCare Health Systems	Santa Ana	CA	43
Seagate Technology Inc.	Scotts Valley	CA	43
Southwest Airlines	Dallas	TX	43
State Farm Group	Bloomington	IL	43
Toys “R” Us Inc.	Framingham	MA	43
Vertis	Baltimore	MD	43
Wal-Mart Stores Inc.	Bentonville	AR	43
AIG (American International Group)	New York	NY	29
Albertson’s Inc.	Boise	ID	29
Archer Daniels Midland Co.	Decatur	IL	29
Automatic Data Processing Inc.	Roseland	NJ	29
Bank of New York Co.	New York	NY	29
Bethlehem Steel Corp.	Bethlehem	PA	29
Circuit City Stores Inc.	Richmond	VA	29
Emerson Electric Co.	St. Louis	MO	29
FedEx Corp.	Memphis	TN	29
Genuine Parts Co.	Atlanta	GA	29
H. J. Heinz Co.	Pittsburgh	PA	29
Harrah’s Entertainment Inc.	Las Vegas	NV	29
Hormel Foods Corp.	Austin	MN	29
Lear Corp.	Southfield	MI	29
May Department Stores Co., The	St. Louis	MO	29
Maytag Corp.	North Newton	IA	29
MeadWestvaco Corp.	Stamford	CT	29
New York Life Insurance Co.	New York	NY	29
Newell Rubbermaid Inc.	Freeport	IL	29
R.R. Donnelley & Sons	Chicago	IL	29
RadioShack Corp.	Fort Worth	TX	29
Rite Aid Corp.	Camp Hill	PA	29
Rohm & Haas	Philadelphia	PA	29
Sprint Corp.	Overland Park	KS	29
Staples Inc.	Westborough	MA	29
TIAA-CREF	New York	NY	29
United Parcel Service (UPS)	Atlanta	GA	29
Wyeth	Madison	NJ	29
Aramark Corp.	Philadelphia	PA	14
Domino’s Inc.	Ann Arbor	MI	14
Exxon Mobil Corp.	Irving	TX	14
Meijer Inc.	Grand Rapids	MI	14
National Gypsum	Charlotte	NC	14

* It appears that a significant shareholder of Coors Brewing Co. stock may have supported an institution whose mission includes undermining the goal of GLBT equality. To HRC’s knowledge, such support has not affected the company’s policies or practices related to it GLBT employees.

** It appears that a significant shareholder of Qwest Communications International Inc. stock may have supported an institution whose mission includes undermining the goal of GLBT equality. To HRC’s knowledge, such support has not affected the company’s policies or practices related to it GLBT employees.

*** It appears that a significant shareholder of UnumProvident Corp. stock may have supported an institution whose mission includes undermining the goal of GLBT equality. To HRC’s knowledge, such support has not affected the company’s policies or practices related to it GLBT employees.

APPENDIX 4. CORPORATE EQUALITY INDEX SCORES

for Fortune 500 and Forbes 200 Companies (sorted alphabetically)

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
3M (Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing)	St. Paul	MN	71
Abbott Laboratories	Abbot Park	IL	71
Aetna Inc.	Hartford	CT	100
Agilent Technologies Inc.	Palo Alto	CA	86
AIG (American International Group)	New York	NY	29
Air Products & Chemicals Inc.	Allentown	PA	71
Albertson's Inc.	Boise	ID	29
Allegheny Energy	Hagerstown	MD	57
Allstate (The Allstate Corp.)	Northbrook	IL	86
Altria Group Inc. (Philip Morris Companies Inc.)	New York	NY	57
Amazon.com	Seattle	WA	71
American Airlines (AMR Corp.)	Dallas-Fort Worth Airport	TX	100
American Express Co.	New York	NY	86
Amgen Inc.	Thousand Oaks	CA	71
Anheuser-Busch	St. Louis	MO	79
Anthem	Indianapolis	IN	43
AOL Time Warner Inc.	New York	NY	86
Apple Computer Inc.	Cupertino	CA	100
Applied Materials Inc.	Santa Clara	CA	71
Aramark Corp.	Philadelphia	PA	14
Archer Daniels Midland Co.	Decatur	IL	29
AT&T Corp.	New York	NY	86
Automatic Data Processing Inc.	Roseland	NJ	29
AutoZone Inc.	Memphis	TN	43
Avaya Inc.	Basking Ridge	NJ	100
Avnet Inc.	Great Neck	NY	43
Avon Products	New York	NY	57
Bank of America Corp.	Charlotte	NC	86
Bank of New York Co.	New York	NY	29
Bank One Corp.	Chicago	IL	100
Barnes & Noble Inc.	New York	NY	57
Baxter International Inc.	Deerfield	IL	64
BellSouth Corp.	Atlanta	GA	86
Bethlehem Steel Corp.	Bethlehem	PA	29
Boeing (The Boeing Co.)	Seattle	WA	86
Booz Allen Hamilton Inc.	McLean	VA	86
Borders Group Inc.	Ann Arbor	MI	86
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.	New York	NY	71
Calpine Corp.	San Jose	CA	79
Campbell Soup Co.	Camden	NJ	71
Capital One Financial Corp.	Falls Church	VA	100
Cargill Inc.	Minneapolis	MN	86
Carlson Companies Inc	Minneapolis	MN	43
Caterpillar	Peoria	IL	57
Cendant Corp.	New York	NY	86
Charles Schwab (The Charles Schwab Corp.)	San Francisco	CA	86
ChevronTexaco Corp.	San Ramon	CA	86
Chubb Corp.	Warren	NJ	86

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
Cigna Corp.	Philadelphia	PA	86
Cinergy Corp.	Cincinnati	OH	71
Circuit City Stores Inc.	Richmond	VA	29
Cisco Systems	San Jose	CA	86
Citigroup Inc.	New York	NY	86
Clorox Co.	Oakland	CA	57
Coca-Cola (The Coca-Cola Co.)	Atlanta	GA	71
Coca-Cola Enterprises	Atlanta	GA	43
Colgate-Palmolive Co.	New York	NY	79
ConocoPhillips	Houston	TX	64
Consolidated Edison Co.	New York	NY	71
Continental Airlines	Houston	TX	86
Coors Brewing (Adolph Coors Co.)*	Golden	CO	86
Costco Wholesale Corp.	Issaquah	WA	43
Cummins Inc.	Columbus	IN	71
Dana Corp.	Toledo	OH	43
Darden Restaurants	Orlando	FL	86
Deere & Co.	Moline	IL	64
Dell Computer Corp.	Austin	TX	71
Delphi Automotive	Troy	MI	71
Delta Airlines Inc.	Atlanta	GA	71
Dole Food Co. Inc.	Westlake Village	CA	71
Domino's Inc.	Ann Arbor	MI	14
Dow Chemical Co.	Midland	MI	86
DPR Construction	Redwood City	CA	57
DTE Energy Co	Detroit	MI	71
Duke Energy	Charlotte	NC	71
DuPont (E. I. du Pont de Nemours)	Wilmington	DE	57
Eastman Kodak Co.	Rochester	NY	100
Edison International	Rosemead	CA	71
Electronic Data Systems Corp. (EDS)	Plano	TX	86
Eli Lilly & Co.	Indianapolis	IN	71
EMC Corp.	Hopkinton	MA	57
Emerson Electric Co.	St. Louis	MO	29
Ernst & Young	New York	NY	79
Estee Lauder Companies	New York	NY	57
Exxon Mobil Corp.	Irving	TX	14
Fannie Mae	Washington	DC	86
Federated Department Stores	Cincinnati	OH	86
FedEx Corp.	Memphis	TN	29
FleetBoston Financial Corp.	Boston	MA	86
Ford Motor Co.	Dearborn	MI	86
Freddie Mac	McLean	VA	71
Gannett Co. Inc.	Arlington	VA	86
Gap Inc.	San Francisco	CA	57
Gateway Inc.	North Sioux City	SD	71
General Dynamics Corp.	Falls Church	VA	57
General Electric Co.	Fairfield	CT	86
General Mills Inc.	Minneapolis	MN	86
General Motors Corp.	Detroit	MI	86
Genuine Parts Co.	Atlanta	GA	29
Georgia Pacific	Atlanta	GA	71
Gillette Co., The	Boston	MA	86

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
Goldman Sachs Investment Banking	New York	NY	86
H. E. Butt Grocery Co.	San Antonio	TX	43
H. J. Heinz Co.	Pittsburgh	PA	29
Hallmark Cards Inc.	Kansas City	MO	57
Harrah's Entertainment Inc.	Las Vegas	NV	29
Hartford Financial Services Co.	Hartford	CT	86
Health Net Inc.	Woodland Hills	CA	57
Hewlett-Packard Co.	Palo Alto	CA	100
Hilton Hotels Corp.	Beverly Hills	CA	57
Home Depot	Atlanta	GA	57
Honeywell International Inc.	Morristown	NJ	86
Hormel Foods Corp.	Austin	MN	29
Host Marriott	Bethesda	MD	57
Humana Inc.	Louisville	KY	43
Hyatt Hotels Corp. (H Group Holding)	Chicago	IL	86
IBM (International Business Machines Corp.)	Armonk	NY	100
Illinois Tool Works Inc.	Glenview	IL	64
Intel Corp.	Santa Clara	CA	100
International Paper Co.	Purchase	NY	86
Interpublic Group of Companies Inc.	New York	NY	71
J.C. Penney Corp. Inc.	Plano	TX	57
J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.	New York	NY	100
John Hancock Financial Services Inc.	Boston	MA	86
Johnson & Johnson	New Brunswick	NJ	71
KB Home	Los Angeles	CA	43
Kellogg Co.	Battle Creek	MI	71
Kimberly-Clark	Dallas	TX	71
Kmart Corp.	Troy	MI	57
Kroger Co., The	Cincinnati	OH	57
Lear Corp.	Southfield	MI	29
Lehman Brothers Holdings	New York	NY	100
Levi Strauss & Co.	San Francisco	CA	100
Lexmark International Inc.	Lexington	KY	86
Limited Brands Inc.	Columbus	OH	86
Lincoln National Corp.	Philadelphia	PA	86
Liz Claiborne Inc.	New York	NY	57
Lockheed Martin Corp.	Bethesda	MD	71
Lucent Technologies Inc.	Murray Hill	NJ	100
Marriott International	Bethesda	MD	43
Marsh & McLennan	New York	NY	43
MassMutual Life Insurance	Springfield	MA	57
Mattel Inc.	El Segundo	CA	57
May Department Stores Co., The	St. Louis	MO	29
Maytag Corp.	North Newton	IA	29
MBNA Corp.	Wilmington	DE	57
McDonald's Corp.	Oakbrook	IL	57
McGraw-Hill (The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.)	New York	NY	86
McKinsey & Co. Inc.	New York	NY	86
MeadWestvaco Corp.	Stamford	CT	29
Meijer Inc.	Grand Rapids	MI	14
Mellon Financial Corp.	Pittsburgh	PA	86
Merck & Co. Inc.	Whitehouse Station	NJ	86
Merrill Lynch & Co.	New York	NY	86

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
MetLife (Metropolitan Life Insurance)	New York	NY	100
Microsoft Corp.	Redmond	WA	86
Morgan Stanley	New York	NY	86
Motorola Inc.	Schaumburg	IL	86
National Gypsum	Charlotte	NC	14
Nationwide	Columbus	OH	86
Navistar International	Warrenville	IL	57
NCR Corp.	Dayton	OH	100
New York Life Insurance Co.	New York	NY	29
New York Times Co.	New York	NY	86
Newell Rubbermaid Inc.	Freeport	IL	29
Nextel Communications	Reston	VA	57
Nike Inc.	Beaverton	OR	100
Nordstrom Inc.	Seattle	WA	86
Northeast Utilities System	Berlin	CT	71
Northrop Grumman Corp.	Los Angeles	CA	79
Northwest Airlines Corp.	Eagan	MN	71
Office Depot Inc.	Delray Beach	FL	43
Omnicom Group	New York	NY	43
Oracle Corp.	Redwood Shores	CA	71
Owens Corning	Toledo	OH	57
PacifiCare Health Systems	Santa Ana	CA	43
Pathmark Stores Inc.	Woodbridge	NJ	50
PepsiCo Inc.	Purchase	NY	71
Pfizer Inc.	New York	NY	86
PG&E Corp.	San Francisco	CA	100
Pitney Bowes Inc.	Stamford	CT	71
PNC Financial Services Group Inc.	Pittsburgh	PA	64
Polaroid Corp.	Cambridge	MA	86
PPG Industries	Pittsburgh	PA	71
PPL Corp.	Allentown	PA	57
PricewaterhouseCoopers	New York	NY	86
Principal Financial Group	Des Moines	IA	71
Procter & Gamble (The Procter & Gamble Co.)	Cincinnati	OH	86
Progressive (The Progressive Corp.)	Mayfield Village	OH	57
Provident Financial Corp.	San Francisco	CA	71
Prudential Financial Inc.	Newark	NJ	100
QUALCOMM Inc.	San Diego	CA	71
Quest Diagnostics	Teterboro	NJ	86
Qwest Communications International Inc.**	Englewood	CO	86
R.R. Donnelley & Sons	Chicago	IL	29
RadioShack Corp.	Fort Worth	TX	29
Raytheon Co.	Lexington	MA	86
Reebok International	Stoughton	MA	79
Rite Aid Corp.	Camp Hill	PA	29
RJ Reynolds Tobacco	Winston-Salem	NC	86
Rohm & Haas	Philadelphia	PA	29
Ryder System Inc.	Miami	FL	71
SAFECO Corp.	Seattle	WA	86
Safeway Inc.	Oakland	CA	57
Sara Lee Corp.	Chicago	IL	71
SBC Communications Inc.	San Antonio	TX	86
S.C. Johnson & Son Inc.	Racine	WI	100

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
Schering-Plough Corp.	Madison	NJ	86
Seagate Technology Inc.	Scotts Valley	CA	43
Sears, Roebuck and Co.	Hoffman Estates	IL	86
Sempra Energy	San Diego	CA	86
SLM Corp. (Sallie Mae)	Reston	VA	86
Software House International	Somerset	NJ	57
Southwest Airlines	Dallas	TX	43
Sprint Corp.	Overland Park	KS	29
St. Paul Companies	St. Paul	MN	86
Staples Inc.	Westborough	MA	29
Starbucks Corp.	Seattle	WA	86
Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide	White Plains	NY	86
State Farm Group	Bloomington	IL	43
Sun Microsystems	Palo Alto	CA	86
SunTrust Banks Inc.	Atlanta	GA	71
Supervalu	Eden Prairie	MN	71
Target Corp.	Minneapolis	MN	86
Tech Data Corp.	Clearwater	FL	71
Texas Instruments Inc.	Dallas	TX	86
TIAA-CREF	New York	NY	29
Toys "R" Us Inc.	Framingham	MA	43
Unisys Corp.	Blue Bell	PA	86
United Airlines (UAL Corp.)	Elk Grove	IL	86
United Parcel Service (UPS)	Atlanta	GA	29
UnumProvident Corp.***	Portland	ME	79
US Airways Group	Arlington	VA	86
US Bancorp	Minneapolis	MN	86
Verizon Communications	New York	NY	86
Vertis	Baltimore	MD	43
Viacom Inc.	New York	NY	71
Visteon Corp.	Dearborn	MI	86
Wachovia Corp.	Charlotte	NC	86
Wal-Mart Stores Inc.	Bentonville	AR	43
Walgreen Co.	Deerfield	IL	86
Walt Disney Co.	Burbank	CA	86
Washington Mutual Savings Bank	Seattle	WA	86
Wellpoint Health Networks	Thousand Oaks	CA	86
Wells Fargo & Co.	San Francisco	CA	86
Whirlpool Corp.	Benton Harbor	MI	71
Williams Companies Inc.	Tulsa	OK	57
Wyeth	Madison	NJ	29
Xcel Energy	Minneapolis	MN	86
Xerox Corp.	Stamford	CT	100

* It appears that a significant shareholder of Coors Brewing Co. stock may have supported an institution whose mission includes undermining the goal of GLBT equality. To HRC's knowledge, such support has not affected the company's policies or practices related to it GLBT employees.

** It appears that a significant shareholder of Qwest Communications International Inc. stock may have supported an institution whose mission includes undermining the goal of GLBT equality. To HRC's knowledge, such support has not affected the company's policies or practices related to it GLBT employees.

*** It appears that a significant shareholder of UnumProvident Corp. stock may have supported an institution whose mission includes undermining the goal of GLBT equality. To HRC's knowledge, such support has not affected the company's policies or practices related to it GLBT employees.

APPENDIX 5. CORPORATE EQUALITY INDEX SCORES

for Other Companies With At Least 500 Employees (sorted alphabetically)

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
A.G. Edwards Inc.	St. Louis	MO	43
Abercrombie & Fitch Co.	New Albany	OH	71
ABN AMRO	Chicago	IL	86
Accenture	Chicago	IL	86
Adobe Systems Inc.	San Jose	CA	71
Advanced Digital Information Corp.	Redmond	WA	29
Advanced Micro Devices	Sunnyvale	CA	71
Agouron Pharmaceuticals	La Jolla	CA	57
American President Lines	Oakland	CA	43
Arhaus	Columbus	OH	57
Aventis Pharmaceuticals Inc.	Bridgewater	NJ	71
Baldor Electric Co.	Fort Smith	AR	29
Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	Baltimore	MD	43
Bausch & Lomb Inc.	Rochester	NY	100
Bayer Corp.	Pittsburgh	PA	29
Bear Creek Corp.	Medford	OR	64
Ben and Jerry's Homemade Inc.	South Burlington	VT	71
Biovail Pharmaceuticals Inc.	Morrisville	NC	57
Blockbuster Inc.	Dallas	TX	71
BP (formerly BP Amoco)	Chicago	IL	86
Bridgestone Americas Holding Inc. (Firestone)	Nashville	TN	57
Cambridge Technology Group	Cambridge	MA	43
Celestial Seasonings	Boulder	CO	43
Cerner Corp.	Kansas City	MO	29
ChoicePoint Inc.	Alpharetta	GA	100
Cingular Wireless	Atlanta	GA	86
Comark Inc.	Bloomington	IL	29
Compass Group North America	Charlotte	NC	57
Cracker Barrel Restaurants (CBRL Group Inc.)	Lebanon	TN	29
Credit Suisse First Boston	New York	NY	86
D&B (The Dun & Bradstreet Corp.)	Murray Hill	NJ	57
Daimler Chrysler Corp.	Auburn Hills	MI	86
Deloitte & Touche	New York	NY	86
Deluxe Corp.	Shoreview	MN	71
Deutsche Bank	New York	NY	100
Digitaria Interactive Inc.	San Diego	CA	57
Donna Karan	New York	NY	57
Dow Jones & Co. Inc.	New York	NY	43
E*TRADE Group Inc.	Menlo Park	CA	86
EarthLink Inc.	Atlanta	GA	86
Franklin Templeton Investments	San Mateo	CA	29
Gallup Organization, The	Princeton	NJ	57
Genentech	San Francisco	CA	86
GlaxoSmithKline Inc.	Research Triangle Park	NC	86
Hannaford Brothers	Scarborough	ME	29
Harris Trust & Savings Bank	Chicago	IL	86
Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Inc.	Wellesley	MA	86
Hasbro Inc.	Pawtucket	RI	29

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe	San Francisco	CA	86
Hewitt Associates	Lincolnshire	IL	86
Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.	Nutley	NJ	86
Howard & Howard Attorneys, PC	Bloomfield Hills	MI	50
Imation Corp.	Oakdale	MN	79
Instinet Group Inc.	New York	NY	57
Jenner & Block	Chicago	IL	86
Kaiser Permanente Foundation Health Plan Inc.	Oakland	CA	86
Keane Inc.	Boston	MA	71
Knight Ridder	San Jose	CA	71
KPMG LLP	Montvale	NJ	86
Kraft Foods Inc.	Northfield	IL	86
L.L. Bean Inc.	Freeport	ME	57
Latrobe Brewing Co.	Latrobe	PA	43
Lauren International	New Philadelphia	OH	29
Lillian Vernon Corp.	New Rochelle	NY	71
Marimba Inc.	Mountain View	CA	57
Men's Wearhouse Inc., The	Houston	TX	71
Miller Brewing Co.	Milwaukee	WI	86
Mitchell Gold Co.	Taylorsville	NC	100
Morningstar Inc.	Chicago	IL	29
Morrison & Foerster	San Francisco	CA	100
N. W. Ayer & Partners	New York	NY	43
Nestle Purina PetCare Co.	St. Louis	MO	29
Nims Associates Inc.	Decatur	IL	71
Northern Telecom Inc.	Nashville	TN	43
Northern Trust Corp.	Chicago	IL	86
Ortho-Neutrogena	Los Angeles	CA	43
PacifiCorp	Portland	OR	86
Pennzoil-Quaker State Co.	Houston	TX	43
Perkins & Will	Chicago	IL	71
Perot Systems Corp.	Dallas	TX	14
Prime Access Inc.	New York	NY	86
Quaker Oats Co.	Chicago	IL	57
Quantum Corp.	Milpitas	CA	71
Quark Inc.	Denver	CO	86
Replacements Ltd.	Greensboro	NC	100
Reuters America Holdings Inc.	New York	NY	57
Rockwell Collins	Pomona	CA	43
SAP America	Newton Square	PA	57
Scholastic Corp.	New York	NY	86
Scudder Kemper Investments	New York	NY	43
SGI (Silicon Graphics Inc.)	Mountain View	CA	86
Shaw Industries Inc.	Dalton	GA	14
Shell Oil Co.	Houston	TX	86
Siemens Energy & Automation Inc.	Alpharetta	GA	71
SRA International Inc.	Fairfax	VA	29
Subaru of America Inc.	Cherry Hill	NJ	86
TAP Pharmaceutical Products Inc.	Lake Forest	IL	57
Times Mirror Co.	Los Angeles	CA	57
Toyota Motor Manufacturing North America Inc.	Erlanger	KY	71
Travelers Property Casualty Corp.	Hartford	CT	71

EMPLOYER NAME	CITY	STATE	HRC RATING
UBS (Paine Webber)	New York	NY	86
University Hospitals of Cleveland	Cleveland	OH	71
Verio Inc.	Englewood	CO	71
Visa International	Foster City	CA	71
Vision Service Plan	Rancho Cordova	CA	86
Vivendi Universal	New York	NY	71
Volkswagen of America Inc.	Auburn Hills	MI	71
Wainwright Bank	Boston	MA	86
Whole Foods Market Inc.	Austin	TX	57
Working Assets Funding Service	San Francisco	CA	71
Worldspan L.P.	Atlanta	GA	100
WPP Group USA	New York	NY	57



www.hrc.org/worknet

A project of the Human Rights Campaign Foundation, 1640 Rhode Island Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036

8/2003