MUNCIE, INDIANA 1/2 2023 MUNICIPAL EQUALITY INDEX SCORECAR

| I. Non-Discrimina | La | V** | State | COUNTY | MUNICIPAL | avallable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This category evaluates whether discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity is prohibited by the city, county, or state in areas of employment, housing, and public accommodations. | Employ | ment | 00 | 00 | 55 | 55 |
|  | Housing |  | 00 | 00 | 55 | 5 |
|  | Public | Accommodations | 00 | 00 | 55 | 55 |
|  | SCORE |  |  |  | 30 out of 30 |  |
|  | FLEX | Single-Occupancy All-Gender Facilities | +0 | +0 | +0 |  |
|  |  | Protects Youth from Conversion Therapy |  |  |  |  |
| II. Municipality as Employer |  |  |  | county | MUNICIPAL | Avallable |

By offering equivalent benefits and protections to LGBTQ + employees, awarding contracts to fair-minded businesses, and aking steps to ensure an inclusive workplace
municipalities commit themselves to treating LGBTQ + employees equally.
Non-Discrimination in City Employment
Transgender-Inclusive Healthcare Benefits
City Contractor Non-Discrimination Ordinance
Inclusive Workplace
SCORE
FLEX City Employee Domestic Partner
Benefits
III. Municipal Services

| This section assesses the efforts of the city <br> to ensure LGBTa+ residents are included in <br> city services and programs. | Human Rights Commission |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | NDO Enforcement by Human Rights |
| Commission |  |
| LGBTQ+ Liaison in City Executive's Office |  |
|  | SCORE |
|  | FLEX Youth Bullying Prevention Policy for |
| City Services |  |
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## IV. Law Enforcement

Fair enforcement of the law includes esponsible reporting of hate crimes and thoughtful and respectful way.

LGBTQ+ Liaison/Task Force in Police Departmen
Reported 2020 Hate Crimes Statistics to the FBI

SCORE municipal avallable
V. Leadership on LGBTQ + Equality

This category measures the city leadership's community and to advocate for full equality

Leadership's Public Position on LGBTQ+ Equality
Leadership's Pro-Equality Legislative or
Policy Efforts
SCORE
8 out of 8
FLEX Openly LGBTQ+ Elected or Appointed Leaders
FLEX City Tests Limits of Restrictive State

TOTAL SCORE 69 + TOTAL FLEX SCORE $0=$
Final Score 6
69 CANNOT EXCEED 100

On June 15, 2020 , the U.S. Supreme Court ruted in Bostock $v$ Clayton Countr Georgia thet serwl or rohibited under federal sex-based employment protections. Nevertheless, it is imperative that localities continue enacting explicitly LGBTO+-inclusive comprehensive non-discrimination laws since it will likely take additional litigation for Bostock to be fully applied to all sex-based protections under existing ederal civil rights law. Moreover, federal law currently lacks sex-based protections in numerous key areas of life, including public spaces and services. Lastly, there are many invaluable benefits to localizing inclusive protections even when they exist on higher levels of government. For these reasons, rientation and gender identity. rientation and gender identity.PTS FOR GENDER IDENTITYFLEX PTS for criteria not accessible to all cities at this time.
OR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT CITY SELECTION, CRITERIA OR THE MEI SCORING SYSTEM, PLEASE VISIT HRC.ORG/MEI.
citit's scorecerd were provided their scorecard in advance of publication and given the opportunity to submit revisions. For feedback regarding a particular city's scorecard, please email mei@hrc.org.

