



VIEWPOINT DIVERSITY SCORE

2026 METHODOLOGY

**How the Viewpoint Diversity Score
evaluates corporate policies and practices**

Research period: October 2025 through July 2026

Methodology at a Glance

The Viewpoint Diversity Score Business Index evaluates whether major U.S. companies respect customers, employees, shareholders, vendors, and other stakeholders who hold diverse religious and ideological beliefs. It also measures whether companies foster viewpoint diversity in the workplace and reflect a commitment to the freedoms of speech and religion through their public engagement.

What the Index Evaluates

- Avoiding viewpoint-based discrimination
- Protecting freedom of expression and freedom of religion or belief
- Applying policies consistently and equally
- Avoiding coercive, exclusionary, or divisive practices
- Providing clear notice and transparency when services or content are restricted

Company Selection

The Index primarily selects U.S.-headquartered companies from the most recent Fortune 1000 list in sectors with substantial influence over access to financial services, communications, digital infrastructure, employment, and the public square:

- Business Services
- Financials
- Retailing
- Technology
- Telecommunications

Additional criteria considered:

- **Headquartered in the United States;**
- **Employ at least 500 full-time staff members in the United States or have annual revenues of \$1 billion or more;**
- **Parent companies, not subsidiaries (with some exceptions), government entities, or non-profits.**

Sources and Evidence

Scores are based on publicly available materials and voluntary company disclosures submitted through the Viewpoint Diversity Survey. Relevant public materials may include:

- Governance and workforce documents
- Terms of use, service agreements, community standards, and core product policies
- Vendor and supplier standards
- Corporate reports, public statements, press releases, and webpages
- Political contribution disclosures and public advocacy records
- Third-party program rules when a company uses an outside administrator

Public Evidence Standard

Scoring records preserve direct quotations, archived screenshots, public source documentation, and traceable URLs. Evidence is evaluated under the benchmark language and scoring criteria in effect for the 2026 Index.

Additional Evidence considerations:

- **Public information is available online from October 2025 through June 2026.**
- **Evidence is limited to U.S.-facing policies,**
- **Some parent companies do not directly deliver core commercial services to customers or clients. In those situations, a subsidiary that meets the criteria for core products or services for inclusion may be scored.**

Scoring

OUTCOME	MEANING
Full points	The benchmark is fully met.
Partial points	The benchmark is partly met, where the indicator expressly permits partial credit.
Zero points	The benchmark is not met, or contrary evidence is documented.
Insufficient Disclosure (I)	Available information does not permit definitive determination. An I-score is worth 0 points and remains in the denominator.
Not Applicable (N)	The activity does not apply to the company. The indicator is removed from the denominator.

Insufficient Disclosure

An I-score may reflect one of three conditions:

- Insufficient disclosure: no relevant public policy was found, the information was inaccessible, or essential details were missing.
- Unclear: similar language exists but does not clearly define the scope, protection, or obligation.
- Potentially problematic: the language is precise but structured in a way that could permit unequal or viewpoint-based enforcement.

An I-score identifies a disclosure or structural concern; it is not a finding that the company committed a confirmed violation.

Final Score

A company's final score is calculated by adding any bonus points earned through company participation or constructive engagement to the company's earned base points, then dividing that total by the base points possible.

Bonus points are not added to the denominator. Indicators designated Not Applicable are excluded from the base points possible.

Final Score = (Base Points Earned + Participation Bonus Points) ÷ Base Points Possible after excluding N scores.

Final percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point for publication. Companies are ranked according to their unrounded final scores.

The Index uses standard competition ranking for ties. Companies with identical final scores receive the same rank, and the next rank reflects the number of companies appearing before it. For example, if two companies tie for third place, the next company is ranked fifth.

2026 Scoring Framework

The 2026 Index contains 30 benchmarks across three domains: 9 Market indicators, 13 Workplace indicators, and 8 Public Square indicators.

Each indicator below states the public benchmark question, maximum point value, and a brief explanation of the general basis for awarding points. Detailed analyst guidance and internal decision rules are maintained separately.

I. Market Benchmarks

Terms of Use or Service Avoid Unclear or Imprecise Terms | 3 points

Do all product- or service-related policies addressing refusal, termination, restriction of service, or content moderation avoid undefined or subjective terms that could suppress particular viewpoints of customers, sellers, creators, users, or external stakeholders?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether relevant policies avoid unclear or imprecise enforcement terms. Scores are based on publicly available information and, when provided, official survey responses.

Harmful Conduct Policies Apply Equally | 3 points

If the company prohibits legitimately harmful conduct, such as bullying or harassment, do the prohibitions avoid offense-based suppression and apply equally rather than only to selected protected groups?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether harmful-conduct policies use objective standards, avoid restricting speech merely because it may be considered offensive, and apply equally to all users and groups.

Terms of Use or Service Avoid Viewpoint Discrimination | 3 points

Do all relevant product- or service-related policies refrain from imposing viewpoint- or content-based restrictions on speech?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether relevant policies avoid express restrictions on religious, ideological, or other protected viewpoints or categories of lawful expression.

Public Commitment to Product and Service Viewpoint Equality | 2 points

Does the company publicly prohibit discrimination against customers, sellers, creators, users, or other external stakeholders based on religious and ideological viewpoints?

Companies may earn up to 2 points based on whether a public policy protects external stakeholders from discrimination based on both religious and ideological viewpoints. Partial credit may be awarded when only some elements are addressed.

Notification of Service Restrictions and Terminations | 2 points

Does the company notify affected users and adequately explain decisions that limit or end access to services, accounts, or content?

Companies may earn up to 2 points based on whether policies provide timely notice, identify the affected service or content, explain the policy-based reason, and state the duration of a restriction. Partial credit may be awarded when only some elements are provided.

CSR/ESG Reporting Includes Freedom of Expression and Belief | 1 point

If the company issues a recent CSR, ESG, human-rights, or civil-rights report, does the report address protection of external stakeholders' freedom of expression or freedom of religion or belief?

Companies may earn 1 point when the company's most recent qualifying report addresses protection of external stakeholders' freedom of expression or freedom of religion or belief.

Respects Vendor Freedom in Hiring and Employment | 1 point

Does the company affirm that vendors, suppliers, and contractors may determine their own lawful hiring and employment policies consistent with their missions and values?

Companies may earn 1 point when an official survey response affirms that vendors, suppliers, and contractors may establish their own lawful employment policies consistent with their missions and values.

Respects Vendor Freedom Concerning DEI Practices | 3 points

Does the company refrain from pressuring or requiring vendors, suppliers, and contractors to adopt diversity, equity, and inclusion policies or programming?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether their survey response indicates that they refrain from requiring or pressuring vendors, suppliers, and contractors to adopt diversity, equity, and inclusion policies or programming.

Prohibits Viewpoint Discrimination Against Vendors | 2 points

Does the company prohibit religious or ideological discrimination against vendors, suppliers, or contractors and/or affirm respect for their free speech or religious freedom?

Companies may earn up to 2 points based on whether policies protect vendors, suppliers, or contractors from religious and ideological discrimination or provide equivalent protections for free speech and religious freedom. Partial credit may be awarded when only one form of protection is addressed.

II. Workplace Benchmarks

Viewpoint Diversity Acknowledged in Workforce-Facing Content | 1 point

Does the company publicly promote respect for different religious or ideological beliefs in the workplace?

Companies may earn 1 point when public workforce-facing materials expressly affirm respect for religious or ideological diversity.

Civil Rights and Off-Duty Expressive Activity Protected | 2 points

Does the company protect employees' lawful civil rights outside work and refrain from undue restrictions on off-duty speech, religion, association, assembly, or protest, subject only to narrow limits tied to law, confidentiality, job performance, or company resources?

Companies may earn up to 2 points based on whether they protect lawful off-duty civil rights and avoid broader restrictions on employee speech, religion, association, assembly, or protest. Partial credit may be awarded if no express protection is found and no restrictive public policy is identified.

Workforce Training Avoids Divisive Concepts | 3 points

Does the company refrain from teaching or advocating divisive concepts in training or workforce materials that denigrate people because of religion, race, or sex?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether available training and workforce materials avoid teaching or advocating defined divisive concepts that denigrate people because of religion, race, or sex.

At Least One Faith-Specific ERG Recognized | 3 points

Does the company officially recognize one or more employee resource groups specific to a religious faith?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether they officially recognize a faith-specific employee resource group. Partial credit may be awarded for an interfaith group or other qualifying evidence.

All Active ERGs Displayed on Company Website | 1 point

Does the company publicly display all active employee resource groups?

Companies may earn 1 point when an official survey response confirms that all active employee resource groups are publicly displayed.

Equal Access for Religious Employee Resource Groups | 1 point

If the company has religious ERGs, do they receive the same access to company resources and opportunities as nonreligious ERGs?

Companies may earn 1 point when an official survey response confirms that religious employee resource groups receive the same access to company resources and opportunities as nonreligious groups.

Written Religious Accommodation Policy and Process | 2 points

Does the company maintain a written policy and process for employees to request religious accommodations?

Companies may earn up to 2 points when official survey response affirms they maintain a written religious-accommodation policy and a process for requesting an accommodation. Partial credit may be awarded when only part of the policy or process is documented.

Workplace Training Covers Religious Discrimination | 1 point

Are new hires and/or supervisors required to receive training that identifies religion as protected, gives practical guidance on religious discrimination or harassment, and covers religious accommodation procedures?

Companies may earn 1 point when official survey response indicates required training identifies religion as protected, provides practical guidance on religious discrimination or harassment, and addresses religious-accommodation procedures.

Employee Giving Programs Include Religious Charities | 3 points

If the company offers an employee gift matching program or paid volunteer time, does the company and any third-party administrator avoid excluding organizations based on religious status, religious use of funds, or faith-based advocacy?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether employee matching-gift and paid-volunteer programs avoid exclusions based on religious status, religious activity, use of funds, or faith-based advocacy. Partial credit may be awarded for limited restrictions.

Recruitment and Hiring Opportunities Are Open to All | 3 points

Does the company ensure that internships and other recruitment or hiring opportunities are open to all applicants without using protected characteristics as selection criteria?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether recruitment, internships, and other hiring opportunities remain open without eligibility restrictions or preferences based on protected characteristics in the latest five-year timeframe.

Company Does Not Promote Workforce Representation Targets | 3 points

Does the company avoid setting numerical workforce targets or aspirational diversity goals based on race, sex, or sexual orientation?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether they avoid workforce targets or aspirational representation goals based on race, gender, or sexual orientation characteristics, or have publicly announced a retraction of targets within the last five years. Partial credit may be awarded when no such workforce goal is identified.

Mentoring, Networks, and Other Benefits Are Open to All | 2 points

Are professional development opportunities available to all employees without eligibility restrictions based on sexual orientation, race, or sex?

Companies may earn up to 2 points based on whether mentoring, networking, and other professional-development opportunities are available to all employees without eligibility restrictions based on protected characteristics.

Equal Opportunity and Merit Promoted in the Workforce | 1 point

Does the company affirm equal opportunity and/or merit in workforce decisions?

Companies may earn 1 point when workforce materials expressly affirm equal opportunity or merit without subordinating those principles to identity-based mandates.

III. Public Square Benchmarks

Political Spending Minimally Undermines Fundamental Freedoms | 2 points

Did no more than a minority of the company's political contributions in the most recent scored election cycle go to U.S. House or Senate members with a legislative record of opposing free speech or religious liberty? See [Appendix A](#).

Companies may earn up to 2 points based on the share of scored federal candidate contributions made to lawmakers identified in Appendix A. A smaller share receives a higher score; companies with no scored contributions are treated as not applicable.

Political Spending Supports Fundamental Freedoms | 2 points

Did a substantial share of the company's political contributions in the most recent scored election cycle go to U.S. House or Senate members with a legislative record of supporting free speech or religious liberty? See [Appendix A](#).

Companies may earn up to 2 points based on the share of scored federal candidate contributions made to lawmakers identified in Appendix A. A larger share receives a higher score; companies with no scored contributions are treated as not applicable.

No Support for Laws Harmful to Fundamental Freedoms | 3 points

Within the last ten years, has the company refrained from publicly supporting legislation that undermines legal protections for freedom of expression or freedom of religion or belief? See [Appendix B](#).

Companies may earn up to 3 points when no qualifying public support for legislation identified in Appendix B is documented during the applicable ten-year period.

No Support for Litigation Harmful to Fundamental Freedoms | 3 points

Within the last ten years, has the company refrained from supporting litigation positions that would narrow legal protections for freedom of expression or freedom of religion or belief? See [Appendix C](#).

Companies may earn up to 3 points when no qualifying support for litigation positions identified in Appendix C is documented during the applicable ten-year period.

No Support for Nonprofits Hostile to Free Speech | 3 points

Within the last five years, has the company refrained from funding, partnering with, or publicly affiliating with organizations that advocate censorship, deplatforming, or laws that undermine free speech or religious freedom? See [Appendix D](#).

Companies may earn up to 3 points when no qualifying financial support, partnership, or public affiliation with organizations identified in Appendix D is documented during the applicable five-year period.

Charitable Giving and Nonprofit Discounts Include Religious Charities | 3 points

If the company makes charitable donations or offers nonprofit discounts, does the company and any third-party platform avoid excluding organizations based on religious status, religious use of funds, or faith-based advocacy?

Companies may earn up to 3 points based on whether charitable donations and nonprofit discounts avoid exclusions based on religious status, religious activity, use of funds, or faith-based advocacy. Partial credit may be awarded for limited restrictions.

Public Messaging Avoids Divisive Concepts | 2 points

Does the company refrain from advocating divisive concepts that denigrate people because of religion, race, or sex in public education, recommendations, or messaging?

Companies may earn full points when no qualifying public advocacy of defined divisive concepts is documented in public education, recommendations, or messaging.

Viewpoint Diversity Survey and Engagement Disclosures | 5 points

Did the company answer the current Viewpoint Diversity Survey or otherwise engage constructively with the Index?

Companies may earn up to 5 bonus points based on completion of the Viewpoint Diversity Survey. Partial credit may be awarded for partial survey completion or qualifying engagement. These points do not factor into base points.

Appendices

Appendix A. Lawmakers Scored Undermining or Protecting Fundamental Freedoms

This appendix identifies members of Congress who sponsored or cosponsored legislation evaluated by the Index as undermining or protecting freedom of speech or freedom of religion or belief. Corporate contributions to these lawmakers are considered when calculating the Political Spending indicators.

The scored list is based on sponsorship and co-sponsorship records for the legislation identified in Appendix C and Appendix D. The analysis covers the applicable election cycle and congressional sessions described in the methodology. Information regarding the company's political contributions over the last year is sourced from [OpenSecrets'](#) corporate political spending database and aligned with the most recent congressional session.

View the complete scored-member list [here](#).

Appendix B. Scored Legislation

[Return to benchmarks](#)

Legislation Undermining Free Speech or Religious Freedom

Do No Harm Act, S.894 and H.R. 1954, 119th Congress (2025 – 2026); S.1206 and H.R.2725, 118th Congress (2021–2022); S. 593 and H.R. 1450, 116th Congress (2019–2020): The Do No Harm Act would strip certain people of faith of the protections that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act provides for people of all faiths. It handpicks certain religious beliefs and practices—specifically those related to abortion, marriage, and human sexuality—and deprives them of the protection of federal law.¹

Equality Act, H.R. 15, 119th Congress (2025 – 2026); S.5 and H.R.15, 118th Congress (2023–2024); S.393 and H.R.5, 117th Congress (2021– 2022); S.788 and H.R.5, 116th Congress (2019–2020): This legislation poses serious threats to religious freedom, free speech, and the progress women have made toward equality in law and culture. Among other things, the law would do the following:²

1. harm the over-400,000 children in our nation's foster care system by closing faith-based adoption and foster care providers who believe children thrive best in a home with a married mother and father.
2. threaten the many faith-based social service organizations that receive federal grants to enable them to better serve the most vulnerable among us every day. These organizations would be prohibited from living out their beliefs about marriage or human sexuality as a condition of continuing to receive federal funding.
3. deny federal financial aid to students at faith-based colleges and universities unless those schools abandon policies and practices reflecting their sincerely held beliefs about marriage and sexuality.
4. nullify many of the opportunities previously guaranteed by Title IX, which provides women equal access to education opportunities on the same basis as men. It could mandate that men who identify as women be allowed to compete for spots on female sports teams, women's scholarships, and other academic and sports-related opportunities designed specifically for women.
5. violate the privacy and safety of women and force them to share sex-separated spaces, such as showers, locker rooms, and other private areas, with men.

¹ Matt Sharp, "[3 Reasons the Religious Freedom Restoration Act Should Be Preserved](#)", Alliance Defending Freedom (June 25, 2019).

² Gregory Baylor, [Here's How the Equality Act Threatens Your Freedom](#), Alliance Defending Freedom (Feb. 18, 2021), last updated July 7, 2023); [Truth about the Equality Act](#), United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (last accessed July 23, 2026); "[Oppose the Equality Act](#)", The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission (June 27, 2023); Heritage Explains: [The Equality Act, How Could Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity \(SOGI\) Laws Affect You?](#), The Heritage Foundation (last accessed July 23, 2026); Nathan A. Berkeley, [Grounds for the Equality Act Are Simply Not There](#), Religious Freedom Institute (March 9, 2021).

Freedom to Vote Act, S.1 and H.R.11, 118th Congress (2023—2024); formerly For the People Act, S.1 and H.R.1, 117th Congress (2021—2022): The Act imposes unworkable and invasive regulations on the ability of individual Americans and groups of citizens to discuss vital policy issues with elected officials or the public and to exercise constitutionally protected freedoms of speech, association, and religion. The bill also intrudes upon private financial decisions made by everyday citizens, subjecting them to harassment and intimidation simply for giving to causes they believe in.³

Fairness for All Act, H.R. 1440, 117th Congress (2021–2022); H.R.5331, 116th Congress (2019–2020): The Fairness for All Act poses the same threats to religious freedom, free speech, and women and girls as the Equality Act. However, it proposes narrow exemptions for some religious organizations. These “exemptions” do not fully protect these institutions and strip fundamental rights from everyone else.⁴

Respect for Marriage Act, S.4556 and H.R.8404, 117th Congress (2021–2022): The Respect for Marriage Act would require the federal government to “recognize without limit any marriage definitions that a state adopts,” opening citizens and faith-based non-profits who make business or administrative decisions based on their religious beliefs to legal attack.⁵

Right to Contraception Act, S.1999 and H.R.4121, 118th Congress (2023—2024); S.4557 and H.R. 8373, 117th Congress (2021–2022): The Right to Contraception Act would give the Food and Drug Administration sole authority to redefine “contraceptives” to include abortifacients, require health care providers to offer abortifacients and information related to them alongside contraceptives despite state or federal laws like the Religious Freedom Act of 1993 (RFRA).⁶

See our [Congress Members](#) resource for a detailed list of federal lawmakers who sponsored and/or cosponsored these bills and laws.

Legislation Protecting Free Speech or Religious Freedom

Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act, H.R.6485 and S.3344, 118th Congress (2023—2024); H.R.1750 and S.656, 117th Congress (2021–2022); H.R.897 and S.274, 116th Congress (2019–2020): This legislation would prevent federal agencies and state governments from discriminating against child welfare providers on the basis of their religious beliefs or moral convictions.⁷

Conscience Protection Act, S.401, 117th Congress (2021–2022): This legislation would protect healthcare professionals who refuse to perform, refer for, pay for, or otherwise participate in abortion.⁸

Free Speech Fairness Act, H.R.837, 117th Congress (2021–2022); H.R.949 and S.330, 116th Congress (2019–2020): This legislation would allow non-profit organizations to speak freely in the ordinary course of their business on all matters of life, including elections and candidates, if they choose to do so.⁹

See our [Congress Members](#) resource for a detailed list of federal lawmakers who sponsored and/or cosponsored these protective bills and laws.

State Laws Protecting Free Speech and Religious Freedom

1. Arkansas Religious Freedom Restoration Act, SB975 (2015)
2. Georgia Religious Freedom Restoration Act, HB757 (2016), vetoed by Governor Nathan Deal
3. Indiana Religious Freedom Restoration Act, SB101 (2015)
4. Act relating to the exercise of religion, SF2095 (Iowa, 2024)

³ [The Facts about H.R.1: The “For the People Act of 2021”](#), The Heritage Foundation (Feb. 21, 2021).

⁴ Andrea Jones, [Misguided Fairness for All Act Would Undermine Religious Liberty](#), The Heritage Foundation (Dec. 7, 2019); The Problem, Heritage Foundation.

⁵ [83 groups to Leader McConnell: Stand firm against legislation attacking religious freedom, marriage](#), Alliance Defending Freedom (last accessed July 23, 2026).

⁶ [House passes contraception bill that threatens life and religious liberty](#), The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention (July 22, 2022).

⁷ Natalie Goodnow, [The Role of Faith-Based Agencies in Child Welfare](#), The Heritage Foundation (May 22, 2018).

⁸ [ERLC supports the Conscience Protection Act](#), The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist

⁹ [ADF joins letter to congressional leaders encouraging prioritization of Free Speech Fairness Act](#), Alliance Defending Freedom (June 22, 2017).

5. An Act relating to restoring religious liberty, HB47 (Kentucky, 2024)
6. Mississippi Religious Freedom Restoration Act, HB1523 (2016)
7. Missouri Religious Freedom Restoration Act, SJR39 (2016), defeated in a House committee vote
8. Montana Religious Freedom Act, SB215 (2021)
9. First Freedom Act, LB43 (Nebraska, 2024)
10. North Dakota Religious Freedom Restoration Act, HB1136 (2023)
11. An Act to provide protections for the exercise of religious freedom, SB124 (South Dakota, 2021)
12. Exercise of Religion Amendments, SB150 (Utah, 2024)
13. West Virginia Religious Freedom Restoration Act, HB2474 (2023)
14. Social credit; discrimination; financial services, SB1167 (Arizona, 2024): did not proceed to a House vote
15. An Act relating to discrimination in the provision of financial services, SSB3094 (Iowa, 2024): defeated in Senate Committee vote
16. Financial Institutions: Provides relative to practices of financial institutions to provide or deny services, HB914 (Louisiana, 2024): defeated in Committee vote
17. Equality in Financial Services Act, HB2100 (Tennessee, 2024)

Appendix C. Scored Litigation

[Return to benchmarks](#)

The “scored” litigation is a collection of court cases affecting freedom of speech and freedom of religion. Companies may earn or lose 3 points based on whether they support or oppose the party protecting these freedoms, as described in each case summary below.

Cases Evaluated

1. *303 Creative LLC v. Elenis*

Penalty for supporting the respondents. In 2023, the Supreme Court ruled 6-3 that Colorado violated the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment by applying a public-accommodations law to compel a web designer to create speech inconsistent with her own beliefs.¹⁰

2. *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.; Conestoga Wood Specialties Corp. v. Burwell*

Penalty for supporting the petitioners. In 2014, the Supreme Court ruled that the government’s application of the Affordable Care Act contraceptive-coverage mandate violated the religious rights of the religious owners of a family business and their closely held, for-profit corporation.¹¹

3. *Brush & Nib Studio, LC v. City of Phoenix*

Penalty for supporting the respondent. In 2019, the Arizona Supreme Court ruled that Phoenix violated Arizona’s free speech and religious freedom protections when it forced artists to create custom artwork conveying messages about marriage that violated their religious beliefs.¹²

4. *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*

Penalty for supporting the respondents. In 2021, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that Philadelphia violated the First Amendment by conditioning a religious agency’s ability to participate in the foster care system on actions and statements that directly contradicted the agency’s religious beliefs.¹³

¹⁰*303 Creative LLC v. Elenis*, 600 U.S. 570 (2023).

¹¹*Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682 (2014).

¹²*Brush & Nib Studio, LC v. City of Phoenix*, 247 Ariz. 269 (2019).

¹³*Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, 593 U.S. 522 (2021).

5. *Groff v. DeJoy*

Penalty for supporting the respondent. The Supreme Court ruled unanimously that Title VII requires employers to grant religious accommodation unless doing so would impose substantial additional costs in relation to the conduct of the business. The decision rejected the lower threshold that many courts had applied when evaluating undue hardship.¹⁴

6. *Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*

Penalty for supporting the respondents. In 2018, the Supreme Court ruled 7-2 that the Colorado Civil Rights Commission violated the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment in assessing a cake shop owner's reasons for declining to create a cake for a same-sex wedding celebration.¹⁵

7. *Scardina v. Masterpiece Cakeshop, Inc.*

Penalty for supporting Scardina. The litigation arose from a discrimination complaint filed against a cake artist after the Supreme Court ruled in his favor in *Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*. At issue was whether the cake artist could be compelled to create an expression that violated his beliefs.¹⁶

8. *State of Washington v. Arlene's Flowers, Inc.*

Penalty for supporting the respondents. At issue was whether the state violated a floral designer's rights to free exercise and free speech by forcing her to take part in and create custom floral art celebrating same-sex weddings or by acting with hostility toward her religious beliefs. After litigation in the Washington Supreme Court and U.S. Supreme Court, the parties settled the case in 2021.¹⁷

9. *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College; Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. University of North Carolina*

Penalty for supporting the respondents. In 2023, the Supreme Court ruled that Harvard University's and the University of North Carolina's race-based admissions practices violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The ruling also raised significant questions about similar race-based programs in the corporate workplace under Title VII.¹⁸

Appendix D. Scored Causes/Organizations

[Return to benchmarks](#)

Purpose

This Appendix identifies organizations that are considered under the "No Support for Hostile Nonprofits" benchmark. A company may lose points under this indicator if it provides financial support to, partners with, or publicly affiliates with organizations that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Advocate for expanded content moderation standards that restrict lawful speech based on viewpoint;
- Supporting legislation or litigation that narrows protections for freedom of expression or freedom of religion or belief; or
- Encouraging companies to deny services, market access, advertising participation, or deplatforming based on religious or ideological viewpoints.

¹⁴*Groff v. DeJoy*, 600 U.S. 447 (2023).

¹⁵*Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*, 584 U.S. 617 (2018).

¹⁶*Scardina v. Masterpiece Cakeshop, Inc.*, 528 P.3d 926 (Colo. App. 2023).

¹⁷*Arlene's Flowers, Inc. v. Washington*, settlement announced November 18, 2021.

¹⁸*Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College*, 600 U.S. 181 (2023).

Inclusion in this Appendix reflects documented activity relevant to the Index's core focus on free expression and religious liberty. These organizations have a record of pressuring companies to take measures that harm freedom of speech and religion, and of supporting legislation that does the same.

Causes and Organizations

Accountable Tech

Pressures technology and social media companies through petitions concerning election misinformation¹⁹ and hate speech,²⁰ and supports the Change the Terms model policy, which promotes content restrictions using standards that may be discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary.²¹ It also pressured X Corp. advertisers to threaten withdrawal of advertising spending unless the platform enforced its Civic Integrity and Hateful Conduct policies.²²

Amalgamated Foundation (Amalgamated Charitable Foundation)

Through its Hate Is Not Charitable campaign, pressures banks and philanthropic institutions to use the Southern Poverty Law Center's Hate Map when determining whether organizations should receive financial support.²³

Center for American Progress (CAP)

Co-authored the Change the Terms model policy and pressures companies to adopt content-moderation standards that may restrict speech in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary manner.²⁴

Center for Countering Digital Hate (CCDH)

Pressures social media and other technology companies, including through advertiser advocacy, to restrict services to advertisers and users that CCDH determines promote hate or misinformation.²⁵ It also publicly supports the Change the Terms model policy.²⁶

Change the Terms

Created and promotes a model policy encouraging companies to adopt content-moderation standards that may restrict speech in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary manner.²⁷

Color of Change

Co-authored the Change the Terms model policy and pressures companies to adopt its content-moderation standards.²⁸

[Return to benchmarks](#)

¹⁹ Final Letter to Tech Companies 2024, Free Press (last accessed July 23, 2026).

[https://www.freepress.net/sites/default/files/2024-](https://www.freepress.net/sites/default/files/2024-04/coalition_letter_urguing_tech_companies_to_strengthen_election_integrity_policies_final_april_9.pdf)

[04/coalition_letter_urguing_tech_companies_to_strengthen_election_integrity_policies_final_april_9.pdf](https://www.freepress.net/sites/default/files/2024-04/coalition_letter_urguing_tech_companies_to_strengthen_election_integrity_policies_final_april_9.pdf)

²⁰ Letter to Meta, Accountable Tech (last accessed July 23, 2026). <https://accountabletech.org/wp-content/uploads/Letter-to-Meta.pdf>

²¹ About the Coalition, Change the Terms: Reducing Hate Online (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://www.changetheterms.com/about>

²² Letter to Twitter Advertisers, Accountable Tech (last accessed July 23, 2026). <https://accountabletech.org/wp-content/uploads/Letter-to-Twitter-Advertisers.pdf>

²³ Amalgamated Foundation 'Hate is Not Charitable' Campaign: Sign-On Campaign for Foundations and Organizations to Pledge to End Hate Funding, Council on Foundations (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://cof.org/content/amalgamated-foundation-hate-not-charitable-campaign-sign-campaign-foundations-and>

²⁴ About the Coalition, Change the Terms: Reducing Hate Online (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://www.changetheterms.com/about>

²⁵ About, Center for Countering Digital Hate (last accessed July 23, 2026). <https://counterhate.com/about/>

²⁶ About the Coalition, Change the Terms: Reducing Hate Online (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://www.changetheterms.com/about>

²⁷ Id. <https://www.changetheterms.com/about>

²⁸ Id. <https://www.changetheterms.com/about>

Common Cause

Pressures technology and social media companies through petitions concerning electoral disinformation,²⁹ hate speech,³⁰ and discrimination,³¹ and supports the Change the Terms model policy.³² It monitors political disinformation on social media platforms, including candidate advertising, and calls on companies to address users' speech.³³ It has also supported the For the People Act.³⁴

Free Press

Co-authored the Change the Terms model policy and pressures companies to adopt its content-moderation standards.³⁵

Global Alliance for Responsible Media (GARM)

Advised advertisers, agencies, platforms, industry associations, and advertising-technology providers to reduce the availability and monetization of content categorized as harmful.³⁶ It also worked with the Global Disinformation Index to direct advertising toward selected news sources and away from websites categorized as disinformation.³⁷

GLAAD

Publicly supports the Change the Terms model policy and pressures companies to adopt content-moderation standards that may restrict speech in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary manner.³⁸ It also organizes petitions urging social media companies to restrict hate speech and disinformation.³⁹

Global Disinformation Index (GDI)

Pressures advertisers to stop funding media platforms that GDI determines disseminate disinformation under its standards and definitions.⁴⁰ It has used the Southern Poverty Law Center's Hate Map in defining hate groups and has advocated terms-of-service restrictions excluding such groups from services.⁴¹

Human Rights Campaign (HRC)

Supports legislation, including the Equality Act, that the Index evaluates as weakening legal protections for free speech or religious freedom.⁴²

²⁹ Coalition Letter for 2022 Mid-Terms, Common Cause (last accessed July 23, 2026). <https://www.commoncause.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Coalition-letter-for-2022-mid-terms-1.pdf>

³⁰ Final Letter to Tech Companies 2024, Free Press (last accessed July 23, 2026).

https://www.freepress.net/sites/default/files/2024-04/coalition_letter_urguing_tech_companies_to_strengthen_election_integrity_policies_final_april_9.pdf

³¹ Sign-On Letter in Support of H.R. 1, civilrightsdocs.info (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://civilrights.org/resource/support-h-r-1-the-for-the-people-act/>

³² About the Coalition, Change the Terms: Reducing Hate Online (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://www.changetheterms.com/about>

³³ How We the People Stood Up to Online Election Lies, Common Cause (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://www.commoncause.org/articles/how-we-the-people-stood-up-to-online-election-lies/>

³⁴ Sign-On Letter in Support of H.R. 1, civilrightsdocs.info (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://civilrights.org/resource/support-h-r-1-the-for-the-people-act/>

³⁵ About the Coalition, Change the Terms: Reducing Hate Online (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://www.changetheterms.com/about>

³⁶ GARM Brand Safety Floor + Suitability Framework, World Federation of Advertisers (last accessed July 23, 2026).

<https://wfanet.org/knowledge/item/2022/06/17/GARM-Brand-Safety-Floor--Suitability-Framework-3>

³⁷ GARM's Harm: How the World's Biggest Brands Seek to Control Online Speech, U.S. House Committee on the Judiciary (July 10, 2024). <https://judiciary.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/republicans-judiciary.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/2024-07-10%20GARMs%20Harm%20-%20How%20the%20Worlds%20Biggest%20Brands%20Seek%20to%20Control%20Online%20Speech.pdf>

³⁸ About the Coalition, Change the Terms: Reducing Hate Online (last accessed July 24, 2026).

<https://www.changetheterms.com/about>

³⁹ LGBTQ Celebrities & Allies Call on Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, TikTok, and Twitter to Stop the Flow of Anti-Trans Hate & Malicious Disinformation About Trans Healthcare, GLAAD (June 27, 2023). <https://glaad.org/lgbtq-celebrities-allies-letter-facebook-instagram-youtube-tiktok-twitter-anti-trans-hate-disinformation>

⁴⁰ The economics of adversarial content, Global Disinformation Index (last accessed July 24, 2026).

<https://www.disinformationindex.org/about/>

⁴¹ Bankrolling Bigotry: An Overview of the Online Funding Strategies of American Hate Groups, Institute for Strategic Dialogue (Oct. 1, 2020). <https://www.isdglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/bankrolling-bigotry-3.pdf>

⁴² Equality Act: Organizations Endorsing the Equality Act, Human Rights Campaign (last accessed July 24, 2026).

<https://hrc-prod-requests.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/Orgs-Endorsing-Equality-Act-4-16-21-1.pdf>

Institute for Strategic Dialogue (ISD)

Joins petitions urging technology and social media companies to address election disinformation on their platforms.⁴³ In partnership with the Global Disinformation Index, it has advocated financial and platform restrictions against groups categorized as hate groups based on their political or religious viewpoints.⁴⁴

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

Co-authored the Change the Terms model policy and pressures companies to adopt its content-moderation standards.⁴⁵

National Hispanic Media Coalition (NHMC)

Co-authored the Change the Terms model policy and pressures companies to adopt its content-moderation standards.⁴⁶

Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)

Co-authored the Change the Terms model policy and pressures companies to adopt its content-moderation standards. Its Hate Map identifies organizations and individuals for potential exclusion from financial services, market access, or the public square based on the SPLC's classifications.⁴⁷

Stop Hate for Profit

Pressures technology and social media companies to restrict services or content associated with hate, bigotry, racism, antisemitism, and disinformation. The campaign partners with other organizations evaluated in this appendix, including Color of Change, Free Press, and the National Hispanic Media Coalition.⁴⁸

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights

Authors and joins petitions concerning election disinformation⁴⁹ and discriminatory advertising⁵⁰ on social media platforms and publicly calls on platforms to address users' hate speech, harassment, and misinformation.⁵¹ In 2025, it also led a petition-supported campaign urging Meta to restore professional fact-checking and content moderation.⁵² It has supported the For the People Act,⁵³ the Respect for Marriage Act,⁵⁴ and the Equality Act,⁵⁵ and opposed the Fairness for All Act.⁵⁶

⁴³ ISD, CAP and 51 Organizations Urge Meta to Delay Shutting Down CrowdTangle Ahead of Elections, Institute for Strategic Dialogue (May 17, 2024). <https://www.isdglobal.org/isd-in-the-news/isd-cap-and-51-organizations-urge-meta-to-delay-shutting-down-crowdtangle-ahead-of-elections/>

⁴⁴ Bankrolling Bigotry: An Overview of the Online Funding Strategies of American Hate Groups, Institute for Strategic Dialogue (Oct. 1, 2020). <https://www.isdglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/bankrolling-bigotry-3.pdf>

⁴⁵ About the Coalition, Change the Terms: Reducing Hate Online (last accessed July 24, 2026). <https://www.changethetterms.com/about>

⁴⁶ Id. <https://www.changethetterms.com/about>

⁴⁷ Hate Map, Southern Poverty Law Center (last accessed July 24, 2026). <https://www.splcenter.org/hate-map/>

⁴⁸ Stop Hate for Profit (last accessed July 24, 2026). <https://www.stophateforprofit.org/>

⁴⁹ Civil Society Organizations Demand Big Tech Protect Voters Against Disinformation, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (June 13, 2024). <https://civilrights.org/resource/civil-society-big-tech-protect-voters-disinformation/>

⁵⁰ Letter to Mark Zuckerberg, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (Oct. 21, 2019). <https://civilrights.org/resource/letter-urging-facebook-to-protect-civil-rights/>

⁵¹ The Leadership Conference Calls Out Threat Against Social Media Monitoring of Misinformation and Hate Speech, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (July 31, 2023). <https://civilrights.org/2023/07/31/the-leadership-conference-calls-out-threat-against-social-media-monitoring-of-misinformation-and-hate-speech/>

⁵² Leadership Conference Letter to Meta on Content Moderation, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (May 8, 2025). <https://civilrights.org/resource/leadership-conference-letter-to-meta-on-content-moderation/>

⁵³ Sign-On Letter in Support of H.R. 1, civilrightsdocs.info (last accessed July 24, 2026). <https://civilrights.org/resource/support-h-r-1-the-for-the-people-act/>

⁵⁴ Respect for Marriage Act Heads to President Biden's Desk, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (Dec. 9, 2022). <https://civilrights.org/2022/12/09/respect-for-marriage-act-heads-to-president-bidens-desk/>

⁵⁵ Supporting the Equality Act (117th Congress - Senate), The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (Mar. 24, 2021). <https://civilrights.org/resource/support-the-equality-act-117th-congress-senate/>

⁵⁶ Civil Rights Groups: The "Fairness for All" Act Is an Affront to Existing Protections, Treats LGBTQ People and Women as Second-Class Individuals, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (Dec. 6, 2019). <https://civilrights.org/2019/12/06/civil-rights-groups-the-fairness-for-all-act-is-an-affront-to-existing-protections-treats-lgbtq-people-and-women-as-second-class-individuals/>