

Leading from the Library Loo: An Illustrated, Documented Guide to New York City Academic Library Bathrooms

*Jennifer Poggiali and Stephanie Margolin**

Introduction

What students need from academic libraries has changed dramatically in recent years. We are reminded of this by each new article on library space design, which may emphasize movable furniture, Wi-Fi connectivity, classroom technology, and group study spaces. What is less frequently noted is that in all these years of change and adaptation, at least one need has remained the same: the need for a working bathroom.

Bathrooms are fundamentally important; nevertheless, we are often uncomfortable talking about these spaces (and the activities that take place within them) in public contexts. In an earlier paper, we discuss how this bathroom taboo contributes to the almost complete absence of research on bathrooms in the library literature.¹ Tied up with the bathroom taboo are various kinds of discrimination. In the Jim Crow era and today, legislation has excluded certain people from using certain facilities.² Even when use of a bathroom isn't legally circumscribed, it may be designed in a way that prevents or hinders its use by marginalized groups. As the "potty parity" movement of the 1990s and 2000s pointed out, many characteristics of public restrooms that we take for granted can make them unusable or inconvenient for women, the disabled, transgender people, parents, and caregivers.³ Although a room of toilets and sinks may seem entirely functional, the forces of power and privilege may still be at work within it.

This discriminatory history makes the problems of library bathrooms political. Working, as we do, in a large and extremely diverse public university system,⁴ we wondered: do sub-standard bathrooms suggest that we believe our students to be sub-standard? Do these facilities send unconscious but potent messages to our students about what they deserve and what they can expect from the institutions that are supposed to serve them? And are the bathrooms in publicly-funded, urban campuses different from those in private institutions or those that serve less diverse populations?

The first stage of our research argues that librarians have overlooked bathrooms in their scholarship and renovation projects, outlines reasons—both social and psychological—why this might be the case, and presents worthy directions for future research into the topic.⁵ This paper reports on the preliminary results of the second stage of our research, which aims to bring clear-eyed analysis to actual library bathrooms. We are evaluating bathroom facilities in New York City colleges and universities to determine what features, services, and maintenance standards prevail; the degrees of variation from institution to institution; how libraries are responding to the needs of their users; and what changes might be advisable for those wishing to improve their bathrooms.

* *Jennifer Poggiali is Assistant Professor and Instructional Technologies Librarian, Lehman College, jennifer.poggiali@lehman.cuny.edu; Stephanie Margolin is Assistant Professor and Instructional Design Librarian, Hunter College, smargo@hunter.cuny.edu*

As a step in this process, we developed a Library Restroom Checklist (Appendix A) that we are using to perform on-site evaluations of library bathrooms. We document our “library bathroom tour” with photographs and written observations about amenities, cleanliness, size, and more. This paper, then, is an illustrated, documented guide to academic library bathrooms that we hope will help other librarians understand the most overlooked but highly-used rooms in their buildings, challenging them to think about bathrooms in a new way and take steps to improve these crucial spaces.

Checklists for the Bathroom: A Literature Review

Although formal mechanisms for evaluating bathrooms are not common, there are several examples we used to develop our Library Restroom Checklist. One particularly valuable checklist was developed by Mary Ann Case, a law professor at the University of Chicago who works in the field of sex discrimination. In an interview with the *University of Chicago Magazine*, Case noted that men’s and women’s rooms may be equal in size, but “men are almost always offered more excreting opportunities than women,” because urinals are smaller than stalls and women’s rooms often have more “amenities,” such as baby changing stations.⁶ Her “Toilet Survey” sought, among other things, to gauge the norms for men’s and women’s rooms in all manner of public locations.⁷ The survey collects information on how restrooms are labeled; the number of urinals, toilets, and sinks; the presence of mirrors, couches, and other amenities; graffiti; and the number of people using the bathrooms and their behavior. In order to collect data, Case posted the survey to the University of Chicago website and invited anyone to fill it out and submit it to her study.

A second very helpful checklist came from PISSAR (People in Search of Safe and Accessible Restrooms), a group formed in the early 2000s at University of California, Santa Barbara. As Chess et al. recount, the group coalesced when the university’s disability and transgender caucuses joined forces to advocate for their common need for safe and secure access to campus restrooms.⁸ Their survey was administered by volunteers who worked in teams (or “PISSAR patrols”) to assess bathrooms in great detail, with measuring tapes in hand.⁹ As activists, they planned to compile their data into a map of safe and accessible campus restrooms. Because PISSAR sought to improve bathroom safety for transgender students and accessibility for the disabled, their questionnaire included issues such as “Does the bathroom open directly to the outside, or is the entry inside a building?” and “Is there a soap dispenser at chair height?”¹⁰ The group was also concerned about meeting women’s sanitary needs, and so asked volunteers to assess the functionality of sanitary product dispensers, including whether the dispenser itself “looks so rusty and disgusting that even if it works, you doubt anyone would use it?”¹¹

A third tool that librarians and other laypeople might use to evaluate their restroom facilities is contained in William W. Sannwald’s *Checklist of Library Building Design Considerations*.¹² Sannwald’s volume is literally a 250-odd page checklist of questions to ask, issues to see to, and potential problems to address. Topics related to bathrooms are contained in several sections of the book, and relate to specific ADA requirements, transgender safety and accessibility, accommodations for obese patrons, and janitorial and cleaning concerns. Of special interest to us are two questions: “Are there shelves for holding books and papers?” and “Are diaper-changing facilities available in all restrooms?”¹³

Clara Greed’s essay “Creating a Nonsexist Restroom” does not present a checklist, per se, but it does describe those elements that she believes are essential for re-thinking restrooms.¹⁴ She is critical of the space allotted to these facilities and vividly describes design blunders such as stall doors that open into toilet bowls, toilet paper dispensers that touch one’s lap as one uses the toilet, and seats where one’s body rubs against the walls. Her recommendations include adequate storage for packages and childcare gear, increased privacy (e.g., removing the gaps between stall walls and doors), seat covers, and, for the many women who opt to squat rather than sit,

she suggests providing a squat toilet. Greed also acknowledges that the bathroom needs of women differ from those of men and strongly recommends soft toilet paper, soap, adequate hot water, and drying systems that work.

As we shall discuss below, we drew on elements of all of these sources in developing our own checklist. It is worth noting, however, that we are not aware of any publications presenting the data collected by either Case or PISSAR, nor are we aware of studies of restroom quality such as ours in the education or library literature. At the risk of overstating our impact, we think it is fair to say that in this matter we are, indeed, leading from the loo.

Methodology

Our Library Restroom Checklist developed from other checklists, our previous research, and a process of testing and refinement. First, we formulated a list of factors we wanted to make sure we measured, drawing on the ideas of Case, PISSAR, Sannwald, and Greed,¹⁵ and on our many discussions of bathrooms and the needs of library patrons. Once this draft list was assembled, we met to refine it into a working checklist. We then used the draft checklist to analyze a bathroom in one author's home library. In order to norm our results, we completed the checklist individually and then discussed our findings and any inconsistencies. The checklist was re-tested at a nearby college library and further refined based on this experience. After that, although we made other joint site visits, we felt able to rely on our individual evaluations using the checklist.

With our Library Restroom Checklist refined, we began our site visits. Alone or as a team, the authors assessed bathrooms in 15 academic libraries in New York City; 14 are part of the CUNY system and one is part of the State University of New York (SUNY) system, but also located in New York City. Because of our gender identities, we visited women's rooms almost exclusively, though we were able to enter and evaluate the men's room in one of our home campuses. All of our visits were on weekdays between 9 AM and 5:30 PM. We performed evaluations throughout the fall semester, but only while the semester was in session. For each visit, we completed paper checklists and took photographs of stalls, fixtures, and notable features. We strove for thoroughness—to step into each stall and test every sink—but our ability to do so depended on the busyness and size of the bathroom. Some bathrooms were so tiny and crowded that we were obliged to perform our evaluation as quickly as possible just to make room for all the students who actually needed the toilets.

Once we completed our fall visits, we compiled our results into a master spreadsheet and organized our photos into folders. When this was complete, we met in person to review and analyze these preliminary results.

Limitations

Perhaps the primary limitation of our research is that because of our gender identities, we have only evaluated one men's room so far. Obviously, this limits our observations to the facilities available to women, and fails to identify differences between the fixtures, maintenance standards, and amenities provided in men's rooms. Omitting men's rooms may also skew our recommendations toward those that would improve experiences for users of women's rooms. Future research should undertake to close this gap.

We also found that our checklist has deficiencies, which we will correct in future iterations. For example, we failed to consider safety issues, such as where the bathroom is sited in relation to other public spaces. Does one need to go into a deserted hallway or turn a blind corner in order to find the bathroom? If a library is less densely populated in the evening or late at night, such isolated spaces may be of great concern. There are also categories of amenities that we omitted from our checklist, such as seat covers and condom dispensers.

It is also crucial to note that, due to our research design, our checklist results accurately record the state of each bathroom at the time we viewed it, but nothing more. We make no attempt to control for factors such as time of day or time since cleaning. Indeed, we never know if we are entering a restroom immediately after a cleaning,

or just minutes before. We don't know what these bathrooms look like in the evenings or early mornings, nor can we comment on their maintenance during the 24-hour periods that many libraries have for final exams. Finally, being unfamiliar with most of the libraries that we visit, we never know if we have chosen a popular or well-kept bathroom that stands in contrast to a dirtier, graffiti-ridden bathroom in another area of the library.

Since qualitative research does not allow for claims of generalizability, our data must be viewed as resulting in themes, commonalities, and anomalies that are not necessarily applicable to other library restrooms. Nevertheless, we do believe that a picture of CUNY library women's bathrooms has begun to emerge from this research.

Results: Our Library Bathroom Tour

Our research into New York City academic library bathrooms is ongoing; we plan to make several more site visits in the coming semester, expanding our inquiry to include at least three private universities and as many as five more public institutions. We expect these additional data will expand and enrich our observations, adding perspective on the relative merits of public and private facilities. However, our 15 site visits have led to some interesting preliminary results, which we've arranged by theme, below.

The Basics

In an earlier paper, we showed that library bathrooms have historically been located in out-of-the-way places, in order to deter users from entering the building *only* to use the bathroom.¹⁶ We saw evidence of this heritage in our library tour; bathrooms were often poorly sited and hard to find. To gauge "findability," we considered two factors: the placement of the bathroom within the library, and the presence and quality of signs and other navigational guides. One library's first floor bathrooms were located down a hallway that leads to private staff areas. In another building, the largest restroom facilities were located in the basement, down a long hallway and around a blind corner. Two libraries had facilities for one gender per floor, meaning that users might need to navigate up or down a floor to locate their restroom. In terms of signage, at least four libraries we visited had no large signs pointing to the restrooms. One library's bathrooms were in the lower level, and while signage was plentiful on that floor, there was none on the entry level. On the other hand, we found the bathrooms in six libraries easy to find, either because of signage or because they were in highly visible locations.

Though the libraries we visited are of different sizes, as are the colleges that house them, the bathrooms were not vastly different in size. The smallest had two stalls and two sinks, while the largest had seven stalls and six sinks. Beyond measuring size in terms of number of fixtures, it is important to consider size relative to the needs of the students in the library or the school. Some bathrooms seemed barely able to accommodate all their users, with students maneuvering around each other (and us) throughout the time we were evaluating the space. When considering the relative size of bathrooms, it is also worth noting that some libraries had more than one set of restrooms, mitigating the impact of a small or large bathroom.

Access

Although we did not attempt to gauge accurate or complete compliance with the ADA, we wanted to record how many of these restrooms provided a larger stall, equipped with grab bars, for those in wheelchairs and other disabled users. Almost all of the bathrooms in our sample had one stall of this nature. One site, which was among the newest libraries we visited, provided a separate room with an accessible stall. However, one bathroom did not have an accessible stall (though one was provided in a different bathroom in the library), while another provided grab bars in a room and a stall that seemed hardly wide enough for wheelchair entry. Despite these notable and

FIGURE 1
A small, narrow library bathroom



FIGURE 2
A relatively large library bathroom



important exceptions, accommodations for wheelchair users were, at least to our imprecise standards, consistent. These results are consistent with a study documenting ADA accommodations in South Carolina public libraries. That study showed that of the libraries surveyed, 86.4% provided at least one wheelchair accessible toilet. Interestingly, accommodations were less common for urinals, with 40.3% of responding libraries reporting that they did not have a urinal that would meet the needs of wheelchair users.¹⁷ Investigating ADA accommodations in men's and women's rooms is an area of potential future research.

In the past several years, access to bathrooms for transgender individuals has become a major national conversation. In May 2016, the U.S. Departments of Education and Justice jointly released a statement of guidance explaining how transgender students are protected under Title IX. The Comparable Facilities statement (34 C.F.R. §106.33) notes that, "A school may provide separate facilities on the basis of sex, but must allow transgender students access to such facilities consistent with their gender identity."¹⁸ We were interested in seeing how libraries responded to this action, and so we noted on our checklist if a policy affecting transgender users was posted outside the bathrooms; if signage used icons that were inclusive of transgender individuals; and if any single-use, gender-neutral facilities were available. Four library bathrooms included signage affirming the rights of entry to all who identified with the gender designation of the restroom. This wording was identical at three campuses: "Under the law, all individuals have the right to use this restroom consistent with their gender identity or expression." One campus advised: "Restrooms at [this school] are gender inclusive. Please feel free to use the restroom that best fits your identity or expression." We toured two libraries that had non-binary or gender-neutral bathroom spaces. In one of these libraries, the ADA-compliant restroom was also designated "all genders." In the other, several single-stall rooms were designated as gender-neutral and identified by a gender-inclusive icon.¹⁹

FIGURE 1
Signs on a single-use, gender-neutral bathroom



Hygiene and Maintenance

To gauge maintenance, we evaluated several factors: whether the stalls had functioning locks; whether all the lighting was working; whether there were any visible leaks; whether hand dryers were present and working; the presence of sanitary bins in each stall; the cleanliness of toilet seats, sinks, floors, and walls; the fullness of garbage and sanitary bins; and whether a notice was posted about the time and frequency of cleanings.

In general, the bathrooms we surveyed met our basic standards of hygiene and maintenance. All stall locks were working. Only one bathroom had a completely burned-out light bulb, and only one showed strong evidence of a current or past leak. All libraries had either a functioning hand dryer or a well-stocked paper towel dispenser; six had both dryers and towels. Only one library bathroom did not provide a place in each stall to dispose of sanitary products.

In terms of cleanliness, results were more mixed.

Two bathrooms had dirty toilet seats at the time of our visit; two had dirty sinks. Seven had paper on the floors, while another had a recent coffee spill. One restroom had a notably filthy wall. In all cases, garbage and sanitary bins were not overly full and soap, paper towel, and toilet paper were present in acceptable levels. Two libraries included a notice about the frequency and times of cleanings while two others provided a phone number to call in the event of maintenance issues.

Finally, we recorded a few interesting maintenance issues not accounted for on our checklist. In the men's room we visited, the automatic flush urinal was malfunctioning, causing it to flush repeatedly. Three restrooms had toilet seats that were heavily marked or peeling, though otherwise clean. One restroom had rust damage on a stall wall, and three others had notable scuffing, marks, or chips on painted walls. One bathroom had a visibly recent paint job.

Restroom Amenities

We identified a range of amenities in the restrooms we visited. Three bathrooms had stocked, functioning vending machines selling sanitary supplies (prices ranged from 25–50 cents), three had empty dispensers, and at one we couldn't determine if the dispenser was working or not. At one bathroom, the empty dispenser bore a sign that advised students to visit the bookstore to purchase sanitary products. Seven women's bathrooms had no sanitary product dispenser. Diaper changing stations were even more rare; of all our campus visits, only one library offered diaper stations. A query to a male colleague confirmed that the stations were included in the men's as well as in the women's bathrooms. Although it was not a separate entry on our checklist, we noted that toilet seat covers were available in three bathrooms. Finally, we looked for air fresheners, as these are often found in higher-end bathrooms, but these were not visible in any of the bathrooms we reviewed.

Because CUNY serves commuter students—who may carry with them the equipment needed for a day of work, school, travel, and child care—we paid particular attention to storage within or near the bathroom. Almost universally, we found one or two hooks inside each bathroom stall, usually on the door. In terms of storage for books, laptops, and other items, shelves were the most common solution. One bathroom had a fold-down shelf

in each stall that might hold books or smaller parcels. Three others had shelves outside the stalls that were suitable for placing larger items. More commonly, we saw small, narrow shelves, that might hold cosmetics or cell phones. One bathroom offered hooks, shelves, and cubbies outside of the stalls. Another bathroom, which had no shelf, instead had a chair where users could place their things.

Libraries Without Toilets

Perhaps the most surprising discovery of our research so far is that two libraries in the sample did not have dedicated student bathrooms. The first of these libraries, which serves one of CUNY's professional schools, is quite small; it comprises two offices, a service desk, and a lending collection. The library is adjacent to a very busy student workspace, comparable to an information commons. This area does contain a bathroom, and given its proximity to the library we decided to include this bathroom in our reporting.

The other library that lacked a student bathroom is part of a large and active community college campus. The library, which is on two levels, resides within a much larger building that also houses classrooms, meeting spaces, and departmental offices. In order to use a bathroom, a student working on the second floor of the library would need to descend to the first floor, exit the library, and cross a large common area into an adjacent hallway. If they wished to return to the library, they would do it all again, showing their ID card to a security guard at the entrance.

Discussion

What has begun to emerge from our research is a picture of the spotty and inconsistent ways libraries try to meet the needs of their users. While every library seems to be doing something to make their bathrooms usable and hospitable, none are yet doing everything they might. Identifying these gaps between what our bathrooms provide and what they could be providing has become a point of passion and advocacy for us.

Most importantly, academic libraries need student bathrooms. Our tours introduced us to one library that had no easily accessible student bathroom. However, this library did dedicate two on-site, multi-user bathrooms solely to faculty and staff use. At another library, which is eight-stories tall, a total of six toilets were provided for women (a four-stall bathroom and two single-use, gender-neutral rooms), while two other single-use rooms were designated as "Staff Only." One can only imagine the frustration a student would feel when, interrupting her studies to visit the bathroom, she encounters a conveniently located facility that she is barred from using. Furthermore, where we do have bathrooms, it is critical that these bathrooms are big enough to accommodate the number of students that our library actually serves. Several bathrooms were crowded and clearly inadequate for the level of usage they received.

FIGURE 4
A vending machine, with nothing to vend



Cleanliness and maintenance, which speak to health and safety, are absolutely crucial in library restrooms. While the bathrooms we visited were, in general, fairly clean, the exceptions could be quite disgusting. For the sake of our users, regular cleanings should be scheduled as frequently and logically as possible. Administrators may wish to map cleaning to times of heavy usage (via gate counts or floor counts) or assess bathroom cleanliness at regular intervals to determine an optimal cleaning schedule. Posting a phone number to report when a bathroom needs cleaning or maintenance will empower students and lead to timely interventions, while posting the cleaning schedule could help assure students that a messy facility will be cleaned shortly. Both are friendly, student-centered steps that are easy and cheap to implement.

Maintenance is similarly important, but can be cost- or time-prohibitive. In our survey, most bathrooms were in good working condition, with no broken locks, good lighting, and functioning plumbing. However, some of the vandalism that we did see appeared to be quite old (e.g., “Toilet Tour 2012”), but had not been repaired. In addition, small and inexpensive changes, like replacing peeling toilet seats and painting scuffed and chipped walls, would go a long way to improving the overall appearance of some of the bathrooms we visited.

It is also important to consider whether our bathrooms meet the needs of *all* of our students. While federal guidance has instructed us that people have the right to use the bathroom that accords with their gender identities, only four of the libraries we visited included a prominent notice welcoming transgender students to use the bathroom of their choice. More comfortable single-use gender-neutral bathrooms were even more rare: we identified them at only two libraries among the 15 sites that we visited. This means that as of our visits, six libraries made no provision at all for transgender students. While single-use, gender-neutral rooms are the “gold standard,” they are expensive to create if a library does not already have a single-stall bathroom. However, signage reminding students of their legal rights and showing a library to be inclusive may be easier to provide.

Finally, there are several steps libraries can take to make their bathroom facilities more user-friendly. Adding signs or maps that direct users to the bathrooms is a simple step that improves user experience significantly. Storage in or near the bathroom can also be helpful. If space or money is not available for built-in storage, a book truck parked near the bathroom might be enough to do the trick. Few libraries in our study provided seat covers, diaper changing stations, and vending machines for sanitary products, all of which would be welcome additions to any heavily-used bathroom. Also, though only one bathroom failed to provide a place in each stall to dispose of used tampons and pads, it is an oversight that women are likely to find unhygienic and inconsiderate.

Conclusion

As we complete our research, we plan to refine our checklist and continue to collect data, with the goal of learning more about the bathrooms in a wider range of academic libraries, including those at private institutions. Ultimately, we hope our Library Restroom Checklist will be a tool for librarians and administrators who wish to turn a critical eye to the bathrooms their students use, and make improvements based on this analysis. Even now, our research has begun to point to a set of changes that could improve library bathrooms. Some of these may, at first glance, seem frivolous. Why spend precious renovation dollars on toilets? Or reassign staff bathrooms for student use? Or add tampon vending machines and diaper changing stations? The answer to these questions is simple: because these features promote the comfort of our students and enable them to study and learn within our libraries. That should be our goal for all the areas in our libraries—even the lowly restroom.

| APPENDIX A Library Restroom Checklist |
|--|
| Name of Library |
| Location in library |
| Number of restrooms |
| Restrooms per floor |
| Ease of access and findability (describe) |
| General |
| Location in library (describe) |
| Date, time, and day of week |
| M or F or other |
| Labeling and signage (describe) |
| First impressions |
| Ventilation: Does there seem to be a problem? (y/n describe) |
| Lighting: Are all light fixtures working? (y/n, describe) |
| Is it bright enough? (y/n, describe) |
| Aesthetics |
| Color of paint and fixtures |
| Decorations (y/n, describe) |
| Layout (sketch) |
| Overall appearance (describe) |
| Air freshener (y/n) |
| Counts |
| Number of sinks |
| Number of toilets |
| Number of urinals |
| Mirrors (y/n, describe) |
| Diaper-changing station (y/n) |
| ADA-compliant stall (y/n, describe) |
| Shelves (y/n, describe) |
| Emergency call box (y/n, describe) |
| In the stall |
| Hooks (y/n) |
| Working locks (y/n) |
| Floor mounted or wall mounted toilets |
| Sanitary bins (y/n) |
| Cleanliness |
| Toilet seats (y/n, describe) |
| Urinals (y/n, describe) |
| Sinks and sink traps (y/n, describe) |

| |
|--|
| Floors (y/n, describe) |
| Walls (y/n, describe) |
| Shelves (y/n, describe) |
| Trash bins overflowing (y/n) |
| Sanitary bins overflowing (y/n) |
| Maintenance and Repair |
| Vandalism (y/n, describe) |
| Graffiti (y/n, describe) |
| Leaks (y/n, describe) |
| Hygiene |
| Soap (y/n) |
| Toilet paper in each stall (y/n) |
| Dryers present and working (y/n) |
| Paper towel dispensers present and stocked (y/n) |
| Tampon/napkin dispensers present and stocked (y/n) |
| Extra toilet paper available (y/n) |
| Notice/chart about how often library is cleaned (y/n) |
| Overall impressions |
| What do you think of the overall appearance? |
| What will you remember from this bathroom? |
| On a scale of 0 (least) to 10 (most), how painful was it to use/be in this bathroom? |
| Photography |
| Photograph full room, at least one stall, at least one sink |
| Which features did you photograph? |
| Other |
| Other notes about this bathroom? |
| Describe other bathrooms in this library, as possible. |

Notes

- Stephanie Margolin and Jennifer Poggiali, "Where Are the Bathrooms?: Revisiting this Question As We Consider Academic Library Renovations and Student Needs," *Journal of Library Administration*, forthcoming.
- Gillian Frank, "Stalling Civil Rights: Conservative Sexual Thought Has Been in the Toilet Since the 1940s," last modified November 9, 2015, *NOTCHES: (re)marks on the history of sexuality*, <http://notchesblog.com/2015/11/09/stalling-civil-rights/>; Elizabeth Abel, "Bathroom Doors and Drinking Fountains: Jim Crow's Racial Symbolic," *Critical Inquiry* 25, no. 3 (Spring 1999): 435–81.
- Kathryn H. Anthony and Meghan Dufresne, "Potty Parity in Perspective: Gender and Family Issues in Planning and Designing Public Restrooms," *Journal of Planning Literature* 21, no. 3 (February 1, 2007): 267–94, doi:10.1177/0885412206295846.
- Our total enrollment of just over 274,000 is roughly 30% Hispanic, 25% each black and white, and 20% Asian/Pacific Islander. For statistics, see: CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. "Total Enrollment by Undergraduate and Graduate Level, Full-time/Part-time Attendance, and College Fall 2015." City University of New York. April 25, 2016. http://www.cuny.edu/irdatabook/rpts2_AY_current/ENRL_0001_UGGR_FTPT.rpt.pdf; CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. "Total Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity and College: Percentages Fall 2015." City University of New York. April 25, 2016. http://www.cuny.edu/irdatabook/rpts2_AY_current/ENRL_0015_RACE_TOT_PCT.rpt.pdf.
- Margolin & Poggiali, "Where Are the Bathrooms?"

6. A.B., "Mary Ann Case—Toilet Inequities," *University of Chicago Magazine*, April 2003, vol 95, issue 4, <https://magazine.uchicago.edu/0304/features/index-toilet.html>.
7. Mary Ann Case, "Toilet Survey," n.d., <http://webcast-law.uchicago.edu/toiletsurvey/form/>.
8. Simone Chess et al., "Calling All Restroom Revolutionaries!" in *That's Revolting: Queer Strategies for Resisting Assimilation*, edited by Mattilda Bernstein Sycamore (Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull Press, 2008), 216–235.
9. *Ibid.*, 218.
10. *Ibid.*, 230–231.
11. *Ibid.*, 232.
12. William W. Sannwald, *Checklist of Library Building Design Considerations*, 6th edition (Chicago: ALA Editions, an imprint of the American Library Association, 2016).
13. *Ibid.*, 219.
14. Clara Greed, "Creating a Nonsexist Restroom," in *Toilet: Public Restrooms and the Politics of Sharing*, ed. Harvey Molotch and Laura Noren (New York: NYU Press, 2010), 134–139, <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/huntercollege/detail.action?docID=10425195>.
15. Case, Toilet Survey; Chess et al., "Calling all Restroom Revolutionaries!"; Sannwald, *Checklist of Library Building Design Considerations*; Greed, "Creating a Nonsexist Restroom."
16. Margolin & Poggiali, "Where Are the Bathrooms?"
17. Ladislava Khailova, "South Carolinian Public Libraries' ADA Accommodations to Persons with Disabilities," *Public Library Quarterly* 24, no. 2 (2005): 32.
18. U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of Education, "Dear Colleague Letter on Transgender Students," May 13, 2016, <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201605-title-ix-transgender.pdf>. Our own municipalities have issued similar orders, which cover our facilities: a March 2016 New York City Executive Order stating that those using city-owned restrooms (such as those on CUNY campuses) could not be asked for identification to prove their gender identity, and a Guidance issued in 2015 through the New York State Department of Education, ensuring the safety of transgender and gender nonconforming students. See: Bill DeBlasio, Executive Order No. 16, March 7, 2016, "Access to Single-Sex City Facilities Consistent with Gender Identity and Expression," http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/home/downloads/pdf/executive-orders/2016/eo_16.pdf; The State Education Department (NY), "Guidance to School Districts for Creating a Safe and Supportive School Environment for Transgender and Gender Nonconforming Students," July 2015, http://www.p12.nysed.gov/dignityact/documents/Transg_GNCGuidanceFINAL.pdf.
19. For examples of gender-inclusive icons, as well as a discussion of restroom icons in general, see Mark Anthony Castrodale and Laura Lane, "Finding One's Place to Be and Pee: Examining Intersections of Gender-Dis/ability in Washroom Signage," *Atlantis* 37, no. 1 (2015).