

Challenging LGBT+ exclusion in UK higher education

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE UNION

May 2021

A report for UCU
by Trude Sundberg,
Paul Boyce and Róisín Ryan-Flood¹



1. Introduction

This report presents key findings from a pilot survey carried out by a project team from UCU, the University of Sussex, University of Kent, University of Essex, and Glasgow Caledonian University. We use terms consistent with UCU policy and practice throughout this report, for example LGBT+ to describe its focus population. This initial report is based on a pilot study of 122 survey responses from LGBT+ members of staff from six different universities across England, Scotland, and Wales.² Supplementary interviews were conducted with six staff members.³ The project explores the working conditions for LGBT+ staff in higher education (HE) in the UK.

Although recent years have seen the welcome introduction of increased formal rights for LGBT+ people in the UK, homophobia and transphobia remain serious issues in the workplace. The increasingly neoliberal, marketised, and individualised university sector has included a 'top down' response to LGBT+ issues situated within the values and hierarchies of UK HE institutions. In practice this has meant that LGBT+ inclusion and discrimination are often addressed via 'tick-box' or performative approaches. These might include, for example, raising a rainbow flag on campus during occasions such as Pride and LGBT History Month, creating LGBT+ social-networks and/or appointing diversity champions who are given insufficient power to bring about substantial change. It may also include equality, diversity and inclusivity (EDI) procedures that monitor diversity according to the distribution of protected characteristics in an institution but which do little to challenge normative power structures in HE management knowledge-cultures and employee performance evaluation.

Whilst the actions described may play an important part in raising the profile of LGBT+ people and issues, they are typically not grounded in nuanced accounts and the complex self-defined needs of LGBT+ staff, something we see as critical to broadening and diversifying HE organisational and knowledge cultures. One interviewee in the present study, for example, noted that they felt participating in Pride events, one common aspect of official university inclusivity actions, almost as an expectation from being a gay-identified member of academic staff. He noted that while such expectations may be well-intentioned, they seem to show little awareness of counter-Pride perspectives and wider aspects of queer political critique. Such viewpoints indicate the narrow optics through which LGBT+ inclusion has become envisioned in the UK HE sector, often performed through the politics of gestures and setting up of events as opposed to more fundamental refigurations of normative power/knowledge structures.

Against this background, in this project we have aimed to better understand structural barriers and wider cultures of indirect exclusion and institutional prejudice as they pertain to LGBT+ EDI in UK HE. In so doing we question whether issues that LGBT+ HE employees face in their everyday working lives can be resolved by addressing the needs of individuals alone, or via tokenistic versions of LGBT+ recognition. Similarly, we note that complaint procedures that LGBT+ employees may want to pursue in the sector can add a layer of pressure on those who are already marginalised. Such actions most often entail taking



up grievances against individuals whereas the issues that individual LGBT+ staff experience are driven by pervasive cultures of structural discrimination, for example, amidst the predominance of cis-normative and heteronormative values in teaching, research and funding in UK HE (Ahmed, 2019).⁴

By noting this we wish to stress that acts of LGBT+ inclusion in UK HE institutions are of little value without more fundamental restructurings of normative organisational logics that so often disempower and diminish LGBT+ critical perspectives. We advocate for comprehensive sector-wide change accordingly, focused on LGBT+ inclusion in the context of other equality and diversity actions (such as those pertaining to race, ethnicity, class, neurodiversity, disability and impairment, and alongside a more fundamental querying of the effects of norms in UK HE knowledge and research economies). This is not to discount existing good practice in the sector; but it is to bring existing work into a critical discussion about the future of LGBT+ inclusivity in UK HE.

This research report recognises and emphasises the importance of making issues visible, in addition to identifying accumulated and established patterns of discrimination experienced by LGBT+ employees in UK HE. As a result we focus on bringing critical concerns to the surface, challenging a silencing of LGBT+ needs and welfare and giving these issues a place in analysis and action.

It has been notable within our research findings that Black, transgender and non-binary UK HE employees reported particularly complicated, discriminatory working experiences. We have also noted discriminations that LGBT+ people experience while working online, which have increased rapidly in a working from home culture brought about by responses to the Covid-19 pandemic. Taking these and other issues into account, in this report we present a picture of precarious LGBT+ working lives in respect of job insecurity, health and wellbeing, discrimination, teaching and learning, Covid-19, 'outness' and care.



2. LGBT+ working environment: findings from the pilot survey

JOB INSECURITY

Experiences of job insecurity revealed in responses to our survey are not unique to LGBT+ people. However, although job insecurity is increasingly common across UK HE, there are compounding factors for LGBT+ employees that accentuate precarity in sometimes discriminatory work environments. Our data indicate:

High levels of job insecurity

- 30% agree with the statement 'I might lose my job in the next 6 months'. This response reflects insecurity across the sector as our respondents represented a range of academic and professional services positions in the institutions sampled: 28% Professional services, 10% Professors, 18% Senior Lecturers, 19% Lecturers, 14% Post-Doctoral or Research Fellows, and 10% PhD Students.
- 67% disagree with the statement 'If I were to lose or quit my current job, it would be easy for me to find a job of similar salary'.
- 77 % of respondents have thought about leaving HE.
- 29% say promotion criteria affect LGBT+ people negatively.
- 57% have been promoted in their current workplace, however, more Lesbian and Gay respondents have been promoted than those who identify as Bisexual and those identifying their sexual orientation as other.

As one interviewee noted:

Universities in the UK are elitist, tribalistic; biologically you will not be a part of the winners – we cannot all be cis-heteros. How can you be in an environment when people ask you all the time 'what do you mean; I don't understand what you are saying.' You have to make a choice for your well-being.

This respondent particularly highlights issues arising from seeking to develop an academic career where gender and sexuality diverse voices are often given less opportunity for career progression or where the viewpoints of gender and sexuality diverse scholars are marginalised or misunderstood.

They added that:

Doing a PhD, you have invested a lot of money in this; but you are in general in a precarious position because this has become the new norm. Then if you add layers to it – the LGBT layer, the Arab layer, the Muslim layer. Each of these layers have their advantages and difficulties.



The issues stressed here point to intersectional attributes of exclusion. These factors combine around a range of characteristics that ascribe normative values to what counts as knowledge and who counts as a credible knowledge producer in UK HE.

Similarly commenting on career progress in respect of gender norms, another respondent noted:

I feel promotion and the ability to negotiate salary has been affected by my gender – or at least the fact that men feel entitled to negotiate and to ask for promotions quicker (and more successfully).

Other respondents described an experience of their work being stymied in respect of their gender/sexuality, or where they have had to challenge such views:

...a colleague interrogated me about my sexuality after I revealed I had a lesbian partner. He was asking whether I identified as a woman and whether I 'liked' men. I had to ask him to stop. I often experience misgendering. One member of staff still misgenders me, two years after my coming out to her.

One senior professor at my previous institution started ranting about trans people at a women in tech lunch. it didn't affect me personally, but it was nasty and I had to challenge her, which was stressful (senior prof vs lowly postdoc).

These perspectives resonate with findings in a number of contexts in UK HE whereby actions to improve the working experiences of scholars who are marginal with respect to gender and sexualities have had limited effect. While progressive policies have been implemented in some institutions,⁵ much more remains to be done to establish such values and practices as a normative and required attribute of professional cultures in UK HE (McKendry and Lawrence 2017).⁶ An effect is to curtail opportunities for LGBT+ (along with Black and Minority Ethnic, disabled and other marginalised researchers and teachers). This compounds normative knowledge cultures and institutional environments that in turn further iterate the exclusion of LGBT+ and other diverse scholarship.

HEALTH AND WELLBEING

A highly concerning image of health issues is painted by the responses to the survey. Combined with job insecurity this gives rise to a need for new measures and policies. 81% of our respondents related that they experienced mental health issues related to their working conditions.

Many UK HE institutions do have mental health and well-being policies in place. Often these are not well-designed in respect of the specific needs and experiences of gender and sexual minority UK HE employees. For the present pilot study we have not undertaken in-depth analysis of such policies (we will be doing this in a larger scale national study that will commence in June 2021). There are examples of good practice in the sector, and these will be examined in a subsequent report. A number of UK HE institutions, for



example, have implemented policies to support gender transition in the workplace, and resources such as 'TransEDU' provide important stepping-stones in framing what gender diverse UK HE cultures ought to look and feel like.⁷

Against this background, however, many of our respondents reported high levels of mental ill health and 'burnout' related to their experiences of gender and sexuality in the workplace. We asked respondents to offer their own definitions of 'burnout'. These included:

Feelings of exhaustion, an ability to focus, lack of joy in doing work.

Overburdened by tasks without support from managers.

Being the one expected to be available for students because i) being female ii) not having children.

A cumulative effect of increased workload demands and an environment that is not conducive to promoting staff well-being that interacts in harmful ways that effects your ability to undertake even the lightest of regular duties.

Not having sufficient resources to cope with the demands of the job and suffering mentally/physically as a result.

Exhaustion, helplessness, inability to focus, stress-linked physical and mental health conditions.

In the context of these experience data pertaining to mental and physical health among our respondents were as follows:

High incidences of mental and physical health problems

- 41 % have experienced burnout (which in turn is a wider problem for all employees in the sector).
- 47% have experienced mental health issues.
- 41% have experienced chronic illness (most commonly anxiety or depression or other mental health illnesses).

Inclusivity measures that seem more like tick-box exercises, and which do not address failures of LGBT+ inclusivity in curricula, teaching and UK HE management and leadership, do not suffice to address serious and long-term health issues experienced by LGBT+ staff in the sector - and may indeed exacerbate mental ill-health and burnout, where inclusive action is experienced as more performative than substantive. This is especially so because the tendency is to address institutional prejudice and exclusion as an issue for those marginalised to resolve, either within their own sense of self,



involvement in EDI committees, or via LGBT+ support networks. 42% of our respondents reported that the labour of inclusivity work (pertaining to LGBT+ and other characteristics) fell disproportionately to them within their institutions.

Work on inclusivity in UK HE most often lies with LGBT+ and other marginal employees as opposed to taking-place within wider organizational contexts. A consequence is that LGBT+ employees may experience institutional discrimination and prejudice and also find themselves in the position of having to articulate this to others if seeking recognition of, or restitution for, such actions – most often to little or no effect when it comes to changing organizational cultures and norms.

As one respondent noted:

There is a lot of unrecognised labour in HE fullstop [for everyone employed in the sector]. This may not attach particularly to LGBT+ but it does attach to people who are on the wrong end of marginalising infrastructures.

DISCRIMINATION

Levels of personally experienced discrimination among LGBT+ staff in UK HE are concerningly high, exemplified by findings here; the regularity varies, although most incidents occur at least monthly as reported in our survey data. This is a high frequency given that it is 10 years since the Equality Act (2010) required organisations to eliminate discrimination, while discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender reassignment have been outlawed since 1999 (under EU regulations).

Despite a range of legal and policy related changes over the last decade, including the Equality Act 2010, and an increase in local Higher Education Institutions (HEI) adopting LGBT+ inclusive policies, high-levels of discrimination toward LGBT+ people persist in the UK HE sector. Our data evidence this, especially in the difficult to report dimension of indirect discrimination that may be hard to address or define in individual cases.

This relates to the everyday effects of the microaggressions that minority UK HE employees may particularly experience. Such aggressions may not always be intentional on the part of those who enact them. And they may not uniformly engender effects that can be pointed to as specifically prejudiced. Ambiguity of intentionality and outcome are aspects of the subtle power of such actions. Minority employees (and students) in HE may not be granted the certainty of being able to point to discrimination as always explicit or self-evident. Rather, indistinctness of intent and consequence are attributes of how such discrimination functions; since it may not be readily defined and managed, it endures.

Examples described by our respondents include:

As an early career researcher, I was regularly mistaken for another female queer colleague in the department, despite my being white and her being Asian.



There have been times when colleagues have expressed positions that I consider to be homophobic, although they did not necessarily understand this themselves.

Overall, we found that discrimination is a part of everyday working life, with derogatory language and pejorative actions particularly reported by transgender and non-binary and Black LGBT+ staff. Experience of derogatory language about sexual orientation was reported by almost one in four of our respondents.

- Derogatory language about gender identity (27%) and gender expression (30%) is more common than for sexual orientation (23%).
- Lower confidence in reporting discrimination among non-binary people.
- Black LGBT+ staff reported more personal discriminatory experiences and derogatory language towards others (100% of Asian and Black Asian and other ethnic background respondents).
- Homophobic/transphobic language was experienced by 25-30% of respondents.
- 30% of respondents have experienced homophobic language.
- 22% transphobic and 10% nonbinary phobic.
- Those preferring to self-define their sexual orientation in our survey (other than Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Asexual) reported higher levels of discrimination.
- Of these, 17% of them have been discriminated on the basis of gender identity and 17% on the basis of sexual orientation.
- Of those identifying as women, non-binary or other 26%, 25% and 33% respectively have witnessed derogatory language towards others. For men this number was considerably lower at 16%.

Examples of non-binary and trans-specific hostile language and discourse witnessed and reported by respondents include:

Colleagues making reference to views that trans women aren't women, for example, and/or contesting academic research and events from a trans-inclusive perspective.

She ranted against trans and non-binary folks.

Expressions of disbelief about identities.



One senior professor at my previous institution started ranting about trans people at a 'women in tech lunch'. it didn't affect me personally, but it was nasty and I had to challenge her, which was stressful (senior prof vs lowly postdoc).

Refusal to use the pronoun that I prefer.

TEACHING AND LEARNING

A range of issues were raised under the theme of teaching and learning that contribute to a picture of a difficult working environment for LGBT+ staff in UK HE. These are organised here under curriculum, working in other countries for HE institutions, issues related to online work, and Covid-19.

LGBT + staff teach and do research on gender, sexuality but do not feel it is valued by institutions

- 40% report teaching on gender, sexuality and diversity, and 42% of these felt that this is not valued by their institutions.
- 36% percent of respondents conduct research on issues related to gender, sexuality and diversity, of these 40% do not see this as valued by their institution.
- 47% indicated that the decolonisation work in their institution does not include working on issues related to gender diversity and sexual orientation. 45% report that it is their responsibility to carry out such work where it occurs, thus this work is not institutionally diversified outside of LGBT+ employees.

Negative experiences working abroad in the HEI sector

- 21% of the respondents who reported working in countries other than the UK had negative experiences relating to their LGBT+ identity.

LGBT+ specific issues related to online work

- Most did not report negative experiences but a few reported issues around how gender identities are highlighted/discussed in online teaching formats, and some reported online bullying.

CURRICULUM

In our survey 33% do not feel that teaching and research on gender and sexualities is valued by their institution. This, combined with 42% responding that teaching on gender and sexual orientation is not valued more generally by the institution, is concerning as a large number of LGBT+ indicate that not only their teaching is undervalued, but also that issues pertaining to their own lived experiences are not valued.

Increasing numbers of UK HE institutions are now implementing decolonising curriculum initiatives. Whether such initiatives are the most appropriate place in which to situate work to deconstruct LGBT+ invisibility and silencing in the curriculum is a matter for



ongoing debate. However, it is crucial to recognise that decolonising implies unpacking the range of gender and sexuality norms that have been intrinsic to colonising practices and their associated teaching and learning cultures in UK HE.⁸

LGBT+ staff are a critical resource when it comes to teaching about sexual and gender diversity. It is important to highlight that many such staff may be happy to carry out this work; it may be their area of expertise in teaching and research and it may be intrinsic to their employment in the HE sector. Nonetheless, it is vital to be careful about putting the work of educating about sexual and gender minority experiences onto LGBT+ people who may be otherwise marginalised in HE institutions. A tendency is to compound a scenario in which LGBT+ employees experience marginalisation and prejudice in UK HE whilst also being expected to educate others about these same experiences, as if such actions constitute institutional inclusivity. Moreover, often when gender and sexualities diverse perspectives are introduced into curricula (whether by LGBT+ employees or otherwise) they are subject to erasure by academic colleagues who may disregard such teaching or feel that they lack the capacity to undertake such work (while conversely LGBT+ HE staff are typically required to teach from within disciplinary infrastructures that are hetero- and gender normative, as a matter of course).

WORKING IN OTHER COUNTRIES

28 respondents reported that they had worked for their HEI in countries other than the UK. Of those specifying their roles when working abroad 6 were related to research and 8 teaching and recruitment related activities.

21% of the respondents who reported working in countries other than the UK had negative experiences relating to their LGBT+ identity. This is a concern; HE institutions should be aware of the likelihood of this when asking staff to work in countries other than the UK. The potential negative impact on LGBT+ staff should also be a consideration in setting up campuses in other countries where there are not the same rights for LGBT+ people as there are in the UK.

ONLINE WORK

Online working has become a substantial part of HE teaching practice during the Covid-19 pandemic. Most of our respondents did not report negative experiences of this related to their gender or sexual orientation. However 8% did report issues around how gender identities are highlighted in online teaching formats. Software used to facilitate home working can include features such as gender markers and pronouns. In common with usual practice it is often taken for granted that pronouns are based on assumed gender but these assumptions can be wrong and may be discriminatory.

As one respondent noted:

I have added my pronouns to my Zoom name, but to date, no cisgender people appear to have done this, and so I feel I stand out as transgender in this regard.



Another respondent described:

Heightened concerns over online bullying from students regarding sexuality who can feel emboldened by the anonymity of online teaching.

An example of the above was given by another respondent:

Some students have used homophobic/biphobic language about my appearance online.

COVID-19

45 of 122 respondents reported general stress and struggles during the pandemic. Specific negative effect relating to the pandemic include:

- isolation from LGBT+ communities, affecting mental health and experiences of burnout
- increased workload, which we know is occurring across the board in HE during the pandemic
- difficulties taking parental/adoption leave for LGBT+ staff due to increased workload within HE institutions
- difficulties taking care of elderly parents and families
- unable to see partners and chosen families due to long distance relationship
- concern that Covid-19 adds to and increases job insecurity in HE.

Among other issues our respondents reported the following concerns, some of which are specific to LGBT+ employees and some of which present intersectional concerns.

I experience stress working from home; lack of work/life separation.

I have been working from home. I have worried about not having any work to do and worried about the future of the university. I have had little support from my manager and little contact with most colleagues.

More isolated - missing mixing with peers, having to teach online which can lead to some barriers.

Before support bubbles were introduced I was unable to see my partner for several months as we don't live together and we couldn't move in [together] because her family might find out.



I have a chronic illness and have been concerned about going out. I have been working a lot online and have felt the usual degree of burnout and isolation from that, especially during lockdown.

I found my first year at work extremely difficult and part of this was about being separated from partners and queer contacts in another country without recognition from co-workers that this was a loss.

Conversely, other respondents expressed a preference of working from home (as brought about by the pandemic). This was due to increased flexibility, and less pressures and negative experiences related to discrimination and microaggression related to LGBT+ identity in the workplace.

OUTNESS

91% of our respondents reported that they are 'out', i.e. open about their gender and sexual orientation, in the workplace. UK HE was seen as a relatively progressive context to be personally open about gender and sexual diversity.

Our workplace among both academic and professional services have a higher proportion of openly LGBT+ people than in the UK workforce as a whole.

Nonetheless there were accounts of difficulties and stresses related to this. Respondents highlight that coming out is a repeated action that may be met by different reactions depending on the situation. It was noted that coming out is never a resolved or singular action in anyone's workplace.

Once you have told some staff, generally people get to know. It's harder with students. You either have to tell a new group directly or they don't know. I have never found this easy.

[I have experienced] burnout and depression caused by overwork combined with the pressures of living for decades as a closeted bisexual.

Respondents noted in interview, that certain aspects of LGBT+ experience are much more socially accepted than others. Talking about a same-sex partner at work would, for example, not be an issue.

I have always casually mentioned that I am gay when I say things like 'Going out with my wife' etc.

I no longer feel that I have to specifically tell colleagues that I am gay; more I include it in natural conversations.

Against this background, coming out as trans or non binary presents particular challenges, including normative assumptions about what those identities 'look like',



or discomfort brought about by dressing/self-presenting in non gender normative ways:

There's a lot of emotional labour of just like what am I wearing in this meeting. [...] I mean having to strategize and I think there's even been times where I've had one meeting with one person and changed after, before meeting with someone else. So I don't feel comfortable wearing a poncho in front of more manly [colleagues].

One respondent noted in interview that certain aspects of LGBT+ experience are much more socially accepted than others. Talking about a boyfriend (as a gay man) at work would, for example, would not be an issue. Yet, this respondent noted that when he started his current job he was in a less conventional form of relationship with multiple partners in different places. He felt that this would not be legible as a form of kinship relation for the employer to recognise [e.g. in case of care-leave], or which would be readily intelligible in the social world of UK HE. This is especially so where, for example, talking about more normative family structures is a common attribute of how social relations are built between colleagues, and how the normative relational attributes of knowledge cultures are reproduced and sustained. .

Other comments reported stress and phobia after coming out:

I experienced harassment from a colleague. He attempted to sabotage my research by taking my lab out of service... In another incident, a colleague interrogated me about my sexuality after I revealed I had a lesbian partner. He was asking whether I identified as a woman and whether I 'liked' men. I had to ask him to stop.

I often experience misgendering. One member of staff still misgenders me, two years after my coming out to her.

He (HoD) mentioned that he had to write a report for me for some reason, and he was using the pronoun 'she' rather than 'they/their'. And the reason for it was because as far as he's concerned 'they/their' was grammatically incorrect.

CARE

Equality policies in UK HE pertaining to the caring labour of employees are most often focused around childcare. Most respondents to our survey do not have children but do have care responsibilities. 28% have care responsibilities that include care for people outside of traditional families (this includes people in the community, relations, loved-one, elderly, partners and animals).

This indicates a need for further action in UK HE institutions to further develop policies around care that can capture and support those who do not have traditional childcare responsibilities as well as those with non-traditional families. There is also a need for further research to understand the variety of families among staff to understand how we can support the range of caring responsibilities that exist. This would include new policies and work on issues arising from cross borders families, something that is common among LGBT+ colleagues. In our sample 30.5% have family abroad.



3. Areas for action

Central to our work on this project is how the findings can be used to generate action. UCU has a long history of promoting LGBT+ equality and liberation and calling on all in the post-school education to engage in developing related action.

The following Areas for Action are situated within our findings and identify how much work there is to do to address LGBT+ people's experience of discrimination within HE. Our work is part of an ongoing discussion and, after further research and national consultation with LGBT+ UK HE staff, we will be launching specific Recommendations for Action in January 2022.

WORK ENVIRONMENTS THAT ARE LGBT+ SUPPORTIVE AND INCLUSIVE

Awareness should be raised at national, institutional, and local levels about the diverse nature of LGBT+ lives, including differences from the normative understandings. This should include:

- a more comprehensive and far-reaching integration of different forms of caring relationships/networks wherever caring relationships are addressed by workplace policies
- messages and policies that demonstrate understanding of the varying experiences of the household as a locus of support and to better recognise varying forms LGBT+ family and household within policies designed for caring duties, bereavement and childcare
- respect for diversity, and understanding of how misgendering happens in HE contexts, including, active and evidenced consideration of default pronouns to address gender assumptions and bias
- a clear message that HE staff should not be subject to homophobic/transphobic treatment by students or other staff.

It is crucial that action plans are developed and implemented comprehensively within the HE sector to address experiences of discrimination, including but not limited to:

- intentionally discriminatory actions
- indirect discriminations
- microaggressions

Rather than using externally awarded badges to brush off claims, they should also be linked to the precarious nature of a lot of employment within the HE sector. Microaggressions should be addressed as part of LGBT+ working lives with serious recognition of the impact on LGBT+ HE staff and mental health.



LGBT+ MENTAL HEALTH

As we have seen, 81% of our respondents reported that they experienced mental health issues underlining that action to improve working conditions for LGBT+ staff is crucial.

Campaigns, events and information can be developed in this area with particular attention to giving voice to Black LGBT+, trans and non-binary people.

PROMOTION CRITERIA

Further research needs to explore why promotion criteria are negatively experienced by LGBT+ people and to collect data on promotions for LGBT+ in comparison to those who are not LGBT+.

ONLINE WORKING

Campaigns and policies should be developed that recognise and address bullying of, in particular, trans and non-binary staff when teaching online.

At institutional level action about misgendering should include how this may be addressed by initiatives related to online working.

NEGATIVE EXPERIENCES IN OTHER COUNTRIES

LGBT+ HE employees experiences of working in other countries should be examined in further research - particularly where there are reports of negative and prejudicial experience, and where UK HE institutions are working to develop operations and partnerships in countries that do not have a similar level of LGBT+ rights as in the UK.

Institutions should practice no negative detriment if an LGBT+ employee turns down work in a country which does not support LGBT+ rights and relationships - including, but not limited to, where this negatively affects a person and their family life on the grounds of sexual orientation and/or gender identity.

ADDRESSING AND CHALLENGING THE LACK OF VALUE GIVEN TO GENDER AND SEXUALITY TEACHING AND RESEARCH

Teaching about the lives, perspectives, and experiences of LGBT+ people should be both integrated across the curriculum and offered visibility as a specialist subject.

Further research into how teaching and research on gender and sexuality can be brought into the heart of learning should be developed and more resources made available across a wide range of subject areas.

The contribution of LGBT+ scholars should be recognised and acknowledged.

Teaching about the lives, perspectives, and experiences of LGBT+ people should be both integrated across the curriculum and offered visibility as a specialist subject. However, this should go beyond focusing on LGBT+ individuals alone to enhance understanding of



how queer and gender and sexualities diverse perspectives intersect with all subject areas - including the humanities, social sciences and sciences.

Queer scholarship on Black and LGBT+ lives needs to be better linked to decolonising the curriculum initiatives - addressing connected issues of power, knowledge and structural exclusion of diverse scholarship in UK HE.



NOTES

¹Trude Sundberg is a Senior Lecturer in Social Policy at the School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research at the University of Kent. Paul Boyce is a Senior Lecturer in Anthropology at the School of Global Studies, University of Sussex. Róisín Ryan-Flood is a senior lecturer in Sociology and Director of the Centre for Intimate and Sexual Citizenship (CISC) at the University of Essex

²University of Cardiff, University of Essex, University of Glasgow Caledonian, University of Loughborough, University of Kent, University of Sussex

³Respondents were members of academic staff, including post-graduate teachers – all of whom were eligible for UCU membership

⁴<https://feministkilljoys.com/2019/07/22/why-complain/>

⁵In this pilot survey we have not conducted a full review of policies in our sampled institutions, as we have focused on experiences of LGBT+ HE staff. However, our future work will include analysis of existing policies, and the development of recommendations for future actions for policy and practice

⁶Dr Stephanie McKendry and Dr Matson Lawrence (2017) 'Empowering Leadership to Support Transgender Students and Staff within Higher Education: What Works to Raise Awareness and Effect Change'. Advance HE

⁷TranDEDU is was supported by the University of Strathclyde and funded by the Scottish Research Council: <https://www.trans.ac.uk>

⁸Memon and Jivraj, 2020

