Welcome by Michiel Kolman
Workplace Pride Co-Chair and Senior VP at Elsevier

Program
10.30-12.00 Symposium
  Have LGBTIQ+ employee resource groups been derailed?
  Prof. Anna Einarsdóttir
  Top down or bottom up? Strategies to assess the needs of LGBTIQ+ employees
  Prof. Joanneke van der Toorn
  Getting down to business: Maximizing the benefits of LGBTIQ+ employee resource group
  Kshitij Mor, Linn ten Haaf, Erik Poolman and David Pollard

12.00-13.00 Coffee and Tea

Meeting tips and rules
• The symposium is being recorded (on-site)
• To ask questions and make comments, raise your hand (on-site) or use the chat (on-line)
• Please use respectful and inclusive language at all times.
• Communicating about the symposium on Twitter/Instagram?
  Please include: @Leiden @WorkplacePride #lgbtiqinclusion #workplaceinclusion #IDAHOBIT #rainbowworkplaces

Welcome by Joanneke van der Toorn
Professor of LGBT+ Workplace Inclusion at Leiden University

Keynote by Anna Einarsdóttir
Senior Lecturer in Work, Management & Organising at York University

Have LGBTIQ+ employee resource groups been derailed?
Dr Anna Einarsdóttir
Reader in Critical Diversity Management
Identities, absence and silence

Lack of discussion about identities in meetings.

Introductions (if done at all) focused on professional identities.

‘Don’t ask, don’t know’ culture, chairs and members unaware of who is represented.

I think there’s a good representation. (Trust D)

I don’t think it’s overly represented by a particular group. (Trust C)

We did have somebody who identified as bisexual, but he’s left, left the trust. (Trust B)

I’m aware of two other trans people in the organisation. (Trust A)

There is no trans in the group, I don’t think there’s a trans in the organisation. (Trust A)

Network membership

Sexual and gender identity composition of LGBT+ networks

- Non-binary
- Trans
- Gay men
- Bisexual
- Other (includes gender fluid, intersex, non-binary)
Lack of diversity and inclusion

Networks dominated by gay men and, to a lesser extent, lesbian women, usually white, and in managerial positions.

Reports of outreach programmes to improve diversity of network members are rare (14%)

Networks were marketed as ‘LGBT+’, but this obscured the reality of who was a member.

People who identified anything other than gay or lesbian were ‘othered’ by the discourses used within the meetings:

Obviously, we’re keen to make sure that sort of, the, the queer, erm, the non-binary, sort of, broader sexual identities, erm, are properly represented, so we’re not too old. (Trust F)

It gets very confusing, doesn’t it? You know, when you heard of gender fluid, binary, non-binary, pansexual, it’s long list now. (Trust A)

Are there any staff networks in your trust?

![Bar chart showing percentage of respondents who have a staff network in their trust: 49.5% have a network, 8.3 have a network in place, 89.1 have a network in place, 14.8 have a network in place, 27.3 have a network in place.]

Staff networks increase visibility of LGBT+ people

![Bar chart showing comparison of visibility of heterosexual and gay networks: heterosexual networks are more visible, with 63.5% visible, compared to 3.5% for gay networks.]

Operation

- Procedural tone at meetings.
- Limited space for the personal.
- Focused on organisational aims and objectives.
- Presence of allies and other staff from the organisation (HR, E&D, Comms) felt inhibiting.
- Meetings dominated by culture and discourse of the NHS.

Impact

Networks face pressure to keep activity levels up and to evidence impact.

Without evidence of local issues that need addressing activities tend to be generic.

Many rely on rainbow material/other freebies to raise awareness, signal understanding of LGBT+ related matters, or to showcase the organisation as inclusive, with outcomes difficult to measure.

Involvement of allies linked to generating impact.
Build community
I feel like ‘part of the family’ at this organisation

On average 55% of the respondents involved in LGBT+ networks agree with the statement.
- Heterosexual cisgender respondents (60%)
- LGBT+ respondents (51%)

Only 38.5% of the LGBT+ respondents, who are not involved in any staff networks, agree.

Build community
I have at least one friend among the people I work with

Almost two-thirds of respondents who are involved in an LGBT+ network agree with this statement (no difference between heterosexual cisgender and LGBT+ respondents in whole sample).

Only around half of the LGBT+ respondents, who are not involved or do not have staff networks, agree.

---

Can LGBT+ networks protect you against negative behaviour?

4 in 5

78% of sexual & gender minority networks
93% of heterosexual cisgender members
71% of other network members

---

Common questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why do people join networks?</th>
<th>Why do they leave?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why do you grow membership?</td>
<td>Do numbers matter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How diverse are networks?</td>
<td>Is everyone welcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What structure works best?</td>
<td>For who?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the purpose of networks?</td>
<td>What are the issues people face in your organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do networks do?</td>
<td>Who benefits from network activities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Key messages

Networks lack diversity and do not represent the communities they are meant to serve

Involving allies can be double edged

The purpose of network is not clear

Focus shifted from supporting LGBT+ employees to championing organisational agenda on equality, diversity and inclusion

https://lgbtnetworks.org.uk/
Thank you
anna.einarsdottir@york.ac.uk
• https://lgbtnetworks.org.uk

Keynote by Joanneke van der Toorn
Professor of LGBT+ Workplace Inclusion at Leiden University

Top down or bottom up?
Strategies to assess the needs of LGBTIQ+ employees
Jojanneke van der Toorn
Leiden University / Utrecht University

Top down or bottom up?
Strategies to assess the needs of LGBTIQ+ employees
Jojanneke van der Toorn
Utrecht University/Leiden University

Processes of inclusion
Belonging + authenticity
Inclusion

Processes of inclusion
Inclusion
Climate for inclusion

Sahin, van der Toorn, Jansen, Bauweman, & Ellemers, 2019
What are LGBTIQ+ employee needs?

Interdisciplinary collab

How can ‘unheard and unseen’ individuals in the hospital, workplace, and neighborhood become better represented in (academic) research and advocacy efforts?

Study 1: HR- and leadership perceptions

13 semi-structured interviews with Dutch HR professionals and LGBTIQ+ employee network representatives.

Study 1

- What are current strategies to identify the needs of LGBTIQ+ employees?
- Whether and to what extent do these strategies reach all LGBTIQ+ employees?
Study 1 - Results

Practical, socio-cultural and assumption-driven barriers

Data privacy and a presumed lack of trust

Study 2 + 3: Employee perceptions

- Representative sample of the Dutch working population
  - N = 558 (95% cis-hetero; average age = 46.23, 51.4% male).
- Sample of Dutch LGBTIQ+ participants
  - N = 183 (100% LGBTIQ+; average age = 25.24, 29% male).
- Measures
  - Perceived privacy and sensitivity of employee characteristics.
  - Willingness to share and register these employee characteristics.
  - Perception of LGBTI+ employees' willingness to share and register them.
  - Trust in their employer.

Perceived privacy and sensitivity

Trust employer with data
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Willingness to share and register data
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Willingness to share and register data
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Conclusions

• There are practical, socio-cultural and assumption-driven barriers to assessing the needs of LGBTIQ+ employees at work.

• Dialogue on how to best assess the needs of LGBTIQ+ employees is crucial

• Knowledge on the GDPR in relation to employee data collection
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Privacy and D&I Policy guide
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P.INC Poster Campaign
Thank you!

j.m.van.der.toorn@fsw.leidenuniv.nl