

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Equalities in Hastings, Rother & East Sussex

Mapping Exercise - Initial Findings

By Nick McGlynn and Dr. Kath Browne

University of Brighton

October 2011

Acknowledgements

The writers of this report would like to thank the following individuals and organisations for their support:

The Hastings & Rother Rainbow Alliance, who initially raised the issue of LGBT research in the area, and helped develop and implement the mapping exercise.

Members of the LGBT Equalities in Hastings, Rother & East Sussex Forum, who worked with the researchers to develop the research, analyse the findings and produce this report. This forum includes members representing the following groups and organisations:

- East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust
- East Sussex County Council (including Adult Social Care, Children’s Services and Library & Information Service)
- Hastings Borough Council
- Rother District Council
- Wealden District Council
- NHS Hastings and Rother
- Sussex Police
- Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
- University of Brighton
- East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service
- Hastings & Rother Rainbow Alliance
- Her Majesty’s Prison Service (HMP Lewes)
- Hastings & Rother Health & Social Care Forum
- Hastings Voluntary Action
- Care for the Carers
- Crime Reduction Initiatives

The responding organisations, for taking the time and trust to contribute to this research and for their commitments to improving equality for LGBT people. These were:

- East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust
- East Sussex County Council (including Adult Social Care, Children’s Services and Library & Information Service, Corporate Services)
- Hastings Borough Council
- Rother District Council
- Wealden District Council
- NHS Hastings and Rother
- Sussex Police
- Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
- University of Brighton
- East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service

On Our Doorsteps and the Brighton & Sussex Community Knowledge Exchange (BSCKE), for providing the funding and other support that made this research possible.

Synopsis of Key Findings

This report maps lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) equalities policies in the Hastings, Rother, Wealden and East Sussex public sector. It examines trends in LGBT equality policies and equalities work in the public sector, and highlights areas for development. 10 public sector organisations took part. The results are reported under 3 broad headings:

Policy Requirements: The research found that while in general there is a good coverage of LGBT equalities from a policy perspective, key areas of concern included engagement with Public Sector Equality Duty C (the duty to foster good relations between LGBT people and non-LGBT people), levels of monitoring of LGBT service users, and appropriately using the data collected about both LGBT service users and staff members.

Policy Implementation: Staff training about LGBT equalities is widespread, but few organisations said that they had specific training about LGBT equalities. 4 of the public sector organisations said that they had networks or groups for LGBT staff, and those these tended to be well-supported by their parent organisations; however the absence of these should not be taken as an example of a lack of commitment to LGBT equalities. 5 organisations designated 'staff champions' for LGBT equality, who tended to occupy high-level positions in their respective organisations. While trans identities were dealt with specifically at the policy level, there was little evidence of policy engagement with specific sexual identities, such as lesbian, gay male and bi/bisexual. 7 of the public sector organisations did not address dual discrimination/multiple marginalisation and 2 noted specific problems in tackling this – however, there may also have been some confusion regarding terminology. 8 public sector organisations were producing LGBT-positive promotional materials targeted specifically at LGBT people, but only 4 were including LGBT-positive images or signage in their 'mainstream' promotional materials.

Looking to the Future: No public sector services who responded to the research said that the public sector financial cuts would definitely affect LGBT equalities work, and 7 saying that they definitely would not. The main means for ensuring this was Equality Impact Assessments, though a variety of other methods were also posited. All of the responding public sector organisations demonstrated that they would welcome assistance in improving LGBT equality. The most commonly-requested or desired types of assistance were partnership work with the LGBT community, and better LGBT training for staff.

Contents

List of Tables

1 – Introduction

- 1.1 Background
- 1.2 Methods and analysis
- 1.3 Key terms
- 1.4 Outline of report

2 – Policy Requirements

- 2.1 Overview
- 2.2 LGBT-inclusion in policies
- 2.3 Equality Duty A
- 2.4 Equality Duty B
- 2.5 Equality Duty C
- 2.6 Monitoring
- 2.7 Conclusions

3 – Policy Implementation

- 3.1 Overview
- 3.2 Staff training
- 3.3 Staff groups
- 3.4 Staff champions
- 3.5 Identity-specific policies (within LGBT)
- 3.6 Multiple marginalisation and dual discrimination
- 3.7 LGBT inclusion in organisational media
- 3.8 Conclusions

4 – Looking to the Future

- 4.1 Overview
- 4.2 Public sector financial cuts and LGBT equality
- 4.3 Assistance in improving LGBT equality
- 4.4 Conclusions

5 – Conclusions

6 – Recommendations

References

Appendix 1 – Questionnaire

Appendix 2 – Public Service Responses by Category

List of Tables

p. 9 - Table 1.1: Key Terms

p. 11 - Table 2.1: Addressing equality duty B (advancing equality)

p. 12 - Table 2.2: Addressing equality duty C (fostering good relations)

p. 13 - Table 2.3: Of those collecting data about LGBT staff members, is this data being used to improve LGBT equality?

p. 14 - Table 2.4: Collecting data about LGBT service users

p. 14 - Table 2.5: Of those collecting data about LGBT service users, is this data being used to improve LGBT equality?

p. 16 - Table 3.1: LGBT equality issues addressed at some point in staff training.

p. 17 - Table 3.2: LGBT staff training as general equality/diversity or LGBT-specific.

p. 17 - Table 3.3: Is there an LGBT staff group or network?

p. 18 - Table 3.4: Does the organisation have a staff champion for LGBT equalities?

p. 19 - Table 3.5: Staff LGBT Equality Champions by organisation and position

p. 19 - Table 3.6: Does the organisation have policies specifically referring to lesbian equality issues?

p. 20 - Table 3.7: Do the organisation's policies address 'dual discrimination'?

p. 21 - Table 3.8: Does the organisation produce inclusive media targeted at LGBT people?

p. 22 - Table 3.9: Does the organisation produce LGBT-inclusive 'mainstream' media?

p. 24 - Table 4.1: Does the organisation think the cuts will impact on their LGBT equality work?

p. 24 - Table 4.2: Methods to ensure LGBT people are not adversely impacted by cuts.

p. 25 - Table 4.3: Types of assistance requested in improving LGBT equality.

1. Introduction

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) lives are marginalised and excluded in spatially uneven ways. This research focuses on LGBT lives in the Hastings and Rother areas in East Sussex, in the south of the UK. Hastings is one of the most socially and economically deprived regions of the UK and the most deprived in the South-East, as evidenced by the English Indices of Deprivation 2010 (ESiF 2011). LGBT people and communities struggle not only against this economic background, but they also have to deal with a low awareness of LGBT needs and the existence of gender and sexual difference in the area. Research specific to the area includes a 2004 survey of LGBT lives in Hastings and Rother (Fairley & Nouidjem 2004), which found that while significant proportions of people said they had not experienced discrimination at work (68%), significant minorities had experienced abuse, violence and/or harassment inside their homes (10%) and outside (26%). There was evidence of seeking to move from the city (36%) and few felt accepted by the local community (16%). The vast majority of respondents (84%) felt that their views were not taken into account by service providers. This is particularly pertinent in as the Equality Act 2010 is put into practice, as this Act puts the onus on public bodies to cater for their LGBT populations. This report seeks to map the provision of LGBT equalities within public sector organizations in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex in 2011.

1.1 Background to this research

In February 2010, an LGBT Equalities Day was organized by the Hastings & Rother Rainbow Alliance (HRRRA), a local LGBT community group, and supported by the University of Brighton. The success of this Equalities Day led to the LGBT Equalities in Hastings, Rother & East Sussex project – a partnership between HRRRA, University of Brighton researchers and public sector providers - which aimed to improve the lives of LGBT people in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex by creating strategic networks between academic institutions, local communities and services. Funding for this project was sought and won from ‘On Our Doorsteps’, a project linked to the Community University Partnership Programme (CUPP) which seeks to make the University of Brighton a better ‘neighbour’ to its local communities.

The LGBT Equalities in Hastings, Rother & East Sussex project developed and implemented a mapping exercise, in order to identify pockets of excellence in LGBT equalities work, as well as notable gaps. This document reports on the findings of this mapping of LGBT equality policies and work in the areas of Hastings, Rother and wider East Sussex.

1.2 Methods and analysis

Designing and collecting data for the mapping exercise ran from September 2010 to May 2011, with most organisations responding in 2011.

Design: Questions for the mapping exercise were designed with the LGBT Equalities Forum. This forum is held on a monthly basis, and attended by a diverse group of activists, academics, community groups, statutory and voluntary service representatives, students and interested individuals with the aim of advancing LGBT equalities in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex. Groups and organisations with representatives on the forum include:

- East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust
- East Sussex County Council (including Adult Social Care, Children’s Services and Library & Information Service)
- Hastings Borough Council
- Rother District Council
- Wealden District Council
- NHS Hastings and Rother
- Sussex Police
- Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
- University of Brighton
- East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service
- Hastings & Rother Rainbow Alliance
- Her Majesty’s Prison Service (HMP Lewes)
- Hastings & Rother Health & Social Care Forum
- Hastings Voluntary Action
- Care for the Carers
- Crime Reduction Initiatives

Members suggested general areas of enquiry and also offered specific questions. These were validated by the researchers on the project, with the help of Ceri Davis (Brighton & Sussex Community Knowledge Exchange). The LGBT Equalities Forum made decisions and addressed gaps through 2 forum meetings. Final questions were approved by the forum.

Data Collection: A questionnaire was sent to a number of local organisations and services in November 2011 (see Appendix 1), with many such organisations also receiving an additional suite of questions specific to them. Responding organisations were asked to include supporting evidence wherever possible. The responses offer both qualitative and quantitative data. The low number of responding organisations (n. 10) is due to the focus on public sector bodies and their implementation of the Equality Act at a strategic level. Many of the local government organisations have multiple facets, for example housing, adult social care and so on. These chose to respond as

one organisation, indicating a 'top-down' approach to developing equalities policies and their implementation. This offers insights into the majority of the public sector organisations in the area. The data offers an insight into the local trends and may have relevance more broadly - this research could be replicated on a national level to examine the implementation of the Equality Act in relation to LGBT people.

Organisations to send the questionnaire to, and contactees at respective organisations, were suggested by members of the LGBT Equalities Forum. The organisations that responded were:

- East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust
- East Sussex County Council (including Adult Social Care, Children's Services and Library & Information Service)
- Hastings Borough Council
- Rother District Council
- Wealden District Council
- NHS Hastings and Rother
- Sussex Police
- Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
- University of Brighton
- East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service

Data Analysis: The data was analysed by the academic researchers. They established the number of responses to each question and then further investigating the qualitative responses given. These were categorised and then examined in relation to each other and the aims of the study, namely to map current equalities policies in public sector organisations in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex. The analysis was at various stages brought to the LGBT Equalities Forum, who advised on information relevant to and on the interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data. Their discussions are used at times, with full consent granted, to further the depth of the data. The report was then drafted by the academic researchers on the LGBT Equalities in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex project. Draft reports were discussed at the LGBT Equalities Forum, and the final report was approved by the Forum.

1.3 Key terms

This report uses a number of terms and phrases in a specific sense which may be used in different senses elsewhere, or which may require some explanation in advance. For this reason table 1.1, below, outlines some key terms.

Table 1.1: Key Terms

Key Term	Definition
LGBT	'Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans'. Used to address 'sexual orientation' and 'gender reassignment' from the Equality Act 2010 and to ensure that diversity within these already diverse communities is at least partially acknowledged. The writers recognise the difficulties of categorising gender and sexual identities in this way and how this can 'gloss over' bi and trans people.
Equality Act 2010	UK legislation relating to equalities across 9 'protected characteristics', including sexual orientation and gender reassignment. The Equality Act made several changes to UK equality law, particularly with regard to the equality duties of public sector services. The Act can be viewed at http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15 .
Public Sector Equality Duty A	'Equality Duty A' is used in this report to refer to Equality Act 2010 149:1:a, the duty to 'eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act'.
Public Sector Equality Duty B	'Equality Duty B' is used in this report to refer to Equality Act 2010 149:1:b, the duty to 'advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it'.
Public Sector Equality Duty C	'Equality Duty C' is used in this report to refer to Equality Act 2010 149:1:c, the duty to 'foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it'.

1.4 Outline of report

This report reveals the findings of the mapping exercise done as part of the LGBT Equalities in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex research project. It begins by looking at the policies of responding organisations and how well LGBT equalities are represented therein. It moves on to the implementation of policies, exploring the equalities work done by responding organisations. Finally, it reports on what these organisations had to say about the future of local LGBT equalities work, particularly with regard to the public sector service cuts planned by the UK's Conservative / Liberal Democrat coalition government in 2011. The report ends with recommendations drafted with the LGBT Equalities Forum.

2. Policy Requirements

2.1 Policy Requirements Overview

This chapter outlines how the policies of the public sector organisations in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex who responded to the research engage with LGBT equalities. It does this by firstly highlighting the extent of LGBT inclusion in the policies, and then their engagement with the new public sector equality duties included as part of the Equality Act 2010:

- Equality Duty A – eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- Equality Duty B – advancing equality for LGBT people;
- Equality Duty C – fostering good relations between LGBT people and non-LGBT people.

(See table 1.1 in the previous chapter regarding these duties.)

Finally, this chapter explores the various ways in which responding organisations monitor their LGBT staff and service users, customers or clients. Overall, the research has shown that while there is generally good policy coverage of LGB and T equalities amongst those organisations which responded, this coverage is not universal - there are some disparities between the engagement with the three equality duties and the monitoring of LGBT staff members and service users.

2.2 LGBT-inclusion in policies

All of the public sector organisations who responded (100%, n=10) demonstrated that they had policies explicitly addressing sexuality. This could be phrased in a variety of ways, including 'sexuality', 'sexual orientation' and 'sexual identity'. Likewise, all respondents (100%, n=10) demonstrated that they had policies specifically addressing trans equality. As with sexuality, above, a variety of terms were used, including 'gender reassignment', 'transsexual' and 'transgender'. Finally, all (100%, n=10) demonstrated that their Equality Impact Assessments addressed LGBT equalities.

These findings indicate that the 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity' protected characteristics of the Equality Act 2010 are being engaged with at a policy level by the public sector in Hastings and Rother.

2.3 Equality Duty A – eliminating discrimination

All of the public sector organisations (100%, n=10) could demonstrate that their policies and practices addressed Equality Duty A – the elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation of LGBT people.

Some organisations, such as Hastings Borough Council, East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service and the University of Brighton, had developed broadly inclusive Single Equalities Schemes and/or Equality & Diversity Policies, which made explicit the drive to remove discrimination across all equality strands or, using the newer language of the Equality Act 2010, ‘protected characteristics’. Others, such as the Sussex Partnership Trust, the East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust, Sussex Police and East Sussex County Council, also dispersed the elimination of discrimination through a variety of more specific policies, such as those making clear policy on internal bullying, staff hiring policies and Dignity At Work policies.

2.4 Equality Duty B – advancing equality

Most organisations (80%, n=8) addressed Equality Duty B – advancing equality for LGBT people.

Rother and Wealden District Councils replied ‘don’t know’ (20%, n=2), which could reflect uncertainty about whether a specific policy addresses this or about the effectiveness of policies or their implementation.

Table 2.1: Addressing equality duty B (advancing equality)

	Number	Percentage
Yes	8	80%
No	0	0%
Don’t know	2	10%
Total	10	100%

Some members of the LGBT Equality Forum expressed surprise at the certainty that some organisations were meeting this equality duty, and suggested it may be difficult to be sure:

The only way [our organisation] would know that we're doing that was through the equality impact assessments. I'm just surprised that other organisations definitely know that that's happening... Equalities monitoring is not brilliant between all of [the responding organisations]... I'm looking at it and thinking [we] have been too honest!

The qualitative evidence received shows that while Equality Duty A saw a variety of approaches, organisations engaging with Equality Duty B cited their broader Single Equality Schemes or Equality & Diversity Policies as evidence of this. This may suggest a less targeted engagement with this equality duty, so that it forms an overarching ethos or overall policy direction.

The drives to eliminate LGBT discrimination and advance LGBT equality made explicit in Equality Duties A and B could be said to be broadly related to foregoing national legislation regarding LGBT

equality, such as the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 2000, which lowered the age of consent for same-sex couples in line with that of opposite-sex couples, and the Equality Act (Sexual Orientation) Regulations 2007, which prohibited discrimination based on sexual orientation in the private (as opposed to public) provision of goods and services. The general public and the public sector are thus already familiar with the drives to eliminate clear LGBT discrimination and improve LGBT equality with non-LGBT people. This previous work may have paved the way for the widespread engagement with Equality Duties A and B we see here.

2.5 Equality Duty C – fostering good relations

Equality Duty C was markedly less well addressed than duties A or B. As table 2.2, below, shows, 60% (n=6) of responding organisations said that they did address equality duty C – fostering good relations between people of different sexual orientations and between trans and cisgendered¹ people. However, Rother and Wealden District Councils (20%, n=2) were unsure, while Hastings Borough Council and the Fire & Rescue Service (20%, n=2) said that they were not addressing this duty.

Table 2.2: Addressing equality duty C (fostering good relations)

	Number	Percentage
Yes	6	60%
No	2	20%
Don't know	2	20%
Total	10	100%

Evidence received suggests that none of the organisations have a clear policy approach to addressing equality duty C. The most commonly cited evidence was the organisation's attendance at Pride in Brighton & Hove 2010, either in the form of marching in the parade or having a tent or stall in Preston Park. 3 public sector organisations – the Sussex Partnership Trust, Sussex Police and the University of Brighton - cited this as evidence of fostering good relations between LGBT people and non-LGBT people. East Sussex County Council Library & Information Services suggested their 'Human Library' project was an example of work done to foster good relations between people. Through this project, the Library & Information Service invited *'readers to talk to a range of human books, who represent different groups, communities or life experiences. The events aim to reduce stereotyping and discrimination by promoting understanding and learning about experiences different to your own'* (ESCC Library & Information Services 2011, Human Library Evaluation). Amongst the 'human

¹ Cisgendered is the term used to describe those whose sex assigned at birth is culturally associated with the gender they identify with throughout their lifetimes.

books' were two gay men and a trans woman. East Sussex County Council Children's Services also put forward their resources, including the 'All of Us' resource, designed in partnership with an East Sussex LGBT youth group to tackle LGBT bullying in local schools: *'It is a whole school guidance and teaching resource which was produced in partnership with Allsorts Youth project in Brighton and Brighton University with input from Stonewall. The DVD involved local young people talking about their experiences of coming out, support and homophobia. The pack includes lesson plans for use in PHSE.'*

While Equality Duties A and B have a basis in foregoing legislation, Equality Duty C seems to ask organisations to recognise the part non-LGBT people play in LGBT equality. This is an important shift in locating LGBT equalities as the concern of all people, not solely LGBT people. In addition, while Equality Duties A and B encourage a 'levelling' of LGBT people and non-LGBT people, so that both are treated 'equally' or the same, Equality Duty C seems to encourage the active recognition of difference. Finally, some members of the LGBT Equalities Forum suggested that certain public services (such as Children's Services) may find that addressing Duty C fits more naturally with their core work than others. Further work is needed to raise awareness of this aspect of the Act, to put it into practice, and to evaluate the effectiveness of various forms of interactions between LGBT/non-LGBT people in order to achieve the public duty as outlined in the Equality Act of 2010.

2.6 Monitoring

All of the public sector organisations (100%, n=10) were collecting data about their LGBT staff members through staff monitoring. Table 2.3 shows that the majority of these organisations (70%, n=7) said they were using this data to improve LGBT equality.

Table 2.3: Of those collecting data about LGBT staff members, is this data being used to improve LGBT equality?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	7	70%
No	3	30%
Don't know	0	0%
Total	10	100%

The number of those collecting data about LGBT service users was smaller – table 2.4 shows that not all (60%, n=6) were gathering data about their LGBT service users. Of these organisations who did

gather this data, the majority (67%, n=4) said that they were using this data to improve LGBT equality, as can be seen in table 2.5.

Table 2.4: Collecting data about LGBT service users

	Number	Percentage
Yes	6	60%
No	3	30%
Don't know	0	0%
N/A	1	10%
Total	10	100%

Table 2.5: Of those collecting data about LGBT service users, is this data being used to improve LGBT equality?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	4	67%
No	2	33%
Don't know	0	0%
Total	6	100%

Members of the LGBT Equalities Forum pointed out that some monitoring initiatives may be relatively new and that it takes time to gather usable data, which could explain why some data is not currently being used. Additionally, one member noted that since the data for this piece of research was gathered, actively using this data may no longer be a priority for local authorities:

'There's no longer a requirement to have an equalities scheme of any sort, but every authority must set equality targets. And then it's a case of publishing the data so the public can decide whether or not you're actually achieving them.'

This may make it all the more important for monitoring data to be not only gathered, but disseminated in a clear and useable form. Therefore this report recommends that further work should be done to improve the level of LGBT monitoring across services, and disseminated to LGBT communities empowered to use and critique the data..

2.7 Conclusions

LGBT equality is engaged with at a policy level by all of the public sector organisations in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex who responded to the research, demonstrating a wide acceptance of the need to deal with the 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity' characteristics identified by the Equality Act 2010. Organisations demonstrated a good overall policy coverage of Equality Duty A (eliminate discrimination) and Equality Duty B (advance LGBT equality), which may reflect foregoing

legislation and national and local policy which has driven such agendas in the past. However Equality Duty C (foster good relations) is less convincingly covered.

While staff monitoring is universal, there are much lower levels of monitoring for LGBT service users. In addition, a significant number of the responding public sector organisations who **were** collecting such data said they were not using their LGBT staff monitoring information (30%, n=3) to improve equality, and some said they were not using the LGBT service user monitoring information (33%, n=2).

3. Policy Implementation

3.1 Policy Implementation Overview

The section will now explore the extent and nature of training for staff about LGBT equality issues. Then it moves on to outlining staff groups/networks for LGBT staff, and ‘staff champions’ for LGBT equalities. Next, this chapter looks at whether organisations’ LGBT equalities work tends to consider LGBT as a bloc or whether separate identities within LGBT (such as gay male, lesbian, bisexual and trans) are specifically dealt with. After this it examines ‘multiple marginalisation’ or ‘dual discrimination’, LGBT inclusion in organisations’ Equality Impact Assessments, and finally how responding organisations’ media represents LGBT equality. In general responses vary between public sector organisations in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex.

It should be noted that, as members of the LGBT Equalities Forum have pointed out (see section 2.6), since this data was collected government interpretation of equalities legislation eliminates the requirement for public services to produce equalities schemes or annual reports about their equalities work. It is now considered sufficient for services to publish their equalities objectives and relevant data – the onus is now on communities (such as LGBT communities) to access and challenge public services’ equalities data, and to voice their challenges. Therefore, future research addressing some of the issues discussed in this chapter could be very beneficial in understanding a) the changes to LGBT equalities through these times, and b) the impact of the shift to community responsibility for equalities. This report recommends that such research be undertaken, and that local LGBT communities are aware of and empowered to challenge such data.

3.2 Staff training

All responding organisations included LGBT issues in training and development offered for staff (100%, n=10). See table 3.1 for details.

Table 3.1: LGBT equality issues addressed at some point in staff training.

	Number	Percentage
Yes	8	80%
No	2	20%
Don’t know	0	0%
Total	10	100%

However, LGBT issues were often included as a part of broader equalities or diversity training - few of these organisations (20%, n=2) demonstrated training specifically about LGBT equalities. The majority (80%, n=6) included LGBT equality as a part of more general equality and/or diversity training – see table 3.2, below.

Table 3.2: LGBT staff training as general equality/diversity or LGBT-specific.

	Number	Percentage
General + LGBT-specific	2	20%
General only	8	80%
Don't know	0	0%
Total	10	100%

The amount of time allotted to training may also be an issue – the University of Brighton reports that *‘The university has a network of harassment contacts, who every few years receive one day’s training on equality, diversity and harassment issues relevant to their role, including on LGBT harassment’*. Given the importance placed on staff training around LGBT equality issues by those trying to improve LGBT equality (see section 4.2 of this report), it may be useful to improve LGBT staff development, and use this to implement the three Equalities Duties that pertain specifically to LGBT people.

3.3 Staff groups

Slightly less than half (40%, n=4) of the public sector organisations who responded said they had some kind of internal LGBT staff network or group – see table 2.3.1, below.

Table 3.3: Is there an LGBT staff group or network?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	4	40%
No	6	60%
Don't know	0	0%
Total	10	100%

However, those LGBT staff groups and networks that did exist generally received support from their organisation (75%, n=3). All of the three LGBT staff groups and networks that described organisational support cited three forms that this support took:

- Monetary funding from their parent organisation.
- Use of parent organisation’s equipment and facilities.
- Time arranged to attend relevant meetings and events.

In the LGBT Equalities Forum, representatives of public sector organisations noted a variety of reasons why such groups might not exist. These included:

- The response from LGBT staff was sometimes that such a group was not needed;
- Staff said they did not want to be ‘out’ in the workplace;
- There may not be enough staff to form such a group, particularly since the public sector financial cuts made many staff members redundant;
- There may be no LGBT person willing or able to lead the group;
- Some staff feel unsure about attending without an action plan to follow.

Some of these reasons may be a cause for concern, particularly if staff feel unable to be out in their place of work. Recent research notes the improvements in staff productivity when staff members are out (Guasp & Balfour 2008). Unwillingness to come out could also suggest underlying homophobia or discomfort surrounding homosexuality, either amongst other staff or in the organisation itself. The Equality Act 2010 requires public sector employers to actively advance LGBT equality, and the ability to feel safe and protected from discrimination is a key aspect of this. The forum members discussed other ways their public sector organisations supported LGBT staff through groups and networks, such as signposting LGBT staff members towards local LGBT community groups and organisations like the Hastings and Rother Rainbow Alliance (HRRA), or offering broader ‘equalities’ groups or forums. Therefore the lack of an LGBT staff network or group was believed by some forum members to not necessarily be indicative of less importance placed on LGBT equality. Nonetheless, given recent research, it is also important to ensure that the reasons LGBT staff groups do not exist is not because employees do not feel that they cannot come out or be part of such a group.

3.4 Staff champions

Half of responding organisations (50%, n=5) said that they had an organisational or staff champion or advocate particularly focused LGBT equalities; the other half did not – see table 3.4, below.

Table 3.4: Does the organisation have a staff champion for LGBT equalities?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	5	50%
No	5	50%
Don’t know	0	0%
Total	10	100%

Three organisations had more than one champion, and these champions tended to occupy high-level positions in their respective organisations. This may demonstrate commitment to LGBT equalities within the upper tiers of these public sector organisations (see table 3.5).

Table 3.5: LGBT Equality Champions by organisation and position

Organisation	Equality Champion	Position in Organisation
Sussex Partnership Trust	Dr Richard Ford	Executive Commercial Director
Sussex Partnership Trust	Helen Greatorex	Executive Director of Nursing
East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust	Jim Davey	Director Lead for Sexual Orientation Equality and Gender Identity Equality
Sussex Police	Graham Bartlett	Chief Superintendent
Sussex Police	David Miller	Superintendent
East Sussex Fire & Rescue	Garry Ferrand	Assistant Chief Fire Officer
East Sussex County Council	Peter Jones	Leader of East Sussex County Council

3.5 Identity-specific policies within LGBT

Whereas all of the responding public sector organisations had sections of policies addressing issues specific to trans or gender identity (100%, n=10; see section 2.2, earlier), there were virtually no instances of policies engaging with specific sexualities such as gay male, lesbian and bi/bisexual. Instead, policies focused on ‘LGB’ or ‘LGBT’, or on sexualities and sexual identities as a whole. The Hastings & Rother Primary Care Trust highlighted some specific policy engagements with lesbians (specifically the lesbian partners of new mothers), but aside from this no lesbian-specific policies were shown - see table 3.6, below. Although separate identities such as gay male, lesbian and bi/bisexual were included on monitoring forms (see chapter 2.6, earlier), there were no policies which dealt specifically with gay men’s equality issues or bi equality issues. This is particularly problematic for bisexual people. Evidence suggests that bi identities cannot be subsumed into gay/lesbian or straight, and that bi people can be multiply marginalised and experience specific difficulties because of their bi identities/lives (see for example Browne & Lim 2008).

Table 3.6: Does the organisation have policies specifically referring to lesbian equality issues?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	1	10%
No	9	90%
Don’t know	0	0%
Total	10	100%

3.6 Multiple marginalisation and dual discrimination

The Equality Act 2010 deals with equalities across seven ‘protected characteristics’, and all of the public sector organisations in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex who responded (100%, n=10) demonstrated policy engagement with equality issues outside of LGBT, for example race, ethnicity, religion and economic class.

However, the evidence was less positive about responding organisations’ policy engagement with ‘dual discrimination’ – that is, the equality issues specific to people who fall under two (or more) ‘protected characteristics’, such as black and LGBT, or disabled and LGBT, as opposed to simply an amalgamation of the equality issues facing each characteristic. The Equality Act 2010 describes this as ‘a combination of two relevant protected characteristics’ (Equality Act 2010 14:1). This research suggested that relatively few organisations (30%, n=3) actively addressed LGBT dual discrimination in their equality policies. See table 3.7, below.

Table 3.7: Do the organisation’s policies address ‘dual discrimination’?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	3	30%
No	7	70%
Don’t know	0	0%
Total	10	100%

The evidence here may be less clear due to the terminology used by the research questionnaire,. It specifically inquired about ‘multiple marginalisation’, rather than ‘dual discrimination’ because this is the terminology used by LGBT communities and was used in earlier projects by the academic researchers. While some responding organisations did accept the phrase ‘multiple marginalisation’ as analogous with ‘dual discrimination’ and responded accordingly, others may not have given a full account of their policy engagement with these kinds of equality issues.

Finally, in the qualitative data provided by organisations, some respondents openly expressed doubt or concern regarding the resources necessary to effectively deal with multiple marginalisation / dual discrimination. For example, the University of Brighton indicated a resourcing problem which resulted in less attention paid to these issues:

‘limited resources mean that priorities generally involve working across the broad equalities agenda rather than specific multiple marginalisation issues.’

On a different note, the Adult Social Care department of East Sussex County Council highlighted uncertainty about how widespread the general policy approach to multiple marginalisation was, saying:

‘There is a general policy position that younger and older disabled service users and carers are from a variety of backgrounds and may identify with many different groups of people. How far this is generalised throughout the workforce is unclear however’

This may suggest that dual discrimination / multiple marginalisation is a complex policy area, that has yet to be fully understood/addressed.

The case of blurred, conflicting and/or confusing terminology highlights one further potential problem in dealing with equality issues across multiple organisations in the public sector, but also across the various ‘spheres’ of society, such as statutory services, LGBT communities and academic work around LGBT equalities. This can also be seen from section 2.2, in which it was noted that various forms of terminology were used with reference to sexuality and gender identity.

Additionally, there has been a shift in the legislative language over the past decade, such as that from the ‘equality strands’ of foregoing equalities legislation to the ‘protected characteristics’ of the Equality Act 2010. When considering partnership work or commissioning services across the public, private, academic and community spheres, work needs to be undertaken to develop mutually agreed terminologies that are recognisable by those named by the terms being used. These may be locally specific and relating to the names and labels used in a particular area/amongst particular groups.

3.7 LGBT inclusion in organisational media

Most responding organisations (80%, n=8) said that they produced some media (such as images, pamphlets, posters, websites, etc) that was LGBT-inclusive and specifically targeted at LGBT people.

Table 3.8: Does the organisation produce inclusive media targeted at LGBT people?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	8	80%
No	2	20%
Don't know	0	0%
Total	10	100%

However, less than half (40%, n=4) said that they used LGBT-inclusive language, imagery and/or signage in their ‘mainstream’ media, as opposed to that targeted specifically at LGBT people – see table 3.9.

Table 3.9: Does the organisation produce LGBT-inclusive ‘mainstream’ media?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	4	40%
No	6	60%
Don’t know	0	0%
Total	10	100%

Qualitative data received suggested that LGBT people in organisational media were a particularly difficult area. For some, evidence was difficult to substantiate:

‘I’d say yes but I think it would be hard to evidence it.’ (Hastings Borough Council)

Others were aware of criticism but saw it as a difficult area due to restrictions on symbols:

‘There has been a lot of criticism and feedback from HRRAs and others that the ASC material does not give a message of being LGB and T friendly. The issue is not upfront. The suggestion is to use images and symbols such as the rainbow image. It is not yet practice to do this and there is a view that the use of symbols has to be limited. It would be useful to move forward on this as it is one of the areas of a great deal of criticism.’ (Adult Social Care, East Sussex County Council)

There is thus a disparity between LGBT-targeting and LGBT-mainstreaming in the use of appropriate, welcoming and recognisable signage and imagery, along with the difficulties of inclusion expressed through the qualitative data. Along with East Sussex County Council’s comments, the issue of inclusive LGBT media has been regularly raised at meetings of the LGBT Equalities Forum, suggesting that there is a desire for more work surrounding this.

3.8 Conclusions

This chapter reveals a fragmented picture of LGBT equalities within public sector services in the Hastings and Rother area. Staff training about LGBT equalities is widespread, but few organisations said that they had specific training about LGBT equalities – most incorporated LGBT issues as part of a broader equalities and/or diversity training session. Many of the public sector organisations said that they had networks or groups for LGBT staff, and those these tended to be well-supported by their parent organisations; however it was argued by some LGBT Equalities Forum members that the

absence of these should not be taken as an example of a lack of commitment to LGBT equalities. Member of the LGBT Equalities Forum also noted the importance of signposting staff members to local LGBT community groups and organisations, such as the Hastings & Rother Rainbow Alliance (HRRRA). Five organisations had designated 'staff champions' dedicated to LGBT equality. These champions tended to occupy high-level positions in their respective organisations, which may demonstrate a commitment to LGBT equality from the higher tiers of management.

While trans identities were dealt with specifically at the policy level, there was virtually no evidence of policy engagement with specific sexual identities, such as lesbian, gay male and bi/bisexual. This could be problematic, particularly for bi people.

Some of the public sector organisations suggested that dual discrimination / multiple marginalisation was a particularly difficult or problematic area - further work is needed to understand locally specific work that engages with terminologies and languages.

Finally, although most public sector organisations were producing LGBT-positive promotional materials targeted specifically at LGBT people, few were including LGBT-positive images or signage in their 'mainstream' promotional materials.

4. Looking to the Future

4.1 Overview of Looking to the Future

This section highlights the research’s findings surrounding the public sector service cuts. It begins by discussing what the responding organisations thought about whether the cuts would affect their LGBT equality work, and what methods they said they would use to try to ensure that it does not. It then reveals data about how receptive the responding organisations were to assistance in improving LGBT equality, and what kinds of assistance they ask for. While there is some concern over the forthcoming financial cuts to public sector services and how these might impact on LGBT equalities, organisations are open to assistance and are eager to improve their work for LGBT equalities.

4.2 Public sector financial cuts and LGBT equality

Although most responding organisations (70%, n=7) said that the coming public sector financial cuts would not affect their LGBT equality work, the remaining third (30%, n=3) said they were unsure whether it would or would not, which suggests a considerable degree of concern. See table 4.1, below.

Table 4.1: Does the organisation think the cuts will impact on their LGBT equality work?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	0	0%
No	7	70%
Don’t know	3	30%
Total	10	100%

Most responding organisations (including those answering ‘Don’t know’ in table 4.1) said that the main means they would use to try to ensure LGBT people were not adversely impacted by the financial cuts was their Equality Impact Assessments (80%, n=8).

Other means of ensuring this were also detailed, as shown in table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Methods to ensure LGBT people are not adversely impacted by cuts.

	Number	Percentage
Equality Impact Assessments	8	80%
Liaising and partnership with other organisations	2	20%

Staff training/information about the cuts	1	10%
Community engagement	1	10%

Some members of the LGBT Equalities Forum raised potential problems with ‘partnership’ and ‘community engagement’, which they suggested may place a burden on already-stretched communities and community groups. Thus the public sector financial cuts and attempts to address this might adversely impact on LGBT people and communities. Further work on effective methods, as well as the effects of public sector financial cuts, could identify means to mitigate against these potential dangers.

4.3 Assistance in improving LGBT equality

All responding organisations demonstrated that they would welcome assistance in improving LGBT equality. A wide variety of types of assistance were sought. These have been collated into 6 categories and detailed in table 4.3, below. As can be seen, the most popularly-requested type of assistance were for more partnership work with the LGBT community (40%, n=4) and more or improved training for staff about LGBT equality issues (40%, n=4), suggesting that these might be areas which organisations should look closely at if they wish to improve LGBT equalities.

Table 4.3: Types of assistance requested in improving LGBT equality.

	Number	Percentage
Partnership work – LGBT community	4	40%
Improved/more staff training	4	40%
Partnership work – public services or institutions	2	20%
Further research/improving information	2	20%
More resources for equalities work	1	10%

4.4 Conclusions

This chapter explored the public sector’s responses to the financial cuts imposed by the UK government in 2011, and asked how these cuts would affect LGBT equalities in the local Hastings and Rother area. Services were generally positive, with none saying that the cuts would definitely affect LGBT equalities work and most saying that they would not. Most also said that their main means for ensuring this would be their Equality Impact Assessments, though a variety of other methods were also posited. Evaluating these methods could ensure that LGBT people are not adversely impacted by public sector work, to mitigate against the implications of the financial cuts.

Finally, all of the responding public sector organisations demonstrated in the research that they would welcome assistance in improving LGBT equality. The most commonly-requested or desired

types of assistance were partnership work with LGBT communities and community groups, and more or improved staff training around LGBT issues.

5. Conclusions

This research comes from a mapping exercise designed by the Hastings, Rother and East Sussex LGBT Equalities Forum, consisting of LGBT community groups, Public Sector providers and University of Brighton academic researchers. 10 organisations responded to a questionnaire consisting of generic and targeted questions. This report outlines the main findings of the questions asked to all of the organisations under the headings Policy Requirements, Policy Implementation and Looking to the Future.

Policy Requirements

LGBT equality is engaged with at a policy level by all of the public sector organisations in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex who responded to the research, demonstrating a wide acceptance of the need to deal with the 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity' characteristics identified by the Equality Act 2010. Organisations demonstrated a good overall policy coverage of Equality Duty A (eliminate discrimination) and Equality Duty B (advance LGBT equality), which may reflect foregoing legislation and national and local policy which has driven such agendas in the past. However Equality Duty C (foster good relations) is less well covered.

While staff monitoring is universal, levels of monitoring for LGBT service users is not as well developed. A significant number of the responding public sector organisations who **were** collecting such data said they were not using their LGBT staff monitoring information (30%, n=3) to improve equality, and some said they were not using the LGBT service user monitoring information (33%, n=2).

Policy Implementation

Staff training about LGBT equalities is widespread, but few organisations said that they had specific training about LGBT equalities – most incorporated LGBT issues as part of a broader equalities and/or diversity training session. There was a lack of LGBT-specific training for staff in 8 organisations.

Many of the public sector organisations said that they had networks or groups for LGBT staff, and those these tended to be well-supported by their parent organisations; it was argued by some in the LGBT Equalities Forum that the absence of these should not be taken as an example of a lack of commitment to LGBT equalities. Members of the LGBT Equalities Forum also noted the importance

of signposting staff members to local LGBT community groups and organisations, such as the Hastings & Rother Rainbow Alliance (HARRA).

Many organisations also had designated ‘staff champions’ dedicated to LGBT equality. These champions tended to occupy high-level positions in their respective organisations, which may demonstrate a commitment to LGBT equality from the higher tiers of management.

While trans identities were dealt with specifically at the policy level, there was virtually no evidence of policy engagement with specific sexual identities, such as lesbian, gay male and bi/bisexual. This could be problematic, particularly for bi people.

The research revealed some issues surrounding dual discrimination / multiple marginalisation. Some of the public sector organisations suggested that this was a particularly difficult or problematic area, suggesting that further work is needed, including on developing understanding of locally meaningful terminologies.

Although most public sector organisations were producing LGBT-positive promotional materials targeted specifically at LGBT people, few were including LGBT-positive images or signage in their ‘mainstream’ promotional materials.

Looking to the Future

The public sector’s responses to the financial cuts imposed by the UK government in 2011 was generally positive, with none saying that the cuts would definitely affect LGBT equalities work and most saying that they would not. Most also said that their main means for ensuring this would be their Equality Impact Assessments, though a variety of other methods were also posited.

All of the responding public sector organisations demonstrated in the research that they would welcome assistance in improving LGBT equality. The most commonly-requested or desired types of assistance were partnership work with LGBT communities and community groups, and more or improved staff training around LGBT issues.

6. Recommendations

This report uses the evidence presented here, discussions in the LGBT Equalities forum and the legal duties under the Equality Act (2010) to make recommendations for three separate groups – public services and organisations, LGBT communities and community groups, and the LGBT Equalities Forum itself.

6.1 Public Services

It is recommended that public services:

1. Develop and evaluate approaches to meeting Equality Duty C (fostering good relations);
2. Improve LGBT reporting/monitoring rates, and ensure that data collected is disseminated in a useable form to LGBT communities;
3. Ensure LGBT communities are aware of LGBT equalities policies, provisions and data, and are empowered and resourced to challenge them;
4. Involve LGBT service users and community members in setting equality objectives and evaluations, in monitoring progress and in the design of new services.
5. Make available a variety of LGBT-specific learning and development interventions for staff;
6. Address the particular needs and experiences of specific sexual identities, eg. gay male, lesbian and bi/bisexual;
7. Improve understanding of dual discrimination / multiple marginalisation, and develop practical ways (including consultation with LGBT communities) of addressing this;
8. Engage in further work to develop organisations' abilities to use appropriate, LGBT-positive imagery in their mainstream promotional materials;
9. Establish and evaluate methods to ensure LGBT equalities are not adversely impacted by the public sector financial cuts;

6.2 LGBT Communities & Community Groups

It is recommended that LGBT communities and groups:

1. Work towards, and are supported in, increasing awareness of public services' LGBT equality policies;
2. Offer opportunities and empower LGBT people to access and understand equalities data and information released by public services;
3. Speak up and challenge equalities information and data released by public services.

6.3 LGBT Equalities Forum

It is recommended that the LGBT Equalities Forum:

1. Observes, shares and discusses learnings from recommendations in 6.1 and 6.2;
2. Shares information about LGBT equalities work and data across a variety of sectors and perspectives;
3. Considers and seeks funding to undertake future research building on this 'snapshot' of local LGBT equalities, including key service areas not examined in this mapping exercise such as housing services and GPs.

References

Browne, K. & Lim, J. (2008) *Bisexual report: Count Me In Too additional analysis report*. Brighton: Spectrum & University of Brighton.

ESiF (2011) *Deprivation in East Sussex in 2011*.

<http://www.eastsussexinfigures.org.uk/nesstar/temp/EGMS20110331152226686/IMD+2011-briefing-headline-FINAL.pdf>, accessed 23/10/11.

Fairley, A. & Noudjem, N. (2004) *Go Hastings!: Report of findings from research into the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered community in Hastings & St Leonards, East Sussex*. Hastings: Hastings & Rother Rainbow Alliance.

Guasp, A. & Balfour, J. (2008) *Peak Performance: Gay people and productivity*. London: Stonewall

Appendix 1 – Questionnaire

LGBT Equality Policies

1) Does your organisation have policies that relate to lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) equality? (please tick)

- i. YES___ (go to Q1a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q2)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q2)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q2)

1a) If yes, please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q2.

2) Does your organisation account for 'multiple marginalisation' with regard to LGBT people (eg. LGBT people with disabilities, older and younger LGBT people)? (please tick)

- i. YES___ (go to Q2a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q3)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q3)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q3)

2a) If yes, please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q3.

3) Does your organisation collect data about LGBT service users? (please tick)

- i. YES___ (go to Q3a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q4)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q4)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q4)

3a) If yes, what data is collected? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q3b.

3b) In what ways is this data used? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q4.

4) Have your organisation's Equality Impact Assessments addressed LGBT issues?

- i. YES___ (go to Q4a)

- ii. NO___ (go to Q5)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q5)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q5)

4a) If yes, have these Equality Impact Assessments been acted upon? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q5.

5) Does your organisation try to ensure that its public information and media is LGBT friendly?

- i. YES___ (go to Q5a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q6)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q6)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q6)

5a) If yes, in what ways does it do so? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q6.

6) Will the cuts in public services announced in October 2010 affect LGBT equalities work in your service?

- i. YES___ (go to Q6a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q7)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q7)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q7)

6a) If yes, in what ways will they do so? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q7.

7) What would help your organisation to take further positive steps to improve LGBT equality in your organisation?

LGBT Equality and Staff

1) Does your organisation collect data about LGBT staff members?

- i. YES___ (go to Q1a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q2)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q2)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q2)

1a) If yes, what data is collected? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q1b.

1b) How is this data used? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q2.

2) Does your organisation offer LGBT-related staff training?

- i. YES___ (go to Q2a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q3)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q3)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q3)

2a) If yes, when were these offered and to whom? Please provide details in the space provided, and send Nick McGlynn a recent schedule and agenda as an attachment. Continue to Q2b.

2b) Is LGBT-related staff training compulsory?

- i. YES___ (go to Q3)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q3)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q3)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q3)

3) Are there any LGBT staff associations or groups in your organisation?

- i. YES___ (go to Q3a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q4)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q4)

iv. N/A___ (go to Q4)

3a) If yes, please provide details of these groups and their activities in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn details as an attachment. Continue to Q3b.

3b) What support do they receive from your organisation? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q4.

4) Does your organisation have a member of staff responsible for championing LGBT equalities?

i. YES___ (go to Q4a)

ii. NO___ (go to next section)

iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to next section)

iv. N/A___ (go to next section)

4a) If yes, please provide specific details of the staff and their roles and responsibilities in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn details as an attachment. Continue to next section.

The Equality Act 2010 and LGBT People

- 1) How is your organisation informing its staff about the LGBT-related parts of the Equality Act 2010? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment.

Note: The Equality Act charges public authorities with a proactive duty to

- a. eliminate LGBT discrimination,
- b. advance LGBT equality,
- c. foster understanding between LGBT people and non-LGBT people.

- 2) Does your organisation address duty a: eliminate LGBT discrimination?

- i. YES___ (go to Q2a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q3)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q3)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q3)

2a) If yes, please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q3.

- 3) Does your organisation address duty b: advance LGBT equality?

- i. YES___ (go to Q3a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q4)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q4)
- iv. N/A___ (go to Q4)

3a) If yes, please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q4.

- 4) Does your organisation address duty c: foster understanding between LGBT people and non-LGBT people?

- i. YES___ (go to Q4a)
- ii. NO___ (go to Q5)
- iii. DON'T KNOW___ (go to Q5)

iv. N/A___ (go to Q5)

4a) If yes, please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment. Continue to Q5.

5) In what ways will your organization ensure that LGBT people are not disproportionately affected by the public sector service cuts announced in October 2010? Please provide details in the space provided, and/or send Nick McGlynn specific policies as an attachment.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire and helping us to map LGBT equalities in Hastings, Rother and East Sussex. If your organisation would like to get involved in this initiative please let Nick McGlynn know.

Please return your completed questionnaire to Nick McGlynn at the University of Brighton by email (n.mcglynn@brighton.ac.uk) or mail to:

School of Environment & Technology,

Cockcroft Building,

Lewes Road,

Brighton BN2 4GJ

Appendix 2 – Public Service Responses by Category

<u>Organisation / Category</u>	Hastings Borough Council	Sussex Partnership Trust	East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust	NHS PCT Hastings & Rother	Sussex Police	University of Brighton	East Sussex Fire & Rescue	Rother District Council	Wealden District Council	East Sussex County Council
2.2 - Sexual identity addressed in policies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.2 - Gender identity addressed in policies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.2 - Equality Impact Assessments address LGBT equalities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.3 - Equality duty A, eliminate LGBT discrimination	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.4 - Equality duty B, advance LGBT equality	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Don't Know	Don't Know	Yes
2.5 - Equality duty C, foster understanding between LGBT people and non-LGBT people	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Don't Know	Don't Know	Yes
2.6 - Monitoring LGBT service users	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Organisation / Category	Hastings Borough Council	Sussex Partnership Trust	East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust	NHS PCT Hastings & Rother	Sussex Police	University of Brighton	East Sussex Fire & Rescue	Rother District Council	Wealden District Council	East Sussex County Council
2.6 - Using monitoring data about LGBT service users	No	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	No
2.6 - Monitoring LGBT staff	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.6 - Using monitoring data about LGBT staff	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.2 - LGBT training offered for staff	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.2 - Training either general equality/diversity OR LGBT-specific	General	LGBT-specific	General	General	General	General	General	General	General	Yes
3.3 - LGBT staff group or organisation	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
3.3 - LGBT staff group or organisation well supported	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	No	N/A	N/A	Yes
3.4 - LGBT equalities staff 'champion'	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
3.5 - Gay male specific policies	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

Organisation / Category	Hastings Borough Council	Sussex Partnership Trust	East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust	NHS PCT Hastings & Rother	Sussex Police	University of Brighton	East Sussex Fire & Rescue	Rother District Council	Wealden District Council	East Sussex County Council
3.5 - Lesbian specific policies	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
3.5 - Bi specific policies	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
3.6 - Policies address multiple marginalisation / dual discrimination	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
3.7 - LGBT-inclusive media, targeted at LGBT people	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.7 - LGBT-inclusive media, targeted at 'mainstream'	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
4.2 - Will cuts impact on LGBT people?	Don't know	No	No	No	No	Don't know	No	No	No	Don't know
4.3 - Welcoming assistance in improving LGBT equality	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

