Family Science Review

ISSN: 2331-6780
Journal: https://www.familyscienceassociation.org/journal/

Adding a Course about LGBTQ+ Families to Family Science Curriculum

Áine M. Humble, Department of Aging and Family Science, Mount Saint Vincent University

ABSTRACT. This article explains why a full course on LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, plus) families is needed for family science curriculum instead of incorporating small amounts of LGBTQ+ family content into preexisting courses. It also describes the development of a feminist-informed online, hybrid undergraduate course focusing on LGBTQ+ families, which was reviewed by members of the queer community during development and at completion. Most of the required reading consisted of three books providing first-hand accounts of LGBTQ+ family experiences, whereas class content focused on scholarly work. Many classes also involved prerecorded interviews with LGBTQ+ individuals and practitioners working with LGBTQ+ families. A reflective exercise related to the assigned books and a final learnings paper connected to the scholarly work are briefly described. Two appendices are provided: the first provides more information about the course assignments, and the second is a rubric for the final learnings paper.

Keywords: curriculum development, family science, feminism, hybrid learning, LGBTQ+ families

Cite this article (APA 7):
Humble, A. M. (2025). Adding a course about LGBTQ+ families to family science curriculum. *Family Science Review, 29*(1). https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190

Published online: July 2025
Submit your article to this journal

Direct correspondence to: Áine M. Humble, Ph.D., Department of Aging and Family Science, Mount Saint Vincent University, E-mail: aine.humble@msvu.ca

Adding a Course about LGBTQ+ Families to Family Science Curriculum

We live in a world with tremendous family diversity, including families that have at least one LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, plus) member. Yet, cultural ideologies such as heteronormativity (Oswald et al., 2004) and various phobias related to the LGBTQ+ community (e.g., transphobia, biphobia) make it difficult for these families to reach their potentials, and Family Science (FS) practitioners are generally unprepared to understand their needs and experiences (van Eeden-Moorefield et al., 2018). More education on this topic is needed. Thus, this paper describes the process of developing an undergraduate university course focused solely on LGBTQ+ families. After providing a rationale for this course's creation, I describe its development, content, and assignments.

Documenting the Amount of LGBTQ+ Families Scholarship

Allen and Demo (1995) were the first scholars to document FS research about LGBTQ+ families, focusing on lesbians and gay men who were parents. Examining content in the *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *Family Relations*, and the *Journal of Family Issues* from 1980 to 1993, they found that less than 0.5% (n = 12) had explicit content about LGBTQ+ families or sexual orientation, and another 3% (n = 77) had implicit content.

Since that time, three more studies have examined the prevalence of LGBTQ+ focused family or relationship research. Zrenchik and Craft (2016) and van Eeden-Moorefield and colleagues (2018) examined the same three journals and added more journals to their analyses. Zrenchik and Craft added seven more journals and examined content from 2002 to 2012. They concluded that 2.2% (n = 130) of the total scholarship focused on LGBTQ+ family issues. Van Eeden added four journals and examined content from 2000 to 2015, of which 2.24% (n = 153) focused on the LGBTQ+ population. Pollitt et al. (2023) identified 92 LGBTQ+ focused articles (representing 4.2% of the empirical content) over two decades (2002 to 2021) in the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* and *Personal Relationships*.

The findings from these three studies suggest a very small increase in the amount of scholarship on LGBTQ+ family issues since Allen and Demo's (1995) study. However, the existing research is limited by a lack of intersectional analyses (e.g., samples are typically White, cisgender, middle-class). In their decade review of sexual- and gender-minority (SGM) families, Reczek (2020) highlighted three gaps related to (a) queer diversity in samples (e.g., very little information about intersex or genderqueer individuals), (b) racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity, and (c) age diversity (i.e., lack of content about LGBTQ+ families later in life—see Allen and Lavender-Stott, 2020, for a review on this topic).

Of course, LGBTQ+ content is published in journals other than the ones included in the aforementioned studies. For example, sexuality-focused journals include LGBTQ+ relationship content, and the *Journal of Family Theory & Review* has a few LGBTQ+ focused review articles, such as Clark's (2023) social exchange exploration of asexual individuals' relationships with allosexual partners and Gupta's (2024) review of polyamorous and consensual non-monogamous relationships. Relevant content can also be found in non-American journals (e.g., Humble, 2013). The *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, founded in 2005, was not included in any of the three most recent studies, and many LGBTQ+ focused scholars publish their work there. In 2018, Bible et al. (2018) noted that "this journal fills a critical void" (p. 338) due to the low level of LGBTQ+ content published in other FS-related journals. Finally, LGBTQ+ family research can be found in other sources, such as books and edited books (e.g., Goldberg and Allen's 2020 edited book about LGBTQ-parent families). Grey literature and reports geared toward the general public from organizations such as Family Equality Council (https://familyequality.org/) and the Family Acceptance Project (https://familyproject.sfsu.edu/) are also helpful.

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

My interpretation of this was that even though LGBTQ+ families are a vastly understudied FS topic (van Eeden-Moorefield et al., 2018), the empirical study of LGBTQ+ families has grown enough in the past decade that there is sufficient content to offer a course just on this topic. Indeed, in preparing my rationale for this course, I located over 200 potentially relevant journal articles, in addition to books and grey literature.

Rationale for a Course on LGBTQ+ Families

There are more important reasons for offering a course on LGBTQ+ families than simply having enough content to do so. For FS students to have a good understanding of the complexity of contemporary family experiences, a wide variety of family experiences and configurations must be studied, and LGBTQ+ families are an important part of this diversity. Approximately 4.5% of the United States population identifies as LGBTQ+ (Family Equality Council, 2020), and these individuals represent children, partners, parents, and other family members in many family configurations. Moreover, because of their unique position in societies, studying LGBTQ+ families provides "novel insights into family processes" (Russell, 2019, p. 365) and thus contributes to FS students' critical understanding of family life and development.

LGBTQ+ families might be included in content in other FGSN courses, but typically in small amounts. Moreover, when incorporated into other courses, LGBTQ+ families are often presented as a unified group, which is problematic. The LGBTQ+ community represents a broad group of people who have different relationship experiences, and presenting LGBTQ+ families as a monolithic entity not only renders this diversity invisible but also ignores intracommunity conflictual dynamics (for example, bisexual, gender diverse individuals, or polyamorous individuals feeling misunderstood or rejected by other members of "the community"). People's other social locations add further complexity to their experiences (Goldberg & Allen, 2018). Thus, in an LGBTQ+ families course, instructors can (and *must*) look separately at the experiences of lesbians, gay men, trans people, polyamorous families, asexual individuals, and so on, as well as examine how other social identities such as race, class, and immigration status intersect with SGM identities (where such research exists). Focusing a full course on this topic allows for a much more effective examination of the complexity of family development and dynamics differentially experienced by LGBTQ+ individuals and their families.

In a full course, instructors can also spend more time on topics. For example, they can talk about the importance of chosen families, the dynamics of queer polyfamilies, and critically examine specific experiences related to intimate partner experiences of individuals who are bisexual or asexual. Numerous parenting topics can be discussed, such as the process of becoming a parent; parenting children who are trans, gender diverse, or non-binary; resiliency in families in which a parent comes out as trans; second-generation children (LGBTQ+ children with LGBTQ+ parents); and Black lesbian couples' experiences of social support. Instructors can add much-needed age diversity to the course with topics such as older individuals' transitions later in life and caregiving issues for older gay men living with HIV.

Additional benefits to teaching students about LGBTQ+ families exist (Goldberg & Allen, 2018). Teaching LGBTQ+ family content can help improve the campus climate for LGBTQ+ students, faculty, and staff (and those who have LGBTQ+ family members) who see themselves clearly represented and validated in the curriculum. Learning about this topic can help foster awareness and understanding in heterosexual and/or cisgender students, many of whom will go on to work in service professions and other related areas (e.g., education) and work with families with a range of backgrounds and experiences, including those who identify as LGBTQ+. Emotional support is vital in helping

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

LGBTQ+ families deal with many issues across the life course (Humble, 2021), but a lack of self-efficacy and knowledge can be a barrier for professionals toward offering such support and offering it effectively (Rossetto et al., 2014). Gaining an understanding of the various issues that LGBTQ+ families face, as well as their strengths, can help both current and future human service professionals be more effective in working with these families.

My Theoretical Orientation and Positionality

The theoretical underpinnings of this course are feminist and intersectional. Early in my career, my pedagogical approach was influenced by feminist FS pedagogy published in the late 1980s and early- to mid-1990s (Allen, 1988; MacDermid et al., 1992), with a major emphasis on teaching about family diversity (Thompson & Walker, 1995). Around that time, I also read Allen's (1995) powerful article about how she came out to students about her sexual orientation, and this strongly influenced me to think about heterosexual privilege in the classroom.

Scholarship about intersectionality (e.g., Few-Demo, 2014) and queer theory (e.g., Oswald et al., 2004; Oswald et al., 2009) further contributed to my understandings, and later, I co-authored a paper about how to incorporate these two perspectives into family theory courses (Few-Demo et al., 2016). Goldberg and Allen's (2018) and Kuvalanka et al.'s (2013) articles about teaching about LGBTQ+ identities in FS have also been excellent resources. With regard to Kuvalanka et al.'s paper, I am lucky to teach at a university strongly influenced by feminist principles and there has been no institutional resistance to increasing LGBTQ+ content in courses or curriculum (I will return to this point in the concluding comments).

In terms of my positionality as it relates to the queer community, I identify primarily as heterosexual and cisgender, and I have been married to a heterosexual cisman for almost 20 years (I am also middle class, White, and have lived with a hearing impairment for most of my life). Thus, I approached the development of this course as an ally of the queer community, not as a member of it. However, interestingly, while developing this course, I also realized that my lifetime sexuality experiences were congruent with greysexuality, which refers to a group of asexual individuals whose sexuality falls between being allosexual and asexual (Schneider, 2022; see the Asexuality Visibility and Education Network [AVEN] for more information). So, I learned that I occupied a very small corner of this broad community.

Because of my predominant heterosexual and cisgender identities, I made sure that the course was reviewed by members of the LGBTQ+ community while it was being developed. This occurred in two ways. First, the course outline was reviewed by six SGM individuals who represented faculty, current and graduated Aging and Family Science undergraduate and graduate students, and current and former students in Women's Studies, Social Work, and Education. These individuals provided input and communicated their support for the course. Second, one of the faculty members also reviewed the course after it was fully developed for online delivery and before it was offered for the first time. Importantly, all of these individuals received an honorarium from a grant I received to support the development of the course. This financial acknowledgement played an important role in recognizing their lived experiences, expertise, and time.

Course Format

This course was developed in response to a request from a Coordinator of the Minor in Queer Studies at my university. Any undergraduate student can complete this minor as part of their degree. For the minor, students take one required Women's Studies course about queer studies and an additional 2.5

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

credits (five [12-week] semester courses) from eight course offerings: this third-year course on LGBTQ+ families offered by the Aging and Family Science Department and seven other courses offered by English, Sociology/Anthropology, and Women's Studies. The LGBTQ+ families course is also an elective course in our FS programs (minor, concentration, and combined major).

This course was offered as a "multi-mode" online course, consisting of 24 classes, of which one-quarter were synchronous and three-quarters were asynchronous. This hybrid structure was helpful to reach people who find it difficult to attend classes in person (Stolz & Green, 2020). Starting with the first class, the synchronous classes (75 minutes in length) were held at a time of day convenient for students who live in different time zones in North America and Europe. Additionally, to encourage more students to take the course, the only prerequisite was one year of university study (or instructor permission). The asynchronous classes, which took approximately the same amount of time to complete, had deadlines by which each "lesson" had to be completed. In each lesson, students watched several videos (e.g., prerecorded PowerPoint slide videos, interviews with practitioners), and answered reflective questions in Nearpod lessons (e.g., Whose opinions [friends, family members] matter to you most regarding your choice of intimate partner[s] and why?). Additionally, several "Discussion Forums" provided opportunities for students to engage with the instructor and other students outside of the synchronous classes. All these components were embedded in our university's course management system.

Course Content

While developing this course, I searched online for examples of LGBTQ+ family courses. I found very few examples, but I was able to find a couple of helpful course outlines that gave me ideas for content, assignments, readings, and course outline content. For any content that I wished to use or adapt, such as one instructor's "course ground rules" that were incorporated into the course outline, I contacted the person for permission to do so.

For the course content, I decided on a combination of scholarly work and first-hand accounts of LGBTQ+ family experiences, influenced by Goldberg and Allen (2018), who stated:

> both empirical and personal narratives are arguably important [in teaching LGBTQ+ family content], as both have the power to challenge deeply held beliefs, prompt awareness of and respect for other perspectives, deepen understanding of complex topics, and cause shifts in worldviews. (p. 178)

The required readings were three short books and a small number of scholarly journal articles. The books—two edited collections (Epstein, 2009; Gillespie, 2014) and one autobiography (Jetté Knox, 2019)—offered students the opportunity to engage with first-hand accounts of LGBTQ+ individuals living in many different family and relationship configurations and contexts. For example, Gillespie's book has chapters about a supportive mother of a lesbian struggling to decide whether to stay with her faith community (titled "Finding my grace"), a lesbian couple describing their donor sperm's relationship with their two children (titled "More than a donor"), and a woman reflecting on the end of her one-year marriage after 14 years of being together in "The gay divorcee: how marriage equality couldn't save our marriage." Jetté Knox's book describes a family's resilience after one child and a spouse both came out as trans.

The other required readings provided important background scholarly knowledge and were assigned mostly at the start of the course. The first couple of classes focused on presenting key information and concepts. For example, we talked about how families are defined, the importance of

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

chosen families for SGM individuals; distinguished between sex/gender and sexual orientation/gender identity; reflected on gender and sexual privilege; and defined heteronormativity. Statistics about LGBTQ+ individuals and families were also provided.

This was the first course I developed or taught in which the bulk of the required reading was not scholarly. This was a surprising decision to make, as I believe very strongly in the relationship between scholarly work and FS practice (Darling et al., 2017). This decision was influenced by Goldberg and Allen's (2018) article as well as reluctantly coming to terms with post-secondary students' declining reading rates (Baron & Mangen, 2021). I knew the first-voice narratives would be very helpful for the students to read and reflect on, and then the classes focused heavily on scholarly work about LGBTQ+ families. After the first few introductory classes, the rest of the classes focused on presenting "evidence-based, data-driven" content (Goldberg & Allen, 2018, p. 178) (see Appendix A for a list of course topics). Short videos were also presented where relevant, such as Karen Blair's video about the exclusion of transpeople from the dating world, which is based on Blair and Hoskin's (2019) study.

In classes four and five, I described various theories used to study LGBTQ+ families' experiences (Few‐Demo et al., 2016). I first covered traditional theories (and their limitations) and then moved on to other theories such as minority stress theory, intersectionality, and queer theory. A key concept emphasized in the query theory section was heteronormativity, "an ideological code that promotes rigidly defined conventional gender norms, heterosexuality, and traditional family values" (Oswald et al., 2009, p. 45). I also pointed out the importance of focusing on resiliency in LGBTQ+ families—that they are more than just their minority stress, as others have emphasized.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to go into detail about the content of the course, but I provide a brief example here of the kind of detail that can be explored in a course focusing solely on LGBTQ+ families. When FS scholars talk about "coming out," we can talk about many different contexts in which it occurs (e.g., which family member is coming out and at what stage in their life course) and factors that influence a person's choice to come out (e.g., age, phobias held by family members, cultural issues, what they are revealing). We talk about the different ways in which coming out occurs. For example, when talking about children coming out to their parents, I presented information from Jhang (2018), who identified four ways in which parents in a collectivist culture come to know their children's sexual orientation. These ways were (a) boiling frog (slowly over time exposing one's parents to SGM friendly ideas or revealing things about themselves), (b) nearing-exposure incidents, (c) forced communication, and (c) unspoken consensus (in which the "open secret" of the child's sexuality is never discussed to maintain family harmony). We also explored circumstances under which children had to come out to their parents a second or subsequent time (Denes & Afifi, 2014). These studies helped students understand more clearly the nuances and complexity of children's coming out experiences.

The course ends with a consideration of research issues related to LGBTQ+ families. I presented information about the prevalence of LGBTQ+ family research (e.g., van Eeden-Moorefield et al., 2018; Zrenchik & Craft, 2016) and reminded students of the limitations of the research to date (Reczek, 2020). Students were also introduced to important research issues such as recruitment challenges (Umberson et al., 2015); ethics and informed consent, particularly for LGBTQ+ children (Taylor CG, 2008); and potential problems with using measures developed with heterosexual, cisgender populations (Peterson et al., 2020).

I also note that many classes included prerecorded video interviews (n = 17) between me and individuals about their own experiences (e.g., a lesbian parent's experience with schools) or about the work they carried out with LGBTQ+ individuals in their communities. For example, I interviewed (a) a

medical doctor working in a fertility clinic with LGBTQ+ clients who want to become pregnant or preserve their fertility for later use, (b) a program manager about a camp for children with LGBTQ+ parents, and (c) a university professor about caregiving issues later in life. Individuals who participated in these interviews received honorariums from my grant.

Course Assignments

Students were evaluated in six ways (see Appendix B), two of which are briefly described here. For the assigned books, students were required to write reflective entries where they identified family issues in the chapters and then personally reflected on the content (e.g., what are your reactions to the content, how does the content support or challenge your personal experience or views?). This assignment was submitted five times throughout the term. A final learnings paper then focused on the scholarly content. In this paper, students summarized their broad learnings from the course, clearly citing course material. They were also required to include policy and practice recommendations. Appendix C is the rubric for this assignment.

Concluding Comments

There are many excellent reasons to offer an undergraduate course on LGBTQ+ families, and this article has described the development and content of such a course. Both scholarly work and first-voice narratives play equally important roles in helping students develop critical thinking about LGBTQ+ families, and I hope this pedagogical approach helps to transform FS students' lives and the ways in which they practice (Allen, 2022). Future research could compare students' pre- and post-levels on characteristics such as knowledge about LGBTQ+ families (e.g., do they know what compersion is, as it relates to polyamorous relationships), self-efficacy, and confidence in providing emotional and informational support to LGBTQ+ families.

I hope this article encourages FS scholars to develop their own versions of the course. With that being said, it is important to emphasize again that I had the full support of my department and university in developing this course. My university is situated in Canada, and it has—and is *able* to have—an ongoing commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives. Scholars who feel unable or unsafe to implement an LGBTQ+ family course at this time may want to focus instead on increasing LGBTQ+ content in existing courses. Various scholars (e.g., DiGregorio & Maurer, 2023; Few-Demo et al., 2016; Goldberg, 2013; Goldberg & Allen, 2018) have suggestions for how to increase LGBTQ+ course content, and Kuvalanka et al. (2018) specifically discuss strategies to deal with teaching environments that are resistant to content about SGM identities. There are also university-wide practices that can be continued or implemented to show support for trans and gender diverse students during sociopolitical contexts in which their rights are more broadly being challenged (McLean, 2025).

Acknowledgment: The development of this course was supported by a grant from the LGBT Purge Fund.

References

Allen, K. R. (1988). Integrating a feminist perspective into family studies courses. *Family Relations, 37*(1), 29–35. https://doi.org/10.2307/584426

Allen, K. R. (1995). Opening the classroom closet: Sexual orientation and self-disclosure. 44(2), 136–141. https://doi.org/10.2307/584799

Allen, K. R. (2022). Family science and students: Pedagogical connections that transform our lives. *Family Relations, 71*(5), 2104–2106. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12793

Allen, K. R., & Demo, D. H. (1995). The families of lesbians and gay men: A new frontier in family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*(1), 111–127. https://doi.org/10.2307/353821

Baron, N. S., & Mangen, A. (2021). Doing the reading: The decline of long-form reading in higher education. *Poetics Today, 42*(2), 253–279. https://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-8883248

Bible, J., Bermea, A., van Eeden-Moorefield, B., Benson, K. E., & Few-Demo, A. L. (2018). A content analysis of the first decade of the *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 14*(4), 337–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2017.1349626

Blair, K. L., & Hoskin, R. A. (2019). Transgender exclusion from the world of dating: Patterns of acceptance and rejection of hypothetical trans dating partners as a function of sexual and gender identity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 36*(7), 2074–2095. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0265407518779139

Clark, A. N. (2023). Using social exchange theory to examine relationship processes in asexual-allosexual couples. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 15*(2), 352–372. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12495

Darling, C. A., Cassidy, D., & Rehm, M. (2017). Family life education: Translational family science in action. *Family Relations, 66*(4), 741–752. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12286

Denes, A., & Afifi, T. D. (2014). Coming out again: Exploring GLBT individuals' communication with their parents after the first coming out. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 10*(3), 298–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2013.838150

DiGregorio, N., & Mauer, T. W. (2023). Undergraduate students' attitudes toward marriage equality: Changes in an introductory family science course. *Family Science Review, 27*(3). http://doi.org/10.26536/ZCTL3235

Epstein, R. (2009). *Who's your daddy? And other writings on queer parenting*. Canadian Scholars.

Family Equality Council. (2020). *LGBTQ family fact sheet*. https://familyequality.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/LGBTQ-Families-2020-Sheet-Final-clean-version.pdf

Few-Demo, A. L. (2014). Intersectionality as the "new" critical approach in feminist family studies: Evolving racial/ethnic feminisms and critical race theories. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 6*(2), 169–183. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12039

Few‐Demo, A. L., Humble, A. M., Curran, M. A., & Lloyd, S. A. (2016). Queer theory, intersectionality, and LGBT-parent families: Transformative critical pedagogy in family theory. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 8*(1), 74–94. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12127

Gillespie, B. (Ed.). (2014). *A family by any other name: Exploring queer relationships.* Touchwood Editions.

Goldberg, A. E. (2023). From safety in silence to speaking up for LGBTQ+ families: A reflection on the personal, professional, and political through a feminist lens. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 15*(2), 219–234. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12500

Goldberg, A. E., & Allen, K. R. (2018). Teaching undergraduates about LGBTQ identities, families, and intersectionality. *Family Relations, 67*(1), 176–191. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12224

Goldberg, A. E., & Allen, K. R. (Eds.). (2020). *LGBTQ-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice*. Springer.

Gupta, S., Tarantino, M., & Sanner, C. (2024). A scoping review of research on polyamory and consensual non-monogamy: Implications for a more inclusive family science. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 16*(2), 151–190. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12546

Hall, S. S., & Knox, D. (2022). Not just about sex: Relationship experiences, beliefs, and intentions associated with asexuality. *Sexuality & Culture, 26*, 2274–2287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-022-09997-z

Humble, A. M. (2013). Moving from ambivalence to certainty: Older same-sex couples marry in Canada. *Canadian Journal on Aging, 32*(2), 131–144. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0714980813000196

Humble, A. M. (2021). Social support and LGBTQ+ individuals and communities. In I. N. West (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of queer studies and communication*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.1228

Jetté Knox, A. (2019). *Love lives here: A story of thriving in a transgender family*. Viking (Penguin Canada).

Jhang, J. (2018). Scaffolding in family relationships: A grounded theory of coming out to family. *Family Relations, 67*(1), 161–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12302

Kuvalanka, K. A., Goldberg, A. E., & Oswald, R. F. (2013). Incorporating LGBTQ issues into family courses: Instructor challenges and strategies relative to perceived teaching climate. *Family Relations, 62*(5), 699–713. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12034

MacDermid, S. M., Jurich, J. A., Myers-Walls, J. A., & Pelo, A. (1992). Feminist teaching: Effective education. *Family Relations, 41*(1), 31–38. https://doi.org/10.2307/585389

McLean, D. (2025, April 28). *How colleges can support transgender students amid the Trump administration*. Higher Ed Dive. https://www.highereddive.com/news/transgender-college-student-supports-trump/746381/

Oswald, R. F., Blume, L. B., & Marks, S. R. (2004). Decentering heteronormativity: A model for family studies. In V. L. Bengston, A. C. Acock, K. R. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory and research* (pp. 143–165). Sage.

Oswald, R. F., Kuvalanka, K. A., Blume, L. B. & Berkowitz, D., (2009). Queering the family. In S. A. Lloyd, A. L. Few, & K. R. Allen (Eds.), *Handbook of feminist family studies* (pp. 43–55). Sage.

Peterson, C. H., Peterson, N. A., Cheng, Y.-J., Dalley, L. M., & Flowers, K. M. (2020). A systematic review of standardized assessments of couple and family constructs in GLBT populations. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 16*(5), 455–474. https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2019.1709598

Pollitt, A. M., Blair, K. L., & Lannutti, P. J. (2023). A review of two decades of LGBTQ-inclusive research in JSPR and PR. *Personal Relationships, 30*(1), 144–173. https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12432

Reczek, C. (2020). Sexual- and gender-minority families: A 2010 to 2020 decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 82*(1), 300–325. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12607

Rossetto, K. R., Lannutti, P. J., & Smith, R. A. (2014). Investigating self-efficacy and emotional challenge as contributors to willingness to provide emotional support. *Southern Communication Journal, 79*(1), 41–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2013.854404

Russell, S. T. (2019). Social justice and the future of healthy families: Sociocultural changes and challenges. *Family Relations, 68*(3), 358–370. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12358

Schneider, T. (2022, January 28). *What is greysexuality?* LGBT and all. https://www.lgbtqandall.com/what-is-graysexuality/

Stolz, H. E., & Green, M. (2020). Going hybrid: Traditional versus hybrid family interaction classes. *Family Science Review, 24*(1), 2–20. https://doi.org/10.26536/asfs1365

Taylor, C. G. (2008). Counterproductive effects of parental consent in research involving LGBTTIQ youth: International research ethics and a study of a transgender and two-spirit community in Canada. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 5*(3), 34–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361650802162177

Thompson, L., & Walker, A. J. (1995). The place of feminism in family studies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*(4), 847–865. https://doi.org/10.2307/353407

Umberson, D., Thomeer, M. B., Kroeger, R. A., Lodge, A. C., & Xu, M. (2015). Challenges and opportunities for research on same-sex relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 77*(1), 96–111. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12155

van Eeden-Moorefield, B., Few-Demo, A. L., Benson, K., Bible, J., & Lummer, S. (2018). A content analysis of LGBT research in top family journals 2000-2015. *Journal of Family Issues, 39*(5), 1374–1395. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X17710284

Zrenchik, K., & Craft, S. M. (2016). The state of GLBT family research: An opportunity to critically reflect. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 12*(2), 138–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2015.1011817

Appendix A: Topics Covered in the Course

1. Introduction - part 1*
2. Introduction - part 2
3. Change over time/historical perspectives
4. Theorizing about LGBTQ+ families - part 1
5. Theorizing about LGBTQ+ families - part 2*
6. Social support
7. Monogamous intimate relationships - part 1
8. Monogamous intimate relationships - part 2
9. Parenting - part 1 (becoming parents)
10. Parenting - part 2 (parenting transgender and gender diverse children)*
11. Parenting - part 3 (transitioning after becoming a parent)
12. Second-generation children
13. Consensual non-monogamous relationships
14. Division of labour
15. Family-of-origin and extended family relationships in adulthood*
16. Relationship change, separation, divorce
17. LGBTQ+ youth and homelessness
18. Later in life - part 1 (relationships)
19. Later in life - part 2 (health and caregiving)*
20. Children, parents, and formal education (school)
21. Family life education
22. Conflict and abuse
23. Research considerations
24. Conclusion*

---

* synchronous class

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

Appendix B: Assignments for LGBTQ+ Families Course

Evaluation Plan		
Components	**% of Final Grade**	**Due Date**
1. Participation in Nearpod Lessons and Synchronous classes	10	ongoing
2. Midterm	20	Mar 1
3. Reflective Entries- (5 submissions) Part 1 (submissions 1–2; grade assigned after submission #2) Part 2 (submissions 3–5; grade assigned after submission #5)	 12 18	 Jan 27, Feb 10 Mar 6, Mar 24, Apr 10
4. Discussion Forums (complete 3 of 4 - note that there are two due dates for each one)	10	(1) Jan 20, 24 (2) Feb 14, 17 (3) Mar 14, 17 (4) Mar 28, 31
5. Cultural Immersion Exercise	10	Mar 20
6. Final Learnings Paper	20	April 14

Participation in Nearpod Lessons and Synchronous Classes (10%)

- Nearpod lessons (https://nearpod.com/) are created for all of the asynchronous classes and may also be used in some synchronous classes. These lessons will involve various exercises such as open-ended questions related to course content, matching, fill-in-the blank questions, self-reflections, and PowerPoint presentation (videos). When there is assigned reading, please read it prior to completing the Nearpod lesson or attending a synchronous class, as some of the exercises may be related to required reading. Other exercises will be based on the PowerPoint lectures or other sources (e.g., YouTube videos, websites, social media) that are embedded in the Nearpod lesson.
- Please note that asynchronous lessons must be completed by a specific date (by the end of either a Monday or Friday, with one exception).
- Participation in these lessons is a vital part of how you will learn the content in this course.
- Participation in synchronous classes (e.g., typing in the chat box) also counts toward this assignment.

Midterm (20%)

- The midterm will cover all course material up to and including the 5th week of class (class #9).
- No materials can be accessed while writing the exam; you will be asked to sign an Honour Pledge at the start of your exam.
- This exam will consist of short-answer questions.

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

Reflective Entries (30%)

- This assignment gives you the opportunity to reflect on family-related issues for LGBTQ families within a wide variety of family circumstances.
- For 18 of the 20 chapters in the Gillespie book (NOT including chapter 1: "Race Species") and 9 of the 11 chapters from the Epstein book, write in point form (but using full sentences) the various family-focused issues you see represented in the chapter. There will be multiple issues represented in each chapter—please identify between 10–15 points and consider strengths and/or challenges where relevant. Then, reflect on these issues (minimum length: 2–3 paragraphs). Do the same for every three chapters in the Jetté Knox book—this will result in approximately 10 entries overall for this book- 5 entries for submission #4, 5 entries for submission #5. Please begin each new entry on a new page and include the chapter number(s) and title at top of the page.
- Below are the kind of issues you can reflect on in the second part of your entry:
    - What are your thoughts, feelings, reactions and responses to the ideas presented in the readings?
    - How do the readings apply to your personal experience?
    - How do the readings support or challenge your personal experience or outlook, with regards to your identity (gender, race, sexual orientation, class, age, religion, etc.)?
    - How do the readings apply to your family experience? How do the readings support or challenge your personal experience or outlook, with regards to your family/families?
    - Has your understanding of the issues that were presented in the readings changed, and if so, how?
    - Did any of the readings raise ideas that were new to you? Did any of those new ideas make you uncomfortable? Confuse you? Excite you? Why?
    - Do you have any questions about ideas from the readings that you did not understand?
    - Describe any disagreements that you may have had with some of the ideas or arguments presented in the readings. As long as you can demonstrate that you understood and considered the authors' points, you should feel free to disagree with anything you read.
- ** As we progress through the course, please also consider this question: How does the book chapter(s) complement, complicate, or contradict the scholarly content that has been covered during class lessons/lectures from previous weeks? You can refer to the scholarly reading in the second part of your reflections.
- You will submit this assignment 5 times throughout the course. Please submit each time as a separate document (i.e., rather than adding on to the previous file).
- ** A sample entry will be provided to you for chapter 1 from Gillespie (pp. 7–19)
- Please read these books in this order:
    1. Gillespie book due dates: **Jan 27** (class 5)- choose 9 of the 10 chapters from pp. 21–125 *(starting with chapter 2*); **Feb 10** (class 9)- choose 9 of the 10 chapters from pp. 139–229
    2. Epstein book due date: **Mar 6** (class 14) – choose 9 of the 11 chapters listed below
        - Chapter 4: Boldly going where few men have gone before: One trans man's experience (pp. 65-72, 8 pages)
        - Chapter 9: My co-world and welcome to it: Adventures in non-conjugal parenting (pp. 117-123- 7 pages)
        - Chapter 10: To bi or not to bi: Bisexuality and disclosure in the adoption system (pp. 124-132- 9 pages)
        - Chapter 22: Little white children: Notes from a Chicano dyke dad (pp. 242-251- 10 pages)

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

- Chapter 23: The move (pp. 251-261- 11 pages)
- Chapter 25: Race relations in the family: On being a transracial spawn of white queer parents (pp. 267-277- 11 pages)
- Chapter 26: Lost: The unthinkable cost of love (pp. 277-282- 6 pages)
- Chapter 27: Radical fairies and lesbian avengers: Reflections from a gay dad and his dyke daughter (pp. 283-290- 8 pages)
- Chapter 33: In defense of "traditional" families (pp. 335-345- 11 pages)
- Chapter 34: Houses full of love: Bringing up children in polyamorous relationships (pp. 346-349- 14 pages)
- Chapter 35: I am my father's son (pp. 363-367- 5 pages)

3. Jetté Knox book due dates: **Mar 24** (class 19) - pp. 1–150; **Apr 10** (class 24) - pp. 151–281 (reminder, now you are providing a reflection for every 3 chapters. For example, your first entry will cover chapters 1, 2, and 3. Your second entry will cover chapters 4, 5, and 6, and so on)

Discussion Forums (10%)

- Participate in three of four discussion questions, which are posted to "Discussion Forums" on Moodle, over the course of the term.

Topic	Location on Moodle site	Due Date: Initial Response	Due Date: Responses to Others
DF #1: Introduction/terminology	Topic 2	Jan 20/23	Jan 24
DF #2: Parenting	Topic 10	Feb 14/23	Feb 17
DF #3: Intimate relationships	Topic 16	Mar 14/23	Mar 17
DF #4: Health and caregiving	Topic 19	Mar 28/23	Mar 31

- Discussion questions are related to course lessons and readings. You are expected to respond to each question using lecture content, course readings, and professional experience as foundations for critical reflection, and respond to at least two other students.
- To see other students' postings and respond to them, you must first post your initial response: You are encouraged to use other students' postings as springboards for respectful dialogue. **Other students' responses will be viewable 30 minutes after you post your first response.**
- Criteria for evaluation include:
  - Integration with course material (i.e., course material cited in your response);
  - Thoughtful and in-depth analyses of the issue(s) raised for discussion; and
  - Capacity to engage in relevant dialogue with your classmates and facilitate a spirit of inquiry into the conversation.
- Please note that there is a time limit to when contributions can be made to the Discussion Forums- late contributions will not be accepted.

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

Cultural Immersion Exercise (10%)

- Participate in one LGBTQ community activity of your choosing and write a 2-page reflection paper. Activities may be performances, protests, PRIDE celebrations, meet-up groups, films, playing gay-themed on-line games, other relevant events. Please do not attend a support group as they are private. Your 2-page paper should briefly describe the experience, including date and location, and then discuss how it relates to what you are learning in this class. Attach a flyer or other event documentation (e.g., url) to your paper.
    - How this assignment will be graded: An "A" means your paper is both well written and insightful. "B" means there are some writing issues, or a lack of depth, but overall good job. "C" means both the writing and the content are problematic. "D" means you tried. "F" means you didn't hand anything in (or what you handed in was plagiarized, fabricated, or otherwise academically dishonest). You do not need to identify whether you are a part of the LGBTQ community in your assignment, for either option chosen.

Final Learnings Paper (20%)

- Using course content, write a 1900–2000-word paper (plus references) that summarizes your understanding of LGBTQ families from the course. This is meant to be a broad overview of the learnings rather than picking out the points that you connected the most with.
- The content for your paper will come primarily from the scholarly content (required readings, optional readings, and class lectures) presented in the course.
- Content from the three books is acceptable to use but only if the scholarly content is applied to it. Content from the three books should constitute a very small portion of your paper.
- In this final paper, include policy and practice recommendations related to various systems such as social services, educational systems, economic policies, health care systems, and so on.
- Use APA 7th edition for citations and the reference list.
- For this assignment, to cite lecture content, please refer to the class number in parentheses (e.g., class 5).
- Instructions on how to cite course content and a rubric are posted on Moodle.

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

Appendix C: LGBTQ+ Families Final Learnings Paper

	Unacceptable (F grade)	Acceptable (D to C level grade)	Admirable (B level grade)	Exemplary (A level grade)	SCORE (out of 100)
Integration of knowledge (30 points)	The paper does not demonstrate that the student has fully understood and applied concepts learned in the course. Cursory discussion in all the sections of the paper or brief discussions in only a few sections.	The paper demonstrates that the student, to a certain extent, understands and has applied some concepts learned in the course. Some pertinent information has been omitted or content runs on excessively.	The paper demonstrates that the student, for the most part, understands and has applied concepts learned in the course. In-depth discussion and elaboration in most sections of the paper.	The paper demonstrates that the student fully understands and has applied concepts learned in the course. Concepts are integrated into the writer's own insights. In-depth discussion and elaboration in all sections of the paper.	
Source selection (15 points)	It is not evident that course material has been used for the paper. OR only material from the 3 books has been used Extraneous sources have been cited	Some sources have been used, but more content could be selected. It is not clear at times where the content comes from. Overuse of the three books instead of scholarly materials.	Adequate number of sources of information come both from the scholarly content and the three books. Sometimes the source is not clear. There could be less emphasis on the books.	Sources of information come mainly from the scholarly content (required readings, optional readings, and class lectures) and reflect a wide variety of sources/topics. The three books make up a minority of points.	
Citations (10 points)	No sources are identified	Few sources are identified	Sources are identified, but inconsistently, or not often enough	Content clearly refers to specific content, either to class numbers (e.g., Slide 4, Topic 5), required readings (e.g., Reczek, 2020) or books (e.g., Gillespie, chapter 5)	
Policy and practice recommendations (10 points)	No policy and/or practice recommendations are included	Between 1 to 2 policy and practice recommendations are included, could be more clearly stated, or more variation in recommendations provided	3-4 policy and practice recommendations are stated and connect to the reviewed material. Could have a bit more variation in topics or be more clearly stated.	5 or more policy and practice recommendations related to a variety of areas are clearly stated and connect to the reviewed material.	
General organization (10 points)	Paper has a lack of organization, with no clear introduction or conclusion. No subheadings are included for main body of paper and conclusion. Transitions between main sections are not clear	Paper shows a basic progression of introduction, main body, and conclusion. The introduction or conclusion needs work (e.g., no overview of points to be covered in the intro, no summary of main points in the conclusion). However, some points in the introduction or conclusion are not in the main body of the paper.	Paper shows good skills in writing an introduction, main body of paper, and conclusion, with some areas for improvement (e.g., transitions could be more clearly developed between sections). Subheadings used for main body of paper and conclusion.	Overall structure of paper includes a well-developed introduction, main body of paper, and conclusion. Transitions between sections are well written. Subheadings used for main body of paper and conclusion. Concluding comments show analysis and synthesis of ideas.	

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025

		Transitions between main points could be clearer Subheadings used for main body of paper and conclusion.			
Flow of writing of paper (10 points)	Word choice is informal in tone. Writing is choppy with many awkward or unclear passages. Many paragraphs are less than 3 sentences long or overly long (e.g., a page or more).	Word choice is occasionally informal in tone. Writing has a few awkward or unclear passages. Some paragraphs are less than 3 sentences long or overly long.	Uses a scholarly writing style. Writing has minimal awkward or unclear passages. There is the occasional short or long paragraph.	Uses a scholarly writing style. Writing is flowing and easy to follow. All paragraphs are at least 3 sentences long; no overly long paragraphs.	
Spelling/ Grammar (10 points)	Errors are distracting to the extent that the meaning is unclear Many incomplete sentences are used	Errors are distracting, but the meaning is still clear Some incomplete sentences are used	Occasional minor errors do not distract the reader	Virtually free from mechanical, grammatical, punctuation, and spelling errors	
Length of paper (5 points)	Paper is under 1600 words	Paper is between 1600 to 1749 words long.	Paper is between 1750 to 1899 words or more than 2000 words	Paper is between 1900 to 2000 words long	
Academic Integrity*	Extensive plagiarism (at minimum, AUTOMATIC GRADE OF F on the assignment)	Some content appears to plagiarized (e.g., direct quotes presented as paraphrases) (may result in loss of 10% or more off the paper)	Evident that own words have been used to write the paper		
TOTAL POINTS:					

* No points are assigned for academic integrity, but points may be taken off if content appears to be plagiarized.

Name of student:

Grade:

https://doi.org/10.26536/GGCZ4190
Family Science Review, Volume 29, Issue 1, 2025