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Executive Summary
Spring 2017

Introduction

Institutions across the country are engaging in research on campus climate, diversity and gender-specific challenges in higher education. From campus climate to pay equity issues, solutions focused on increasing the number of women faculty in administrative positions has not created the change expected. In our efforts toward making Colorado State University (CSU) a premier institution for all faculty, including women faculty, President Frank charged the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty (SCSWF), a division of the Commission on Women and Gender, to consider these issues. A 2015 campus-wide survey and a 2016 pilot focus group study, both conducted by the SCSWF, pointed to the need for a more in-depth examination of campus climate and women faculty’s experiences at CSU. An outside consultant was hired to conduct the study and work with the SCSWF’s research subcommittee to provide an understanding of how women faculty’s experiences could inform institutional next steps. The methods, findings, and recommendations from the study, Experiences and Perceptions of Campus Climate for Women Faculty at CSU, are summarized below.

Methods

This comprehensive study integrated data collected through focus groups, individual interviews, and an online written survey to examine the experiences and perceptions of the culture and climate for women faculty at Colorado State University. The research team paired an external researcher with six CSU faculty researchers (tenured and non-tenure track women) to strengthen validity and internal consistency. Maximum variation sampling drew 76 participants who identified as women, representing 12% of all women faculty at CSU, including non-tenure track (40%) and tenure track women (≈60%) faculty across all ranks as well as chairs and administrators. Faculty from seven of the eight colleges were represented in the study. Participants included 70 white women (92%) and six women of color (≈8%). Ages reported for the focus group and individual interview participants ranged from mid-twenties to late sixties. Across all three formats, considerable care was taken to ensure the confidentiality of the participants, who were asked to discuss their perceptions of campus climate for women faculty at CSU and experiences of women faculty, what changes would facilitate more equity, and how women faculty thrive at CSU. The research team drew on modified Grounded Theory methods to analyze all data, incorporating steadfast criteria for judging quality research in constructivist inquiry (i.e., credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability), including interrater reliability and triangulation of data sources (focus group, interview, written responses), multiple statuses of participants (rank and appointment type, administrator), and multiple researchers (external and internal). Data analysis was rigorous.
and systematic, including a two-phase coding process, constant comparative methods, memo writing, relational mapping, systems analysis, and self-reflexivity.

Findings

Fourteen themes were identified from the study and represent the major findings.

1. **Persistent Gender Based Inequities**: Participants consistently reported gender-based inequities at both inter-personal and institutional levels.
2. **Gender Bias Has Significant Impacts**: Gender significantly shapes faculty experiences and perceptions, and gender bias impacts the professional status, productivity, health, and work satisfaction of women faculty.
3. **Micro-Cultures of Gender Inequity**: The experience of gender inequity is most pronounced within “micro-cultures,” i.e., at the level of academic unit (e.g. department).
4. **Bias as a Self-Perpetuating System**: Participants consider institutional structures and policies part of self-perpetuating systems of gender bias.
5. **Professional Dissonance**: Participants expressed profound and multifaceted conflicts between their personal/professional values and those of the institution.
6. **Evaluation Processes Work to Reinforce Inequities**: Participants viewed evaluation processes as erratic, unfair, and inconsistently applied.
7. **Lack of Leadership to Create Real Change**: Participants conveyed disillusion, distrust and/or cynicism regarding the possibility of making CSU a premier institution for women.
8. **Barriers for Grievances and Complaints**: Participants who turned to institutional systems with grievances or complaints often reported dissatisfaction with procedures and systemic barriers to resolutions.
9. **Rank Matters**: Gender inequity disproportionately affects non-tenure track (NTT) faculty.
10. **Carrying the Load**: Women faculty accomplish a disproportionate percentage of service and non-research related work.
11. **Both Women and Men in Leadership Identified as Problematic**: Concerns were expressed about both women and men in leadership roles engaging in actions and decisions that perpetuate the status quo.
12. **Accumulation of Gender Inequity**: Women who had been in the university for a long time were exhausted by having to continually battle sexism and bias.
13. Women of Color and LGBT Faculty at Increased Risk for Inequity: Women Faculty of color and LGBT faculty may experience being institutionally silenced and/or face more severe consequences for expressing concerns about equity.

14. Women Faculty Thriving at CSU: When asked what helped them to thrive, many women pointed to their colleagues and mentors (within and outside their home units) and work within professional societies as significant sources of support.

Recommendations

To improve our campus climate and culture, these findings must be addressed on a systemic and structural level. To that end we generated recommendations that address the specific findings in this study. Various groups across campus are already working to address many of the recommendations from this project. We look forward to working with the campus community on priorities and processes for implementing recommendations. All of the recommendations are guided by the ACT Framework:

- **Accountability (A):** Effective accountability measures—should be implemented for leadership at all levels.
- **Consistency (C):** Within units and at the larger institutional level, leadership decisions that impact faculty should be consistently applied.
- **Transparency (T):** At all levels, significant leadership decisions (and rationale for those decisions) should be clearly articulated and made accessible to the CSU community.

The primary recommendation from this study is to bring in an outside consultant with an expertise in organizational change and gender equity in higher education. It is our hope that an expert in this area can assist us in prioritizing the specific recommendations to create the institutional changes needed at CSU.

Specific recommendations are provided to address the challenges identified from the research findings. These challenges include:

2. Current Complaint & Grievance Processes (OEO, Conflict Resolution, Faculty Council Grievance Committee, Ombuds etc.) often do not Adequately Resolve Gender-Related Concerns or Protect Complainants.
3. Unit and University Culture Fosters Policies and Procedures that Adversely Affect Women Faculty Across Rank and Appointment.
5. NTT Faculty are Disproportionately Vulnerable to Gender Bias and Associated Inequities.
6. Parental Leave Policies are Inconsistently Applied and Require Further Development.
7. Salary Equity remains a Challenge at all Levels and Appointment Types.
8. Faculty Search Policies and Advancement Opportunities often Impede Hiring of Women and Diverse Faculty.
9. Women Faculty are Responsible for a Disproportionate Amount of Service and are not Adequately Credited for the Demands of Service Work.
Report to the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty

Qualitative Study on Culture and Climate for Women Faculty at Colorado State University

Introduction

In 1997 President Al Yates created the President’s Commission on Women and Gender Equity at Colorado State University (CSU). In May of 2014 under President Tony Frank’s leadership the charge to the Commission on Women and Gender Equity was updated to “identify areas of concern in gender equity and campus climate and provide specific recommendations to the President in areas where the university can improve” (http://cwge.colostate.edu/charge/). In 2013, President Frank created a Presidential initiative to “make Colorado State the best place for women to work and learn,” which, in March of 2016, was re-introduced to campus as the Women & Gender Collaborative. The Collaborative aims to increase campus-wide education and engagement around gender-related issues, and serves to connect and promote the efforts of seven distinct campus entities that “support the University’s mission to improve campus culture and climate around gender” (http://thecollaborative.colostate.edu/about/). In 2010 President Frank also created a part-time cabinet position (Vice President for Diversity) and program for Diversity at CSU to further address issues of diversity on campus that position became full time in 2012. (http://diversity.colostate.edu/).

The Women’s Liberation Movement of the 1960s provided inspiration on college campuses around the country to focus on the needs of women. The Office of Women’s Relations (later became the Office of Women’s Programs) was created in 1970 and reported to the Office of Student Relations. The Women’s Studies academic program developed out of the Office of Women’s Programs and was approved by faculty council as an academic program in 1977 and women studies courses began at Colorado State University in 1978. The Office of Women’s Programs and Studies developed and changed over four decades here at CSU. During the 2009-2010 academic year, the Office of Women’s Programs and Studies determined that the student affairs and academic program needed to be separate and distinct. The student affairs part of the program is now The Women and Gender Advocacy Center. The women’s studies academic side of the program was relocated in 2010 and is now housed within the Ethnic Studies Department in the Center for Women’s Studies and Gender Research. A part-time Director was hired in 2012 and that position became full time in 2015.

During the 2012-2013 academic year, a group of senior women faculty met with President Frank and Provost Miranda to discuss gender equity and related issues at CSU. As a result, in 2013 the Commission on Women and Gender Equity created the Standing Committee on the
Status of Women Faculty to address challenges specifically for women faculty. The primary objective for the Commission on Women and Gender equity is to consider issues for all women at CSU and provide the President with policy recommendations. The primary objective of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty is to provide input and work towards needed changes on campus climate and culture specifically for women faculty (http://cwge.colostate.edu/standing-committee-on-the-status-of-women-faculty/scswf-charge-and-mission/).

Since the Standing Committee was created in 2014, committee members have worked and continue to work on promoting and further developing parental leave policies, supporting the hire of a faculty ombuds position, contributing to a Bullying in the Workplace policy, promoting pay equity and fairness, writing of proposals related to women faculty concerns, developing a process for women faculty awards, and engaging in the qualitative research articulated in this report on CSU campus climate research.

In its effort to further develop policies and practices that will make CSU a premier institution for women faculty, the Research Subcommittee of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty (SCSWF) was tasked to launch a qualitative research project, “Female Faculty’s Experiences and Perceptions of CSU Culture and Climate.” The goals of this research are consistent with an array of efforts designed to identify barriers for women faculty and to recommend best practices, launched at universities and colleges across the U.S. Many R1 institutions (e.g., Purdue University, Denver University, Syracuse University) have recently initiated strategic plans to address systemic gender inequities. As the American Council on Education’s (ACE) 2016 report, “Pathways, Pipelines, and Institutional Leadership: An Update on the Status of Women in Higher Education” details, gender-based inequities persist amongst institutions of higher education across the nation: only 31% of all full tenured faculty are women; male faculty out-earn female faculty by an average of $15,000 per annum; and only 27% of university presidencies are held by women. Many of the challenges delineated in the ACE report have also been found in many large scale quantitative studies at large universities, including CSU (Johnson, 2016). The current qualitative research, however, was designed to offer a more nuanced understanding of women faculty’s experiences and perceptions within the context of CSU’s history, policies, and procedures.

The SCSWF research project was conducted in three steps. First, the committee circulated a short survey to gather input from all faculty to establish committee priorities for the newly created SCSWF to address gender issues at CSU (http://cwge.colostate.edu/standing-committee-on-the-status-of-women-faculty/scswf-current-work/campus-climate/). The survey generated significant response, including numerous faculty comments which suggested the need to augment the quantitative data with a richer understanding of women faculty’s experiences and perceptions via more qualitative data. The Research Subcommittee conducted a pilot study; focus group participants were asked a series of questions related to
the culture and climate for women faculty at CSU, and the pilot study revealed this qualitative research project would generate sensitive information that would best be conducted by an outside researcher. Finally, the SCSWF recruited and hired an external researcher to conduct the focus groups and interviews in an effort to maintain confidentiality. As the external researcher, Dr. Nadya Fouad collated transcriptions of the focus groups and interviews and redacted all identifying information before SCSWF’s Research Subcommittee members reviewed the data. Research Subcommittee members and Dr. Fouad together analyzed the data and developed recommendations. The research team and Dr. Fouad then presented major findings to the larger SCSWF, Commission Chair for the President’s Commission on Women and Gender Equity, and President Frank and his leadership team in Fall 2016. The following report outlines the procedures Dr. Fouad used, the major findings from the focus groups/interviews/surveys and the recommendations for future actions.

Method

Purpose: Overall, the purpose of the study was to “capture women faculty’s experiences and perceptions of the culture and climate at CSU.” The study included focus groups, individual interviews, on-line survey responses, and written responses to several questions to better understand the experiences and perceptions of the culture and climate.

Design: A set of interview and focus group questions were created (see Appendices A-C) to assess the complexity of women faculty’s experiences, outcomes, and opportunities at CSU that would allow for an in-depth knowledge of the lived experiences of women faculty. An outside researcher controlled for bias and the insider status of the CSU researchers.

Process: Dr. Fouad conducted the focus groups and individual interviews over six days in April, 2016. Eleven focus groups were conducted (consisting of a total of 45 people), as well as 10 individual interviews. Because additional women wanted to participate in the study, but could not attend the in-person interviews or focus groups due to schedule conflicts, the questions were also posted in an online survey using the confidential online Qualtrics tool and asked the same type of open-ended questions. An additional 21 women responded to the survey. Thus, the results represent the voices of a total of 76 women. The groups included non-tenure track women who were Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Instructors, and tenure track women who were Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors, Chairs and Administrators.

Participants: Tenure and non-tenure track women faculty at CSU, a predominately White university in the western United States were invited to participate in a focus group, individual interview, or confidential online survey. Specifically, women faculty were asked to discuss their perceptions of campus climate for women faculty at CSU, what the experiences are of women
faculty, what changes would facilitate more equity and how women faculty can thrive at CSU. The study received approval from the university’s Institutional Review Board for human subjects review. Women faculty were recruited from an email sent out by the Chair of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty. Women at all ranks and appointment types participated in the study. This included both tenure/tenure track (≈60%) and non-tenure track (40%) faculty at the ranks of Instructor, Assistant, Associate, Full Professors and women faculty in administrative positions (N=76). Faculty from seven of the eight colleges were represented in the study. Participants all identified as female faculty. The race/ethnicity for the overall sample consisted of 70 White faculty (92%) and six faculty women of color (n=8%). Ages reported for the focus group and individual interview participants ranged from mid-twenties to late sixties with a mean age of 46.6 and a median age of 45.5. Of the women faculty at CSU, 76 (n=12%) participated in the study.

Demographics for Participants in the study (N=76)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Range (years)*</td>
<td>Mid-20s to late 60s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Mean (years)*</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Median (years)*</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person of Color</td>
<td>≈8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU College representation</td>
<td>7 out of 8 colleges represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>≈60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In order to protect participant identity, age was not asked on the online survey so the age data above only includes the participants in the in person focus groups and individual interviews.
Data Collection: There was considerable care taken to ensure the confidentiality of the participants. All participants were asked to choose a pseudonym upon registering for a focus group or interview. The only name on the schedule was their pseudonym, and the only person who had the real names and emails was a graduate research assistant assigned to the project. When the women arrived at the session, they were asked to note their pseudonym on a table tent, and that name was the only one used during the focus group or interview. The focus groups were recorded by a certified court reporter, and the only name used in the transcripts was the participant’s pseudonym. Individual interviews were recorded, identified only by the interviewee’s pseudonym and kept in a locked office.

Each individual interview and focus group began with the same information detailed in the revised application to IRB, and included the purpose of the study; Dr. Fouad’s name and title; assurance about confidentiality; and an explanation of the process of the recording responses (a court reporter for the focus groups and tape recordings for individual interviews). Participants were assured they could leave at any point (none did so), that they could elect to write their responses should they wish to not answer verbally (none did so), and that we were not asking for a signed consent form to assure confidentiality – their decision to remain in the interview signaled their consent. Finally, the introduction to the focus groups and interviews concluded with a request to keep others’ information confidential and the limits to Dr. Fouad’s own ability to keep things confidential if there was indication of harm to self or others. There was also a list of counseling resources available to participants.

The questions included general perceptions of the climate for women at CSU; how male and female faculty might experience the climate differently (and why); if there was a particular experience that was challenging for them as women faculty at CSU; what has helped them thrive at CSU; what institutional practices impact women at CSU; what was next for them at CSU (e.g., promotion, leadership opportunities); and if there was something they wanted to
make sure we heard that we hadn’t asked (see attached semi-structured interview and focus group protocol). Finally, each participant was given a card and asked “what may seem impossible, but if we did do it, would fundamentally change the experience of women faculty at CSU and help more women thrive?” Those cards were collected and recorded separately. Questions for each format are included in Appendices A-C.

Each session was transcribed. Dr. Fouad reviewed all transcripts and redacted identifying information (e.g., mentions of specific departments or real names of individuals). At several points, individual participants requested that their comments not be included in the transcript and Dr. Fouad redacted those comments.

**Data Coding and Analysis:** Coding was conducted by the research team. The research group consisted of seven (7) women faculty including two non-tenure track assistant professors and four tenured faculty (one associate and three full professors) from CSU, and Dr. Fouad, a full professor at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. The team included members who identify as women of color and some who identify as LGBTQ.

The research team engaged in modified Grounded Theory methods (Charmaz, 2014) to analyze all data. Analysis incorporated constant comparative methods where data were compared with data during each stage of the coding process. Using this inductive approach, the researchers read the focus groups and interviews assigned to them independently and engaged in a two-stage process of coding. First, the CSU researchers independently conducted a line-by-line analysis highlighting key phrases and coding each section identified. Upon completion, they met to discuss the individualized codes that were generated and to create a codebook to code the remainder of the qualitative data. Next they paired up into three teams of two researchers and re-coded one another’s focus groups and interviews to obtain greater reliability in the coding process. A second stage where focused codes were identified contributed to the development of categories.

Two focus groups and two individual interviews from each research team pairing were then assigned to Dr. Fouad, to compare against the results of her own coding approach. A total of 132 codes and subcodes were constructed. Dr. Fouad met with the research team via Skype to discuss the coding schemes, resolve any discrepancies, and elaborate the themes that arose from the focused codes and ultimately constituted the findings, outlined below.

In sum, the data analysis process was rigorous and systematic, drawing on principles and methods of Grounded Theory (Charmaz, 2014) that included a two-phase coding process, constant comparative methods, memo writing, relational mapping and self-reflexivity. The rigor of the coding process and inclusion of interrater reliability lent validity and credibility to the process. By having multiple forms of data collection (focus group, interview, written responses), multiple statuses of participants (rank and appointment type, administrator), and
multiple researchers, (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015), the team was also able to have triangulation in the analysis.

Findings

Overall, fourteen themes capture perspectives consistently voiced by participants regarding climate and culture for women faculty. Each is listed, with quotes from participants that highlight the theme. We chose not to identify the rank of the women speaking in the quotes below to ensure confidentiality.

1. Gender-Based Inequities: Participants consistently reported gender-based inequities at both inter-personal and institutional levels. Women identified gender-based inequities that were evident in a wide range of environments, from interactions with the department chair (or supervisor), to department/unit meetings, to the classroom. Women at every rank and appointment type noted this, although the specific example differed. For example, women in non-tenure track lines were more likely to note gender-based inequities in the classroom. Sometimes these were comments from students (either overt comments or those in a teaching evaluation), but at other times the examples were made by other faculty in front of students. Assistant professors were more likely to cite examples of comments made by the department Chair or tenured faculty. Associate and Full professors were more likely to discuss inequities in salary, service obligations, overall load allocation; many shared their perspective that their insights and contributions were often undervalued or devalued.

“When [our leader] first came, he met with all faculty individually. He told all of the women the same story about his wife, that she did the right thing and stayed home with the children.”

“There is sexism-mostly from students . . . male students challenge us with behavior that suggests...that women are not as capable.”

“A lot of the problems in our department [are] about gender. So, we have a couple of sort of slightly predatory older men who have, you know, had stuff go through OEO about sexual harassment, you know, the kind of like slap on the wrist here or there, or well, technically you didn’t violate any policies, so it’s fine. And I think among the more senior male faculty, there’s a lot of just old fashioned sexism. I think they don’t think women are as competent. They sort of like evaluate job candidates in this very gendered way. So, you hear things like oh, she was very posed or he’s a real go-getter. And you can tell exactly what that end up meaning in terms of their evaluation.”
“So, I'll share a very typical situation and that was faculty meetings. So, in the area that I was in when we would have faculty meetings, it was run by the men. And when I say run by the men, I mean, they would over talk the women. And not only would they over talk the women, but they were dismissive when women made comments. In addition to that, it was very hard to get things on the agenda if you were a woman to spend any talking about something. It was fine for men to get off on tangents and take things in different directions to, you know, to their advantage. But, if a woman wanted to add something different, a female faculty member wanted to add something different, then that just was not tolerated. And certainly the faculty who were not the females, who were not tenured, they were silenced and they were actually told, just don’t speak up at these, just sit there, be the good junior faculty, which I have issues with that. I think that is demeaning and, and wrong.”

2. **Gender Bias Has Significant Impacts:** Gender significantly shapes faculty experiences and perceptions, and gender bias impacts women faculty in light of professional status, productivity, health, and work satisfaction. The impact of the inequities noted in Theme 1 was evident in many ways, from citations of exhaustion, burnout, depression, and ill health to comments about the impact on ability to work and impact on productivity. Although Dr. Fouad had made the disclaimer that she would need to report if there was evidence of intent to harm self, a number of women noted that they had reached a breaking point. In those cases, there was not a direct threat of suicide, but clearly there was a negative, pervasive impact on health and ability to work.

“...that is why I am taking part in this because, yeah, I just feel like if you don’t talk about these things it’s just kind of stays with you and you just fester about it. But yeah I think they need to know that this is kind of not a very healthy atmosphere over here.”
3. Micro-Cultures of Gender Inequity: The experience of gender inequity is most pronounced within “micro-cultures,” i.e., at the level of academic unit (e.g. department). The decentralized system at the university creates micro-climates within each department or unit. The leader and the most powerful people in the department shape these microclimates. To a remarkable extent, the women who participated in the survey noted that they felt at the mercy of those in power. This was true of even those in administrative positions. And even women who felt that they were in a good climate and had strong allies noted their concern that this could change with a change in leadership. As noted later in this report, this was most evident in the differences in the implementation of the parental leave policy. By the end of the interviews and focus groups, it was clear that several women had experience with the new leave policy. Either they had had a child or they knew someone in their unit who had had a child. The implementation of the policy appeared to be wholly dependent on the chair/leader of the unit, and ranged from denial of leave to being granted more time than the policy stipulated. Many participants commented on the impact of inequities felt most acutely at the level of the department, as represented here:

“It seems like you’re always at the will of whoever comes into power. Whether that be a chair or a Dean or whomever might be entrusted, whether or not they’re going to be honest and, do what’s for the good of the faculty rather than for their friends”

“I’ve seen an environment where local or at the department or college level, people are rewarded in spite of bad behavior or promoted, not reprimanded.”

“And it’s gone from sort of not great but, you know, you can survive, to pretty bad. And I think part of it is what you were describing previously in your department, really bad behavior that’s not getting addressed in any sort of way and is, in fact, getting rewarded. And so, that sort of, I don’t know it’s making the climate really tough . . . the way that change happens around here it all has to go through the Chair.”

“I was on maternity leave last [redacted]. There is a central pool now for funding teaching buyouts and the policy states in a little bit vague language that it is the general expectation that parents should have a semester off of teaching due to [redacted].” Another participant asks, “Are you kidding? We have [number of] faculty who just gave birth, none of whom were given anything off.”

4. Bias as a Self-Perpetuating System: Participants often referred to institutional structures and policies as part of self-perpetuating systems of gender bias. There was a fair amount of cynicism that there would be any change as a result of participating in the focus group or interview. The reason most commonly given was that the top administrators had spent their careers within the CSU culture and thus kept perpetuating the culture. There was a significant concern that, because evaluations of those in power are not anonymous, honest feedback was not given (and in fact, was actively discouraged). The result, participants felt, was that nothing
changes. Thus, although being a premier institution for women was a stated goal, there was little faith among the majority of participants that any concrete steps would be taken to achieve that goal.

“Administrators... [are hired] from within almost all the time. We [have] a lot of... high administrators who have been here for almost all their careers and then you know they never leave.”

“Another process is broken, and that is the evaluation of the administrators . . . [there isn’t any] vetting or weeding out of bad chairs, bad deans, or bad Vice Presidents...they are protected by the administration.”

“There are many other departments where there are really toxic Chairs. And you know . . . the whole faculty refused to even write down anything in the annual review of their Chair, they write zero. “

“And I think you were pointing out some of the kinds of things that happen, like service, like personality. So, if a woman is very assertive and voices an opinion that's very different from the Department Head, that's received differently than if a man does the same thing. And I don't think it's intentional. I agree with you. I don't think it's malicious at all. I think it's just kind of all these cultural things that we've just been raised with, you know.”

5. Professional Dissonance: Many participants expressed profound and multifaceted conflicts between their personal/professional values and those of the institution, due in great part to the historically patriarchal values of the institution. There was considerable sentiment that, even though the goal was to create a premier institution for women, money and time were invested in actions that systematically countered that goal.

“I started this career not to make money, it wasn't my goal. I wanted to create value in the world and I want to be part of an institution...whose primary goals are to create value, whether it's, you know, solving cancer or ameliorating poverty or, or something like that. And so, I feel like right now, my values are just so out of alignment with the University's values.”

(Referring to the differences between her and her department) “Can we be Academics without being in a, a department? I mean, we can make our own little think tank.” Another participant adds, “I’ve been thinking about that a lot.” A third participant adds, “Like a Refugee Department.”

“You know, that if there is a disproportionate investment by the female faculty, these non-bottom line activities and teaching and mentoring and, and like interacting really directly and usefully with them, but their tuition dollars are their tuition dollars regardless of what we do. And so it's hard to say do these students come here because
of the teaching? Like is it -- I don't, I don't know.” Another participant adds, “And that sort of hardly matters because it’s not what the university values.”

6. Evaluation Processes Work to Reinforce Inequities: A large number of participants viewed evaluation processes as erratic, unfair, and inconsistently applied. The decentralized nature of departmental units on campus led to many women feeling that their work was devalued, that the yearly evaluation process was unfair and biased, and that the chair’s friends and high-ranking men received favorable evaluations without merit. Many women cited specific instances of what appeared to be inconsistent criteria applied to move someone from non-tenure track to tenure track (with men being moved and women not). Women talked about the devaluation of service contributions, even while they were encouraged to take on more service obligations. Decisions about spousal hiring also were inconsistently applied. Across the six days of interviews and focus groups, Dr. Fouad talked with women who had themselves been hired when their spouse was hired in a different department, or who had been in a department when a spouse had been hired. In every case, the men who were hired were perceived to be treated much more advantageously than the woman, even in the case where the woman was the original hire. Finally, the salary equity study was cited very frequently as an example of very unfair evaluation, even from those who said they received more salary as a result of the exercise. The biggest issue was the expectation that the gain in salary was at the discretion of the chair to advocate for them—often, a chair they did not trust.

Regarding the merit review process: “I did great on my research stuff and the Committee looked at my record and felt, oh for us, it’s really, really hard to get exceeds expectations on teaching. Almost nobody gets that, at least that is what we’re told. And [redacted] but the Committee gave me this, exceeds expectations. And my Chair downgraded me because he said, I’ve sent you a message. You are annoying people. You are frustrating and annoying. I mean he literally docked my pay… ”

“Evaluation where predominantly men would make comments very clear comments, such as: Remember we’re the ones who decide if you get in the club...that explicit. And that is ingrained in me that, we’re the ones that decide if you get in the club. When I talk to other female faculty who are not tenured, they had similar experiences. But, it was because of that climate that, when someone came and said, hey, guess what, we need you to do X, Y, Z. Then you had this compelling sense of, oh my God, job security.”

“And so, one comment that, that was directed at me that does come back to my head over and over again was, I was sitting with my Department Chair kind of in one of the yearly evaluation meetings. And he’s like, well, you’re really just kind of a one-trick pony, aren’t you because I was a Ph.D. so I can’t work in a [redacted]. I, you know, my skill set is not there. And it was just very, you know, discouraging.”
7. **Lack of Leadership to Create Real Change**: Most participants conveyed disillusion, distrust and/or cynicism regarding the possibility of making CSU a premier institution for women. There was a perception that there had been many “surface” actions but no real change. One of the questions explicitly cited the goal to be a premier institution; many participants noted that, while that is an admirable goal, it is unlikely to be achieved within the current climate. There was also concern about participating in the focus group (many said they were discouraged from attending by colleagues; others requested that the facilitator ensure the hallway was clear before they exited the room, etc.), and many participants explained that, while they wanted to share views and make working experiences better for future female faculty, they were concerned about retaliation and/or confidentiality in the process.

> “So at the bottom of my heart I know that this is probably never going to happen as long as the provost’s office people stay... [the same]. [There is] probably never going to [be] any change here because there is a big block there.”

> “One is I think this kind of thing is a, is a good thing [telling women what their rights are]. Secondly, I want to say I think CSU is really behind on this stuff. I’ve worked at other places. CSU is by far, both in terms of its policies and in terms of its climate. It’s like 20 years behind other universities. And so, I really want to sort of emphasize that on the record because I’m not sure people in higher administration quite get the situation.”

> “I don’t know if women are taken seriously on this campus. I have noticed—I have witnessed some instances where certain administrators will shut a female down before she has a chance to finish what she’s trying to say.”

> “So we have this flagpole to rally around and then if I were looking at it and thinking ‘Okay, CSU is the best place I wanna come, I’m gonna see who is in leadership around campus,’ and I see a white male President, white male Provost, white male, um next in line you know Associate Provost. So you look down the Chair and the very top leadership positions are white men. So I think, “Okay who else?” So again if you start to look around the cabinet or at Deans and department Heads, there’s still a gender imbalance.”

> “But when you think about all the Administrators, they are all full Professors, they’ve gone up through the ranks, and they’re very removed from where you and I are. And they’re very removed, probably, from the culture of what it was like to try to get your career started, or balancing work -- you know, family life with.”

8. **Barriers for Grievances and Complaints**: Participants who turned to institutional systems with grievances or complaints often reported dissatisfaction with procedures and systemic
barriers to resolutions. There were many comments about not trusting grievant or complaint processes. The most commonly cited concerns related to breaches of confidentiality. On several occasions, when this was mentioned, others in the focus group nodded, indicating they, too, had heard about the situation, further indicating the breach of confidentiality. Thus, although some offices are charged with helping women (and others) resolve conflicts, if there is a lack of trust that confidentiality will be maintained, people will not see those offices as sources of help. There was also a very clearly articulated concern about retribution if one complains. This was such a strong concern that we have chosen not to cite quotes from participants that directly relate to this issue in an effort to protect confidentiality. Instead, we offer quotes that address the issue more broadly, in response to the question, “what do you recommend is needed to make CSU a premiere institution for women?”

“Better resources to help solve conflicts with disruptive or disrespectful male students. And better support from administration to deal with this.”

“I feel like one of the big problems here, and this gets back to the sort of differences among departments, one of the big problems here for a lot of people are sort of individual people who are complete jerks... like your chair [referring to another participant’s comment] and I feel like CSU as an institution doesn’t have any way of correcting those problems.”

“I feel that there is at some level not somebody to go to and talk about like if you have some academic or professional needs who do I talk with? And if you feel that you are actually not being treated just the same, then who is the person to go to without being without kind of you know compromising your status and what might happen to you down the road. I feel like there has not been an easy way to talk to somebody.”

“I didn’t talk about this sort of like here’s the thing I went through but it all involved students being targeted by this harasser. And I will say one of the problems at this university is that way [redacted] so once something like that starts, once you get involved with OEO and you’re sort of everything is super confidential. Like, you can’t talk about this to anybody. And so I’m caught in a position where I have to say like I don’t recommend you take a class offered by this person from 7:00-10:00 at night, you know. Why? Well, I just don’t think it would be a good fit for you.”

9. Rank Matters: Gender inequity disproportionately affects non-tenure track (NTT) faculty. Dr. Fouad met with several groups of non-tenure track faculty. Their comments were characterized by a very strong desire to serve the University and their students, but also a clear vulnerability to gender biases against them from their students and others in the unit. Because they often felt vulnerable in their “at will” positions, they were particularly concerned about confidentiality and the possibility of retribution for voicing concerns. This group was the most vocal about the gender biases of teaching evaluations, where both male and female
students commented on and evaluated them on their physical appearance, yet their future contracts were dependent on good evaluations. Several felt their potential contributions were discounted because of their non-tenure-track status. It was also clear that the process of moving from non-tenure track to tenure track status was mysterious, although many had heard of men who had made this move.

“As non-tenure track part-time adjunct faculty, I have talent and experience to give but few opportunities to use and express those talents and my experience because of how the system of hiring and distributing classes is not one to recognize those talents and experiences.”

“I was at a huge advantage coming here because I was pre-tenure somewhere else. So I had stuff in progress, um, I don’t think I would have made it here, if I had to start from scratch because there is no support for research. None. No research time. Which is not what I was told.”

“But -- and some of it is not about individuals or this institution, but a larger patriarchal structure, one that is deliberately blind to the realities of adjuncts, such that many of my colleagues have no idea what my circumstances are or what my, the circumstances of my peers are.”

10. **Carrying the Load:** Women faculty accomplish a disproportionate percentage of service- and non-research related work. Women at all ranks talked about the inequity of service expectations. This included expectations of meeting with students, doing departmental service, taking on advising, and doing university service that didn’t “count” in yearly evaluations. Although the questions did not explicitly ask about differences in service expectations, this finding was expressed by nearly every focus group. The participants felt that they were frequently in a double bind—that they were given committee or advising assignments because they did them well, and then received another assignment as a result. Many women talked about being given a time-consuming assignment because their chairs knew they would do it well, and then not being given recognition in the yearly evaluation for that work. Many also said they did the service work because students would suffer if they did not do it, but were frustrated about their (mostly) male colleagues who seemed indifferent to the consequences of not doing service at all or not doing it well.

“So you get so many more demands placed on you. And I really do feel like this comes heavily to the female faculty and staff, heavily. And that does not get counted for at all in any way . . . [women’s service] gets pushed into [gender-biased] paradigms.”

“I plan to spend that whole week writing letters for students for graduate school because I expect to be writing 20 or more letters for students. Well here’s the response of the men in my Department. One of them says, well, I just tell the students that I only
write letters for students who have taken two classes with me. Well, he only teaches
one class, and so it’s not possible.”

“And so, these guys get great reviews because they’re publishing because they’re doing
nothing else, where all this other work is being done by women. So, that’s one example
about how the experience for women is different. In my experience, there are women
on campus who have collapsed from exhaustion because they’re giving so much.”

“Another woman came in the same year with me and we sat down with one of the
two women faculty who was leaving, and that’s what she said to her, we’re having
lunch at the Aspen Grill, and she said, here’s the deal. You’re going to get run into the
ground if you take on this service and don’t do the stuff. So, you need to know what
stuff gets rewarded and you need to do that. Otherwise, you’re going to leave like me,
a permanent Associate Professor who graduates the most students and never gets a
raise.”

“They expect women to be on every committee; they expect women to do tons and
tons of service. Well guess what that comes at the expense of? Scholarship. So I turned
down service opportunities sometimes, but then you get labeled—you know—as
“you’re not a team player.” But if a guy does that, oh you know, there is one
department on campus that’s famous, it’s mostly male, and it’s famous for not doing
any service and no one calls upon them to do it.”

11. Both Women and Men in Leadership Identified as Problematic: Concerns were expressed
about current men and women leaders, who many participants felt continued the status quo
(department chairs, deans, administration). A number of participants expressed that the
women who were in leadership positions had not taken strong stances to support other
women, and were too often trying to appease their supervisors and top administration, rather
than working for change. There was a concern that ineffective women and men leaders were
more often promoted into leadership and were maintained in those positions rather than
being replaced with stronger, more effective women leaders.

“Those women who are in top administrative positions seem to reinforce the male-
dominated culture rather than work to help other women, particularly adjunct women
establish career paths, get evaluations, get access to resources, or be considered for
merit raises.”

“And so you have these really bad guys and they’re not necessarily men. I mean,
women can be toxic, too but you have these bad players who the system just allows
them to be, you know, vicious, vindictive, and we lose faculty, we lose really good
people over it.”
“This holds true for men or women, but I’m speaking of my perspective from dealing with women, is that you, you have the folks that have made it, and then try to help everyone else up. And you have the folks that have made it and try to keep everyone else down.”

12. Accumulation of Gender Inequity: Similar to the comments about the impact of gender inequity were comments made by women who had been in the university for a long time, most of whom were Associate Professors, Full Professors or in academic leadership. Many expressed exhaustion from and frustration about ongoing gender bias, conscious and unconscious, in their departments and beyond. Many expressed frustration about perceptions that, while their significant professional accomplishments, which was recognized outside the university in their professional circles, but not within the university. Dr. Fouad asked about what helped them be successful and thrive, and while many noted things that helped them be successful (see next finding), the question caused several women to tear up and say that nothing had helped them thrive, but merely to tread water, in their current positions.

“I did what I was supposed to do as Assistant Professor, I did it as an Associate Professor, I got to be a full Professor, and then I looked around and literally it’s like -- what now? ... And you never arrive. You never, you never are in . . . You’re never accepted.”

“So, the fact that the climate in my department is problematic for me becomes overriding. It kind of doesn’t matter that there’s [many great programs and events that happen on campus] all this great stuff going on.”

“I mean I think it’s good to have mentors and for us to come together, but at the end of the day if there’s jerks in power . . . we can help each other survive this, but if CSU really wants to be an excellent place for women, we need to be doing more than figuring out how to survive.“

“I think there are the obvious solutions, like let’s raise salaries to make salaries gender equitable. I think that’s great, but I don’t think it stops there. Right? I think there are plenty of other, um, I don’t know, I’ve heard people refer to it as like death by a thousand cuts, or microaggressions—smaller things that just build up and are frustrating.”

“Where it might not be enough for another -- you know, another woman in, in my Department although it doesn’t seem like they failed to advance, they are certainly full Professors in my Department that are women. But, they don’t seem to be in the leadership structure.”

13. Women of Color and LGBT Faculty at Increased Risk for Inequity: Women Faculty of color and LGBT faculty may experience being institutionally silenced and/or face more severe
consequences for expressing concerns about equity. This study primarily reflects the narratives of women faculty who identify as white, middle-class and heterosexual; the lack of participation from underrepresented populations may suggest concerns about reprisals for sharing experiences coded as racist and/or heteronormative. Those few women faculty of color or gender queer who did participate disclosed the expectation of multiple forms of retribution for identifying racist, heteronormative, and/or classist policies and procedures. Additionally, white women participants sometimes discussed the double impact of sexism and racism on their women of color colleagues.

“I don’t see many women of color like putting themselves in leadership positions because of the climate and I even feel it in even meetings I mean being on sorta of the diversity committees from the college level it’s very evident “

“Um so there’s not necessary like any structural issues like um support systems for women of color I think we have to sorta like go out and find them and navigate those spaces um and question like who who’s here you know and again in a place where I am not the only women of color and so I’ve been able to sort of like get connected with people that um outside of my department but you know its um yeah so I think at the university level there is this recognition that it is a chilly climate here for women in general and even more chillier climate you know for women of color but I also feel like there’s um I think white women don’t understand race sometimes and so um while I do have allies um from some of my white women colleagues in my department um there very few you know um and so I think it’s hard to create solidarity you know among women when there’s not this understanding that this issue is very intersectional.”

Talking about mentoring other women: “She was so concerned about what she knew, especially for some of the female faculty members --that would come to her on the side or that she was trying to mentor. And this particular area was notorious for female faculty leaving, especially female faculty of color.”

14. **Women Faculty Thriving at CSU:** The final question asked women what helped them to thrive. Many talked about their colleagues, both within their department and across the university, and mentors within the university as significant sources of support. Many women talked about gratification that came from their own scholarship and from working with students. Still others talked about the success they feel from significant involvement in, and recognition from, their professional societies beyond CSU.

“I think it’s real important for me to feel part of a big collaborative venture... But, but those collaborative ventures I’ve found nationally and internationally [not on my own campus or department].”

“Yeah, so, you know, I think from my perspective there’s probably a lot more equity in our department in terms of how young faculty are, are nurtured, and I think they really are nurtured. And there’s protection for new faculty coming in both from the
Administration so you don’t get put on a ton of Committees if they can avoid it. But, I think in general, the equity is pretty good in our department.”

“I used to be the first one to say that the central Administration talk, that they talk about being the best place for women and does absolutely nothing to actually change things. But this is one place [policy on parental leave] where they are moving in the right direction in my opinion.”

“In my department, we’re higher than the national average in our field of, of women. We’ve organized ourselves to be very family friendly to both men and women. So allowing people to sort of schedule their classes around, you know, child pickup, the ongoing issue of what you do in maternity leave. You know, I think that’s gotten better”

“The women here that I have run into, and not just in groups like this but on Committees and stuff, are smart, are thinking about how to change this, are doing really good constructive stuff within their own departments and often have really inspiring stories about like here’s how you make this work well. And so whatever they decide to do, keeping in touch with actual women about how things are going, would be a good idea because I think there’s a lot of wisdom from experience.”

**Conclusion**

We understand from these findings that the Colorado State University community is grappling with campus climate and a culture in which gender equity and gendered practices have left many women faculty feeling discouraged and less valued than the male faculty members they work alongside. The findings articulated here must be addressed on a systemic and structural level if we are to improve our campus climate and culture at CSU. In the 2016 fall address President Frank said, “Change is hard but it’s what we do and after all, not changing is even harder.” We know from research that when change is proposed particularly arising from reports like these, there is organizational resistance particularly to the message being presented and the people presenting the message – especially if we are not attentive to our own desire to resist change (Bridges, 2009). CSU has initiated efforts, programs, services, campaigns and academic programs to address the needs and challenges for women in the academy. These efforts have occurred over the course of many decades and across different administrations. It is our hope that our continued and future efforts will address gendered practices that keep structures in place that benefit some at the expense of others in order to improve the climate and culture for everyone at Colorado State University.
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APPENDIX A
Focus Group Questions

1. Suppose someone asked you what the campus climate was like for women (of color/LGBTTQ/NTT) faculty that work at CSU what would you say? [prompt for what they’ve seen around them, i.e. Perceptions] How would you describe that and why do you see it this way? [prompt for is it different from what you expected and why?]

2. Tell me about what some typical situations might be at CSU that woman (of color/LGBTTQ) faculty members experience differently than male faculty and why that is the case? [prompt for institutional culture here e.g., service contributions, collegiality, assumptions about nature of work, workload, classes/evaluations/confidence, competence]

3. Tell me about a particular experience that was challenging for you as a woman (of color/LBGTTQ) faculty member at CSU [prompt for a time you were bothered and kept thinking about it after work]? And how so?

4. What has helped you or other women faculty (of color/LGBTTQ/NTT) to thrive and feel successful at CSU?

5. Suppose someone asked about institutional practices that impact women (of color/LGBTTQ/NTT) faculty at CSU – what would you tell them about supports or barriers in the department/college/university? And why? [prompt for what should the institution stop doing in order to make us a premier institution for women e.g.: excluding women, leadership opportunities, traditional roles, silencing, taking up space, misuse of power and what should we keep doing to make us a premier institution]

6. CARD 1: What seems impossible to do today to improve campus climate but if we did do it, would fundamentally change the experience of women faculty at CSU and help more women thrive?

CARD 2: Please add any additional information you wish about your experience as a woman faculty member at CSU

7. Is there something else I could have asked about that I didn’t ask? (prompt for Is there something else you want to say?)
APPENDIX B
Individual Interview Questions

1. Suppose someone asked you what the campus climate was like for women (of color/LGBTQQ/NTT) faculty that work at CSU what would you say? [prompt for what they’ve seen around them, i.e., Perceptions] How would you describe that and why do you see it this way? [prompt for is it different from what you expected and why]

2. Tell me about what some typical situations might be at CSU that woman (of color/LGBTQQ) faculty members experience differently than male faculty and why that is the case? [prompt for institutional culture here e.g., service contributions, collegiality, assumptions about nature of work, workload, classes/evaluations/confidence, competence]

3. Tell me about a particular experience that was challenging for you as a woman (of color/LGBTQ) faculty member at CSU [prompt for a time you were bothered and kept thinking about it after work]? And how so?

4. What has helped you or other women faculty (of color/LGBTQQ/NTT) to thrive and feel successful at CSU?

5. Suppose someone asked about institutional practices that impact women (of color/LGBTQQ/NTT) faculty at CSU – what would you tell them about supports or barriers in the department/college/university? And why? [prompt for what should the institution stop doing in order to make us a premier institution for women e.g.: excluding women, leadership opportunities, traditional roles, silencing, taking up space, misuse of power and what should we keep doing to make us a premier institution]?

6. What seems impossible to do today to improve campus climate but if we did do it, would fundamentally change the experience of women faculty at CSU and help more women thrive?

7. Is there something else I could have asked about that I didn’t ask, or something else you want to say about your experiences as a woman faculty member at CSU?
APPENDIX C
Online Survey Questions

Welcome to the electronic open-ended survey for the research project “Experiences and Perceptions of Campus Climate for Women Faculty at CSU.” Because we were unable to accommodate you in one of the scheduled interview or focus group sessions, we would like to invite you to respond to the interview questions through an anonymous electronic survey. These are the same questions that were used for the focus group and individual interviews. You are welcome to respond to the questions at any length. Before doing so, please take a few moments to read the cover letter:

For all questions, when thinking about the experiences of women faculty, consider intersecting identities (e.g., race/ethnicity, sexual identity, and faculty status and appointment type). Suppose someone asked you what the campus climate was like for women faculty that work at CSU what would you say?

1. How would you describe that and why do you see it this way? Is it different from what you expected and why?
2. Tell me about what some typical situations might be at CSU that woman faculty members experience differently than male faculty and why you believe that is the case? Consider institutional culture, practices, and policies.
3. Tell me about a particular experience that was challenging for you as a woman faculty member at CSU? And how so? Consider a time you were bothered and kept thinking about it after work. What has helped you or other women faculty to thrive and feel successful at CSU?
4. Suppose someone asked about institutional practices that impact women faculty at CSU – what would you tell them about supports or barriers in the department/college/university? And why?
5. What should the institution stop doing in order to make us a premier institution for women and what should we keep doing to make us a premier institution?
6. What seems impossible to do today to improve campus climate but if we did do it, would fundamentally change the experience of women faculty at CSU and help more women thrive?
7. Is there something else I could have asked about that I didn’t ask, or something else you want to say about your experiences as a woman faculty member at CSU?

Thank you very much for taking the time to participate in this study. Your voices and stories will contribute to campus-wide improvements. This summer the research team will analyze data, prepare a report for the CSU Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty, and then report to the CSU administration with recommendations.
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“When we pause, we tend to wipe our brow, take a breath, smile and then put our shoulder back to the wheel—because we know there is so much more to do and CSU does things.”

--Tony Frank, “Fall Address,” 2016

Overview

Colorado State University (CSU) President Tony Frank set a goal for our campus to become a premiere institution for women to work and learn. To make that goal a reality, we understand that the CSU culture and climate must shift in order for women faculty, those who are historically marginalized in the U.S., and indeed all members of the CSU community to thrive at Colorado State University. The following recommendations are preliminary. They are meant to provide an overview of the challenges identified by the research study, Experiences and Perceptions of Campus Climate for Women Faculty at Colorado State University, conducted by the Qualitative Research Subcommittee of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty (SCSWF). These recommendations draw upon a) the results of a qualitative study, conducted in April 2016, which was initiated by the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty at Colorado State University and implemented by an outside researcher with strong expertise in this area to collaborate with the CSU/SCSWF Research Subcommittee (IRB approval was received to conduct this study); b) administrative reports on gender equity and faculty completed by other universities; and c) related literature and scholarship. However, for these recommendations to be integrated into the university policies and structure, an external organizational consultant with an expertise in gender and higher education is needed. An external consultant is in a unique position to work with upper administration to review these preliminary recommendations and provide suggestions for best practices.

Women faculty (N=76, 12% of the women faculty at CSU) participated in either one of the 11 focus groups, ten individual interviews, or 21 individual responses to the online surveys; all participants responded to the same set of questions. Women at all ranks and appointment types were included in the study (including Instructors, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors both on and off the tenure track). Participants all identified as female faculty. The race/ethnicity for the sample consisted of 70 faculty who identified as White (92%) and six women of color (8%). The age of participants ranged from 26-late 60s years of age. Transcripts were collated and all identifying information was redacted before the CSU/SCSWF Research Team reviewed data to ensure the utmost confidentiality for participants. Rigorous methodology was employed to analyze the data to generate findings that informed the recommendations contained herein.
Part I: Guiding Framework

The guiding framework reflects the findings from Experiences and Perceptions of Campus Climate for Women Faculty at Colorado State University, a qualitative study commissioned by the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty and conducted by an external researcher working with the SCSWF Research Subcommittee. These data, combined with reports on women faculty and input from the SCSWF, provided the basis for the preliminary recommendations provided herein. Following the schema for effective institutional change produced by the American Association for University Professors (AAUP, n.d.), we draw upon the following concepts within each recommendation:

**Accountability (A):** Effective accountability measures—including clearly articulated outcomes/objective statements, as well as fair and confidential procedures of information collection—should be implemented for leadership at all levels.

**Consistency (C):** Within units and at the larger institutional level, leadership decisions that impact faculty should be consistently applied.

**Transparency (T):** At all levels, significant leadership decisions (and rationale for those decisions) should be clearly articulated and made accessible to CSU faculty to enhance effective communication and inspire the trust necessary for productive collaboration and shared goals.
Part II: Processes for Implementing Preliminary Draft Recommendations

The preliminary recommendations require cultural changes that will challenge unconscious biases. Institutional cultural change is often difficult to initiate and sustain so that transformation is possible. Successful recommendations (Part III) require cultural and structural changes and challenges to various forms of unconscious bias that are difficult to transform. We suggest the following strategies to successfully implement meaningful, systemic change:

1) Hire an external consultant with expertise in organizational change with a specific emphasis in gender equity in higher education. This consultant will work with President Frank and his cabinet to engage in the structural changes needed as indicated by the findings of the study, *Experiences and Perceptions of Campus Climate for Women Faculty* at Colorado State University.

a) External consultant will initially consult with the SCSWF and the Research Subcommittee to review research findings and review and revise the preliminary draft recommendations to incorporate best practices and related research.

b) The Subcommittee has identified two possible experts who illustrate the kind of consultant we recommend for this position:

   i) Dr. Susan R. Madsen, the *Orin R. Woodbury Professor of Leadership and Ethics* in the Woodbury School of Business at Utah Valley University, a *Visiting Fellow* of the Faculty of Economics and Business at the University of Zagreb (Croatia), *Distinguished Visiting Fellow* of the Lancaster Leadership Centre in the U.K, and a *Fellow* of The Leadership Trust Foundation in Ross-on-Wye, England. “Dr. Madsen has been heavily involved for the last decade in researching the lifetime development of prominent women leaders. She has personally interviewed a host of women university presidents, U.S. governors, and international leaders, as well as studying many aspects of women and leadership more broadly. Susan has conducted related research in the U.S., the six Arab Gulf countries, China, and Eastern Europe” (Press, 2016).

   ii) Dr. Sandy Shullman, managing partner of the Columbus, O.H. Office of the Executive Development Group, an international leadership development and consulting firm, with offices in Greensboro, N.C., Atlanta, Columbus, O.H., and London. Dr. Shullman “directs large scale executive coaching, executive education, and development projects for national and multinational client organizations. She also works individually as an executive coach with senior executives, especially in the financial services, high technology/scientific, higher education and health care areas. She has had a distinguished career working with senior executives and executive teams in a
wide range of national and multinational organizations” (Biography of Sandra L. Shullman, 2016).

2) Re-evaluate position descriptions and duties of current upper level administrative positions responsible for faculty affairs regarding gender equity and make appropriate changes. If needed, develop a new administrative position (or build into existing positions), to be held by an experienced faculty member who will have the power and authority to implement meaningful change that is transparent, holds individuals and groups accountable, and is consistently implemented across units and via larger institutional policy. This position might be a Vice Provost for Gender Equity or similarly influential leadership position with the authority to address organizational policy compliance, accountability, and resistance.

3) Establish an Implementation Change Team (or similar entity) including representatives from SCSWF, Faculty Council, Deans, Associate Deans, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, etc., to ensure accountability, review evaluation measures and results, and guide the implementation of institutional changes. This entity will work with the new administrative position, the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty, and the external consultant. This committee will function as a “think tank” to develop objectives, consider consequences (intended and unintended) of initiatives, etc. This committee is referenced through the recommendations listed below.

4) Develop concrete objectives to improve gender equity and campus climate with measurable metrics that include incentives for meeting stated goals and ramifications for under-performance by administration and faculty across the university (e.g., increase the number of women full professors; allocate equitable service loads by gender; provide annual progress on incorporating recommendations from the Committee on Non-Tenure Track faculty).

5) Develop procedures for effective and meaningful evaluation in light of the outcomes/objectives and metrics described above in #3. Ensure that these procedures provide confidentiality for individuals and measurable results. Units should contribute to specific gender related goals and annual reports, and/or audits should provide feedback on outcomes that might be collected via a color-coded “progress card” (green=completed; yellow=pending; red=not completed).

6) Conduct an audit of all university policies, including unit, department, college, and university codes, to ensure consistency and compliance with gender-equitable practices as articulated in this report. Incorporate audit into existing review procedures (i.e. regular departmental reviews).
7) Provide space and mechanisms for CSU community members to provide feedback, share their perspectives, and allow time to accept the change ahead (Bridges, 2009).

8) Ensure a process of campus-wide accountability for all faculty/administrators responsible for implementing concrete and meaningful changes. An external consultant who is an expert in this area would contribute to ensuring there is an effective process for accountability. In addition, require regular reports on progress and advances to the CSU community and facilitate dialogues to enhance awareness and enable multiple perspectives to be shared.
# Part III: Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Challenges Identified from Research Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A. Current Leadership Model Lacks Accountability and Training for Chairs, Heads, Deans and Upper Administration.** | **College and Departmental Level Leadership (Deans/Chairs/Heads)**

1. Incorporate outcomes/objectives regarding gender equity as criteria in Chair/Heads/Deans annual evaluations; ensure equitable and confidential procedures for collection of information from faculty for evaluation of Chairs/Heads/Deans. Incorporate performance on outcomes/objectives/metrics as campus climate improvements on annual performance evaluations. Report back annually to faculty on gender equity and campus climate for improvements at the unit/college level. (A, T)

2. Regularly conduct meaningful gender-aware training for Chairs/Heads/Deans; training should include strategies for addressing unconscious bias, effects of intersectionality, and strategies for changing systemic/institutional structures that adversely impact women faculty. All supervisors should be trained in handling challenges, conflict, having difficult conversations and developing approaches for early interventions. Implement best practices in these trainings. (A, C)

3. Review distinction between “Head” and “Chair” positions; conduct analysis to determine which model provides more equitable leadership. (A, C)

4. Ensure that Chairs/Heads consistently implement university-wide policies regarding gender equity and develop mechanisms to effectively communicate rationale for and effects of that implementation. (C, T)

5. Ensure clear, effective and ongoing communication with department Chairs/Heads and faculty regarding implementation of university-wide policies. (T)

---

1This includes all units, centers, schools, and other entities involving faculty.
### University-wide Level Leadership (President’s Cabinet)

1. Incorporate outcomes/objectives regarding gender equity as criteria in annual evaluations of upper administrators; ensure equitable and confidential procedures for information collection for evaluations. (A, T)

2. Ensure that hiring at the upper administrative level be through open searches and preferably with national searches to allow for diverse leadership experiences and styles to bring new approaches into the institution and avoid entrenched leadership. Any exceptions to open searches should be clearly explained and communicated to the campus community. (T)

3. Each level of administration from the Dean level and above should be accountable for outcomes/objectives regarding gender equity in the colleges and areas they supervise. (A)

### B. Current Complaint & Grievance Processes (OEO, Conflict Resolution, Faculty Council Grievance Committee, Ombuds etc.) often do not Adequately Resolve Gender-Related Concerns or Protect Complainants.

1. Communicate clearly the multiple processes for addressing complaints and grievances, including timelines, actions that will be taken, potential consequences of actions, etc. (T)

2. Ensure confidentiality for complainants without retribution. (A)

3. Ensure university policies and unit codes address gender-related concerns and protect complainants. (A, C)

4. Procedures for redress should be consistent across departments, units, colleges, & ranks. (C)

5. Develop evaluation procedures such that all participants in any complaint/grievance process can provide feedback on their experiences with that process. (A, T)

6. Foster accountability by charging the Implementation Change Team (or similar entity) with annual reviews of offices that address gender-related complaints or grievances. (A, T)

7. Recognize effects of intersectionality in complaint
and grievance process; e.g., how identity of complainant can impact confidentiality, microaggressive responses, possible retaliation, retribution, etc. (A, C)

8. Promote the new Faculty Ombuds actively and in an ongoing manner so that faculty across all ranks and colleges are aware of the services and supports. (C, T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Unit and University Culture Fosters Policies and Procedures that Adversely Affect Women Faculty Across Rank and Appointment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Charge an organizational change consultant to work with the Implementation Change Team (or similar entity) to identify institutional cultural practices and university policies and procedures that contribute to gender (in)equity. Recommend best practices for addressing cultural and policy change. Develop/track measurable outcomes associated with their implementation to impact positive cultural changes for women at all ranks and appointment types. (A, C, T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regularly conduct meaningful gender equity training for faculty in all units to promote culture change and fairness for all. Training should include best practices for supervisors and strategies for addressing unconscious bias, effects of intersectionality, ethics, leadership, conflict resolution, how to have difficult conversations, and strategies for changing systemic/institutional structures and culture that adversely impact women faculty. (A, C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Train Chairs/Heads in identifying and addressing gender-related micro-aggressions in departments, committees, etc. (A, C, T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In conjunction with the external consultant, develop gender-related competencies for the evaluation of all administrators. Add incentives for comprehensive implementation of gender equity practices and disincentives for underperformance. (A, C, T)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Evaluation Protocols Need to Better Account for Potential Gender-Bias.

1. Coordinate public discussions regarding potential for gender bias in evaluation, including student course evaluations, (e.g., Type B courses taught, graduate advising).
2. Redesign university-wide course surveys to address gender bias in student evaluations of faculty. (A, C, T)
3. Revise evaluation processes to account for plural forms of teaching, research and service that occur in multiple locations (e.g., community presentations, engaged collaborative community scholarship). (T)
4. Recognize that collaborative, inter- and transdisciplinary scholarship has significant and valuable impacts while also often being more time consuming and challenging for faculty. (C, T)
5. Revise evaluation criteria for Non-Tenure Track faculty to align with recommendations from the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty proposal\(^2\). (A, C, T)
6. Foster accountability by charging the Implementation Change Team (or similar entity) with regular audit of T&P and annual merit evaluation practices that considers gender-related outcomes/objectives. (A, T)
7. Make results of said audit available to all faculty. (C, T)

### E. NTT Faculty are Disproportionately Vulnerable to Gender Bias and Associated Inequities.

1. Clearly communicate to the campus community about NTT faculty issues, acknowledging that the majority of NTT faculty are women. (A, T)
2. Implement recommendations of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty to include the creation of secure, centrally funded lines for teaching faculty with support for a vested career path. Changes should also include multi-year or renewable contracts for Senior Teaching Appointments (74% women), offer letters, due
**NTT Faculty continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process, resources to support work NTTF are hired for, and full emancipation into governance of units and larger university with full voting rights at all levels. (C, T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensure consistent application of university-wide policies for NTT Faculty. (A, C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Incorporate university-wide policies for NTT Faculty into annual Chair/Head trainings. (A, C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Charge the Implementation Change Team (or similar entity) with oversight and have each unit conduct an immediate internal review of their NTT evaluation procedures to consider gender-related outcomes. Thereafter incorporate regular review of NTT procedures and policies. (A, C, T)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Parental Leave Policies are Inconsistently Applied and Require Further Development.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Provide meaningful annual training for Chairs/Heads and interested faculty to understand policies and implementation expectations. (A, T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Track Chairs/Heads participation in annual parental leave training. Provide incentives for Chairs/Heads compliance with parental leave policy. (A, T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consistently enact parental leave policies across all units and colleges. (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consider centralized human resource staff to monitor implementation of parental leave policy for university wide implementation. (A, C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop evaluation tools to invite feedback from faculty who use parental leave. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Charge the Implementation Change Team (or similar entity) with annual review of said evaluation materials and with making recommendations for improving policies and procedures based on that feedback. (A, T)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^2\) Aberle, J, Barnes, N., Doe, S., DiVerdi, J. Greene, D. Morse, J, Ooi, N. & Schaeffer, S. [CSU Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty]. (June 2016). *Re-Envisioning Faculty Appointments: Proposal to Transform Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments.*
| G. Salary Equity remains a Challenge at all Levels and Appointment Types. | 1. Ensure that rationales and/or formulas for faculty pay raises by Chairs/Heads or Deans—whether based on merit, equity, or dispensation of discretionary funds—are clearly communicated to all faculty in the relevant departments/units. (A, T)  
2. Include both TT and NTT faculty in salary equity processes and access to discretionary funds. (C)  
3. Distribute responsibility for advocating for salary equity reviews beyond department Chair/Head. (A, C)  
4. Charge the Implementation Change Team (or similar entity) to conduct a regular review of salaries across the university that considers gender equity. (A, T) |
| --- | --- |
| H. Faculty Search Policies and Advancement Opportunities often Impede Hiring of Women and Diverse Faculty. | 1. Ensure that searches (internal and external) implement OEO practices. Provide opportunities for faculty advancement or access to positions with workload adjustments. (A, C, T)  
2. Ensure all search committee members have engaged in training on unconscious bias and best practices for equitable searches. Establish specific goals for increasing representation of under-represented groups across units. (A, C)  
3. Enact best practices in spousal hire/dual hire initiatives and evaluate their implementation and consistency across the university. (A, C, T)  
4. Centralize human resource staff to monitor spousal hire/dual career policies for university wide implementation, (A, C)  
5. Annually review all hiring procedures and results, based on outcomes statement/objectives for gender equity, including conditions of employment, rank, salaries, etc., with a goal of exceeding our national peers. (A, C) |
I. Women faculty are Responsible for a Disproportionate Amount of Service and are not Adequately Credited for the Demands of Service Work.

1. Charge the Implementation Change Team (or similar entity) to audit service contributions by all faculty; this audit should not only use FARs data but more nuanced measures that include time commitment, number of meetings, significance of committee/service work, etc. (C, T)

2. Publicly disseminate the findings of the service audit to ensure opportunities for broad discussion and accountability of the findings. (A, T)

3. Implement best practices for accounting for and rewarding service, including making necessary changes to the annual evaluation and T&P processes and requirements. (A, C, T)

4. Provide a mechanism to document actual time spent in service activities, track delegation and volunteering of service, and compensate faculty for assigned service overloads. (A, C)

5. Establish criteria for service oriented scholarship that engages and benefits communities. This entails reevaluation of T & P guidelines to ensure that scholarship produced for communities and pedagogical scholarship be recognized as scholarly contributions and not serve as a barrier to promotion.

3 It is critical to recognize different types of scholarly activity that are often dismissed, devalued, or marginalized for a range of reasons that include gender.
J. Inadequate Number of and Support for Qualified Women in Leadership Positions.

1. Clarify the processes by which leaders are hired and evaluated. (T)
2. Administrators should be evaluated on gender-equitable practices in their units. (A)
3. Provide training and education across the university on best practices in leadership, differences in leadership styles, unconscious bias in perceptions and evaluations of women in leadership positions. (A, C, T)
4. Charge the Implementation Change Team (or similar entity) to create and implement innovative and consistent mentorship opportunities to attract and support women in leadership positions. (C)
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