

**Annual Report
2008-2009
Status of Women Review Committee
Brandon University**

1. Committee members:

(a) Jagdish Malik	Board of Governors
(b) Linda Burridge	Deans and Directors
(c) Dr. Tish Langlois	Arts
(d) Sherry Peden	Education
(e) Karen Doty-Sweetnam	Health Studies and FNAC
(f) Dr. Andrée Dagenais	Music (on sabbatical Jan-July 2009)
(g) Kathleen Nichol	Science and BUFA
(i) Dr. Shannon Gadbois	Invited (on sabbatical)
(j) Dr. Marion Terry	Student Services
(l) Marianne Reid	Library/invited

2. The committee held twelve meetings between April 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009.

Please see the report **Status of Women Review Committee - Summary of Activities and Future Directions** (attached) for a summary of the aims of the committee.

3. Workshops and events organized or attended:

- (a) **End of term Celebration, April 15, 2008:** Female students, staff and faculty who were honoured on International Women's Day were invited to join in the last event of the year, "Making us proud: a celebration of women's achievements at BU" with all invited to share good news, and the occasional gripe. Twenty-three attended. Honoured guests were treated; faculty paid.
- (b) **Spring Promotion and Tenure Dossier-Viewing Workshop** was held on May 22, 2008. Six faculty were asked to present their hints for preparing dossiers. These members' dossiers had been recommended as good models by either the chair of the tenure or of the promotion committee. Twelve faculty members attended and three received notes or information afterward. SW provided refreshments. Feedback from participants indicated that the session was useful, although more time to view dossiers would be appreciated.
- (c) **The session for BUFA members during New Employee Orientation** was held on August 27, 2008. Twenty-two new faculty (out of a possible 28) attended the session for BUFA members, to hear of topics of concern specific to them. Representatives from BUFA, the Research Office, the bookstore, the library, info tech, the registrar's office, finance and registration and student services introduced themselves to the group and outlined how they are able to assist faculty in their research and teaching roles. Generally, new faculty found the orientation useful, especially the BUFA introduction and information on teaching resources. A desire for a visit from BUFA representatives to the Winnipeg Health Studies site was expressed. The Faculty of Arts provided refreshments.
- (d) **Fall Promotion and Tenure workshop** was held on September 12, 2008. Dr. Visentin, Dr. Doug Pickering (most recent chair of the tenure committee) and Dr. Erasmus Monu

(most recent chair of the promotion committee) presented, giving their advice. Then participants broke into groups, by faculty, to view dossiers and hear advice. One or more faculty members, whose dossier was recommended by either the promotion or tenure committee, were invited to lead these groups – they stated briefly how they approached the process and showed their dossier organization. Seventeen faculty attended the workshop, and three who were unable to attend were forwarded notes after the session. Participants indicated that they appreciated hearing hints on the process and on preparing dossiers and seeing sample dossiers. And they wished for a larger room and more time! SW provided refreshments.

(e) **Women’s Research Network fall wine and cheese & Mentoring kick-off** was held October 24, 2008. Several established researchers were invited to serve as mentors for female faculty researchers. Bernadette Ardelli, Fran Racher, Meg Carrington, Pamela Rutherford and Marion Terry were able to attend. Helen Armstrong, Di Brandt, and Mary Malainey have agreed to serve as mentors, as well, but were unable to attend. All female faculty were invited, new faculty in particular. The presentations by mentors were followed by a time to connect and ask questions, over wine and cheese. This session was co-organized with Robin Saliba, of the Research Office. SW provided refreshments.

(f) **SW sent a delegate to the CAUT Equity Conference, titled “Recasting Equity”, in February 2009.** This was CAUT's first forum for equity of individuals with differences of colour, race, physical ability, mental health, sexual orientation, etc. The purpose of this forum was to explore the ways that universities disadvantage people with these differences, and to identify means to address the problem.

Conference attendees noted that training for hiring committees should also include equity training – "what does this person bring specially because a person of colour/disability/other minority?" or "what skills can this person bring to open a new area of learning?"

CAUT has developed an equity awareness workshop that universities can invite to be given on their campuses free of charge.

The delegate's full report is attached to this report. Comments quite related to Brandon University have been underlined.

(g) **BU Women’s Research Network brown bag lunch session “Making time for Research”** was held on March 26, 2009. This session was organized for female researchers in conjunction with the Research Office. Dr. Kathryn Hyndman from Health Studies and Dr. Pamela Rutherford from Biology, along with written advice forwarded by Dr. Tish Langlois from Sociology and Gender and Women's Studies and Dr. Suyoko Tsukamoto from Archeology, led off the discussions. Twenty one attended the session (three of these via video connection with the Health Studies site in Winnipeg), and two more who were unable to attend were forwarded minutes of the session. The VP Academic's office provided refreshments. Feedback received was positive and will be used to plan future sessions.

(h) **To celebrate International Women’s Day on March 8, 2009,** faculty were asked to nominate their exceptional senior female students. Twenty-five students were profiled on the BU home page for the week leading up to International Women's Day, thanks to the excellent assistance of Lisa Thomson, Communications Officer.

- (i) **A year-end celebration/honouring-students lunch was held April 22, 2009** for female faculty and those students honoured on March 8th. Thirteen students and fifteen faculty attended. SW provided refreshments for the students, while faculty members contributed to their lunches.

4. Workshops and Events planned:

- (a) **This summer's review:** The SWRC is instructed by the CA to conduct a review of the status of female faculty at five year intervals. As in past reviews, statistics on the present status of female faculty, according to salary, hires, tenure, promotions, are being gathered and analyzed. As well, a survey to gather perceptions of the working/research/and teaching conditions of female faculty is being conducted, via a web-based survey tool. A Masters in Education student, Jill Martine, has been hired as our research assistant. The results will be presented to BUFA members, to the BUFA executive and to the new President, Dr. Barbara Poff, in the fall.
- (b) **Women's research network future session "From Submission to Publication":** This session will aim to provide tips from experienced researchers on writing, how to handle feedback from reviewers, different ways to follow through to publication; discussion of the respect due e-journals and other acceptable outlets; discussion of methods of analysis; discussion of how the final work developed/morphed from the initial idea, due to reviewers' comments

5. Other:

- (a) **Resources in Brandon:** While conducting interviews, members had the need for quick access to information on housing, schools, daycares, events in Brandon to give to candidates. We note that a good set of links is provided on the Human Resources webpage under "Relocating to Brandon" – others may wish to know.
- (b) **Exit Interviews:** When leaving BU, faculty are asked to complete an exit questionnaire. SW was interested in what these might tell the university about why members leave. SW is pursuing the possibility of having such feedback given to Deans and Directors, and faculties, in a compiled, anonymous report.
- (c) **Safety on Campus:** Some concerns regarding safety arose at SW meetings – what persons are banned from BU campus? What emergency procedures are in place? How much do employees know about what to do in the event of an emergency? Is a PA system planned for campus? What safety improvements are being planned with the new money received? It was noted that the twenty television monitors are a help. **Denise Merrill, campus safety officer**, was invited to the April meeting to speak to new safety programs/devices on campus. Denise reported that with new money from COPSE,
- 1) the number of buildings with card scanners is being increased. The goal is to be able to shut down buildings rapidly in case of emergency.
 - 2) Four blue phones have been installed. By pushing the button the caller has a direct line to 911, and a revolving light helps locate the caller. The phones are located on the NE corner of KD bldg, on the N side of McKenzie, on the W of Library and S of gym.

- 3) BU is complying with Biosafety, as per Bill C-11, by tracking all pathogens. Pathogen hazards range from a low of 1 to a high of 4. Dr. Ardelli's lab contains some level 2 hazardous materials.
- 4) There are 24 BUNOW screens.
- 5) Fire drills were re-implemented this year and will be held again in the fall.
- 6) The emergency P.A. system has been installed. Tests will be carried out over the summer, and in the fall in conjunction with the fire drills. The whole campus or individual buildings can be addressed.

Thus, there are three methods of notification in case of emergency – the PA system, email and BUNOW. In response to a question, Denise noted that campus guards are on duty: Residence guard 11 p.m. – 7 a.m. every day, Parking 8 a.m.-8 p.m. Monday to Friday, Campus patrol 5 pm. – 1 a.m. on Monday to Friday, and 9:00 a.m. – 6:30 p.m. on weekends. Concerns were raised about the icy walkways on campus and the crosswalks on 18th street.

(d) Review of Status of Women Actions: Shannon Gadbois compiled "A Review of the BU Status of Women Review Committee Actions". *Please see the attached report. The report reviews past actions and indicates possible future directions of the committee. This review, along with this summer's review, will indicate future directions of the committee in its mandate to improve the status of women at BU.*

6. Financial Report: Please see next page.

6. Financial Report:

Balance as of April 1, 2008:	\$1280.29	
Income:		
	300.00	From President's Office for operating
	775.00	From President's Office for conference
	300.00	From BUFA for operating
	775.00	From BUFA for conference
	104.00	Recoveries from April 4, 2008 lunch
	25.68	Overcharge of May 22, 2008 canned drinks
	<u>74.60</u>	Recoveries from April 22, 2009 lunch
Total income:	+ \$2,354.28	
Expenses:	\$ 207.30	Honouring students lunch April 4, 2008
	82.93	Promotion & Tenure May 22, 2008
	16.99	Promotion & Tenure May 22, 2008
	28.85	Reimbursement to Andree Dagenais
	90.14	Promotion & Tenure Sept 12, 2008
	12.00	Copying Sept 18, 2008
	445.00	Registration to CAUT conference Oct 16 <i>Due to strike, travel to this conference was cancelled, and funds were applied to the CAUT equity conference of February 6-8, 2009</i>
	219.19	BU Women's Research Network session Oct 24, 2008
	2.04	FAX and copying Nov 13
	801.50	Marlin Travel flight & air shuttle for Oct 16 <i>Due to strike, travel to this conference was cancelled, and funds were applied to the CAUT equity conference of February 6-8, 2009</i>
	1.00	Fax January 16, 2009
	1170.48	Remainder of expenses for conference Feb 6-8, 2009
	158.55	Honouring students lunch April 22, 2009
	27.08	Honouring students lunch April 22, 2009
	1.76	Copying May 19, 2009
	78.25	Promotion & Tenure workshop May 28, 2009
	<u>2.56</u>	Copying June 17, 2009
Total expenses:	– \$3,345.51	

Balance as of June 30, 2009: \$ 289.06

NOTE: We have a credit with Westjet of \$102.90 to be used within one year (by February 2010).

Kathleen Nichol
July 10, 2009

CAUT EQUITY FORUM

“Recasting Equity”

February 6-8, 2009

Delegate Report by Marion Terry

On February 6-8, 2009, CAUT hosted its first equity forum. CAUT hosts gender equity forums every other year, but 2009 is the first year that CAUT has held a forum for the equity of individuals with other differences: colour, race, physical ability, mental health, sexual orientation, etc. The purpose of the forum was to explore the ways that universities disadvantage people with these differences, and to identify means to address the problem.

The message that prevailed during the conference was that universities are supposed to be “an industry of equity” (James Turk, CAUT Executive Director), and should therefore be exemplars of equity within their own operations. Before we can solve equity problems, we need to acknowledge that these problems exist, and that makes people uncomfortable. Discomfort is thus a necessary first step to ensuring equity in the university environment, as is having people of privilege (notably experienced white males) give up some of their power (such as positions on the BUFA Executive) in order to make room for people who are disadvantaged by their differences.

Another theme of the forum was that equity is not sameness (Richard Atleo, Yasmin Jiwani). Atleo used the Nuuchah Nulth Origin Story as an analogy, to show that just as people are different from animals without being superior to them, people can be different from each other without being superior or inferior. Atleo’s lesson was “I am equal to everyone else who is different from me.” As well, just as the people and animals in the Aboriginal origin story negotiated their reciprocal relationships in the natural world, people must learn to cooperate and accommodate each other in the human world. Equitable relationships are part of this learning experience. “Mutual misunderstanding creates mutual fear” (Atleo).

Yasmin Jiwani also insisted, “We need to get over the idea that equity means sameness.” Instead of striving for sameness, we need to embrace otherness. We tend to tolerate differences when we are fed them in small doses, but the indignities of everyday life add up to create “complete incarceration of self” (Jiwani). The elite racism that permeates university structures sets the tone for ambient racism.

In 1984, the Abella Commission’s report, *Equality in Employment*, defined employment equity as a removal of barriers to employment based on anything other than skill and ability. The Abella Report focused not on quotas, but on resolving pre-employment issues such as education, childcare, and workplace conditions. Equity is not affirmative action; it is “not a numbers game” (Audrey Kobayashi), but a means to ensure inclusive working environments. Such social change requires changes in human relationships. “Without equitable distribution of resources, equality is a hollow game” (Jiwani).

“Equity is like fixing the toilet” (Piet Defraeya). It is not a choice, but a necessity in the university milieu. We may not all like the way that equity policies play out in the real world, regardless of which end of the equity-inequity continuum we are on, but we all agree that equity is essential. The problem is that not everyone admits to the inequities that exist, and not everyone is committed to making whatever sacrifices are necessary to solve them.

An underlying theme of the discussions that occurred during the forum was how to resolve gender-based inequity. The term *double-othering* was used to identify women who had “other differences.” These women saw women’s groups (such as BUFA’s Status of Women Review Committee) as equity seekers, and other groups as diversity seekers. Some forum participants cautioned that we need to avoid making a split between “women and others” within the context of equity and diversity; others noted that while the number of women on university faculties is increasing, the number of “others” is decreasing. It was also noted that universities record the number of female who are hired, but no one records the number of people hired within other designated groups (colour, physical ability, sexual orientation, etc.).

As a middle-aged female university employee, I was particularly interested when the issue of age was raised as a difference of equitable concern. Age factors into hiring practices for women, because university women are generally seen as “too old” when they are at least ten years younger than their male cohorts. University administrators are eager to be rid of older employees of either gender, in order to save money by hiring younger workers.

In terms of the informal power that affects employees with differences, one delegate described universities as “bastions of white power” – and no one disagreed. Employees of lesser privilege tend to be drawn into services that do not count for tenure and promotion. For example, women are expected to serve on social committees. Demeaning behaviour by privileged employees is bullying, as distinct from harassment. We need to stop apologizing for racist and other offensive behaviour while continuing to do it.

In terms of formal power, the attitudes of senior university administrators were deemed critical. The problem in most universities is not policies regarding equity, but how they are applied. Most senior administrators do not recognize or believe that racism exists, so they resist efforts to combat it. The term “hysterical administrator” was used to describe administrators who are so fearful of the problem that they deny its existence. We need to teach senior administrators, most of whom are ex-professors, how to safeguard equity.

Hiring committees tend to short-list applicants who resemble themselves, so we need to make sure that these committees include not only women as well as men, but also people with other differences. The following questions were suggested as a means to identify applicants who would help to make the university environment more inviting: “How would you ensure that every student feels welcome in your class?” “What new ideas would you bring to the university community because of who you are?” “What initiatives would you bring to your academic discipline?”

Hiring, tenure, and promotion committees find reasons to reject professors who are different. For example, a professor who is a stellar teacher may be found lacking in research (even if that professor has as much research as an “acceptable” colleague), or a professor who does stellar research in one area may be found lacking in another. For tenure and promotion decisions in particular, it was noted that informal criteria such as “fitting in” and “belonging” are used to disadvantage people who are different. Delegates expressed a need to include diversity training in their preparation sessions for members of hiring, tenure, and promotion committees.

There was some discussion about the difference between visible and invisible differences. Inequities due to visible differences such as colour, gender, and physical ability are easier to redress. Invisible differences are subject to more subtle forms of oppression, such as the tendency to see some illnesses (both physical and mental) as more “authentic” than others. For example, our colleagues may accept diagnoses of diabetes (which they understand) but not multiple sclerosis (which has symptoms that may come and go). One delegate reported that his colleagues were very supportive of his mobility needs when he broke his leg, but they voted to remove him from the department while he was away temporarily due to a severe case of Seasonal Affective Disorder..

A prevailing theme that ran through the conference was ensuring equity for Aboriginal employees. Post-secondary education is still education for assimilation. There are only 50 Aboriginally run post-secondary institutions in Canada, and the First Nations University is the only Aboriginally run university that can apply for federal funding. CAUT’s censure of the First Nations University is a continuation of the effects of white colonialism in education (Bonita Lawrence). We need to use existing rich community models to give voice to Aboriginal ways of knowing and producing knowledge. We need to disrupt the whiteness that is embedded in our universities. Equity can be seen as a threat to non-Aboriginal employees (Richard Atleo). We fear what we do not know, and most people do not know Aboriginal ways.

The overall recommendations of the forum were as follows:

- Put equity on CAUT’s agenda, including an equity officer.
- Make equity a part of the hiring process, including the job ads – what they say and where they are placed.
- Expand the notions of inequity to include age, mental health, and other less commonly identified differences.
- Track data regarding hiring, tenure, and promotion of “employees of difference.”
- Include equity awareness as part of the training procedures for hiring, tenure, and promotion committee members.
- Include employees of difference as university union officers.
- Get out of the “talk shop” that we’ve been in for the past twenty-five years, and become activists for equity.
- Change our perspectives and terminology from “accommodation” and “acceptance” to “integration” and “inclusion.”
- Identify a clear process for employees who feel that they have not been treated equitably in the general workplace and in tenure and promotion decisions.

Status of Women Review Committee

Summary of Activities and Future Directions

Positive Action, Article 30, BUFA Collective Agreement

From Article 30: Positive Action to Improve the Status of Women of the Brandon University Collective Agreement, we get the mandate for our responsibilities that begin with the acknowledgement of:

“systematic discrimination to which women have been subjected in the past...”

Though the article makes reference to equity for all members, there are some specific elements of the article that emphasize our role on behalf of women, including Article 30, (e):

“Each Faculty/Unit will be responsible for establishing reasonable goals for the hiring of women where there are serious imbalances in the composition by sex of the membership of the Faculty/Unit. These goals shall be set by December 31, 1988.”

Article 30, (l) specifically refers to the responsibilities of the committee:

“The Review Committee shall review actions taken to improve the status of women in the university community, and, in particular, the development and implementation of the hiring goals required for academic faculties/units. It is also responsible for ongoing reviews to ensure that there is no discrimination based on sex in salaries, the process of securing tenure, promotion, the granting of sabbaticals or research grants. The Review Committee shall conduct a major review of such matters within one (1) year of April 1, 1988 and a similar retrospective review of five-year intervals thereafter. The Review Committee shall report at least annually to the Parties to this agreement. The Review Committee shall include an assessment of the progress being made towards the objectives on this Article. The Review Committee may assist academic Faculties/Units in establishing outreach programs to ensure equal access of women and men to all university programs.”

What has the Status of Women Review Committee Done?

Here is a general list of the main activities that the Status of Women Review Committee has organized and carried out:

- Teaching workshops (e.g., preparing a teaching dossier, teaching Aboriginal students, etc.)
- New Faculty Orientation sessions (since 1997)
- Tenure and Promotion workshops
- Research Network meetings and Discussions
- Social Gatherings for networking
- Recognition of women and students on campus for International Women’s Day
- Support for sessional staff

Generally attendance has been good at sessions and the feedback has been positive. Any recommendations for changes have always been attended to and implemented when possible. For example, people have found the tenure and promotion workshops very useful and have asked for the timing to be modified (e.g., to have them in the spring) and to have an opportunity to view successful dossiers, etc. These suggestions have been implemented.

From the work *initiated through* the Status of Women Review Committee, the university administration has taken on the responsibility of providing:

- Orientation for new staff, generally
- Research-based lunch discussions/women's research network
- Research mentors
- Teaching based sessions (BUTEC, currently inactive)
- Sessional Representative is now part of BUFA

Feedback from members: Major Themes Across Almost 2 Decades of Status of Women Work

I have reviewed all the information that we had readily available from about 15 years of activities and work on the part of the Status of Women Review Committee including meeting minutes but particularly from:

- 3 retrospective reports (1996; 2000, 2004) and a Needs Assessment (2005)
- Feedback from sessions presented by the Status of Women (beginning in 1997 with the first new faculty orientation session)

General Themes:

Based on the summaries that have arisen from the retrospective reports, several key themes were consistently shown to arise. Specifically, faculty members are looking for assistance with:

- Teaching – opportunities to learn about and discuss effective teaching
- Research – support in order to seek funding, write proposals, conduct research, collaborate with others, share research ideas and outcomes
- Work climate – particularly women perceive that they are subject to intimidation and gender discrimination (primarily from colleagues)
- Advocacy – for untenured faculty in terms of teaching workload, applying for tenure and promotion, making sure that chairs (and members) of tenure and promotions committees are trained
- Examination of the CA – particularly with regard to issues that put women at a disadvantage

Specifically with reference to the Status of Women Committee

As early as 1996, members who provided thoughts on the work of the Committee emphasized that they would like to see the committee:

- Make resources available to women
- Address safety issues on campus
- Review policy
- Become more visible

In the most recent needs assessment (2005), respondents indicated the following preferences for the primary role of the Committee:

- 47% believed **advocacy** regarding issues related to tenure and promotion, discrimination and dissemination of information should be the primary role
- 25% believed **job satisfaction** (e.g., via new faculty orientation, etc.) should be the primary role
- 16% believed **research support** (e.g., research mentors, research funding, brown bag lunches, etc.) should be the primary role
- 16% believed **teaching development** (e.g., teaching sessions, etc.) should be the primary role

It is also relevant that 58% of respondents of the Needs Assessment (2005) indicated that they believed these activities should be carried out expressly for women.

What are the Implications for the Activities of the Status of Women Review Committee?

If we review the most recent assessment regarding the Committee's activity, the Committee has achieved the primary role of job satisfaction, research support, and teaching development. For example, through the activities of the Committee, the research office, in collaboration with the Status of Women, now organizes two research sessions per year. Also, new faculty orientation sessions are regularly carried out and, until recently (i.e., 2007), the teaching development piece was also handled by the research office.

What remains for the Status of Women Review Committee is to consider whether or not to carry out the most "expected" role of **advocacy** on behalf of women faculty members.

In the context of this discussion, for example, advocacy may take many simple forms, including advocating for:

- a re-establishment of the Teaching Enhancement committee
- professional development sessions that offer benefits to our membership (through professional development staff member, Erica [Weshnoweski](#))
- mandatory training regarding the relevant collective agreement articles for those individuals who are recruited to serve on tenure and promotion committees

- untenured faculty members not to be asked to sit on contentious committees (e.g., Brandon University Research Ethics Committee)
- modification of Article 30 of the collective agreement such that the findings of retrospective reports may lead to reasonable expectations for change (i.e., consider that our most recent report in 2004 shows that there has been no movement in the science faculty, in particular, in the percentage of female faculty members compared to men since the original targets were set). Currently, Article 30 indicates that we must report and work with others, there is no specific onus on the employer to move to implement necessary changes.
- Sessional faculty, e.g., so that when they are “encourage/expected” to support a strike mandate that they should also be given some sort of bonus for returning to work. If our association is truly a “collective” then all members should benefit from the signing agreement that arises from strike action. (Note that sessional staff, along with those on sabbatical, did not receive a back to work “bonus”.)
- Continued measures to improve safety on campus (e.g., review/promote documents that outline safe practices – particularly for faculty members who teach/work at night)

General advocacy may also be enhanced by reviewing and editing our webpages, as needed in order to provide relevant and useful information for staff/faculty regarding relevant issues.

Thank you to Dr. Shannon Gadbois
for compiling this review,
January 2009.