Date: June 11, 2018

Report to: Chancellor Cartwright, in care of Anna Ball, Faculty Fellow for Faculty Development

Attention to: Michelle Marsden

Report submitted by: Nicole Campione-Barr (Faculty Co-chair) and Heather Hoffman (Staff Co-chair)

Charge: For more than 40 years, the Chancellor's Standing Committee on the Status of Women (SWC) has worked to create an environment of equity, fairness, and justice for all women on campus—including women-identifying students, faculty and staff—respecting the diversity of women's experiences. In this pursuit, we investigate the status of women at the University of Missouri and make policy recommendations to the Chancellor as necessary. We also promote the advancement of campus women through education, communication, advocacy, support and activism.

Committee Members: Nicole Campione-Barr (Faculty Co-chair) and Heather Hoffman (Staff Co-chair), Anne Alexander, Lisa Dorner, Urmeka Jefferson, Renee Jiji, Mark Milanick, Yong Volz, Kim Dude, Michelle Heck, Susan Lasley, Stacy Osterthun, Sherry Pollard, Jane Kielhofner (MSA student representative), Christina Wang (GPC student representative), Alejandra Guardino (Ex Officio), Andy Hayes (Ex Officio), Dani Palermo (Ex Officio), Krista Jennings (Ex Officio), and Leslie Palmer (Ex Officio)

Meetings: During the 2017-18 academic year, the SWC convened a total of 8 times: September 15, October 20, November 13, December 18, January 24, February 14, April 18, and May 9.

Major Accomplishments and Highlights:

1. **Review of 2016 Campus Climate Survey Gender-Related Findings & Recommendations**
   The SWC committed much of the 2017-2018 academic year to analyzing and devising recommendations based on the Campus Climate Survey and our conversations with campus stakeholders. The full report is within the appendix, but to summarize briefly, we identified three important themes that diminish the campus climate for women in particular: 1) Salary equity; 2) Service; and 3) Culture/environment. Based on these findings, we recommend:
   - Review the salary equity work that the SWC has already pursued.
   - Investigate salary equity for other groups, such as NTT faculty and staff.
   - Investigate broad-based equity raises in conjunction with merit-based raises.
   - Provide training and resources to all supervisors to ensure a more equitable culture.
   - Rethink how we measure and value service.
   - Work towards a women friendly campus climate.
   - Re-administer the Campus Climate Survey on a recurring basis.
2. **Women’s History Month Events**

The SWC coordinated the 11th annual Women’s Health and Wellness Fair, a “one stop shop” resource fair open to MU students, faculty and staff. We hosted 35+ community vendors and over 300 attended. For the first time this year, we also worked with the School of Nursing to host two student interns who worked on the fair as part of their capstone project. The event was held in Memorial Union on Wednesday, March 21st from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and Heather Hoffman served as lead on the event, while Kim Dude provided staff and supplies from the Wellness Resource Center, Stacy Osterthun coordinated prizes, and Susan Lasley coordinated food. Most committee members volunteered and/or attended the event.

The SWC coordinated the 4th annual Tools for Breaking the Glass Ceiling (TBGC), a Q&A session featuring MU women leaders who have successfully “broken the glass ceiling” and gives attendees the opportunity to ask questions about career advice, planning and mentorship, etc. The 2018 panel was attended by approximately 35 students, faculty and staff. Panelists included:

- Stephanie Shonekan, Professor & Chair of Black Studies, Professor of Music
- Jo Stealy, Director of School of Visual Studies
- Norma Jackson, Director of Faculty & Professional Staff Diversity Enhancement & Engagement, College of Education

TBGC was held in the MU Women’s Center on Tuesday, March 6th from 12:00 to 1:00 p.m. and Nicole Campione-Barr served as lead on the event.

In conjunction with the Department of Women’s & Gender Studies, the SWC coordinated the annual Tribute to Women awards ceremony. The award honors any outstanding MU faculty, staff or student who has worked to create an environment of equity, fairness and justice for women, has demonstrated respect for the diversity of women's experiences, and helped promote the advancement of women through education and advocacy are eligible. The 2017 honorees included:

- Carrie Collier (staff honoree), Sr. Student Services Coordinator, MU Career Center
- Dalisha Herring (student honoree), doctoral student, Personal Financial Planning
- Mike Urban (faculty honoree), Associate Professor and Chair, Geography

The Tribute ceremony was held in Reynolds Alumni Center on Monday, March 12th from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. and Michelle Heck served as lead on the event.

3. **Building Campus Partnerships**

The SWC worked with women across campus on establishing the “Women of Mizzou” affinity group, which “engages a diverse group of women-identifying individuals and allies to promote equity in higher education. Through advocacy, expanded networks, and shared resources, we
take strategic and confident action toward achieving our aspirations and goals”. So far, the group has been largely successful, with over 800 Facebook followers, monthly networking or professional development opportunities, and exploring ways to increase awards and mentorship opportunities for women.

4. **Nominate co-chairs for AY2018-2019**

During the May meeting, as indicated by our committee by-laws (which pre-date faculty council oversight of standing committees), members voted to have Nicole Campione-Barr and Heather Hoffman remain as co-chairs of the committee for the 2018-2019 academic year. We also voted to add the positions of “faculty co-chair elect” and “staff co-chair elect” to be voted on in Fall 2018 in order to allow for easier transition of leadership in Fall 2019.

5. **Key Initiatives for Next Year:**

- SWC will work with campus leadership (e.g., Chancellor Cartwright, Vice Chancellor Kevin McDonald, various Deans) to develop and implement a professional development session targeted towards department chairs regarding gender inequity in teaching, service, and mentoring responsibilities and their impact on productivity & advancement of faculty women based on the findings of the 2015 Faculty Salary Equity Study and research on informed by research on higher education.
- SWC will continue to work closely with Women of Mizzou to offer more professional development, mentoring, and advancement opportunities for women faculty, staff, and students on campus.
- SWC will work to sponsor or co-sponsor a women-centered event in the fall (our 3 annual events are traditionally concentrated in March during Women’s History Month).

**Recommendations for Next Year:**

SWC would be better positioned to accomplish its objectives if it had additional campus support, such as:

- Clear budget and fiscal administrator (historically our budget has been $1,500).
- Technical support with website.
- Assistance in correcting the current member terms, which are currently out of sync (please note that faculty terms listed on the website are accurate, but staff terms are all set to expire the same year).
The Chancellor’s Standing Committee on the Status of Women
Report and Recommendations on the 2016 Campus Climate Survey

During the fall 2016 semester, the University of Missouri administered the “Campus Climate Survey”, a comprehensive survey of all campus students, faculty and staff in order to “develop a better understanding of the learning, living, and working environment on campus.” In September 2017, the results were shared with the campus through two town hall meetings and were subsequently posted online. At one of the town halls, the co-chairs of the SWC submitted a question to the consultant group, Rankin and Associates (R&A), regarding how the findings might be used to improve the campus climate for women specifically. While R&A provided a more general answer than we would have preferred, responding that all campus stakeholders should take responsibility for the results and work towards change, we accepted their challenge. The SWC was committed to the CCS over the 2017-2018 academic year, analyzing the survey, researching potential recommendations, and discussing the survey and other concerns of various campus stakeholders. This report is the culmination of these efforts.

Campus Climate Survey Findings

As with any survey, it is worth noting when a demographic group has higher response rates than what might otherwise be representative. While women in general make up a slightly larger proportion of the campus population than men (52.8% vs. 47.2%), they constituted an even larger proportion of survey respondents (61.3% vs. 36.5%), with a response rate nearly 10 percentage points higher than that of men (25.3% vs. 16.8%) (pg. 15). The higher participation of women-identified respondents is relevant as it is widely accepted within survey research that response rates can serve as a proxy for level of engagement. In the case of the CCS, women’s higher response rates may be due to greater feelings of obligation to respond to campus requests, a desire to contribute to improving the campus climate, frustration regarding a diminished sense of belonging and enfranchisement, or a combination thereof.

Regardless of the exact reasons, the survey shows that women staff, faculty, and students are indeed less comfortable with campus climate than are there men: women staff respondents (37%) were less “very comfortable” than men staff respondents (51%) with workplace climate on campus, while women faculty and student respondents (31%) were less “very comfortable” than men faculty and student respondents (42%) within the classroom. We identify three important themes that appear to strongly impact the experience of women on the University of Missouri campus: 1) Salary; 2) Service; and 3) Culture/Environment. We also provide recommendations for how we might work towards a more woman-friendly campus.

Campus Climate Theme #1: Salary

The CCS confirms that for women faculty and staff, the issue of salary equity continues to be an important issue to ensuring a positive campus climate. For instance, women adjunct faculty (66.4%) were more likely than men adjunct faculty (55.2%) to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that “salaries for adjunct faculty are competitive” (pg. 239). Similarly, women NTT faculty (64.6%) were more likely than men NTT faculty (55.8%) to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that
“salaries for non-tenure-track faculty are competitive” (pg. 239). Unfortunately, these results are not broken out by gender identity on the equivalent question for tenure-track faculty (pg. 238), but we know from our extensive work on faculty salary equity that this is also a concern for tenure-track faculty women. Lastly, while women staff (58.2%) were less likely than men staff (70%) to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that “staff salaries are competitive” (pg. 189), some of this might be attributed to the fact that more women participated and negative responses therefore comprised a smaller percentage. Overall, nearly twice as many women staff (960) and men staff (513) did not find staff salaries to be competitive. This perception was reaffirmed in the qualitative findings, as one woman staff member remarked “I am a woman and am paid $20,000 a year less than my male counterpart in my department. We have the same job title and similar responsibilities” (p. 199).

We understand the issue of salary equity is a difficult one to resolve in times of budget constraints. We also agree, to an extent, with R&A’s assertion that “salary is always the number one concern for every institution we survey because everyone wants to be paid more” and that improved workplace culture can help to alleviate some salary issues. However, we should also be careful not to dismiss the fact that women are consistently less satisfied with their salaries than their male counterparts. It suggests a culture in which women are not viewed as productive and their labor is devalued. Outside offers provide an example of the nuance here. For example, research shows that, while women faculty are less likely to seek outside offers than their men colleagues, they are much more likely to leave their institution once they’ve received an outside offer because searching for one means that they are extremely dissatisfied and have already reached a “point of no return”, whereas men are more likely to view the outside offer as means for eliciting a counter-offer towards a pay increase. Therefore, salary is not always about the pay, but also about feeling valued, which impacts women’s sense of belonging within the institution in which they work.

**Campus Climate Theme #2: Service**

Through the CCS results and our conversations with campus stakeholders, we have also observed that women students, faculty, and staff dedicate more of their time to service and service-like activities that must be completed, but are often undervalued, uncompensated, and unrecognized. Both the CCS findings and recent research suggest that women may be performing more “academic housework” (i.e., service, maintenance, social-planning, or care-work) than their male counterparts. This is both impacting women’s experiences of equality on this campus, as well as their productivity, and these experiences may be compounded for Women of Color.

Since service is a formal component of many faculty job descriptions, the CCS asked faculty directly about service. Women tenured/tenure-track faculty (55.6%) were much more likely than men tenured/tenure-track faculty (35.8%) to agree or strongly agree with the statement “I feel burdened by my service responsibilities beyond those of my colleagues with similar performance expectations” (p. 227). Women tenured/tenure-track faculty (27.8%) were also more likely than their men counterparts (16%) to strongly agree with the statement “I perform more work to help students than do my colleagues” (p. 227). Unfortunately these statistics are not broken out by gender for NTT (pg. 233), but the margins for women tenured/tenure-track faculty are quite large, and reaffirms what the research
shows, in that women faculty spend more time mentoring and meeting with students, taking on more committee roles, planning social events, etc., and typically to the detriment of their research productivity.

While staff do not formally have a “service” component to their job description and were therefore not asked about it on the CCS, they do occupy committee roles and perform other acts of service on campus. We also know, anecdotally, that women staff may take on some of the “academic housework” or “care work” of the office beyond their normal duties (e.g., mentoring students and other staff, coordinating meetings, office celebrations, etc.), and therefore we refer to all of this uncompensated work as “service-like” activities. Women staff (25.7%) were more likely than men staff (22.5%) to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that “I am able to complete my assigned duties during scheduled hours” (p. 170). We suggest that some of this may be due to the fact that women salaried staff, without the time constraints imposed by hourly status, are more likely to succumb to increased pressure to complete work outside of their normally scheduled hours or more likely to experience an increased workload without additional compensation. Unfortunately, these latter results are only broken out staff status or gender identity, and not both (pg. 170-171), but we suggest the burden of service and service-like activities for women salaried staff can be inferred through the fact that their levels of satisfaction relative to their male counterparts is consistently lower than that of women hourly staff relative to their male counterparts.

Lastly, while students again were not asked this question directly in the CCS, our conversations with leaders in the Missouri Students Association and the Graduate Professional Council revealed that service obligations were very gendered for them as well. Specifically, undergraduate students (MSA) referenced that male students tended to occupy more prestigious roles, such as policy roles in which there are elections, as opposed to event planning roles. Relatedly, graduate students (GCP) reported the perception that graduate student men were more likely to receive research assistantships for their funding, while graduate student women were more likely to receive teaching assistantships or student affairs-related assistantships, which often require more time away from their own important research due to mentorship and service-related commitments. This is also supported by recent research.

In short, although women faculty, staff and students occupy very different roles on campus, there are commonalities in their experiences with taking on undervalued service and mentorship roles.

**Campus Climate Theme #3: Culture/Environment**

While our campus has made positive developments in advancing the campus culture for women, such as greater representation of women in leadership roles (e.g., administration, deans) and higher faculty ranks (e.g., associate and full), the CCS findings and our conversations with other campus stakeholders revealed that there is much more work to be done. Gender/gender identity is the most often cited explanation for those who personally experienced hostile or exclusionary conduct within the past year (p. 108), and the third most cited explanation (behind race and ethnicity) for those observed hostile/exclusionary conduct during the same time period (p. 127). Please note, while the category of gender/gender identity is not limited to women, women are likely to comprise a large portion of this
category. Moreover, women staff respondents (37%) were less “very comfortable” than men staff respondents (51%) with workplace climate on campus, while women faculty and student respondents (31%) were less “very comfortable” than men faculty and student respondents (42%) within the classroom (pg. xi). Taken together, however, these results all point to a campus climate that is less favorable to women.

The CCS and our conversations with campus stakeholders also suggest that the University does not provide adequate resources for caregivers and, more generally, for women’s health. For instance, the CCS demonstrates the difficulty faced by women in balancing work-life issues. Women staff (14.3%) were more likely than men staff (13.5%) to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement “My supervisor provides adequate support for me to manage work-life balance” (p. 166). Similarly, women faculty (54.6%) were more likely than men faculty (45.9%) to disagree or strongly agree with the statement that “University of Missouri-Columbia provides adequate resources to help me manage work-life balance” (p. 242). We also know from our interactions with women across campus that they are unsure of what resources are available, how to coordinate FMLA, or how to ask for time off or family-friendly schedules without fear of reprisal. While campus has made some steps towards maintaining a more “family friendly” environment (e.g., lactation rooms), it has not taken hold at the level of culture. Just as service is rendered invisible, the caregiving responsibilities of women go unnoticed as well. In our conversations with MSA and GPC student leaders, we also learned that students do not feel as though they have adequate access to basic needs, such as feminine hygiene products or contraception. It was suggested that campus is a “tampon desert” where women must leave campus in order to find affordable options (particularly during evenings and weekends). Therefore, we suggest that our definitions of “sense of belonging” should be expanded to incorporate the sense that women’s bodies are accommodated and welcomed.

Committee Recommendations based on CCS Survey Results

In order to increase the sense of belonging, as well as satisfaction and retention of women faculty, staff, and students we have devised the following recommendations:

● **Review the salary equity work that the SWC has already pursued.** In 2015, the SWC and other campus partners successfully pushed for the [2015 faculty salary equity study](https://example.com). While the study found no “unexplained” salary differences between tenured/tenure-track faculty men and women, we suggest that factors that determine pay are themselves subject to gender inequity. For instance, research productivity measures reflect gender bias if there is a preference for citing male-authored research. We provide further recommendations in our 2017 SWC annual report.

● **Investigate salary equity for other groups.** We continue to have little-to-no data regarding salary equity across NTT faculty and staff. Conducting similar studies on these populations is important for not only identifying potential gaps, but also in reflecting the University’s commitment to these groups during a time when their positions are less secure than ever. As mentioned in our annual report, the Office of Institutional Research & Quality Improvement
(IRQI) has developed faculty salary equity tools that are used by Deans and Chairs. Similar tools might also be provided for other employee groups. Special attention should also be given to intersectionality, such as the experiences of women of color and transwomen.

- **Investigate broad-based equity raises in conjunction with merit-based raises.** It has been suggested that there will be some funds available for strictly merit-based raises in the coming fiscal year. If this is the case, we suggest that consideration also be given to parity when making salary adjustments. For instance, percentage increases have the potential to compound salary inequity if women have a smaller base pay. Instead, flat-rate raises (i.e., same dollar amount increase) can help to correct for past inequity.

- **Provide training and resources to all supervisors to ensure a more equitable culture.** Supervisors of all kinds (e.g., chairs, directors, student supervisors) are not always aware of the best practices to ensure fairness and equity, nor the resources available for doing so. How might the language of a job posting intimidate qualified women from applying? In the case that a salary disparity is found, what steps should be taken? If an employee is requesting FMLA or a flexible work schedule, what does that conversation look like? How do we ensure that women aren’t overburdened by service? There is plenty of research to inform more equitable practices, so we suggest that these be compiled, shared and discussed with supervisors. The SWC would be more than happy to help with this effort.

- **Rethink how we measure and value service.** With an increased emphases on shared governance and committee work, mentorship, and improving campus climate, we must be careful to either ensure that this work does not disproportionately fall on women or, if it does, that it is seen as valuable work. An important step increasing the value of service is developing a method for recording it; the University needs more data on the actual distribution of service and mentorship on this campus. For faculty, the myVita reporting system holds the possibility for better documenting student mentoring and service-related activities, although the fact that it cannot be easily imported will mean that faculty might not take the time complete these aspects thoroughly. However, they can be incentivized to do so if service is formally considered as part of the evaluation process. Similarly with staff, they should be encouraged to document their service work within the myPerformance system as part of their evaluation process. Lastly, student organizations might rethink their organizational structures so that those who do much of the ground work and coordinating activities/events are just as recognized as those who create policy, whether through new titles, mixing up the gendered or division of labor, etc.

- **Work towards a women-friendly campus.** While all of the recommendations above work towards this, there are also some specific changes that can be made to promote a more women friendly campus. First, we need a website that compiles information and resources related to women’s physical and emotional health (e.g., feminine hygiene products, Green Dot, intersectionality, Title IX processes), caregiving responsibilities (e.g., lactation stations, FMLA policies), and professional development (e.g., mentoring, trainings) and it must be easily
accessible to students, faculty, and staff. Second, but more importantly, we must work to make more of these resources available. Lactation stations must be adequate. Residence halls and other public places (e.g., student centers, libraries) should have affordable options for feminine hygiene products and contraception. Some of the professional development opportunities currently offered by the Status of Women Committee and the Women of Mizzou grassroots initiatives should be institutionalized (i.e., ran by staff and not volunteers).

- **Improvements to the Campus Climate Survey.** While the CCS was impressive in its comprehensiveness and we applaud the town hall format used to share the findings, we recommend the CCS should be re-administered on a recurring basis (every three years) and we also have a few suggestions of how it might be improved. First, the next iteration should be conscious of reaffirming classism/rankism in how the questions were asked. For instance, faculty were asked about their interactions with other faculty, and not their interactions with staff, as though they do not work together. Second, questions might be introduced that get more at the nature of uncompensated work (serve and service-like activities) performed by staff, faculty and students. Lastly, graduate students would appreciate more questions related to their assistantships and professional development, whereas the issue of undergraduate student workers on campus was not addressed at all. More generally, the work of the faculty, staff, and student subcommittees examining the CCS should be made public. With this instance of the CCS, it is so far unclear as to how the findings have been used to better the campus. Furthermore, if these subcommittees are still working on the results, we recommend that this report be shared with them to give special insight to the campus climate for women.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, our findings suggest that there are a number of ways to increase the sense of belonging, as well as satisfaction and retention of women faculty, staff, and students. We felt that, despite the evidence that the campus climate is less hospitable to women, that the findings presented in the final report and in the town halls failed to highlight this issue specifically. Therefore, we have worked to distill certain themes that cut through the categories of faculty, staff, and students, and can hopefully make this a more women-friendly campus for all.

We would like to thank University leadership for seeing the necessity of administering the Campus Climate Survey, transparency in sharing the results, and, finally, the encouragement for the campus to become involved in improving the campus climate. While we understand that time and resource constraints may at first limit the feasibility of some of the recommendations above, we are more than happy to work with leadership, as well as the subcommittees, on how these might be implemented.