

## ***Gender Equity Group Report: Moving forward with insight from those affected***

September 2019

### **Background**

During a meeting of the RFA Reps Council, an *ad hoc* group on gender discrimination was created. The intention of this group was to investigate the experiences of RFA members with gender discrimination and to make recommendations that could be used by the RFA in contract negotiations, and by administration in creating more equitable work environments. In early March, all members of the RFA were sent a brief email invitation to a meeting to discuss gender discrimination at Ryerson University and plan a path forward. Thirty-five women answered that call and agreed to attend or receive information about the outcome of that meeting. At the meeting, many issues around gender discrimination were discussed (roughly divided into the same areas as this report). It was decided that the committee would solicit the experiences of RFA members with gender discrimination. The call for their experiences can be found in Appendix 2 of this report. A two-week window was given for response and this was extended one week due to the busy time of year when the call was made (April 1<sup>st</sup>). Fifty-eight separate emails or phone calls were received in response to this call. All but three were from individuals identifying as women (the remaining three were from supportive men who had concerns about the unfair treatment of their colleagues). In order to keep the identity of the respondent (RFA member who responded to the call) anonymous, the individual comments were edited to remove details that could identify. In addition, when many comments on the same issue were submitted, the content of these comments were summarized. Further, most individuals identified more than one area of gender discrimination, so comments were broken down into different areas of discrimination. For example, if pay equity and retirement pay were in a single email, the portion about pay-equity was reported in section 1 (pay equity and process transparency) of this report and the portion about retirement was reported in section 2 (retirement and pay equity). Finally, the report author did their best to capture all comments and content submitted, however, we acknowledge that there may be further issues that must be addressed. This report represents a start. We divided experiences into eight distinct sections; **(1) Pay Equity and Process Transparency, (2) Retirement and Pay Inequity, (3) Racialized Individuals and Gender Identification on Gender Pay Inequity, (4) Gender and Workload in Teaching and Service, (5) Civility and Bullying, (6) Access and Promotion to Tenure, (7) Full Professor, (8) Other Important Issues**. In this report, each section is followed by recommendations for the RFA and administration that the committee believes must be considered in the workplace, during contract negotiations and in Ryerson policy. For convenience the recommendations have also been summarized in a separate document that can also be found in Appendix 3 of this report.

Respectfully submitted,

The Ad Hoc Gender Equity Committee of the 2018-2019 RFA Reps Council

## 1. Pay Equity and Process Transparency

### *a. Pay inequity*

Respondents noted that pay-equity is a complex process and were very clear that pay equity issues at Ryerson are NOT anomalies but clear and planned discrimination against those identifying as women (when women is used in this document it should be interpreted as those identifying as women). Many respondents also note that gender discrimination is very likely reflected in the pay of others such as racialized, LGBTQ and transgendered but Ryerson has not made efforts to investigate these possibilities. Currently we, know based on past analyses, that those identified as women at hiring are more likely to experience pay discrimination than those identifying as men. Below is a summary of pay equity issues revealed by those responding to our call.

- o Many individuals felt that the inequities happen at hiring where women's past professional experience is not adequately counted towards salary decisions.
- o In salary negotiations at hiring, those identifying as women were given little information or inadequate information about salary norms, nor were they encouraged to reach out to sources that could assist (e.g. RFA).
- o Many respondents noted that their qualifications were identical or surpassed men in their department who were hired in a similar timeframe, but these women received a lower salary after negotiations.
- o Some respondents noted that pay inequities are also reflected in start-up funds, lab allowances, course releases, and opportunities afforded (e.g. CRC).
- o Some talked of salary pays scales (used during negotiations) that differed between men and women in some faculties.
- o Some respondents reviewed the sunshine list in Ontario and note that it identifies many cases where few women receive the highest salaries.
- o Salary disparities exist between faculties where faculties dominated by men are given higher salaries (though many women in male dominated faculties are still given lower salaries). Some individuals noted that the rationale given by administration was 'market value' and that the faculties dominated by women or have equal male and female representation are in fields that are payed less in society. In other words, men dominated professions are valued more than women dominated professions. The obvious problem with that argument is that the jobs WE do are identical across facilities. Some individuals noted that they were told by administration they had to pay more in faculties like engineering because they cannot attract faculty, though no test of this hypothesis has been done. Further, one individual noted that the university refused to pay a competitive salary for a woman hire in an Arts program, even though a woman hired in TRSM male-dominated faculty, with the exact same professional background, was offered a significantly higher salary.
- o Many respondents expressed disappointment in the university administration because the process of creating equity has been dragged out for many contracts now and reflects an administration unwilling to acknowledge the long-term consequences of pay discrimination on those identified as women.
- o Some women faculty noted that they struggle with supporting family in Toronto with their current pay.
- o Some Junior faculty are finding it hard to pay rent and expenses in Toronto during a time where they are paying student debt.
- o Deans appear to have too much discretion in deciding salaries which results in game-playing with faculty (e.g. matching competitive offers from elsewhere for some (typically men) but not others (typically

- women)). Faculty members in women dominated fields noted that their Dean and sometimes chair provided false information about typical starting salaries in order to negotiate low.
- o Women identified respondents wondered how men feel about these inequities and men respondents noted that they feel ashamed of their employer that such inequities would be allowed. Would men be willing to give up some salary increase to increase equity for women?
- o Some suggested we look at representative female hires and then examine the next male hire in the same school on the following factors: Class numbers, TA hours, Non- competitive travel funds, Non- competitive GA or other funds and Non-competitive appointments.

*b. Transparency of Process*

Many respondents acknowledged that the gender-anomalies process has reduced the average salary difference between women and men identified faculty. However,

- o Respondents noted that reducing the average pay difference between women identified and men identified individuals does not affect the cause of the difference (e.g. hiring processes). Current analyses miss individual discrimination that is hidden due to a few highly paid individuals. A few highly payed women would influence multiple regression calculations, especially where there are not enough individuals in the analysis, across the hiring spectrum due too few women hires in early years (e.g. before 2001), few women in some faculties, few men in other faculties, few women full professors.
- o The 'gender-anomalies' process at Ryerson is not transparent. While the RFA has provided some information on how anomalies are decided, many women wrote that it was not clear why some receive gender-anomalies money and others do not. A few wrote that others in their department with higher salaries received these monies, while they did not. Many were concerned about a regression-based model for deciding if pay-equity has been met because such models are based on averages rather than individuals and what variables, beyond gender are put into that model are largely unknown to anyone other than the model creator. These variables are critical to the model's outcome. Some indicated that regression modeling requires adherence to assumptions, many of which would not be held true with the salary data of this limited sample across faculties. Many indicated that the current process (each women is reviewed) is still unclear. How are salaries compared, who or what are they compared with (are we sure the men comparator has no anomaly?), how is the amount decided, who serves on the gender-anomalies committee and how are they chosen?
- o Many noted that the piecemeal way of providing redress has further hurt them because annual salary increases are based on percent of current income; thus a women receiving less than a man would have less of a dollar value annual increase in salary.
- o Most responded that treating discrimination as an anomaly is inappropriate and a new process should be considered (see below in recommendations).
- o No rationale has ever been given for the acceptance of the current process and it appears to have been created by RFA executive members and administrators with little consultation of those discriminated against.
- o Some women note that the rationale for the piecemeal process is either that there is not enough money to fix the salaries of so many who have been cheated, or that money needs to be available for people hired in the next year. Both these arguments are shameful; especially when some individuals from other public service sectors had salary redress in one year.
- o Some junior faculty have expressed that they do not 'apply' for redress of any type due to concerns over retribution by administration. There was considerable confusion over the process and whether one must

apply (they do not have to apply but messages sent out in the last round incorrectly suggested the process requires application).

### **Recommendations on dealing with Pay inequities**

#### *a. To understand these inequities the university must*

- o Create an evidence based process to determine WHY women identified faculty have lower salaries. What are the criteria used across faculties to determine salary and do those processes favour men? Consider how salary negotiations are handled and what factors go into them (e.g. contribution of previous experience)
- o Given that it is at the time of hiring where salary differentials often begin, provides all faculty members and potential new hires (prior to negotiation of salary), with concrete information on average salaries, benefits, start-ups funds, etc.
- o Deans should be trained if they are to continue negotiating salary.

#### *b. A committee (majority women) needs to be formed to deal with inequities in salary and a review by this committee of all women's salaries should be conducted (especially new hires). Among other things this committee should:*

- o Vet starting salaries of all RFA across all departments, schools etc. Hiring committees and deans must clearly justify their starting salary suggestions.
- o Oversee research into the current salary inequities at Ryerson. Why are they continuing to occur?
- o An alternative approach is to have rule-based salary scales that are the same for all employees.
- o Oversee research into the cost of these inequities over the course of a career
- o Help to identify the specific steps the university needs to take ensure that gender discrimination is not occurring at the time of hiring
- o Communicate the impact of faculty of lower salary (ability to thrive, ability to feel appreciated, ability to work and pay off student debt, etc.) on women identified faculty

#### *c. How redress is determined should be inclusive of those affected.* No one individual should decide how equity decisions are managed. For example, regression is a flawed method of determining levels of inequities (it is used at Ryerson to see if we still have inequities). It requires mathematical assumptions to be met, is affected by variables placed in the equation (thus consideration must be given to which are reflective, and these should be evidence based), and says little about any single individual inequity.

#### *d. Redress Committee:* We recommend a committee be struck to examine HOW inequities are to be redressed. This committee should consider the following and once decided on a strategy demand compliance to it by all those involved in negotiating. These processes might involve;

- o Scrapping the current process and consider processes used at other universities (e.g. across the board increases, annual increases where women receive more than men, etc.)
- o Consider that discrimination should not be something done in contract negotiations, but should be considered a university responsibility whenever it is identified and create a committee that reviews salary annually and provides compensation
- o Consider the advantages of negotiated monies and how they should best be distributed.
- o Require redress be conducted immediately and fully (not piecemeal)
- o Determine how much is owed to women identified faculty (inclusive of back pay)
- o Consider differential annual salary increased between men and women (e.g. women receive a higher increase until real equity is achieved)
- o Consider that annual increases in salary should be in dollar amounts, not percent of current salaries because using percent disadvantages individuals who have experienced gender discrimination (e.g. their increase in dollar value is lower than those not discriminated)

- o Consider that discrimination has been long-term for many women identified faculty. Retroactive compensation is necessary.
- o Assist women identified faculty in launching a human rights case and provide them with legal support from a human rights lawyer.
- o Possibly promote a grievance against the university
- o Oversee research to determine the impact of family (child-rearing, elder care, etc.) on women identified faculty careers and create a system that is equitable (e.g. changes in tenure and promotion criteria) that acknowledges that this work (child rearing, elder care) disadvantages women in their career more so than men.

## **2. Retirement and Pay Inequity**

Many women identified faculty who are in their last five years of work, will retire with lower pension. The piecemeal way in which gender discrimination has been addressed has hurt these older workers. Some respondents stated (these comments are in their own words but edited to ensure anonymity);

- o I fully support a point system (or similar system) that would give faculty, close to retirement, priority regarding the gender salary anomaly process.
- o Despite receiving a number of gender anomaly supplements in the past few years, I remain anomalous and expect to not only work longer than my colleagues of all genders, but also to retire with a lower pension.
- o I receive a lower salary and will receive a lower pension when I retire. Past experience has shown that Ryerson refuses to address the issue once and for all. At the same time, Ryerson praises itself for EDI – allegedly it is in our DNA. I would suggest we make pay inequity a Human Rights issue. This effects all those with pay inequities. Many members will retire with lower pension due to pay inequities through their entire career as gender discrimination hurt older workers or anyone along the trajectory as pension is an average of the last ten years of salary - but also was the ability to save along the way for it.
- o Pay equity and related pension equity is an important issue for me. Although I have received increments based on gender anomalies, the amount is too small to make much of a difference in my salary or expected pension. My White male colleagues in similar fields, with similar experience, continue to earn much more than I do because of our different starting points.
- o I believe a full restitution asap for women 60+ is needed to ensure we retire with the same pension as our male colleagues.
- o I have tried to capture my thoughts around the retirement income inequity that I will experience upon my retirement from Ryerson. I absolutely love my job but I don't love the fact that I am, and my contributions are, considered less than my male colleagues.
- o Having salary remedied to ensure my pension calculations are based on a salary that is a true reflection of my rank and years of service and is in line with my male colleagues of the same rank and years of service. I do not think that this is asking too much.
- o For decades, I have continued to be systematically paid less than my male faculty colleagues, for doing the same work, thus lowering my yearly salary which will continue to significantly lower my future retirement income. The fact that I consistently make much less per year than male faculty members (with the same rank and same number of years of service) will continue to systematically disadvantage me now (lowering my yearly salary - salary inequity) and will reduce my retirement income (causing my future pension calculations and pension payments to be lower), which I will need to rely on in my retirement. Therefore, I believe that there is a systematic salary bias in favour of male faculty colleagues over me (female faculty member) that cannot be explained by rank and years of service. I believe that a full restitution for each female faculty member over 60 years of age is necessary and should be given priority to ensure we retire

with the same pension and dignity as our male colleagues. The amount of each restitution could be calculated by determining what each woman's (over 60 years of age) salary would have been had they been paid fairly i.e. the same as their male colleagues.

- o I am most concerned with the long-term Implications of the systemic gender biases on our overall earnings and ultimately our pensions. The idea of addressing the gender bias first for those who will be retiring is something I like.
- o Retirement and full professor are particular issues for those who are close to retirement. Gender influenced that original hiring salary and subsequent percentage increases in pay, particularly for those hired in the 80s, 90s and early 2000s. This gender anomaly directly relates to pay equity. The effect of gender on my salary and pension is so incredibly sad and frustrating, particularly in a university that espouses social justice.

Some respondents reported other issues that affect retirement as related to salary

- o How are delayed retirements preventing the university from diversifying the professoriate? Undoubtedly in my department the vast majority of those over the age of 65 are white men.
- o Some respondents spoke of issues such as child rearing that often result in shortened careers, difficulty balancing an intense research program and children, all resulting in fewer opportunities and lower salary and in the end lower pension. Trying to work on research to gain promotion in some cases resulted in voluntary reduction in salary in order to reduce teaching. Respondents noted that they were forced to choose between their children and their jobs. Such decisions often result in lower pension.

### **Recommendations**

There is no doubt that older women identified faculty members are at a disadvantage for their pension. We thus recommend

- a. At the time of retirement women's salaries are reviewed to determine the differential between what they would have made had they been men and their current salary, and this difference is corrected in their pension.
- b. Individual investigation of starting salaries of each woman identified faculty member 60+ years of age. Determine what would have been an equitable starting salary and follow that salary through a career (exclusive of merit pay and administrative pay) and increase salary to that level plus merit and administrative pay (retroactive to 60 years of age)
- c. Examine how lower pension may force women identified faculty to keep working beyond a normal retirement date or how delayed retirement may reduce the ability of the university to reach equity where very high salaries are primarily going to older men.

### **3. Racialized Individuals and Gender Identification on Gender Pay Inequity**

There may be an intersection of gender inequities with race, sexual orientation and marital status. To our knowledge, analyses of this issue has not been conducted at Ryerson. Some respondents noted (edited for anonymity);

- o I believe this is directly related to gender, race and the effects of immigration in the hiring process at Ryerson. Although the relationship of race and pay equity has not been discussed at Ryerson, the devaluing of credentials and qualifications of scholars from outside Euro-America is well-known.
- o I would reemphasize the need to maybe look at other intersectional aspects such as ethnicity and marital status. I think there maybe a perception that single women or women without children have more time to take up the responsibilities of service.
- o I would like to know if pay inequities are worse for racialized women. Quantifying this would be very important.

- o I am thinking about how gender equity plays out for trans folx on campus in terms of hiring, tenure and promotion. This stems from issues in the classroom but also incivility and ignorance from staff and faculty generally.
- o Gender inequities may be higher in racialized individuals (e.g. racialized women). Considerable research suggests that this is likely the case, however, such analyses seem to not have been done at Ryerson to date. A. I believe racial differences and gender have both played a role in my disadvantage. B. Even though my department has hired more female, but none of them are non-white. The majority is still white male.
- o A few of us undertook a small study to examine the experiences of minoritized faculty at Ryerson. We conducted focus groups with different groups including tenured faculty. Our research indicated that many of us experience emotional and physical stress due to our race, gender, sexual orientation and sexual identities, especially those who teach courses in these areas.

### Recommendation

- a. Over the last several years Ryerson has collected data on race and gender orientation. These data should be used to determine the intersection race and gender orientation on pay inequities, promotion inequities (e.g. getting 'extra time' to tenure or, work costs of child and elder care, unsuccessful promotions), and workplace stress. Such analyses would be a first step in understanding this intersection and should lead to changes that remove this inequity.
- b. Review gender related recommendations from the anti-racism taskforce report and promote their implementation.

### 4. Gender and Workload in Teaching and Service

How gender affects workload at work is not clear. Many respondents had the impression that they were asked and pressured into higher levels of service and that their were expectations (from administration, chairs and students) around teaching that differed from male colleagues (e.g. higher class sizes, more student contact, more assistance on issues outside of course material (e.g. writing help, mental health help, etc.)). ***These teaching and service activities impact on the ability of individuals to conduct research, thus putting individuals at risk during promotion.*** Respondents stated (edited responses for anonymity);

#### Teaching

- o I urge the RFA to make transparent the hidden funding. A chart listing RFA members by gender and rank of: a) student #s, b) TA hours, c) non-competitive funds d) non-compete appointments. My bet is such a chart would be stark and demonstrate the inequities. Because there is no transparency, the equity issues remain hidden. It is less about salary and more about the very gross structural inequality. The chart I am suggesting would, I think, generate data that would be explosive. I know it would be in my school.
- o I also think that while we are able to list that we require classes at a specific time due to childcare, this often is not accommodated. While this impacts on all parents, I think it may disproportionately impact women. This is particularly true for large classes (which are going to be more common).
- o Gendered workload analysis: I would like to see an analysis of teaching loads broken down by the sex of professors by faculty/department. Although this seems better in my department than it used to be, there was a period of time when women were mostly teaching very large undergraduate sections while senior men were given lighter teaching loads.
- o I also think that Male directors assume that female staff will be more willing to take on extra loads... I have often taken on extra courses, not because I have wanted to but b/c I have felt pressured to do so...I never had a 1-2 in my first year, in fact I had a 2-3! Often my male counterparts had lower loads than me.

- o Departments and faculty that are primarily male dominated - may have more hours of TA time (\$\$) dedicated to their courses; have less budget cuts requested of them annually; have lower teaching loads compared to other departments. This data would be interesting to compare across departments and faculty
- o Two women note that the department, without consultation, removed their teaching area from the curriculum
- o Being in a female dominated School and a female dominated Faculty, I've never had a male chair or Dean, or Associate Dean. However, what I see, is that this female dominated Faculty is marginalized at Ryerson. We have the least number of T.A.s/G.A.s for one. This faculty brings in A LOT of research money to the university, but is not taken seriously (that's the feeling).
- o I do know that as a woman I carry an extra burden mentoring students. I think this is also true for my mentoring of junior faculty.
- o How gender affects workload at work is not clear. However, some members state that they are unfairly loaded in both teaching and service, making it harder for them to complete research (thus affecting promotion). Consideration to this issue should be done. For example, looking at student to teacher ratios for all faculty (divided by gender) or looking at, for example, the proportion of men vs. women teaching upper level and graduate courses may be a first step.
- o I had this disadvantage during my first 6-7 years, too many occasions of inequality, in loading, time and date, number of students and service load.
- o Workload is also a gender issue (in addition to the societal demands on women for child and elder care, maternity leaves, etc., that interrupt/impact the SRC flow}. For example, some schools still assign high teaching loads. This workload directly affects SRC output and therefore the time it takes to build a portfolio that allows for application for promotion to full professor.

#### *Service*

- o I would be interested in knowing if women are more likely to take on additional committee, supervision, and administration work and how this is assessed in the promotion process.
- o And of course regulations about equity require women on many committees. This impacts women, especially in male dominated faculties
- o Taking on additional administration roles (which I think women may be more likely to do) needs to be reflected in pay and/or other support that allows for research programs to continue to prosper so that promotion is supported.
- o Unintended consequences of gender equity targets. One issue I've noted that I'm sure others will raise is that gender equity targets for committees can increase pressure on female faculty to serve more often. This has the unintended consequence of increasing the service burden on female faculty. Yes, it is possible to say no. But it is a problem if female faculty are asked more often and then have to say no more often, because this can impact how they are perceived. So perhaps one solution would be for each department to compose a set of approximate guidelines for service on committees, that lays out how frequently each faculty member can expect to serve on each dept committee. I don't think this needs to be binding or included in the CA, but it might be a good step to help demonstrate how the quota of service is meant to be distributed across the dept membership.
- o The most important to me are pay equity in combination with gender workload -- i.e., that women disproportionately contribute more service to the university (and in particular, in service roles that are time-consuming and relatively thankless, and that detract from research and other praiseworthy endeavours), yet typically earn a lower salary.



- o The way that “service” is described matters a good deal for how much service is done. When I began my tenure process I was told that I should aim for “three service positions” which I did. I was also quite proud of myself for refusing some offers of committee membership that went beyond the required three. I had heard that women do more service, so I was determined to protect my research time by only doing three service positions per year. Later, the department discussed service requirements again, and the advice changed, (such that this respondent was doing more service than required). Having clear expectations that are articulated in the same way to all pre-tenure people seems important
- o Another pressing issue is the disproportionate labour undertaken by mostly women to fulfill administrative roles in our Department. Increasingly these roles have become more burdensome in the last decade, and stepping in to assume an Associate Director role often feels like assuming a full-time second job, on top of other expected duties for teaching, and research. In other words, the demands of service roles are quite overwhelming, and come with very little remuneration, beyond 1 course release and a small sum. My evidence is anecdotal and is based on observations over my time at Ryerson, but in my Department, the gender imbalance in these roles is heavily skewed to women who after considerable arm-twisting, finally agree to step up. I also watch as some suffer after 2-3 years in these roles, due to work stress. I think one solution to this problem is to request that the University provide adequate extra pay for these positions, at a level that would make them more attractive to everyone, and at a level that shows they are valued positions within the University. I am simply very tired of watching women I care about step into these kinds of roles that are seen as non-glamorous, and come with little recognition, only because they feel a sense of responsibility to keep our Departments running.
- o As a racialized faculty member, this would not surprise me given how much work I do over and above what most faculty members do. When there are so few of us, there is a great deal of pressure to take on more and more work if we want to make real change and we are called on to sit on so many committees, do speaking engagements and educate other faculty/administrators/staff/students on everything about my culture.
- o The issue of workload is difficult especially when you bring service into the equation. I find that when my male colleagues say no to service, they are rarely pressured further. When I have said no, there will be many different members of the department at my door trying to persuade me (in flattering terms) into service.
- o In that vein I am concerned that women take on too many of the caretaking service roles. Again making this elephant visible is important. We need women to do some of the investigating of these things; many men do not see the inherent issues as they are more subtle than simply pay anomaly. It is also important that the ‘reality’ is not ‘mansplained’ to us by ‘well-meaning’ male colleagues.
- o As for service, yes, we need to find out how much various people do. This data exists through self-reporting in annual reports although there are confidentiality issues of course. It also does not count for women “underreporting” service (those times when they “step in” to do stuff that no one else is willing to do for no credit – coach debate teams, help organize student events, host film evenings, even fetch water and coffee for job candidates when it does not occur to some colleagues to do so because failure to do so would make us look like a bunch of socially dysfunctional philistines).
- o There is a lot of research that shows that women take more of a service load than men and I have seen this in our faculty. Worse, substantial amounts of service are not counted towards promotion to full professor in any significant way. This then becomes a gender issue because it differentially impacts women. My own trajectory through Ryerson has set me up as not having a real chance toward full professor because of taking on enormous service. The service requirements in smaller, but growing, departments put additional

strain on the few women who are doing the work for the rest of the department and the university needs to value this work. How to resolve? The administration has to place value (in terms of pay and promotion) on service rather than leaving it to a collegial/informal and not recognized model.

- o Kinds of service and hours of service-Some individuals suggest that the type of service they perform is onerous and low profile. It is not clear who receives higher profile service (service that is given recognition, awards, course release, stipend). Service that was conducted by some members was not credited to them and higher-level colleagues took credit for their work.
- o The emotion burden carried by diverse and female-identifying faculty for representing diversity in service and especially to students, even those who are not their own.
- o The enormous load female-identifying faculty carry for service. Since service does not 'count' for tenure or promotion, it is given little value

#### *Intersection of research administration and other service*

- o Several respondents identified high profile centers and grants that they were working on which required considerable administration, yet they were still required to continue to do all other service and noted they had never received accommodation in workload with course release, stipend, or any other form of tangible recognition. Their experience is that men are more likely to receive accommodation when taking on high profile centers or large multiyear grants. They also note that there is no reduction in other service to committees at the departmental, faculty, university, and professional levels, and there is no place in the Annual Report to document it. In terms of service, one notes that "my service to the professional academic community is intense, as and includes serving on boards, mentor junior colleagues, post-docs, and doctoral students around the world, write endless letters and evaluations of manuscripts and fellowship applications, none of which is recognized as part of workload. I wonder how many of my male peers, working at this senior level, are expected to maintain a full teaching load despite their extraordinary service and research loads."
- o My urgent request to the negotiating team, and it's not just a gender equity issue, is to revisit what "workload" is at Ryerson. Right now, the language of the RFA Contract implies that our workload takes place over 8 months and is constituted entirely by teaching. While there are provisions for additional teaching to be assigned if a faculty member supposedly isn't doing any research, there are no provisions for teaching reduction if a faculty member is carrying an extraordinary research load. So, section 10.15 of the contract, on Reduced Voluntary Leave, assumes that "a reduction of up to 50% of the workload" means 2 courses rather than 4, for half pay: in other words, the assumption is that we do not work 12 months of the year, if we do research it is a sideline, not part of our workload, and our service is entirely voluntary. Minimally, the math should work on 3 4-month terms; it should include research and service; and there should be some flexibility that allows for adjustment when a faculty member has extraordinary research load or service.
- o My point may be a gender equity issue; I am not sure, but suspect, that senior male professors have more accommodation for their research and service than women do. I suspect women do the heavy lifting in teaching, research, and service, without much credit for it.

#### *Research opportunities*

- o Research opportunities/lab space. Male peers were offered lab space to conduct their research properly. I did not have a proper lab space till recently. Imagine not having a lab for almost 12 years. But still I manage to do my research and excel at it.

#### **Recommendations**

- a. Analysis of teaching workloads need to be conducted, by gender, class size, TA support, course numbers, teaching releases, student supervision, student contact hours, email tracking to students. Some could easily be conducted (e.g. class sizes by gender and faculty) and other might be investigated via a faculty wide survey of teaching experience. Using this information in negotiations would be imperative. This could also help deans and chairs to address their unknown/unacknowledged but systemic biases.
- b. Service levels and service-related benefits (course-releases, stipends) need to be examined to determine if there is equity in the number of service commitments, the hours of service, and the type of service. Benefits for service need to be examined to ensure that benefits are equal across types and hours of commitment. Pressure for service should be discouraged once faculty members have reached particular levels of service.
- c. Departments must make transparent service levels of department members in terms of hours, committees, types of service and benefits received for service. Service should be shared (especially higher level and more attractive service) across faculty members in a way that it is not left to the discretion of a single individual (e.g. chair). Contributions of service individuals do at the department, faculty and university level need to be shared.
- d. Higher levels of service should 'count' as part of a promotion file. While such could not replace research, expectations for research could be altered for those taking on higher service roles.
- e. Research administration for high level projects and multiyear grants may result in more reductions of teaching and service for men than women. This needs to be investigated and uniform rules about reductions in teaching and service need to be developed and adhered to.
- f. The contract needs to address course releases for individuals with high research administration

## 5. Civility and Bullying

Many RFA members speak about being bullied and treated with incivility. It is not clear if this is a general issue or if gender is predictive of such treatment. Below are some examples from faculty (edited to protect identity).

- o Like many women and racialized faculty at Ryerson, I am disproportionately involved in committees and events in the interest of promoting EDI at Ryerson. Since our very bodies become the topography of what we teach and promote, we often experience incivility and micro-aggressions that sometimes take insidious and un-nameable forms, both from our students and colleagues.
- o As a probationary faculty member, I was mistreated by those who were assessing my progress toward tenure. This resulted in a terrible abuse of power, in which my pre-tenure assessment was coloured by jealousy.
- o I have been bullied when I have taken leadership positions. The member speaks of a male colleague who disliked a hiring decision and berated her in front of the dean.
- o I find that when I have questions - especially about financial matters - they are simply ignored or dismissed.
- o With regard to the civility and bullying issue, I have heard incidents from my female colleagues about uncivil and poor treatment and a lack of respect they have received from some students in their undergraduate classes that I have never experienced from my students. I have been appalled by the unfair treatment my colleagues have experienced in the classroom that reflects some students' lack of regard for their professors. It is an instance of workplace abuse that needs to be recognized and acknowledged by the university.
- o This has been a concerning issue for me throughout my career at Ryerson. I have been bullied by colleagues, sometimes in front of others such as in meetings and no one supports me or speaks up about it. In addition, I have been bullied by male students to the point where I felt threatened and afraid. This individual spoke

of a disturbing incident where she was made to change her work rather than the student being held accountable. She received very little support from the university.

- o Bullying was a huge issue during my tenure process. The bullying needs to stop - we need to mandate (gender) bias training. I wish I had a mentor to help get through all this. This individual recalled not understanding the contract and listed clear and documented cases of collegial bullying.
- o There were about 3-4 incidents that I was bullied in the first 6 years of my career at Ryerson. I had wasted time to defend myself. Written letter to explain why I was not wrong. Even though, all these incidents were resolved to my clearance, I had wasted too much time and suffered emotional damages. One of the incidents was about sexual harassment, that no one was on my side. Sad
- o I taught over-load for three consecutive years as a probationary member, I remember I taught one course in other department that was forced on me. Back then, I told the chair, I don't want to teach this course, and guess what, he told me I gave my word to the chair of the other department, and I can't back off.
- o Other women mention that they are forced to teach courses out of their area of expertise and cannot negotiate
- o One member speaks of unwanted touching by several colleagues and does not speak up because she is afraid of repercussions. She wishes the university would remind all employees about respecting personal boundaries.
- o As women we are expected to go on maternity leave and publish. One member felt shamed by colleagues for not publishing enough during a leave and the respondent noted how distraught she felt.

### **Recommendation**

a. The types of bullying experience by women may be unique to them (e.g. unwanted touching, demands to publish on leaves, sexual harassment, and student harassment of women faculty) and other types may occur for all colleagues to some level. A systematic study of bullying at Ryerson should be conducted and reviewed. Such work should be conducted by a joint taskforce of the RFA equity committee (with input from a gender equity committee recommended above) and the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion.

### **6. Access and Promotion to Tenure**

Respondents spoke of difficulties with the tenure process that are related to gender. For example, literature shows that women disproportionately are slower to progress towards tenure and are more likely to be denied tenure than are men (Acker, 2012;). It is not clear how this looks at Ryerson. Many respondents shared stories of difficulties they experienced during their tenure and their concerns around tenure issues. Some of these comments (edited) are presented below;

- o One respondent talked of experiences on the DHC and the lack of interest in promoting women candidates by committee. This individual believed that DHC members do not understand that in a university that prides itself on professional practice, people come to academia from different career trajectories and these are equally valid. This respondent feels that as academics and teachers we are not very well equipped to hire for the future or to hire at all. We need better training and perhaps a more organized method for those being elected to the hiring committee to present their approach to hiring. This respondent also noted, based on experience, that the lack of diversity on hiring committees promotes a lack of gender diversity.
- o If we face a round of budget cuts, will there be a gender difference in how the cuts are made? It could be that those who hold non-tenure track positions, but are still RFA, may be impacted more by budget constraints. Is there a gender difference in those who hold these positions?
- o A number of individuals reiterated that the FCS (even without the numbers used) has a negative bias towards women. "The current approach to FCS post-arbitration does not address this underlying bias. It may be that nothing can, because these biases act implicitly. For this reason, I think the clear solution is for

the university to treat FCS as a method of raising possible red flags to the DEC (e.g. if multiple students indicate problems of fairness/punctuality/respect etc). If red flags are raised, the DEC investigates and it's the evidence they gather which will form the bases of any tenure/promotion impacts, not the FCS reports themselves. I would also advocate that FCS reports be submitted to and a summary made by the DEC, rather than to the faculty member directly. I realize that faculty members should be able to request to view their FCS reports, particularly if there is an issue of dispute. However, the routine provision of FCS reports, known to be gender biased, to faculty members with an expectation of response in annual reports can pose difficulty for morale." Another respondent stated "Student evaluations (often called FCS). I realize this is already an issue the RFA has taken on aggressively. However, I hope we can reiterate at this opportunity that this is a gender equity issue. I'm sure the RFA has already compiled the relevant literature on this for the grievance/arbitration, but I include a relevant reference here <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4>"

- o I have personal experience with "extra time" extensions to tenure clock and agree this process is messy. There is confusion on the part of others on how this would be dealt with. I think it would help to compile a worksheet/checklist of typical/general processes and recommended steps to help those who end up requiring extensions. This would help RFA members in these (often challenging) situations, regardless of gender, but, as we know, it could help redress inequity since this disproportionately affects women. This member recommends a possible info sheet/worksheet around extensions.
- o In my department there are no clear guidelines for tenure, and the guidelines offered change depending on the particular individuals on the DEC. This has a terrible effect on morale. For example, one woman in our department had positive annual reviews, then went on maternity leave, and upon returning from maternity leave was told that the DEC has concerns about her SRC because too many of her publications were book chapters that might not have sufficient independent (i.e. anonymous) review. I also had a similar experience.
- o There should be clearer standards for tenure-related publications. The standards should not change from one committee to the next. Ideally, the standards would be within a RFA member's control (e.g. number of submissions per year, which is under one's control, vs. number of publications per year, which is out of one's control). This is not to say that trying rather than success is all that matters. But there is a world of difference in failing to publish one year (which might put you impossibly behind the requirements) vs. failing to submit (which is under your control). The former leads to demoralization in a way the latter does not.
- o I did get "extra" time toward tenure, and I suspect this will make me believe I never really deserved to be here. On the other hand, my department has informal mentoring rather than clear expectations. This kind of mentoring tends to favour men over women. Some women in the department have reported overhearing the informal mentoring (to men) occurring though the walls of their office in ways they never received. All of the women who have heard others receive informal mentoring when they have not report that this is demoralizing of one's value in a department and discouraging for one's prospects at becoming tenured.
- o A respondent was made to do an extra year based on teaching scores. RFA argued that it is not appropriate. The member feels we need to investigate who is getting 'extra years' and why the extra year is given. It may be that women who teach courses around feminism and racism receive these lower 'scores' and this is impacting their salary and autonomy
- o Respondents spoke of their trek to tenure as being difficult. Some mentioned that when 'extra' time to tenure is given, it is disproportionately given to women, and racialized individuals. This respondent spoke of her tenure being given without promotion based on a single negative teaching evaluation, where research

publications were well above the department norm. Her committee told her to stop publishing (presumably to work on teaching). She noted that at the time of her tenure all DEC members were white males. She was humiliated and demoralized by the situation. She also noted that she has had fewer departmental opportunities (e.g. departmental executive) than others in her department.

- My male peers hired around the same time as me were granted early tenure, and I was not although my SRC/teaching/service dossier was similar or in some cases better. Because of the early tenure, my male peers were in advantage, they became full professors after only 8 years, I needed to wait two more years.

## Recommendations

- a. It is not clear if women are more often getting 'extra time' in the tenure period but comments suggest that they are for a variety of reasons. Such extensions need to be examined to see if they are gendered, and the reasons for extensions documented. In addition, comparisons need to be made with those not extended to determine if others with similar records are not given extension and if so, are promotions more likely given to men, regardless of their productivity in research, service and their teaching.
- b. When extra time is given, it is not clear how this intersects with higher teaching and service requirements placed upon women identified faculty. This must be investigated.
- c. Achieving tenure seems in part based on who is sitting on the DEC at the time of tenure. There is a need for the university to investigate whether annual letters given to pre-tenure faculty of their progress outline concerns that are later used to deny tenure. In addition, extra time seems to reflect DEC opinion of teaching and research, but in no consistent way. Within departments, clear guidelines must reflect that all faculty are treated in a consistent manner over time.
- d. Accessing the academy for women, may depend on who sits on the DHC. Clear training on gender issues is needed, beyond what is currently available. Policy should be reviewed around hiring and the type of experiences that 'count' in hiring should be reviewed. Follow-up with justification on hiring decisions should be mandatory.

## 7. Full Professor

We know that at Ryerson, fewer women are full professors than are men and it seems this difference has been getting larger in the last few years. While it is not clear if women are more often denied promotion than men at Ryerson, research in Canada suggests that women more often do not apply for Full professor. This may reflect on-going gendered issues that women face at Ryerson. Respondents made the following (edited) comments;

- Members of the DEC or FPC are individuals who have already achieved rank. This means they are likely to reinforce the status quo ("this is what I had to do to get promoted!); which, I would suggest, leads to the underrepresentation of female-identifying faculty who are full Professors.
- What specific steps are being taken to have more women full professors at Ryerson?
- I would be interested in hearing more quantitative data about how many women to men are full professors and some reasons why that gap is increasing.
- One respondent stated that they would not apply for full professor because as a racialized women it is not clear how service they do for the university will be counted. This individual noted that they often are asked help students and faculty understand the perspectives of their race. This respondent states that they are asked to teach courses and research from their racial perspective and these perspective are understood by those making the decisions. This respondent states; "Why should I have to translate how I do these things to try to help others understand? Once again, this would turn out to be much more work than other faculty need to go through. I cannot separate my gender and my race, so I don't believe it is about one or the other, but rather a combination of the two. I have noticed however that male employees (from the same racial background) appear to be more respected, listened to and appreciated than women."
- My issues are: retroactive pay, current pay equity, and support for promotion

- o An additional concern I have was raised at the meeting is the low numbers of women who are full profs, and the how difficult the process seems to be for many women faculty to go through.
- o We need more women who are full professors and Librarian 4!
- o Because of the early tenure, my male peers were in advantage
- o There are few female-identifying full professors in my department, which is frustrating as the path to attaining tenure status is prohibitive for women. They must first establish themselves in their industry by receiving recognition or getting published, etc., which in itself is difficult due to gender-based discrimination. It's a deep-rooted, circular issue I'm not sure how to resolve.

## **Recommendations**

a. An examination of the reasons women less often apply for full professor is warranted. This investigation needs to consider women's career wide treatment and struggles that have been put upon them. The early career treatment, pay inequities, civility issues, opportunities afforded, workload, experiences at tenure, departmental treatment and stress involved in producing research during child rearing and elder care likely contribute to decisions. Based on responses, developing a plan to provide mentoring, workshops and resources towards Full professor is needed.

## **8. Other Important Issues**

Many respondents had comments and suggestions that were important in further understanding the impact of gender inequities. The comments presented below are on a great number of issues that need to be considered and addressed. They range from the difficulties women feel including; lack of research support, unfair treatment at the department level, lack of inclusion, the impact of unfair treatment, lack of gender diversity in higher administration, and loss of pride in working at Ryerson.

- o My interest is less about pay and more about the experience of women in the Ryerson culture, the hidden funding mechanisms and the inequitable opportunities for women.
- o I know that you would like to hear about impact to faculty but I also have a concern about how little attention has been paid to the dearth of women in the VP roles of the University. The effort to include more women as Deans is commendable. I would be interested in letting the Executive know that we notice how few women are around the table at the VP level of decision-making
- o Quite frankly, I feel very uncomfortable knowing that my career has been facilitated relative to some of my colleagues only because I'm male and they're not.
- o Although the institution has changed significantly, and overall I am a contented faculty member who now feels supported by the University, I have been marked by my pre-tenure experience at Ryerson and by the lack of salary equity.
- o I would like to suggest that we continue to have a forum, not just for bargaining, but to represent and support women in the RFA throughout the year. It could help them apply for promotions, take leadership roles, and demand greater accountability.
- o Men outnumber women in my discipline. This is true generally not just in our department, compared to the discipline our department is a little better than most. However, we often don't take gender concerns into account so that what might on the surface appear to be a fair practice (e.g. a vote as a selection procedure) might actually systematically disadvantage women because we will never be a majority of the voting block. This respondent outlines a policy decision that was split on gender lines and the males then won. The issues ended up making women work on things other than research in the summer and while the men brought in the policy, they managed not to have to do the non-research chores as often.
- o I think we should not be afraid to share lived experiences. Too often the perception that "facts and numbers" are more important overshadow the actual emotional impact of stories and experiences.

- o There needs to be ongoing conversation about the impact of gender expectations and mentoring of newer young faculty. I think this could be an important role for this caucus- or whatever this group becomes. Need to create a broad voice for women.
- o So another concern I have is that virtually all the upper admin at Ryerson is made up of men from disciplines like Economics and Engineering (e.g. VPFA, President, VPRI). I see that as a problem. I believe strongly that this University could care less about disciplines that don't make the university money. They don't care about justice, equity, good pedagogy etc. There were so many things we asked for that did not cost a cent during bargaining, that they batted them off the table with little or no consideration. They have no imagination, they do not care. They care about reputation/public perceptions/marketing, platitudes and so on. They see faculty as a nuisance. I do have faith in this group of women and I hope this group pushes back in whatever way we can to make changes.
- o Maybe an apology from the administration is needed! A public one of course.
- o Women and leadership both in university administration AND in the RFA. With regards to the latter, why have we not had a woman president or chief negotiator in at least 2 decades?
- o Upon hearing from other female faculty who have been at the university for decades, I was shocked to hear how little the university has done to help ensure an equitable and fair system for all. Hearing stories of female faculty members still being denied promotion to full professor due to old teaching evaluations, female engineers being denied early tenure when less accomplished male colleagues are promoted, and entire faculties that are more female dominated being taken advantage of with regard to budget cuts and poor salaries. All of these issues negatively impact women's quality of life. It means that their earning potential and comfort for retirement is significantly lower than their male colleagues and it contributes to a hostile and resentful relationship with the Ryerson administration. I also have a more negative view of my employer and no longer feel pride when I see campaigns or marketing about the importance of equity and diversity. It is clear that women do not feel included and that they are not treated equitably. Research and teaching suffer in such an environment. The lack of inclusion and fairness undermine Ryerson's core values.
- o I have also heard from men in our department that they are supportive of reversing these inequities. It was good to hear. They were surprised and saddened to know that women in our department were earning some of the lowest salaries in the Faculty.
- o I would add that as another long-term effect, women getting discouraged and burn-outs are not uncommon. Part of a burn-out is not to feel appreciated or getting the same recognition as others.
- o I don't see this being solved at the bargaining table ever - but providing an extensive, comprehensive document that details the evidence may be more effective. It would involve a lot of work to do this but an effective and committed committee, with members that have the right kind of research skills to do this work, might be a possible approach to take.
- o As I started to think ahead to my twilight years at Ryerson, I knew that I needed to start planning effectively and perhaps start to climb up the Administrative ladder, where higher salaries were available. These salaries could make retirement sustainable (as many males know). However, it was at this point that personnel changes in the upper administration occurred and support for my efforts to start to climb the administration ladder precipitously declined. It was not only males in the upper administration who were responsible for this lack of support, but notably females also. The result has been a stagnation in my own professional career, including financial compensation.



## **Recommendation**

It is clear there are many gendered inequities at Ryerson which were not highlighted as potential issues in our call for feedback. In addition, women clearly feel undervalued and unfairly treated and this impacts all aspects of their work life. We therefore recommend;

- a. A gender forum be established at Ryerson, which could among other things;
  - o assist university administration and the RFA in creating policy and decisions
  - o assist Ryerson in creating a methodology to increase diversity of gender in higher administration
  - o make recommendations for educating the university about the many ways gender discrimination is promoted at Ryerson.
  - o recommend changes in hiring processes
  - o assist the RFA in promoting women to senior executive roles in the RFA
  - o act as a resource and support for women identified faculty
  - o recommend workshops and mentoring that would assist women identified faculty

## Appendix 1

Gender Equity group who assisted with this report (some who assisted with this report chose not to report their names). Please note, these are **not the names of respondents to our call from Appendix 2**; those were kept confidential and anonymized.

Emily vander Meulen	evandermeulen@ryerson.ca;
Laurie Petrou	lpetrou@ryerson.ca;
Kim Snow:	ksnow@ryerson.ca;
Diane Granfield	dgranfield@ryerson.ca;
Jacqui Gingras	jgingras@ryerson.ca;
Sara Edge	sedge@ryerson.ca;
Jean Li	jeanli@arts.ryerson.ca;
Fiona Yeudall	fyeudall@ryerson.ca;
Miriam Anderson	miriam.anderson@politics.ryerson.ca
Marusya Bociurkiw	marusya@ryerson.ca;
Shelagh McCartney	shelagh.mccartney@ryerson.ca;
Jenny Carson	jcarson@arts.ryerson.ca;
Katherine Zubovich	kzubovich@ryerson.ca;
Alyssa Counsell	a.counsell@psych.ryerson.ca;
Magdalena Ugarte	magdalena@ryerson.ca;
Ann Marie Singh	singh@crim.ryerson.ca;
Habiba Bougherara	habiba.bougherara@ryerson.ca;
Lynda McCarthy	L3mccart@ryerson.ca;

Gerda Cammaer	gcammaer@ryerson.ca;
Mary Han	mhan@ryerson.ca;
Wendy Cukier	wcukier@ryerson.ca;
Ann Duanty	adulhant@ryerson.ca;
Lorella Di Cinto	ldicintio@ryerson.ca;
Sue Bishop	s2bishop@ryerson.ca;
Lorraine Janzen	ljanzen@english.ryerson.ca;
Corinne Hart	c4hart@ryerson.ca;
Lori Beckstead	lbeckste@ryerson.ca;
Racheal Dodds	r2dodds@ryerson.ca;
Kim Varma	kvarma@crim.ryerson.ca;
Maureen Reed	mreed@ryerson.ca;
Joey Power	jpower@arts.ryerson.ca;
Catherine Ellis	cellis@ryerson.ca;
Rachel Berman	rcberman@ryerson.ca;
Tracey Raney	traney@politics.ryerson.ca
Leslie Campbell	lesley.g.campbell@ryerson.ca

## **Appendix 2: Letter of request sent April 1 2019**

Dear Friends,

A motion was passed at the RFA reps council to constitute a Gender Equity Committee to provide recommendations around gender equity to the RFA, which will inform bargaining. The group agreed that we need to learn from those affected by gender discrimination.

We need your help. We are interested in the opinion of all RFA members on gender equity issues. We would like to hear what ***you consider to be the most important issues. Please include the effect of the issue on you or others and any suggestion you might have for methods for the university to resolve the issue.***

To this end, below we have listed some issues that came up in our meeting. Feel free to comment on any of them and add issues we have not yet discussed.

Please email [mreed@ryerson.ca](mailto:mreed@ryerson.ca) and 1. Identify any gender discrimination issue 2. Identify its effect on you (or others) and 3. Suggest how the issue might be resolved (or better resolved than a current process). Please note that identifying information and your email address will be removed from your response prior to it being shared with the committee.

We hope to hear from many of you by April 15, 2019. Any help is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

The Gender Equity Committee

### Appendix 3: Summarized Recommendations

The Gender Equity Group recommends a three-pronged approach to rectifying and ending gender-based pay discrepancies:

1. **Research:** a full understanding of the issues, why they are occurring, and best practices for remediation is needed.
2. **Salary Review Committee:** this committee's mandate would be to ensure gender-based pay discrepancies do not occur at the hiring stage.
3. **Redress Committee:** this committee's mandate would be to determine how redress should be managed for current faculty members and those who have retired who are/have been affected by a gender-based pay discrepancy.

Specific recommendations for each of these three key areas are detailed below.

---

#### 1. Research Recommendations:

- Conduct research into the current gender-based salary inequities at Ryerson. Why are they continuing to occur? What are the criteria used across faculties to determine salary and do those processes favour men? Consider how salary negotiations are handled and what factors go into them (e.g. contribution of previous experience)
- Research the cost of these inequities over the course of a career
- Research the impact on faculty of lower salary (ability to thrive, ability to feel appreciated, ability to work and pay off student debt, etc.), particularly on women-identified faculty
- Research to determine the impact of family (child-rearing, elder care, etc.) on women-identified faculty careers
- Research how other universities have dealt with gender-based salary inequities
- Research whether alternative approaches to establishing starting salaries would be more appropriate, such as having rule-based salary scales that are the same for all employees
- **Racialized individuals and gender identification on pay inequity:** Over the last several years Ryerson has collected data on race and gender orientation. These data should be used to determine the intersection of race, gender, and sexual orientation on pay inequities, promotion inequities (e.g. getting 'extra time' for tenure or, work costs of child and elder care, unsuccessful promotions), and workplace stress. Such analyses would be a first step in understanding this intersection and should lead to changes that remove this inequity.
- **Gender and workload in teaching and service:**
  - Analysis of teaching workloads need to be conducted, by gender, class size, TA support, course numbers, teaching releases, student supervision, student contact hours, email tracking to students. Some could

easily be conducted (e.g. class sizes by gender and faculty) and other might be investigated via a faculty-wide survey of teaching experience. Using this information in negotiations would be imperative. This could also help deans and chairs to address their unknown/unacknowledged but systemic biases.

- Service levels and service-related benefits (course-releases, stipends) need to be examined to determine if there is equity in the number of service commitments, the hours of service, and the type of service. Benefits for service need to be examined to ensure that benefits are equal across types and hours of commitment. Pressure for service should be discouraged once faculty members have reached particular levels of service.

- **Access to Tenure and Promotion:**

- It is not clear if women are more often getting 'extra time' in the tenure period but anecdotal evidence collected in the comments (see supplementary documentation) suggest that they are for a variety of reasons. Such extensions need to be examined to see if they are gendered, and the reasons for extensions documented. In addition, comparisons need to be made with those not extended to determine if others with similar records are not given extension and if so, are promotions more likely given to men, regardless of their productivity in research, service and their teaching.
- When extra time is given, it is not clear how this intersects with higher teaching and service requirements placed upon women-identified faculty. This must be investigated.
- Achieving tenure seems in part based on who is sitting on the DEC at the time of tenure. There is a need for the university to investigate whether annual letters given to pre-tenure faculty of their progress outline concerns that are later used to deny tenure. In addition, extra time seems to reflect DEC opinion of teaching and research, but in no consistent way. Within departments, clear guidelines must reflect that all faculty are treated in a consistent manner over time.
- Accessing the academy for women may depend on who sits on the DHC. Clear training on gender issues is needed, beyond what is currently available. Policy should be reviewed around hiring and the type of experiences that 'count' in hiring should be reviewed. Follow-up with justification on hiring decisions should be mandatory.

- **Promotion to Full Professor:** An examination of the reasons why women apply for promotion to full professor less often and at a later stage of their career compared to men is needed. This investigation needs to consider women's career-wide treatment and struggles that have been put upon them. Factors are likely to include: early career treatment, pay inequities, civility issues, opportunities afforded, workload, experiences at tenure, departmental treatment, and stress involved in producing research during child rearing and elder care. Developing a plan to provide mentoring, workshops and resources towards Full Professor is needed.

- **Civility and bullying:** The types of bullying experience by women may be unique to them (e.g. unwanted touching, demands to publish while on maternity leave, sexual harassment, and student harassment of women faculty) and other types may occur for all colleagues to some level. A systematic study of bullying at Ryerson should be conducted and reviewed, with consideration for how such bullying is gendered. This work should be conducted by a joint taskforce of the RFA equity committee and the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion.

---

## 2. Salary Review Committee:

Because gender-based salary inequities continue to occur at Ryerson, it is clear that the status quo is not working to address the problem. Deans are continuing to offer women-identified hires lower salaries. Therefore, **it is imperative that a committee of majority female-identified members be formed to deal with inequities in salary** and a review by this committee of all women's salaries should be conducted, especially new hires.

Among other things this committee should:

- Vet starting salaries of all RFA across all departments, schools etc. Hiring committees and deans must clearly justify their starting salary suggestions to this committee. The committee can make recommendations to deans and/or the newly hired faculty member in terms of whether the offered salary is appropriate.
  - Oversee research into the current salary inequities at Ryerson as outlined in section (1) above.
  - Help to identify the specific steps the university needs to take ensure that gender-based discrimination is not occurring at the time of hiring.
  - Communicate the impact of faculty of lower salary (ability to thrive, ability to feel appreciated, ability to work and pay off student debt, etc.) on women-identified faculty.
- 

### 3. Redress Committee

We recommend a committee be struck to determine how inequities are to be redressed, and to oversee the implementation of redress. This committee should consider the following, and once decided on a strategy, demand compliance to it by all those involved in negotiating. These processes might involve:

- Require redress be conducted **immediately** and **fully** (not piecemeal)
- Determine how much is owed to women identified faculty (inclusive of back pay)
- Scrapping the current process and consider processes used at other universities (e.g. across-the-board increases, or annual increases where women receive more than men, etc.)
- Consider that discrimination should not be something done in contract negotiations, but should be considered a university responsibility whenever it is identified and create a committee that reviews salary annually and provides compensation
- Consider differential annual salary increased between men and women (e.g. women should receive a higher increase until real equity is achieved)

- Consider that annual increases in salary should be in dollar amounts, not a percentage of current salaries because using percentages disadvantages individuals who have experienced gender discrimination (i.e. their increase in dollar value is lower than those not discriminated against)
- Consider the advantages/disadvantages of negotiated monies in RFA contracts and how they should best be distributed.
- Consider that discrimination has been long-term for many women identified faculty. Retroactive compensation is necessary.
- Assist women-identified faculty in launching a human rights case and provide them with legal support from a human rights lawyer.
- Possibly promote a grievance against the university.
- Communicate to the public via the media about the ongoing gender-based pay discrimination happening at Ryerson.

*How redress is determined should be inclusive of those affected.* No one individual should decide how equity decisions are managed. For example, the current regression model in use at Ryerson is a flawed method of determining levels of inequities. It requires mathematical assumptions to be met, is affected by variables placed in the equation (thus consideration must be given to which variables are appropriate, and these should be evidence-based), and says little about any single individual inequity.

---

## **Other Important Issues**

It is clear there are many gendered inequities at Ryerson that were not highlighted as potential issues in our call for feedback. Women at Ryerson clearly feel undervalued and unfairly treated and this impacts all aspects of their work life. We therefore recommend a gender forum be established at Ryerson, which could, among other things:

- Assist university administration and the RFA in creating policy and decisions
- Assist Ryerson in creating a methodology to increase diversity of gender in higher administration
- Make recommendations for educating the university about the many ways gender discrimination is promoted at Ryerson
- Recommend changes in hiring processes
- Assist the RFA in promoting women to senior executive roles in the RFA



- Act as a resource and support for women identified faculty
- Develop a plan to provide mentoring, workshops and resources towards encouraging women-identified faculty to apply for promotion to Full Professor
- Recommend workshops and mentoring that would assist women-identified faculty

#### **Appendix 4: References submitted by respondents**

Note that many other pdf files were submitted were forwarded to Maureen Reed who will pass these on to any committee interested.

##### *Inequity in salary*

[https://www.aaup.org/2018-19-faculty-compensation-survey-results#data?link\\_id=1&can\\_id=a7efcd9c75c127c58e8f72472f777588&source=email-aaup-faculty-compensation-survey-shows-little-movement-on-salaries-and-gender-pay-disparity-3&email\\_referrer=email\\_526340&email\\_subject=aaup-faculty-compensation-survey-shows-little-movement-on-salaries-and-gender-pay-disparity](https://www.aaup.org/2018-19-faculty-compensation-survey-results#data?link_id=1&can_id=a7efcd9c75c127c58e8f72472f777588&source=email-aaup-faculty-compensation-survey-shows-little-movement-on-salaries-and-gender-pay-disparity-3&email_referrer=email_526340&email_subject=aaup-faculty-compensation-survey-shows-little-movement-on-salaries-and-gender-pay-disparity)

<https://t.co/UlGlxKkHkb>

(<https://twitter.com/MalindaSmith/status/1121923298365808640?s=03>)

<https://www.utoronto.ca/news/u-t-implement-salary-increase-more-800-women-faculty-members>

<https://www.utfa.org/content/utfa-executive-committee-newsletter-december-2018>

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/headlines/female-mcmaster-professors-getting-a-pay-boost-to-same-level-as-men-1.3052626>

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/headlines/female-mcmaster-professors-getting-a-pay-boost-to-same-level-as-men-1.3052626>

##### *Inequitable teaching loads*

<https://www.nature.com/news/teaching-load-could-put-female-scientists-at-career-disadvantage-1.21839>

##### *Inequitable service loads*

[https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2?wt\\_mc=Internal.Event.1.SEM.ArticleAuthorOnlineFirst](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2?wt_mc=Internal.Event.1.SEM.ArticleAuthorOnlineFirst)

<https://www.aaup.org/article/ivory-ceiling-service-work#.WgE0mxNSySM>

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/04/12/study-finds-female-professors-outperform-men-service-their-possible-professional>

<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/female-professors-pay-price-academic-citizenship>

[https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/01/10/study-finds-female-professors-experience-more-work-demands-and-special-favor?fbclid=IwAR2dFW67GpWC6mIrYEI7LmcVYyUwna77NNvoBZghT\\_DS1zzMNSSX7e4fwYA](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/01/10/study-finds-female-professors-experience-more-work-demands-and-special-favor?fbclid=IwAR2dFW67GpWC6mIrYEI7LmcVYyUwna77NNvoBZghT_DS1zzMNSSX7e4fwYA)

##### *Inequity in Grant Award Rates and Amounts and Publication*

###### *NSERC inequity*

<https://medium.com/@MHendr1cks/men-get-bigger-science-grants-in-canada-6033da63d832>

##### *Nepotism and sexism in publications*

<https://www.nature.com/articles/387341a0>

##### *Incivility directed towards women in a culture where they are blamed for it*

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/18/magazine/salk-institute-discrimination-science.html>

<https://www.straight.com/news/937181/jennifer-berdahl-crazybitch-narrative-about-senior-academic-women>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/18/magazine/when-the-revolution-came-for-amy-cuddy.html?module=inline>

<https://www.nap.edu/catalog/24994/sexual-harassment-of-women-climate-culture-and-consequences-in-academic>

### *Articles about Gender Discrimination*

<https://www.hastac.org/blogs/superadmin/2015/01/26/gender-bias-academe-annotated-bibliography-important-recent-studies>

<https://www.pnas.org/content/early/2012/09/14/1211286109#aff-1>

<https://www.pnas.org/content/112/43/13201>

<https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/01/09/women-and-men-in-stem-often-at-odds-over-workplace-equity/>

<https://www.economist.com/business/2019/04/20/the-subtle-ways-that-discrimination-works?fsrc=scn/tw/te/bl/ed/thesubtlewaysthatdiscriminationworksbartleby>

<https://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo2819>

### Care giving demands

<https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/the-black-hole/parental-leave-for-scientific-group-leaders-changes-needed/>

### *Two interesting Articles*

Instructors Spend ‘Emotional Labor’ in Diversity Courses, and Deserve Credit for It

*By Alexander C. Kafka*

NOVEMBER 15, 2018

The Chronicle of Higher Learning

For most faculty members who teach diversity courses, moderating heated discussions and hearing students’ personal tribulations are part of the job. That could be OK, a new paper says, if it were recognized and rewarded.

Diversity courses help sensitize students to a wide array of cultural backgrounds and outlooks, and many colleges include them in their general-education requirements. But because of the sometimes-tense subject matter, a new paper says, faculty members who teach those courses often bear a particularly heavy emotional load that isn’t generally recognized or compensated.

In the paper, presented on Wednesday at the Association for the Study of Higher Education’s annual meeting, in Tampa, Fla., the authors urge colleges and universities to prepare academics for that burden, and to acknowledge, document, and reward it.

According to a 2015 survey, 60 percent of member institutions in the Association of American Colleges and Universities reported including diversity courses in their general-education requirements.

The authors of the new paper — Ryan A. Miller and Cathy D. Howell, both of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and Laura Struve, of the University of Texas at Austin — interviewed 38 teachers of those courses at three unnamed liberal-arts institutions in two neighboring Southern states. The three institutions were an elite, private college and a private, highly selective college, both with white enrollments of about 70 percent, and a midsize public regional college that’s about one-third African-American, 10 percent other students of color and international students, and 60 percent white.

The authors of the paper, which has not yet been submitted for publication, define the instructors' emotional labor as "attending to students' needs beyond course content, both inside and out of the classroom, as well as addressing one's own emotional management and displays as a faculty member."

Some interviewees said they consider that kind of labor integral to any kind of teaching. But many felt that the nature of diversity courses and the fact that they may be taught disproportionately by women and members of ethnic and other underrepresented groups — who studies show are generally thrust into heavier unofficial counseling roles anyway — raise the emotional stakes.

In a number of cases, the teachers felt compelled to reveal to their students aspects of their own background because they expect students to do the same. Yet they also want to demonstrate objectivity and to reassure students that they won't use their minority identities in an antagonistic way against them.

Teachers of such courses are plunged into various roles. They are protectors of students who feel hostility from peers toward their points of view. They try to reassure students during political upheaval — for instance, one faculty member checked in particularly with Muslim students in the wake of the 2016 election.

Intense classroom discussions sometimes spill over into chats about personal issues after class or during office hours. The three institutions in the study all have relatively small class sizes, and students feel as if they know their professors but don't necessarily know a counselor. The teachers must decide whether a student just needs to talk out a problem, or whether the student should be referred to mental-health or other services.

#### 'Emotional Exhaustion'

Teachers of the courses don't necessarily see the emotional weight they carry as a problem, but cite "emotional exhaustion" all the same. One said that "if you're not willing to walk that growth journey with them, then you shouldn't be teaching this course." Another said that although she performs emotional labor "constantly, excessively, and all the time," she harnesses the emotional energy into "better discussions, more probing conversations, students making more connections."

Interviewees "who saw emotional labor as an expectation ... tended to discuss such work as a burden, and as tense and contested." But those who considered that labor as at least partly "a matter of choice often saw the work as valuable and beneficial to their teaching." Some saw it as "both an expectation and a choice, or saw choice in embracing the expectation."

Many interviewed, especially women, saw a need to set boundaries. They try to observe strict time limits on office-hour sessions — 20 minutes, say — and to make clear that academic issues take precedence and that personal matters should come up only at the end if there's time.

#### **"Students who come into my office crying, they're not crying about their papers, or their grades."**

Those intentions often crumble, though. Said one faculty member: "Students who come into my office crying, they're not crying about their papers, or their grades. ... They're coming in talking about microaggressions, about things that happen on campus, things people are saying to them."

Then again, not all of those interviewed were willing to cast themselves in the role of empath. Some men, in particular, do their best to opt out of emotional labor altogether, the authors report. One said that he "conveyed he did not have the extra time to engage in emotional work." As he put it: "I'm usually so busy with grading and designing lectures and

discussions that deep emotional engagement is something that in a way there's not time for because I've got a stack of midterms on my desk."

The authors recommend that colleges make the discussion of emotional labor more visible. Faculty members chat about it in hallways, but it needs to be incorporated into faculty handbooks, contracts, and tenure and promotion documents. Those teaching diversity courses, where the demand for emotional labor may be greater, should get more training and support (invited speakers, workshops), and recognition for that work. And the authors suggest more research on emotional labor in a greater variety of institutions.

The authors also reveal their own experiences. For instance, Miller, "a white, queer, cisgender man and tenure-track faculty member," is usually sought out by students for course and research advice. In contrast, Howell, "a black, hetero, cisgender woman" not on the tenure track at a predominately white institution, performs significant emotional labor, "being the depository of anger and frustration experienced by students."

"Students," she writes, "feel liberated to approach me in ways that they would not do to white males or females. To a certain extent faculty are the same. I was told early in my professional career to never have tissues on my desk, as students and faculty would take it as an invite to emotionally disclose. I am currently on my third box of tissues that I used to keep in my desk drawer."

*Alexander C. Kafka is a Chronicle senior editor. Follow him on Twitter [@AlexanderKafka](https://twitter.com/AlexanderKafka), or email him at [alexander.kafka@chronicle.com](mailto:alexander.kafka@chronicle.com).*

### **UTFacAssociation - Gender Salary Gap**

Led by me and Cynthia Messenger, since 2016 UTFA's staff and consultants have devoted substantial time and attention to investigating the gender salary gap at the University of Toronto. This work has included a rigorous and comprehensive statistical analysis, a half-dozen focus group meetings, and detailed qualitative research. UTFA has found evidence of a persistent, systemic, and significant gender salary gap that affects our members, and has filed a draft Association grievance (i.e., policy grievance) as the first step in seeking redress. The grievance seeks to go beyond what was done at most other Canadian Universities (one-time payments) and aims to put in place a process designed to actually remedy the root causes of the gender salary gap. In December 2018 and January 2019, the grievance will go to mediation before William Kaplan.

Throughout 2018, Cynthia and I have worked closely with the grievance portfolio to compile qualitative research and produce a 57-page brief in support of this mediation. In preparing this brief, UTFA identified the four determinants of faculty and librarian salaries at the University of Toronto:

- the negotiation of starting salaries
- annual Progress-Through-the-Ranks (PTR) increments

- the negotiation of market-retention salary increases
- across-the-board (ATB) salary adjustments

UTFA's analysis showed that each of these factors contributes to gender bias in salary determination. UTFA also found that rank is correlated with higher salaries and is also a highly gendered variable. Further, UTFA discovered that precarious positions (e.g., part-time and CLTA appointments) are gendered, and that conventional measures commonly used in the assessment of merit (e.g., outside offers, citation counts) are tainted by discriminatory bias. UTFA also determined that a phenomenon called labour segregation lowers salaries in female-dominated units and in units that do "women's work," and found evidence that there is also likely to be a significant salary gap for members of other equity-seeking groups.

Salary equity is close to the hearts of many in the UTFA membership and leadership. I'm working closely with Keith Adamson (Chair, Membership Committee), Roy Gillis (Vice-President, University and External Affairs), and Azita Taleghani (Chair, Equity Committee) and our respective committee members to plan and conduct an ambitious, multi-faceted outreach campaign to support UTFA's grievance on this important issue.