

## **Commission on the Status of Women FY 05 Year-End Report**

### **2004-2005 Members:**

Kellian Clink, IFO, Co-chair (resigned March 2005)  
Patricia Davis, AFSME  
Suzanne Dugan, ASF  
Jane Earley, Liaison to the President  
Theresa Evers, ASFME  
Janine Juberian, MMA  
Anne Lacsamana, Women's Studies  
Kelly Meier, ASF, Co-chair  
Tonya Phillips, Student  
Kay Puttock, IFO  
Deirdre Rosenfeld, Women's Center, Co-chair  
Karissa Stubstad, Student  
Susan Taylor, ASF  
Denise Thompson, Excluded Administrator  
Danielle Thomsen, Student  
Maggie Weller, Student  
Kenneth White, Affirmative Action Officer  
Sarah Wolter, Student  
Betty Young, IFO

### **1. Information-sharing and Campus-wide Communication**

The president charged the Commission to develop strategies for disseminating information to stakeholders. To address this concern we:

- Established a website ([www.mnsu.edu/csw](http://www.mnsu.edu/csw))
- Reported to bargaining units and student leaders at February 2005 Meet & Confer
- Contacted all employees and students via email to promote new website, recognition and funding opportunities
- Published reports and made announcements via email to deans, directors, and chairs for distribution

In the future we will take advantage of MSU's monthly newsletter and will explore methods to communicate directly and effectively with students.

### **2. Fall Reception for Women**

The Commission and the Women's Studies Department sponsored this annual event on September 9, 2004. This long-standing reception is designed to welcome new women employees and develop networks for new and returning employees alike. More than 75 people participated in this event. The Commission plans to continue this developmental tradition.

### **3. Professional Development & Research Grants**

The 2004-2005 academic year marks the second time that the Commission on the Status of Women has offered professional development and research grants to MSU community members. Stipends were available to students and employees who plan to attend professional conferences concerned with the status of women, or conduct research in this area. Funding criteria are: 1) Relation of the activity to the status of women; 2) Applicant's financial need and access to other sources of funding; and 3) Extent to which the activity benefits the applicant and/or the campus or local community. Out of 19 applications, 7 candidates were selected to receive funding. Recipients include 4 students, two faculty members and one staff member.

### **4. Research Project of the Year Awards**

This is the fourth year that the Commission has recognized excellence in research work pertaining to women. Members of the MSU community are invited to submit projects in one of three categories, Faculty/Staff, Graduate or Undergraduate Project of the Year. The recipients are recognized at the Women of Courage and Vision reception and are granted a \$350 award. This year's award-winning projects are:

- "How Does Automobile Dependence Affect the Health of Children?" by Heather Gay, Construction Management/Urban Studies, Undergraduate Project of the Year
- "The 'Trokosi' System and its Impact on Women in Ghana" by Beatrice Quist, Women's Studies, Graduate Project of the Year
- "Who Compares to Mother?" by Susan Schalge, Anthropology, Faculty/Staff Project of the Year
- "De-Gendering Youth Violence: A Media Analysis of the School Shooting at Rocori High School in Cold Spring, Minnesota" by Lana Gertsen, Women's Studies, Honorable Mention Graduate Project

The Commission plans to continue to administer this research recognition process next year.

### **5. Women of Courage and Vision Recognition Reception**

The Commission on the Status of Women, in partnership with the Women's Center, hosted our 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Women of Courage and Vision recognition reception on Monday, March 28, 2005. This program allows any MSU student or employee to nominate any MSU woman (student or employee) for recognition. All nominees receive a certificate and souvenir. More than 350 people participated in this event recognizing almost 300 MSU women. This year's program demonstrated a significant increase in the number of student participants. The Commission plans to continue to cosponsor this annual event.

### **6. Communication Workshop**

In collaboration with the Student Affairs Professional Development Committee, the Commission sponsored a women's communication workshop on Monday, April 18, 2005. Dr. Audrey Nelson presented "Speaking from a Position of Strength" to a packed room. More than 70 people took part in a session designed to help participants maximize their credibility through communication, to eliminate some less assertive speech patterns and nonverbals, and what communication behaviors contribute to enhance credibility. The audience consisted of mostly employees, but

more than 15 students were present. This session marked the Commission's first venture into providing developmental education targeted at women. Participant evaluation results indicate significant interest in future gender-based professional development opportunities.

## **7. Sexual Assault Concerns (see appendix A for original proposal submitted 12/03)**

### **A. Establish a position for a Sexual Assault Services & Outreach Coordinator**

On November 9, 2004, Commission co-chairs met with President Davenport, Student Affairs Vice President Swatfager-Haney and Director of Human Resources Lori Lamb to discuss the FY 04 wrap-up report and plans for FY 05. This issue (SASO position to address sexual assault concerns) was a primary concern carrying over for the second year.

In this meeting President Davenport stated that he supports having an expert professional in this position and assigned Vice President Swatfager-Haney to "free up funding" for the FY 06 academic year. The Director of the Women's Center was directed by Vice President Swatfager-Haney to continue to solicit funding from Student Activity Fees. MSSA denied this request, expressing remarkable support but stating that Student Activity Fees should not be used to fund this position. At this point (May 2, 2005) there is still no funding allocated for this position. The Commission stands behind this need and recommends that this position is established and staffed by the start of the 2005-2006 academic year.

### **B. Additional Full-time Campus Security Officers Needed**

Similar to the sexual assault services and outreach position above, this issue was discussed at the November 9, 2004 meeting between administration and Commission leadership. This issue (additional full-time CSO's needed to address sexual assault concerns) was a primary concern carrying over for the second year.

At this meeting President Davenport noted his support for this recommendation. Following this meeting the Director of Security was directed by Vice President Swatfager-Haney to request funding for two additional full-time Campus Security Officers from Student Activity Fees. The MSSA voted against this request, stating that these positions were not candidates for an allocation from student fees. At this point (May 2, 2005) there is still no funding allocated for this position. The Commission stands behind this need and recommends that these positions are funded and staffed by the start of the 2005-2006 academic year.

Another issue raised at the November 9, 2004 meeting was the Commission's concern regarding Security's location on campus. At this meeting Vice President Swatfager-Haney was asked to do a space study to evaluate options for Security's location. The Commission recognizes that this is a long-range project and requests a progress report.

## **8. Addressing Workplace Bullying (see appendix B for original concerns from 7/03 and appendix C for feedback submitted anonymously via the CSW website)**

This issue is another carry-over issue from the past two academic years. In the November 9, 2004 meeting with President Davenport the Commission on the Status of Women was charged to

work with the Diversity Commission to make sure that bullying was incorporated into a campus climate survey. This issue was not incorporated into the campus climate survey. Both Commissions support further study of bullying on campus. Both Commissions collaborated to request a diversity strategic priority allocation to support such a study in FY 06.

The Commission continues to support the Workplace Environment Policy and Employee Complaint Procedure. These drafts are currently in the final stages of formal review. The Commission recommends that the President approve both of these documents.

### **9. Helping outside speakers meet MSU's diversity goals**

The Commission, in collaboration with Human Resources and several concerned MSU employees, helped bring the following to a Cabinet meeting.

Every speaker who comes to MSU presents an opportunity for the University to reinforce its diversity goals. Presenters need to be aware that diversity is a priority for MSU and that we expect them to play a role. When you consider or engage a speaker for an MSU event, please take the following three steps to help make them aware of our expectations:

1) Inform them of the University's active commitment to diversity, and share the following definition:

*Diversity at Minnesota State University, Mankato is a commitment to create an understanding and appreciation of diverse peoples and diverse perspectives; a commitment to create an academic, cultural, and workplace environment and community that develops mutual respect for all and celebrates our differences.*

*Meeting this commitment requires a transformation of the University Community to respect, teach, and learn from differences that can separate rather than unite the University Community as a genuine learning, teaching and living community dedicated to the education of all. These differences may include, but are not limited to, gender, ethnicity, race, national origin, socio-economic status, religion, sexual orientation, abilities/disabilities, age, physical appearance, marital/partnered status, and veteran status.*

*Meeting this commitment also requires action from the entire University Community to end discrimination and prejudice by and toward all people and groups.*

2) Make it clear that the University expects all presenters to help advance this strategic priority, realizing that different presentations allow for this to different degrees.

3) Offer specific examples of how presenters can achieve this--e.g., a guest should ensure that examples used reflect a diversity of voices and experiences; a workshop facilitator should use visuals that include people of different ethnic backgrounds, genders, ages and abilities.

## **10. Athletic Department Logo Concerns**

The Commission on the Status of Women expressed concerns regarding both the process and the outcome of the Athletic Department logo change. In the future, when decisions affecting the whole university community arise, we recommend that the Athletic Department as well as all departments use the following guidelines:

1. That the decision-making process be public and follow the standard consultative process (i.e. Meet and Confer).
2. When consulting other entities, a follow-up communication is vital to acknowledge receipt of the input from that entity.
3. That decisions affecting the University community be made during the academic year in order to solicit the maximum amount of community input.
4. When someone contacts a director about an issue of this magnitude, the director should respond personally rather than delegating the response.

Some of the Commission members feel it would be beneficial to revisit the mascot issue in light of the omnipresence of both the iconography and the word MAV (mail, disk, etc). We also recommend having additional input from the professors, staff and students who make up the MSU community.

## **11. Consensual Relationships Concerns**

The President reported that establishing a policy related to this concern is not possible, according to MnSCU's attorneys. The Commission continues to believe that MSU can take steps to reduce the risk of student or employee victimization due to relationships with instructors or supervisors. The Commission recommends that MSU take steps to protect and advise students and employees related to this issue. For FY 06 we plan on posting a value statement, links to sexual harassment/nondiscrimination (1B.1) policies and procedures, and information regarding support resources on our website. We encourage the President to take steps to increase campus awareness about this issue.

## **12. Employee Equity Data Published**

The Commission received several requests for information regarding the number of women, and specifically women of color, working on campus. Partnering with Human Resources, the Commission on the Status of Women published several data reports sorting MSU employees by division, gender and ethnicity. These reports can be found online at <http://www.mnsu.edu/csw/equity/>. We look forward to updating this data annually.

**Appendix A**  
**Commission on the Status of Women**  
**Plan to Address Sexual Assault Concerns**

In light of the Commission's July 2003 report to the President of Minnesota State University, Mankato, we propose the following to address MSU's significant safety concerns related to sexual assault:

**C. Establish a position for a Sexual Assault Services & Outreach Coordinator**

**Rationale:** As noted in the Commission's July 2003 report, the high incidences of sexual assault and related crimes on campus merits the full-time attention of a professional. This 12-month MSUAASF position would:

- Provide direct services to survivors, serving as a first point of care for referral and advocacy during business hours
- Design and implement sexual violence education for all new MSU students
- Coordinate education and outreach to the MSU community including but not limited to:
  - Working with students to coordinate prevention education
  - Training for MSU employees about sexual assault prevention, services, referrals and response protocol

The Commission recommends that this position reports to the Director of the Women's Center or other appropriate administrator.

As part of the start-up process for this new position, the Commission advises that appropriate consultation occur. Specifically, we advise MSU to bring a consultant to campus to advise the development of a campus-wide sexual assault services strategy. A nationally recognized expert on campus-related sexual assault issues would help us establish a program with minimal liability concerns and maximum effectiveness. A consultant would be able to advise us about things that have and have not worked on other campuses. While on campus, this expert will be able to offer resources and program review services to Security, the Commission on the Status of Women, the Women's Center, Human Resources and others.

**Anticipated expenses:**

*Program Coordinator, full-time, 12-month, range B	\$35,000 salary
	\$9,800 fringe
	\$10,000 supplies
*Consultant Visit	\$2,500 flat fee
	<b>\$57,300 total</b>

**Notes from 11/9/04 meeting:**

- President Davenport supports having an expert professional in this position
- Vice President Swatfager-Haney assigned to "free up funding" for at least a half-time position
- Deirdre met with VP S-H on 12/6 to map out funding options
- VP S-H and other leadership will follow up with CSW via Dean Earley

#### **D. Make Security accessible to survivors of sexual violence**

- Security is the current 24/7 response agency for campus crimes, including sexual assault
- Current facilities do not allow for comfortable or private crime reporting
- There are not enough full-time, professional Campus Security Officers to staff a 24/7 schedule

**Rationale:** To best serve the campus community and provide a visible welcoming security presence, we recommend that the Security Department be relocated to a central highly visible area of campus. Its current location in Wiecking Center is not only tucked away from the general campus population on the most distant north end of campus, its present facility layout hampers their ability to serve their customers. The current layout of the office is quite frankly unwelcoming and could deter victims especially victims of sexual assault, physical assault, harassment from even filing a report as they must do so while standing in a highly used hallway. The office is located next to one of the building exits, public restrooms and the university Post Office. There is no reception/interview room within the department so individuals must wait for an officer to file a report on chairs outside the office in the public hallway which is heavily used by the building occupants. If a new location is not feasible in the near future we recommend that at minimum additional space be provided adjoining the current location to allow for reorganizing space to include a private area to serve victims.

In researching staffing standards for campus security and police services we reviewed The Bureau of Justice Statistics report, Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, 1995 which provided comparative information on officer per student population for 4 year private/public institutions. This information comes from the 1995 Survey of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, the largest study of police and security services at institutions of higher education ever conducted. The document indicated that for institutions with a student population of 10,000 – 14,999 the median number of officers is 18. Among all 4-year campuses of 2,500 or more students, about two-thirds of the law enforcement employees worked at public institutions. However, private institutions had nearly twice as many law enforcement employees per 1,000 students (4.5 versus 2.4). Both types of campuses had approximately 1.5 officers per 1,000 students.

With a student population of 13,000 + the committee feels that requesting two additional Campus Security Officers which would bring our total officer number of officers to seven, still leaves MSU considerably short staffed in comparison to the median in the Department of Justice study.

In order to not re-victimize individuals of personal crimes especially crimes of violence, it is imperative that first responders are professionals trained in handling these types of incidents. We are very concerned that due to current Campus Security Officer staffing levels (5) they cannot provide 24/7 professional coverage. Due to this lapse in full-time coverage, there are times when the response to incidents and the security of our campus rests on the shoulders of an 18+ year old part-time student guard. When a Campus Security Officer is on shift, they must rely on assistance/backup from student guards. With an increase in violent behavior, safety for the current officers, and liability, this current staffing level should be a concern to us all and priority given to increasing these positions. We are recommending that funding be provided to hire a minimum of two additional Campus Security Officers.

**Anticipated expenses:**

*Campus Security Officers (2), full-time, 12-month	\$35,000 salary
	\$9,800 fringe
	\$1,000 uniform

**Total anticipated expenses: \$148,900**

**Notes from 11/9/04 meeting:**

- President Davenport reports there are several options in the works:
  - Partnering with the city
  - Hiring our own
  - Focusing on specializations (EMT, other)
- This recommendation is supported, and the President is not looking for anything more from the Commission
- Regarding location, VP S-H has been asked to do a space study to evaluate options for Security. The President is not optimistic, and notes that this is a long-range project.

**Appendix B**  
**Workplace Abuse and Bullying**  
**Taken from July 2003 “Giving Voice to the Concerns” report**  
<http://www.mnsu.edu/csw/csw-report-20030701.pdf>

**From the Executive Summary page vi:**

Reports of workplace abuse and bullying emerged from discussion among Commission members and also in open meetings with faculty and staff. The university must a) establish a climate of fairness and of direct attention to employee complaints that may not “qualify” for discrimination or other grievance procedures, b) properly equip administrators and supervisors to guide these concerns to resolution, and c) clearly communicate specific steps an individual can take to address problems.

*Concern:*

This new issue may be related to the inadequacy of the response to “chilly climate” issues. In addition to training, there is a need for new policy and processes to address abuse and bullying.

**From pages 17-19:**

*Workplace abuse and bullying*

Unfortunately, the Commission noted a sobering new issue that may be related to the inadequacy of the response to “chilly climate” issues. It has become painfully evident from the open meetings and from the responses to the Commission’s website that many women (both faculty and staff, but particularly support staff) are experiencing a climate that might better be described as “hypothermic” rather than chilly. Some women described being overworked, badgered, harried, and intimidated. A staff member reported that “*individuals use their size, position and their impressive vocabulary to bully, intimidate, belittle and keep people in line.*” At one of the open meetings for faculty the word “bullying” was used several times and it also was used occasionally on the website.

The comments suggest that both women and men supervisors exhibit abusive behavior, but the recipients are overwhelmingly women. Bullying comes in many forms. A female staff member wrote, “*When we go to our supervisor with concerns, he often tells us if we don’t like working here we can look for another job. Obviously, problems do not get solved.*”

Another female staff member provided a detailed breakdown of all the hours of unpaid extra work she has been putting in for more than a year. She then goes on to say, “*The ‘temporary’ project has been extended through at least next summer, and it is being assumed that I will donate the necessary hours to get both jobs done.*” Last summer, when she asked for a week of vacation, “*My supervisor left on an extended vacation and left word with his associate that she may sign the leave slip after checking with me to see if ‘I really felt caught up enough on my work to take off a whole week.’*”

A faculty member with more than 20 years of service added, “*I almost did not respond to this survey because of fear of retaliation . . . In some ways I feel it is worse now on campus than ten years ago because the administration refuses to deal with real problems. People (victims) are now more afraid to speak out than ever because they will be labeled troublemakers . . . One*

woman told me she was afraid to speak to the Chronicle of Higher Education about the salary equity settlement because of it.”

Perhaps the supervisors described are not abusive only to women. Perhaps male employees, if they happened to be working in traditionally “female” job categories, would be treated in the same way. Perhaps men would be equally hesitant to be quoted in the *Chronicle*. As far as the Commission is aware, there has not yet been sufficient research to be sure of the answer. However, after one of the open meetings, a male staff member mentioned that he had observed instances of bullying and intimidation against women, but was afraid to raise the issue for fear of retaliation against him for “*sticking up for the women.*”

A frequent complaint heard was that administrators who should deal with these issues fail to do so, leading to a lack of trust in the system. The following analysis is from a female staff member who has been on campus for more than eleven years: “*Under [the previous administration] problems were all pushed under the rug. Favoritism ran amok and individuals who should have been held accountable for egregious conduct were given free reign to abuse, bully and harass to their heart’s content. . . It will take the new president a long time to develop a culture of trust in the system.*”

Another female staff member with more than 15 years of service says that the problem is “*Sexist, unaware men in significant leadership positions.*” She feels that these administrators are helping to perpetuate or even cause problems. The same staff member points out that sometimes female administrators are hired to deal with the problems, but they are set up for failure from the beginning: “*There is a double standard in performance expectations for women. . . Supervisors look the other way and choose not to confront and deal with poor performance [by men], and then hire women to patch the performance holes.*”

**Concern:**

Of major concern to the Commission is the general consensus from women regarding the inability to get assistance. Numerous respondents cited examples of individuals who have gone to the Human Resources Office to discuss “non-discriminatory” workplace issues (e.g., bullying) and have been told “*there is nothing we can do*” or “*your only option is to get another job.*” As an example of petty behavior by a supervisor, a staff member who attended the appreciation event to which she had been invited to honor her years of service was called to task upon her return for being “gone too long.” When she went to Human Resources for help, she was told that it might be necessary to adjust to a new supervisor.

These insufficient institutional responses contribute to the abusive work environment that many employees are experiencing daily. The university must a) establish a climate of fairness and of direct attention to employee complaints that may not “qualify” for discrimination or other grievance procedures, b) properly equip administrators and supervisors to guide these concerns to resolution, and c) clearly communicate specific steps an individual can take to address such issues and who is responsible for decision making.

**Appendix C**  
**Anonymous Feedback Gathered from Website**

2/10/05

gender: Female  
ethnicity: Caucasian  
classification: faculty  
service: 2-5 Years

Message: Dear Committee,

Although it is too late for me, as I have been non-renewed, I sincerely hope the President in future exit interviews with female faculty will spend more time exploring the problems which concern them. At my interview, Dr. Davenport came in ten minutes late, eating birthday cake from a party he had just attended at a neighboring office, and responded to me as if I were a little girl who just "needed to do her work". I was taken back by his total disregard and respect for my position, my professional experience and my concerns as a woman, wife and mother. The President and others at MSU Mankato need to "walk the talk," rather than just provide lip service. Thank you for providing this avenue to express my thoughts. Good Luck in all your endeavors and know that your work is very important to those who otherwise have little voice.

2/10/05

gender: Female  
ethnicity: Caucasian  
classification: Staff  
service: 2-5 Years

Message: I only have a comment--I am so happy that you are doing the work that you are. Because women seem to be the majority in the entry-level to director positions in student affairs on this campus, we forget that there are still issues out there that are important to deal with for staff. And we NEED to do whatever we can to make this a safe place for our female students.

2/11/05:

Comment: Commission on the status of women? Don't get me wrong i'm all about "celebrating" women but when is the commission on the status of men going to be formed? First with the diversity commission and now this, i'm starting to think my university has forgotten about me.

2/14/05

gender: Female  
classification: Staff

Message: Not enough women are promoted from within MSU (from lower to higher ranks; even "secretaries" who have degrees) -- even though they have proved themselves over and over and over again -- MSU would rather hire from "outside", then allow someone within MSU to move up the ranks (even when these lower ranked people have degrees; including the appropriate degree for the job). Also, women are still behind in wages (and wage increases) compared to men.