

Commission on the Status of Women FY 06 Year-End Report

2005-2006 Members:

Maria Bevacqua, Women's Studies Representative
Katie Boone, Graduate Assistant to the Commission
Julie Carlson, IFO Representative
Lisa Darvell, Student Representative
Suzanne Dugan, ASF Representative
Jane Earley, Liaison to the President
Carol Endres, AFSCME Representative
Margaret Frazee, MMA Representative
Kristeen Giese, Student Representative
Rosemary Krawczyk, IFO Representative
Sarah Jane McLaughlin, Student Representative
Kelly Meier, ASF Representative, Co-chair
Deirdre Rosenfeld, Women's Center Representative, Co-chair
Susan Taylor, ASF Representative
Denise Thompson, Excluded Administrator Representative
Shannon Villwock, MAPE Representative
Kenneth White, Affirmative Action Officer
Betty Young, IFO Representative

1. Fall Reception for Women

The Commission and the Women's Studies Department sponsored this annual event on September 6, 2005. This long-standing reception is designed to welcome new women employees and develop networks for new and returning employees alike. More than 100 people participated in this event. The Commission plans to continue this developmental tradition while taking steps to include women working in classified positions.

2. Professional Development & Research Grants

The 2005-2006 academic year marks the third 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 eleven applications, eight candidates from a broad range of fields of study were selected to receive funding. Recipients include two students, and six members of the faculty.

3. Research Project of the Year Awards

This is the fifth 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 undergraduate student Gina Martino, graduate student Adriane Brown, staff member Angie Bomier and faculty member Ann Quade were honored. The Commission plans to continue to administer this research recognition process next year.

4. Women of Courage and Vision Recognition Reception

The Commission on the Status of Women, in partnership with the Women's Center and Panhellenic Association, hosted our 6th Annual Women of Courage and Vision recognition reception on March 28, 2006. 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. We continue to have about 350 people participate in this event that recognizes 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.

5. Sexual Assault Concerns

A. Establish a full-time, probationary Sexual Violence Education Coordinator

This has been one of the Commission's greatest success areas. A half-time, fixed-term professional Sexual Violence Education Coordinator began working at MSU on November 22, 2005. This position received a \$10,000 operating budget allocation. On February 13, 2006, President Davenport announced funding for a full-time, probationary position, supported by a graduate assistant and a \$15,000 operating budget. This action supports not only student survivors of sexual violence, but also risk reduction/prevention resources for all students.

B. Increase full-time Campus Security Officers, access to Security services

With this significant accomplishment, the Commission will focus increased energy on the number of full-time Campus Security Officers and the extent to which the Security department is located at an accessible location and facility.

6. Addressing Workplace Bullying (see appendix A for original concerns from 7/03 and appendix B for Strategic Priority Funding Request)

The Commission began the academic year with enthusiasm for the recent institutional approval of the Workplace Environment Policy and Employee Complaint Procedure. We recommend widespread publicity about these policies, targeting training for supervisors who will need to be able to respond to complaints. In addition, all employees need to be made aware of this new option.

While the Commission appreciates the above policy and procedure, the existence of these administrative procedures does not satisfy our concerns related to workplace bullying. We submitted a successful request for Strategic Priority Funding to collect data that will allow us to

compare our campus climate, in respect to bullying issues, to nationwide trends and capitalize on other campus, corporate and community successes. This will be a primary work area during FY 07 for the Commission on the Status of Women.

7. Listening Panel (see appendix C for comments submitted at this session)

In the spirit of reaching out to the campus community, the Commission hosted an open listening session on April 26, 2006. More than 30 members of the MSU community participated in this session, sharing institutional successes and concerns with others submitting comments online. Discussion at this session and throughout the year articulates appreciation for existing resources yet significant work remaining related to gender equity and the status of women, including increased listening/assessment work to unearth the primary concerns.

Appendix A
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 B
Minnesota State University, Mankato
Strategic Priority Funding Proposal Request Form

President's Commission on the Status of Women Bullying Assessment Request

STEP 1a. THE MISSION, VISION, ALIGNMENT FOR MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY, MANKATO

The University's vision sets out the reasons for the organization's existence and the "ideal" state that the organization aims to achieve; the mission identifies major goals and performance objectives.

1. Does the program support the University's vision and mission?

This proposal includes a request for funding to implement a campus-wide assessment of bullying on campus. This project, first recommended by the Commission on the Status of Women in 2003, has also been supported by the Diversity Commission since 2004. This project supports the University goal of fostering an actively engaged and inclusive learning community based upon civility, trust, integrity, respect, and diversity in a safe, welcoming physical environment.

2. How does the program support the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system strategic work plan?

This project, like all other Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) work, is focused exclusively on moving MSU closer to meeting Focus Area 5: Serving the Underrepresented in the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities 2005-2006 Annual Work Plan.

STEP 1b. NEEDS ANALYSIS

The needs analysis can be performed within the frameworks of the SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis.

Internal

1. How does the program develop a new strength or utilize an existing strength within Minnesota State Mankato (existing organization)

Based on the findings of FY 05's Campus Climate Survey, the annual work of the CSW and the Diversity Commission, as well as the newly-implemented Workplace Environment Policy, this assessment project would develop a new strength area for Minnesota State Mankato.

2. How does the program address a weakness or existing weakness within Minnesota State Mankato?

This purpose of this project is to assess the extent to which bullying is a concern on campus and make recommendations to address possible concerns. See the appendix following this form, a literature review drafted by CSW members in FY 04 for more information.

External

1. How does the program develop a new opportunity or utilize an existing opportunity within Minnesota State Mankato's external environment?

Collecting data will allow us to compare our campus climate, in respect to bullying issues, to nationwide trends and capitalize on other campus, corporate and community successes.

2. How does the program address a new threat or an existing threat within Minnesota State Mankato's external environment? Consider the following factors: demographic, technological, political, legal, social, international.

This assessment project mostly focuses on Minnesota State Mankato's internal environment. Of course, our campus community is directly shaped and influenced by fiscal, social and political factors. Research and program development related to bullying is a booming trend in K-12 schools and communities.

3. How does this program address a market demand/need within the Minnesota State Mankato organization?

This project, whose primary aim is to enhance our campus climate, is likely to improve both student and employee recruitment and retention. Our hope is that increased recruitment and retention of women and people of color is an outcome.

4. Is this program to address a legislative action? If yes, how would this program address a legislative action?

n/a

STEP 2. PROGRAM JUSTIFICATION/RATIONALE

Periodic evaluations of a programs strategies, tactics and action are essential to assessing success of the strategic program planning process.

1. What are the program's long term performance goals?

This one-time assessment project will result in a series of recommendations for the campus community. Our long term goal is to move the campus towards a reduction in bullying.

2. Who are the responsible entities for this proposed program?

This project would be supervised and facilitated by the Commission on the Status of Women co-chairs, in partnership with a campus-wide working group. The assessment project would be outsourced to an external expert.

3. What are key strategies or tactics for achieving the performance goals?
 - Partner with Diversity Commission, Human Resources, Affirmative Action, Institutional Diversity, Bargaining Units and Cabinet throughout the assessment and recommendation process
 - Select expert to conduct the assessment and summarize data collected
 - Engage campus leaders and interested campus community members in the planning process
 - Engage campus community when assessment results return to campus
 - Seek consultation with experts on and off campus when making recommendations
4. What are the measurable outcomes that would be used to determine if the performance goals are being achieved?

Goals will be achieved when the assessment project yields meaningful data from student employees, faculty members, classified and unclassified staff. Another outcome will be that specific, measurable recommendations will be created for the University community and submitted to President Davenport.

5. How and when would the measurable outcomes be assessed?

Progress towards these outcomes will be assessed at several steps:

- Once an on-campus working group has been established to steer this process
- After an assessment expert has been selected
- When the assessment tool and methods have been established
- After the results are presented on campus
- Once recommendations have been drafted and submitted to President Davenport

6. Identify a standard or criteria for measuring the outcomes
 - Campus-wide representation on working group established
 - Credible expert selected
 - Working group and IRB approval of assessment tool and methods
 - Statistically significant results and/or meaningful qualitative data summarized clearly, with responses from each campus constituency group:
 - Student employees
 - Faculty
 - Classified Staff
 - Unclassified Staff
 - Specific, measurable recommendations received by President Davenport

- Minnesota State Mankato creates a strategic plan to address bullying (if deemed necessary by assessment project)

7. What are the resource needs and financial indicators (fiscal, salary, space, equipment and other non salary items)?

The approximate cost of hiring an outside agency to create a relatively short survey, administer it to a significant percentage of the 1500 MSU employees, analyze it and write a report would be approximately \$10,000-20,000. The cost could possibly be reduced to \$5,000 if an internal consultant was hired through the Center for Applied Social Science. The Commission does not recommend hiring an MSU employee because of fears of retaliation evident among those being surveyed.

8. What other sources of funding, self-generated income, or collaboration currently exist that are available to support this proposed program?

none

9. What is the proposed timeline for implementation of this program?

September 2006	Working group established
September-October 2006	Identify and review candidates, select assessment expert to create and administer survey, analyze results and write a report
October-December 2006	Survey and methods created by expert
January 2007	Survey administered on campus
March 2007	Survey results presented to campus community
May 2007	Recommendations presented to President Davenport

Review of Workplace Bullying- The Silent Epidemic

Compiled by Terry Salerno, Becky Zacharias and Terri Evers for the Commission on the Status of Women, Fall Semester 2004

I. Introduction

The review of literature suggests that a significant percentage of workers experience mistreatment in the workplace. This abusive behavior is sometimes referred to as bullying. Even the university workplace exhibits this hostile environment. The cost to both the institution and the individual is great since bullying impacts productivity, quality of work, health, and family life.

Bullying can become systemic when there is no policy in effect to eradicate it in its early stages. This is especially true if no confidential mechanism exists to report bullies and if bullying is treated apathetically by the institution.

There is evidence of bullying at Minnesota State University, Mankato. Comments at open meeting and summaries of the Web site submissions verify different types of bullying tactics and also suggest that targets are afraid to report it. The extent of bullying on campus is unknown because of the small numbers who attended the open meetings or submitted Web comments.

This proposal requests funding to conduct a survey of campus employees to analyze the bullying tactics and effects of the mistreatment on all university employees. The purpose of the questionnaire is to further probe the extent of workplace bullying on campus so that the hostile work environment can be improved.

Bullying Definitions

Bullying or workplace mistreatment is persistent and negative, unwanted acts that target one or more individuals and which create a hostile work environment. The acts must be repetitive and must have a significant negative effect on the victims. Bullying is not harassment; "any conduct related to sex, race, color, disability or sexual orientation which is unwanted by the recipient." (McMahon 384)

The following are some examples of bullying definitions taken from the literature:

- "Repeated illegitimate mistreatment of a targeted employee by one or more persons characterized by acts of commission and omission which impair the target's psychological and physical health and economic security." (Namie 2)
- "Repeated aggressive behavior that deliberately caused physical or psychological torment" (Glendinning 272)
- Bullying is "offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behavior, an abuse or misuse of power through means intended to undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the recipient." (Seward 16)
- "Repeated and persistent negative acts toward one or several individuals, which involve a victim-perpetrator dimension and create a hostile work environment." (Salin 425)
- "Negative behaviors from another individual or group of people consistently for a period of time." (Hoel 196)
- "Behavior or situations-without sexual or racial connotations-which the recipient perceives to be unwelcome, unwanted, unreasonable, inappropriate, excessive, or a violation of human rights." (Price Spratlen, p. 287)

Tactics of the Bully

The negative behaviors of the bully can be grouped into various descriptions of bullies. One possible categorization is given below and is a modification of Namie's bully strategies defined in the U.S. Hostile Workplace Survey (Namie 3) and Rayner and Hoel's summary review of workplace bullying (Rayner 183), and those listed in Seward's article (Seward 16):

➤ **“Screaming Mimi**

These are the verbal intimidators. They are the chronic bullies. They start this behavior in their childhood and continue it as adults in the workplace. They use cut-throat competition so that they can climb the ladder. Their long-standing habits of intimidation can traumatize the targets. The tactics of this type of bully are:

- Verbal abuse, often in the presence of colleagues
- Unreasonable job demands (targets are intimidated and afraid to take sick leave, vacation time)
- Yelling and screaming at the target, public humiliation
- Criticism and ridicule of the target's abilities

➤ **“Gatekeeper”**

These bullies are abusers of power. They prevent their targets from being successful at their jobs. The tactics of this type of bully are:

- Controls all resources, keeps targets from being successful at their jobs
- Takes credit for the work of others
- Sets impossible deadlines and work objectives (unrealistic targets)
- Withholds information that affects the target's performance
- Prevents access to opportunities; assigns meaningless tasks
- Overworks the target
- Sets the target up for failure
- Does not consistently enforce rules

➤ **“Constant Critic”**

The constant critic is the bully boss who micromanages. He or she wears down the most competent employee with constant negative remarks and no positive compliments. The tactics of this bully are:

- Conducts personal verbal assaults
- Unnecessary high level of supervision/ micromanagement
- Constant criticism of competent worker so that the target loses self-confidence
- Threatens job loss
- Insults and humiliates the target in the presence of colleague

➤ **“Two-headed Snake”**

The two-headed snake is a bully who attacks the target's professional standing. This bully tries to isolate the target from his or her colleagues by creating

a bad impression of the target among his or her peers. This bully likes to cause a division in the department or office group. The tactics of this bully are:

- Ruins the target's reputation with peers
- Spreads malicious rumors
- Copies critical memos about someone to others who do not need to know
- Ostracizes and isolates the target from the group to the extreme (icing out)
- Creates a division in the department forcing others to take sides
- Punishes target- sets the target up to take blame for others' failures

➤ **Accidental Bullies**

These are social fools who have no idea that their actions are affecting others. When confronted, these individuals apologize and change their behavior.

II. How prevalent is bullying in the workplace?

Workplace bullying is very prevalent in both the corporate and university workplace. Several studies have been done to document this fact. Many of the studies have been done in Europe. Fewer studies have been done in the US. Only a handful of surveys have been conducted in university workplace environments. Bullying can occur between colleagues as well as between a manager and subordinates. Many times targets are bullied in groups. (Hoel 201)

Wayne State conducted a study of Michigan residents in 2000. 16.8% of the respondents reported personal experiences in bullying (Namie 1). In a study conducted in Baltimore (Forni 3), 36% reported being victims of incivility. In a study of Finnish business professionals, only 8.85 % reported being bullied but when asked to identify negative acts, the number of those identified as being bullied rose to 24%. (Salin 425) It is generally accepted that the number of false negative reports of bullying is high. (Rayner 200)

In the studies conducted in the university workplace, bullying was also found to be significant. A Wales higher education study found 18% of the respondents to have been bullied and another 22% had witnessed bullying in the workplace (Lewis 112).

A Finnish university study reported the incidence of bullying to be 30% among males and 55% among females. The number of respondents in this case was 338. This study found more bullying among administrative and service jobs than among the faculty (Price Spratlen 286). In the best documented American university study, done at the University of Washington, 23% of the total 810 responses indicated workplace mistreatment. Forty percent observed bullying in their workplace. Even though the term bullying was not used, the mistreatment tactics clearly mimicked those found in workplace bullying. (Price Spratlen 292). Furthermore, focus groups of university ombudspersons have provided records of several incidents of workplace bullying and random sampling of Ombudsman's records found 35% of the recorded incidents could be grouped into this category (Price Spratlen 287).

All these studies support the contention that both men and women are bullied. The University of Washington study found little gender bias for faculty or classified staff, but a much larger percentage of women were bullied among the professional staff (66% versus 21%). Professional staff are unprotected by a union or tenure. The Finnish university study found a large gender difference; 30% of the men and 55% of the women reported some personal experience with workplace bullying. The authors of this study concluded that women are bullied more often and with greater severity. (Hoel 201)

In non-academic settings, women have been found to be the majority of the targets. In the Michigan study by Wayne State, 77% of the targets were women. The types of bullying may be gender related. Women who are quiet or men who put their families above their jobs may be targeted (Lee 225).

Types of bullying tactics are similar in both the corporate and university workplace environments. In the British UNISON study of civil service workers (Rayner 30), the most common types of bullying were found to be: withholding information (42%), belittling remarks (32%), persistent criticism (31%), setting unrealistic targets (31%), intimidation (28%), meaningless tasks (28%), and excessive work monitoring (28%). In a British study of workplace bullying of part-time students, approximately 50% of the students reported being bullied in the workplace. These students identified the negative behaviors in the following categories: belittling remarks, persistent criticism, exclusion, public humiliation, malicious rumors, and setting up to fail (Rayner 205). The frequency of the negative acts was much higher among those who considered themselves to be bullied. In the University of Washington study (Price Spatlen 292) verbal mistreatments (including yelling, intimidation, demeaning comments, verbal assaults, name-calling) and environmental mistreatment (ignored, isolated, treated in a rude, hostile, and demeaning manner, belittled in front of others) were the most common types of bullying. The mistreaters were found to be both coworkers and bosses or managers.

III. Consequences of Bullying to the Institution and the Individual

The Institution

The consequences of bullying are extensive and very costly for both the institution and the individual. For the institution there is low morale among employees, reduced productivity, damage to the company's future success, and possible legal consequences. These negative effects are described below and are a compilation of those cited in McMahon (384), Namie (1), Glendinning (273-275) and Forni (5) :

➤ **Low morale**

Bullying leads to low morale among workers which in turn leads to higher turnover and the need for more recruiting. Job dissatisfaction creates a poor image of the work environment. The hostile work environment infects the other workers with bad attitudes so that everyone feels trapped in a bad situation and wants to leave.

➤ **Reduced productivity**

The target of bullying loses time thinking about the bullying, avoiding the bully and worrying about the bully's next actions.

A stressed, angry worker doesn't produce as much. He or she may also not be able to focus so that the quality of the work also decreases.

The manager also must spend more time resolving the conflicts. Other workers may also become involved and their productivity will also be affected.

➤ **Damage to the company's future success**

The bully is less likely to take risks so creativity is discouraged. The bully is less likely to communicate and cooperate with others in a team effort. The bully is less likely to give constructive criticism. All these hamper innovation and growth for the company or institution.

The Individual

The individual also suffers many negative effects. These include: poor health, poor concentration, loss of self esteem and self confidence, economic loss, and negative effects on personal life.

➤ **Poor Health**

Health effects include severe anxiety, sleep disruption, loss of concentration, stress headaches, racing heart, physical exhaustion, new body aches, depression, significant weight change, panic attacks, chronic fatigue syndrome, colitis, migraines, and chest pains

➤ **Poor concentration**

Poor concentration results from thought intrusion, and obsession with the bullying tactics. This results in the inability to do a good job at work which amplifies the loss of self esteem.

➤ **Loss of self esteem and self confidence**

The target starts to doubt his or her worth because of the constant negative criticism.

➤ **Lost job**

The bullying may become so unbearable that the target quits the job or is fired.

➤ **Negative Effect on Personal Life**

The shame or embarrassment results in isolation in personal life as well as in work life.

In all cases reviewed in the literature, the negative effects of the bullying were very costly to both the individual and the institution. In the University of Washington Study, job satisfaction was the most severely perceived negative effect. Self-esteem, self-confidence and personal health were also severely affected. (Price Spratlen 295). In the Finnish university study 19 cases of bullying were so severe that the targets showed symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (Price Spratlen 286). In the US Hostile Workplace Study, 41% were diagnosed with depression and 80% of those targeted lost focus and sleep (Namie 1).

The corporate losses from workplace bullying are just as severe. Bullying resulted in less communication with superiors and with lowered productivity in the University of Washington study. Many other studies also reported less productivity; e.g.

80% reported less productivity in the Michigan study and 22% purposefully decreased production time in the Chapel Hill Study (Johnson 710). In the Chapel Hill Study, 52% of those

bullied lost work time and 12% quit their jobs to avoid the bully. In Great Britain, the cost of bullying was high and included sick leave and high turnover rates; about 25% of those bullied left their jobs (Rayner 32). In the Baltimore Civility Study 37% of those bullied decreased their work effort and 64% said they were less committed to the organization (Forni 4).

IV. Causes

There are several causes of bullying. These can be identified in the personalities of individuals and in the hierarchal organization of the company or university. (Liefoghe 377)

Organizational

➤ Management style

- Objectives are rigid and inflexible and insensitive to personal
- Rules are set by some impersonal beings.
- Bullying is encouraged by top-down unilateral control.
- There is a general lack of respect for employees in the organization
- There is a lack of constructive leadership
- There is lack of professionally trained managers

➤ Bullying is OK

- There is apathy on the part of HR
- There is a lack of power in the HR office

Individual

➤ Bullies manipulate for power or privilege (Rayner 184)

➤ Bullies are angry and stressed and overworked (Johnson 708)

Why does bullying continue?

If bullying is so costly, why isn't stopped. Some cite the anger among employees and the power imbalances which exist in hierarchal systems. Others cite the lack of professionally trained managers (Lewis 113). Still others have discussed the lack of punishment of bullies. In the U.S. Hostile Workplace study it was found that bullies were punished in only 7% of the cases. 63% of the targets reported bullying to Human Resources. Of these report, 17% were acted on in a positive way while 32% were acted on in a negative way by HR. The remaining 51% were treated with apathy and ignored. (Namie 7) In the British Unison studies, 95% felt that workers were too afraid to report bullying and bullies were never given any consequences. (Rayner 31).

V. Reported Incidences of Workplace Bullying at MSU

Several reported incidences of workplace bullying were noted in the open meeting and Web remarks. They are summarized below using the categories of tactics previously described:

A. Screaming Mimi – Verbal Intimidation

1. “Since our goal was to simply stop the abusive and disparate treatment...” (pg 9).
2. “This woman has been in contact with me about a Vice President, who, in a private meeting he convened, argued, yelled and upset this student to the point that she left in tears” (pg 12)

3. "Our supervisor often makes negative comments about me in front of others" (report 11)
4. "I almost did not respond to this survey because of fear of retaliation" (report 12)
5. "but was afraid to raise the issue for fear of retaliation against him for 'sticking up for the women'" (report 12)
6. "I know of a female professor who refuses to allow students to tape record classes. This is because she throws fits, swears, and beats on equipment in front of her students. Her department chair has received complaints but nothing has been done" (report 30)
7. "Several faculty and staff members raised issues on behalf of students concerning mistreatment of students by both male and female faculty" (report 30)

B. Gatekeeper

1. "She was hired to be a slave for the two male administrators that can't get along". And of course she was set up to fail (the men are both still here). (page 3)
2. "She was told nothing about being able to use disability insurance for family leave" (pg 4)
3. "Double standards, hierarchy of privilege, old boy network hires and abuse of power" (pg 4)
4. "They take credit for women's ideas" (page 5)
5. "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" (pg 5)
6. "I still worry today about my job security because of a particular individual connected to all this" (pg 9)
7. "I do not believe that we will get any credit or possibility of promotion because of this very increased knowledge that we are attaining" (pg 10)
8. "We are forced to find our own coverage if we want to take annual leave" (report 11)
9. "Supervisors look the other way and choose not to confront and deal with poor performance, and then hire women to patch the performance holes" (report 13)
10. "Twenty-one years ago I petitioned to change my position from full-time to part-time. I was grateful for the opportunity to work three quarters time and flex my hours...I was doing the same work for less pay, so I just pedaled faster" (report 25)
11. "I was forced to drop a course when my daughter became ill and had surgery because I had missed the number of absences the professor allowed. There was no one else available to stay home with my daughter. My professor said, 'Sorry, there are no exceptions to the rule.'" (report 32)

12. "It appears that there are frequent abuses of graduate students; including asking them to do work that is inappropriate, e.g. personal errands, or requiring the graduate students to work far more hours than they are being paid for, e.g. demanding 60 hours of work a week instead of the 20 hours specified in their contracts, or 'volunteering' on weekends" (report 33)
13. "I was standing at the Hub when a professor went right to the front of the line saying, 'Excuse me, I have to get to class' He cut in front of international students without asking permission," (report 35)
14. "Unless you are a female with a 'title' your efforts go largely unnoticed" (report 35)
15. "Another challenge is...for women be involved in some decision making" (report 35)
16. "When taking the tests given by HR, the woman next to me and myself experienced computer failure. She was told that she would be marked down as 'passing'. I was told I would have to return the next week to retake the tests" (report 37)
17. "Most weeks I actually work about 45 hours per week (donating 5 hours per week) and I am frequently questioned in staff meetings regarding how far behind I am with work, when I expect to be caught up, etc." (report 37)
18. "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" (report 12)
19. "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'" (report 12)

C. Constant Critic

1. "I have found women to be less empowered" (page 3)
2. "They make inappropriate gender based comments" (pg 5)
3. "Women's shortcomings are exaggerated" (pg 5)
4. "individuals use their size, position and their impressive vocabulary to bully, intimidate, belittle and keep people in line" (report 12)
5. "The climate feels like, 'You have been sick and made life hard for me (boss) so therefore, I (boss) am going to make life hard for you too'" (report 22)
6. "Managers...need to know that workers are actually people" (report 35)
7. "a staff member who had attended the appreciation celebration to which she had been invited to honor her twenty-five years of service was reprimanded for being "gone too long" on her return. (report 36)
8. "When asked why women faculty have left our department, I hesitated for a while. There were personal reasons but the major factor was the lack of support for these women and the overwhelming feeling that

they did not belong. Both of these women were bright and articulate and brought new and creative ideas to the department. They were never rewarded for their dedication but instead were reprimanded for faults that were never fully revealed to them” (report 41)

9. “She then questioned me about my own career as a faculty member at MSU. I very honestly admitted that it was not at all compatible with family life, and that without a supportive partner it would be impossible to do both” (report 41)

D. Two-headed snake

1. “On May 1, 2002, this male faculty member typed a two-page memo on departmental letterhead and sent a copy to everyone in my department” (pg 11)
2. “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” (report 11)
3. “There is nothing we can do” (report 13)
4. “Your only option is to get another job” (report 13)
5. “You learn to be silent; there is too much to lose” (report 39)

VI. Actions to Remedy Workplace Bullying

There are several actions that have been recommended in the literature (Glendinning 279-283; Johnson 711-712; Hoel 211) to decrease the amount of workplace bullying. These include the following:

- **Establish a code of conduct**
 - Establish an institutional code of conduct
 - This should clarify expectations regarding interpersonal interactions.
 - This code must be clearly communicated to all employees in the workplace.
- **HR should establish a monitoring system for bullies.**
 - Monitor employees abandoning ship in a particular department.
 - Make sure targets that leave the company have exit interviews.
- **Create an environment in which targets are comfortable enough to speak up.**
 - Make sure that targets have a place to go where they can speak without retribution.
 - If HR is not appropriate, an ombudsperson should be hired.
- **Create a grievance policy to handle complaints of bullying**
- **Document and change the behavior of the bullies**
 - Bullies must be notified of unacceptable behavior. This should be done as early as possible.
 - Intervener must give the bully the tools to change.
 - Training and counseling should be mandatory
 - If the behavior doesn’t change, the bully must be removed.

- **Establish a better work environment**
 - Reduce the stress and workload for employees
 - Adopt flexibility in scheduling, assignments, and work-life issues.
 - Make it clear that the employee is valued
 - Make it clear that bullying is a bad thing for the university and will not be tolerated

- **Provide general training**
 - Raise the bar of expectation for managers and train them
 - Train new employees and old employees about bullying

VII. Types of studies

The literature review has revealed four types of design for studying workplace bullying. These have included:

- Structured interviews
- Interviewer administered questionnaires
- Postal questionnaires
- Focus groups

Questionnaires are the most common type of study performed. It was important to list negative types of mistreatment because not all respondents considered these negative treatments to be bullying. Negative treatments are well summarized in the Salin study of business professionals (See attached appendix from Salin 440-1).

These surveys covered several research questions. Many of the surveys covered the following questions: (Price Spratlen 290)

1. How common is bullying among the employees? (Includes those targeted and also those who see others targeted)
2. Who are the targets?
3. What are the types of bullying tactics used?
4. Who are the people who mistreat (bosses, coworkers, etc)?
5. What are the negative effects of the bullying?

The number surveyed is important. It is important to have a good return on the survey. In the University of Washington study the surveys were sent to 11% of each population category. The categories were: faculty, classified staff, professional staff (un-protected employees)

In the University of Washington study, a time limit was set for the reporting of incidents (the last 18 months)

The questionnaire included:

- Employment information
- Experience of interpersonal conflict and improper workplace behavior

- Who did the mistreating?
- What form of mistreatment?
- The questionnaire included a section to describe the most recent experience of interpersonal conflict which included mistreatment.

Criteria must be established to identify bullying. In the University of Washington study the description of the mistreatment had to meet five criteria. These were that at least one type of mistreatment was identified and the severity was identified, at least one mistreated was identified, the respondent could identify when the mistreatment occurred, where the mistreatment occurred, and the respondent could identify the negative effects of the bullying. (Price Spratlen 289)

Sample Questionnaire

Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ). (Salin, 440-1)

1. Your opinions and views are ignored
2. You are given tasks with in reasonable or impossible targets or deadlines
3. You are ordered to do work clearly below your level of competence
4. Someone withholding information, which affects your performance
5. You are exposed to an unmanageable workload
6. Your work is excessively monitored
7. You are repeatedly reminded of your errors and mistakes
8. Rumours and gossip are spread about you
9. You are ignored or excluded
10. You are shouted at or the target of rage or anger
11. Key areas of responsibility are removed or replaced with trivial or meaningless tasks
12. Persistent criticism of your work and effort
13. You are systematically required to carry out tasks which clearly fall outside your job description
14. You are humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work
15. Pressure not to claim something which by right you are entitled to (e.g., sickleave, holiday entitlement, travel expenses)
16. You are excluded from social events
17. You are subjected to false allegations
18. Insulting or offensive remarks about your person (e.g., habits and background) or your private life
19. Being moved or transferred against your will
20. You are sexually harassed or get unwanted sexual attention
21. You get other insulting written messages or telephone calls
22. You get insulting emails
23. Somebody tries to sabotage your performance
24. You are the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm
25. Insulting remarks or behaviour with reference to your native language, your race, or ethnicity
26. Threats of making your life more difficult (e.g., overtime, unpopular tasks)

27. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job
28. Intimidating behaviour, such as invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking/barring the way
29. You are physically isolated
30. Somebody causes you economic or material damages
31. Physical abuse or threats of violence
32. Insulting comments or behaviour with reference to your religious or political convictions

References

- Forni, P.M., Buccino, D.L., Green, R.E., Freedman, N.M., Stevend D., and Stack.T. (January, 2003). *The Baltimore Workplace Civility Study*.
- Glendinning, Peter M. (2001). Workplace bullying: Curing the cancer of the American workplace. *Public Personnel Management; 30-3*, 269-286
- Hoel, H., Rayner, C. & Cooper, G.L. (1999). Workplace Bullying. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 14*. 195-229
- Johnson, P. R. & Indvik, J. (2001). Slings and arrows of rudeness: Incivility in the workplace. *The Journal of Management Development 20*, 705-713.
- Lee, D. (2002). Gendered workplace bullying in the restructured UK. *Civil Service Personnnel Review Vo. 32*, 205-227.
- Lewis, D. (1999). Workplace bullying-interim findings of a study in further and higher education in Wales. *International Journal of Manpower, 20*, 106-118.
- Liefoogh, A. and Davey, K.M. (2001) Accounts of workplace bullying: the role of the organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology 10(4)* 375-392.
- Loafmann, B. (2001). Taking out violence. *Occupational Health & Safety, 70-71*, 32.
- McMahon, Lucy. (2000). Bullying and harassment in the workplace. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 6*, 384-387.
- Namie, G. (September, 2000). U.S. Hostile Workplace Survey 2000. The Workplace Bullying & Trauma Institute, <http://www.bullinginstitute.org>.
- National Study on the Nature & Extent of Workplace Bullying: Recommendations. (2001). <http://www.siptu.ie/publications/b13.html>.
- Prevention Strategies. (2000). <http://civil.nih.gov/strategies/workplace.html>
- Rayner, C. and Hoel, H. A. (1997a). Summary Review of Literature Relating to Workplace Bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, Vol. 7*, 181-191.
- Rayner, C. (1997b). The Incidence of Workplace Bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, Vol. 7*, 199-208.
- Rayner, Charlotte. (1999) From research to implementation: finding leverage for prevention. *International Journal of Manpower Vo. 20*, 28-38.
- Salin, D. (2001). Prevalence and forms of Bullying among business professional: a comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying. *European Journal of Work and organization Psychology Vol 10*, 425-441.
- Seward, K. & Faby, S. (2003). Tackling workplace bullies. *Occupational Health 55,5*, 16-18.
- Spratlen, L.P. (1995). Interpersonal conflict which includes mistreatment in a university workplace. *Violence and Victims, Vol 10, No. 4*, 285-296.

Yandrick, R. M. (1999). Lurking in the shadows. *Society for Human Resource Management*.

Commission on the Status of Women: Recommendation to Address Workplace Bullying

Summary of Justification

Bullying has moved from the playground to workplace. The belligerent boss with poor management style exists in every workplace, and statistics show that employers are paying a heavy price with a 12-fold increase in stress claims over the last two years (Seward 16). Peer bullying also exists in the workplace. The Commission believes that MSU is no exception. In the open meetings and web survey conducted by the Commission last spring [spring 2003], several experiences of all types of bullying tactics were reported. The Commission believes that fears of retaliation led to significant under-reporting of bullying. Therefore, we feel that it is imperative that we hire an outside agency to conduct a survey of a representative sampling of all the employees on campus. The results of the survey can be used to draft a code of conduct for the university and a grievance policy that demands changes in the behavior of the bully and thus, establishes a better work environment for the targets of bullying at this university.

Survey Design

- Included in the survey must be a significant and proportional representation of:
 - Adjunct Faculty (245)
 - AFSCME (364)
 - Commissioner's Plan (23)
 - Excluded Administrators (33)
 - IFO (593)
 - MAPE (59)
 - Managerial Classified (3)
 - MGEC (5)
 - MMA (22)
 - MNA (2)
 - MSUAFF (110)
 - Student employees (undergraduate student help and work study students, graduate assistants, and MSU interns)

(Note: This survey would ignore the issue of student bullying by faculty in the classroom.)

- The survey should be designed and conducted by an independent agency.
- The survey should be designed to define the existing problems and provide direction for solutions.
- The survey should include quantitative and qualitative sections.
- The survey should list different types of negative behaviors.
- The survey should question the frequency of the negative behaviors.
- The survey should be mailed to ensure better responses.

Projected Costs

The approximate cost of hiring an outside agency to create a relatively short survey, administer it to a significant percentage of the 1500 MSU employees, analyze it and write a report would be approximately \$10,000-20,000. The cost could possibly be reduced to \$5,000 if an internal consultant was hired through the Center for Applied Social Science. The Commission does not recommend hiring an MSU employee because of fears of retaliation evident among those being surveyed.

Appendix C
Listening Panel Notes from April 26, 2006

Success: approval of a full-time sexual violence coordinator, student senate supported this, appreciates recognition of importance

Success: senior women faculty have offered to mentor new faculty women

Question: is there a supported network for classified women staff members (e.g.: secretaries)

Response: Classified staff person- there has been more seminars etc.

People need to be able to recognize harassment

Barrier to women on campus is the misconception that all problems related to sexism have been solved. Should be mandatory consciousness-raising

Woman student worker in the library was stalked when closing- it was a real eye opener for library staff.

Many department secretaries have been at MSU for many years and have reached the top of pay scale- can MSU support changes to support these employees?

There should be a discussion started on the value of work provided by clerical staff- a value that is not reflected in their salaries.

Issues for Women: last week met with 3 women facing discrimination. (Barb Carson's written comments: attached)

Faculty: Study of new female professors

- *CETL has been helpful, as has been mentoring program

- *There is an overwhelming feeling of being unprepared for new professor role and unsure about where to turn for support

- *MSU could be more family-friendly for new female faculty with children- flexibility and scheduling.

Concern about lack of women in leadership positions across the university- there seem to be fewer than in 1994.

Concern about pay and administrative positions

Concern about safety – sexism and racism are alive at MSU.

Current helpful resources include: Women's Center, LGBT office, Institutional Diversity Office, Office of Multicultural Affairs

Concern – need to have an open discussion on Affirmative Action.

Concern – few women in leadership roles – regardless of race, top leadership still mostly male. Need feminine/female perspective; could resolve a lot of issues.

Resources needed – more women in influential positions; training for everyone – male and female; family friendly programs/schedules. All of these will be important to men, too.

Experience on search committee for non-teaching position: what can committee's do to balance hiring the best candidate with gender equity?

Affirmative action for search committees is sorely lacking.

There needs to be a campus-wide discussion on affirmative action. What do we mean by affirmative action? Are we equal opportunity or really affirmative action?

Affirmative action training should include an examination of more subtle forms of gender discrimination... What is legitimate experience or what is gendered/raced work? Is there less value given to candidate with feminist/multicultural/social justice based work experience?

What were issues that came to CSW last year and what has been done to remedy these concerns?

1. Workplace bullying- workshop on workplace bullying
2. Campus Safety- push for full-time sexual violence coordinator
-advocated for another full-time security officer

Sexual Violence Education Coordinator will be affiliated with the Women's Center. Work will deal with advocacy and support for victims and education and prevention.

Follow up “?”: Does placing of this position in Student Affairs imply that this service is there only for students?

Response: Staff perception is that it's there for students

Workplace bullying is an issue for staff, students and faculty. The SVEC not meant to deal with bullying.

How do we educate campus about bullying?

Workplace environment policy has been developed but we need to get the word out... We need training to help implement and respond to these, the institution community members need to know where the resources are and how to respond...many people don't know that they are being bullied.

Not clear who is responsible for responding to bullying.

Policy doesn't spell that out. Many not aware of policy

Ombudsperson? Has commission pursued?

Not this year because possibility was squelched a couple of years back due to 1B1 conflicts.

A member of another department smearing WOST in his classes. When this was taken to Affirmative Action, the response to WOST was that it had been addressed, but no specifics provided.

Will victims of sexual violence report to sexual violence coordinator?

CSW has recommended a more accessible space for security to allow for more secure reporting.

Is there a crisis line for sexual assault other than security?

Now it is security. In the community there are several resources.

Campus staff person, union steward: bullying a huge issue. Usual response of HR is to move victim out of unit when mediation is suggested, no follow-up. There's a fear of retaliation, actual retaliation does occur.

Institutional response pattern: little information is shared, there is a concern that the way that the response is addressed is that it is not empowering for complainer- the person feels isolated, and there is a fear of retaliation because it has happened before.

Probationary faculty depend on approval of department colleagues for tenure/promotion- makes it difficult to speak out.

Are there residual effects for people who report bullying when they are moved to another dept. /unit?

Safety is still an important issue. Lack of safety when taking night classes and getting to/from parking area to campus. Vans to parking lot don't wait around until people get into their cars. Red-eye shuttle drivers inconsistent in driving safely and in being supportive of riders.

Story was shared on a particular incident of a woman being followed home in her car and the Reporter revealed all the things the woman did wrong and very little about the man who followed her home.

Campus master plan several years ago included enhanced pedestrian-level lighting on campus. What happened to that?

Campus car parking is isolated for faculty returning cars after off-campus night classes. Some faculty have stopped taking university cars for that reason.

There are security cameras in many areas on campus- in parking areas. Apparently these cameras are not continuously activated.

Sunken lot feels isolated.

There should be a policy that Red-eye shuttles wait until riders get into their cars.

Resources:

- ~we need more education about resources available to them.
- ~Appreciate the resources that do exist.
- ~Appreciation for listening panel
- ~What is the best way to communicate with the larger university?
 - ~Smaller group or unit-based informational sessions may be most effective.
- ~How can the Commission better serve community?
 - ~monthly campus-wide email from CSW
 - ~campus-wide newsletter
 - ~Forums 3 times a year.

Concerns expressed about lack of clarity on resources available to someone who may be experiencing bullying/discrimination and who falls in multiple categories- gender, race, ability, etc.

Bullying by workload is a type of bullying that occurs but is often not recognized.

There should be mandatory workshops for supervisors.

Facilities staff doesn't have easy access to email, even though MSU's response is that everyone has access and has an email acct.- so there may need to be other ways to get the word out from CSW to them.

For an educational institution we need to work on inspiring members of the MSU community to pursue professional development opportunities, without mandating it. What can be made mandatory?... We are in a place where no one wants to be mandated to do anything, so how do we get more people to take diversity training, computer training, etc... Perhaps it could be part of the job description or part of the evaluation.

Possible creation of professional development certification- linking to salary advancement?

Department chairs should have training on supervision of classified employees.

Sometimes when women use existing processes, the result is not as successful as a male who uses and "old boy network" to achieve a similar outcome.

Seems to be a culture of privilege on campus, it's very subtle about who gets lunch, coffee, who get to attend that meeting... it is hard to name and challenge when it comes to interpersonal relationships.

Is there support for a campus-wide assessment of workplace bullying?

- ~need to gather data and share information
- ~maybe it could be part of a multi-prong assessment at MSU

How can CSW make MSU a more positive place for women?

- ~keep doing what you're doing
- ~include updates in campus newsletter
- ~it's ok to "toot your own horn" about accomplishments

Online submission: In your opinion, what are the main issues facing women here at MSU?

Last week I met with 3 female faculty members who described gender discrimination going on in their department. What was in common about these situations is that: 1. faculty members were unsure of their options and possible procedures for intervention. While we have Affirmative Action, Human Resources, and bargaining units on campus, it is still extremely difficult for employees to know which place to go. 2. They were uninformed about possible implications of whistle-blowing and of means to protect themselves while reporting gender discrimination 3. They felt extremely isolated and had doubts about whether or not they should report fairly serious misbehaviors. Let me add that their descriptions of the behaviors of their male colleagues reminded me of things that happened 30 years ago (i.e. rubbing the backs of female students or lifting their shirts wanting to see their tattoos) Okay 30 years ago female students didn't have tattoos BUT, males back then still found a way to justifying touching females and lifting up clothing.

How can we make MSU a more positive place for women?

Collectively, women on campus need to be extremely angry. The procedures for ensuring equal treatment on this campus simply do not work. So, we all need to work together and find means to express this anger and demand that changes be done. Perhaps the Women's Commission could organize a campus event that presents speakers on how to exert pressure on a college campus to facilitate change.

Online submission: I think this "President's Commission on the Status of Women" is rather ironic since he is planning to close a program that is predominantly women, the Interior Design program. From what I have heard since I come back to school after several years later, this school has a history of closing or trying to close predominantly women programs. I personally think this was a "railroaded" job. This program had over 200 students and turned away 150 students last fall. Now course are closing, students are being herded through the classes, faculty are wondering where all these students are coming from so new sections have to try to be opened to accommodate students needing classes. This closing wasn't a well thought out plan. I read the self study and I don't believe the process was followed. If it was why were the ID faculty just as surprised as the students? They should have been part of the program closing process. The closing should have been their recommendation.. If the ID program no longer fit the mission of the CSET, then they should have been given the opportunity to adjust their program to fit the mission statement as did the CM program. CM and ID were a department, but CM stays and ID goes? That means someone in CM knew about the changes and quickly made adjustments so they would fit. Oh and I think the timing of the closing of the program was ironic too. Announce that the program is closing down just before everyone leaves on Christmas break, so no one has the opportunity to respond, then a month later when they come back, oh it is a done deal - no one responded. You know, justifiable reasons for closing a program down would be now students of no money, but the ID program takes in (took in now probably) than it used so that was money in you pocket, but then you probably don't need any money - you just beg the students to allow you to increase our student fees to support the building projects on the table. That doesn't impress me at all. If there are alumni who are willing to help financially with building facilities, go for it. They have the money - WE DON'T.