

## Ways to move forward at CAUT for equity

### What is to be done?

I would like to offer some concrete suggestions about how the issues of harassment which have been detailed on this list should be addressed by CAUT. CAUT should definitely take a leadership role on this issue, as it has done on other issues significant to many faculty in Canada.

1. Set up a CAUT Taskforce on these issues. Membership to be based on an open call for participation rather than appointed.
2. A qualitative and quantitative survey be developed under the auspices of the CAUT and working with the member associations as a vehicle to document the extent of the problem. In some universities where such surveys have been done, what was revealed was so egregious that it actually forced administrations to act.

We need to hear the voices of women faculty and members of other equity-seeking groups who face chilly climates, harassment and discrimination. This underscores the importance of the qualitative portion of such a survey which will provide detailed narratives of discrimination similar to the ones recently posted on the cauteq list.

- i) These narratives (could be anonymous) should be put together as a supplement to the CAUT Bulletin.
- ii) Once the survey and these narratives are available, the CAUT should launch a public campaign to highlight the problems of harassment in the universities. This could involve press releases, and public challenges to administrations to address some of the underlying issues which permit such harassment. It is only through breaking the silence that a change in culture will begin to be possible.

3. CAUT should organize a major conference on this issue which should include safe spaces for sharing experiences, and strategy sessions, and the concrete development of a major campaign.

Mechanisms should ensure that those who have faced such harassment are able to attend. This might mean several from the same university, or some who do not have active relation with their faculty association. The Conference should be widely publicized.

4. Most major Canadian unions are far ahead of faculty associations in developing procedures to deal with the complexity of member-to-member harassment. We should learn from their decades of experience.

- i) a second supplement or a major article in CAUT Bulletin should detail these procedures and their success. Detailed narratives about how they have been used should be included.

5. Leadership of all faculty associations should participate in diversity training sessions organized by the CAUT. Such sessions could explore the actual textured experience of harassment, consider the procedures in place in (non-faculty association) unions to address

member-to-member harassment, and develop specific plans for addressing the issue in their own faculty association.

Faculty associations in nearby locations could co-operate on this issue, and share experience. These sessions might be organized geographically so all southern Ontario universities come together.

6. A fund be set up similar to the CAUT Strike Fund to support harassment cases. So many of these cases have involved faculty using their own resources to get help.

7. A very clear and tight timeline should be developed for these steps.

I look forward to continuing discussion about how to move forward.

Linda Briskin  
Professor, Social Science Department/School of Women's Studies  
Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies  
York University

-----

Richard, Colleagues:

While it is useful to note the types of cases in the public domain (media, blogs, etc), I agree it is not prudent for any of us to comment on specifics on this listserv about any case currently in human rights tribunals. That said, we can try to glean lessons from what is in the public domain to assist our members.

To add to the list of what is to be done:

1. Revisit the concept of "systemic discrimination" and the more subtle implications for diverse members, and perhaps enhance model clauses in ways that may assist member associations in understanding how systemic discrimination plays out in practice and how they may address such cases.

-- In an era of renewed backlash on equity and diversity we should not assume everyone "gets it" or are even aware of Canadian historical equality struggles (especially in an era of intensified global recruitment of students, faculty and administrators).

2. Confidentially keep track of the 'cases' known to CAUT and develop scenarios, which may be used to help raise awareness and educate members and member associations on the realities of systemic discrimination and especially climate and harassment (and bullying) issues.

3. Develop an FAQ on process, including if and where CAUT enters such processes (mindful that in the first instance it is our local union/faculty associations). Perhaps develop a list of resources to assist members in thinking through how to proceed.

If a high-level panel is struck, as Linda Briskin proposed, it may be tasked with looking in to these kinds of things.

Malinda Smith  
Political Science, University of Alberta

-----  
Dear Professor Anne Marie Miraglia:

Thank you for sharing this story and for the courage and determination you obviously had to demonstrate in order to achieve what you had earned -- you now are a full professor, one of ... 20-25 percent in Canada? We all know there are scars to show for it so when I say congratulations it is also for your ongoing determination to speak the truth to power and to act for social change.

I also want to thank Professor Dubé for coming forward with her story. You both are right -- and I would encourage us all not only to listen but to *\*hear\** and heed the call to action. Over the past year alone I have heard similar stories (including from women in senior administration) about the very real sense in which women, as Aboriginal scholars and racialised scholars, feel there is nowhere to turn to be heard and to be taken seriously. That is the perception, based on having knocked on many doors to no avail.

And, yes, I did recommend faculty associations, university human rights offices and CAUT. So this begs the question: Why do so many folks feel like CAUT is not listening/hearing/responding, given what Jim Turk has indicated previously about CAUT's commitment? What accounts for this apparent disconnect? What are other national organisations doing on equity in 2011?

I know of colleagues who have raised similar issues about 'nowhere to turn' to be heard in relation to chilly climate, harassment and hostility for Aboriginal and racialised scholars. Here, again, I recommended faculty associations and CAUT and, again, the response was similar to what Professors Miraglia and Dubé have said about their experiences; everyone passes the buck or say the cases are too difficult to prove, or some such. Nothing happens.

Faculty members rightly feel set up. They take associations at their word -- commitment to equity, diversity, inclusion, to addressing chilly climate and a hostile work environment, to

working for pay equity, etc etc -- but when these same associations are needed most there is a perception of intransigence. What gives?

Given Jim's email indicating that CAUT is committed to addressing harassment and discrimination I would really like to hear more about the process and, more important, I would like to know how many cases (not who or where) on harassment and discrimination have been taken up. I am not asking for names or institutions. Also, what, exactly, is being done to publicize the commitment and the mechanisms for addressing harassment and discrimination for those less familiar with how national associations work?

What is being done on bullying? I know of atrocious examples.

What I can say is this:

\* First, in this moment (2011) the \*perception\* is that few national associations seem willing or able to take on longstanding equity issues; that the backlash is as pervasive as it has ever been; and that there is a lot of passing the buck. The result? Demoralised, sick and discouraged colleagues who are then less likely to either achieve tenure and/or promotion.

\* Second, what worries me is the question raised by Paddy and responded to by Jim Turk. Why? Because in a moment of backlash -- and I would even say retreat from national conversations on equity -- we cannot afford to have divisions among those of us who are committed to equity. These two conversations need to be brought together somehow differently. I would like to hear if the new structure works better and whether it achieves results that ensure intersectional analyses (Falguni A Sheth argues that sometimes we need to drill down within specific groups and, at the same time, we need to have shared forums.) I think we need to be careful not to throw those who differ under the bus as none of us have the Truth, but we all are committed to greater equity.

What troubles me more than ever is how many times I've heard conversations that \*seem\* to pit one equity group against the other, to all of our disadvantage. This tendency is all the more puzzling as it happens even when colleagues also say they are committed to inclusive notions of equity, to gender equity, to anti-racism equity, to decolonisation, and so on.

Personally I do not think \*any\* equity group is getting more than token attention. On the one hand, there is cherry-picking (sometimes prioritising, sometimes, privileging - we need to sort out) ... LGBTQ, Aboriginal peoples, disabilities -- but more as "one-off" projects or initiatives rather than as systematic thinking through. The equity group that is both hyper visible and invisible is racialised minorities. I think it is no accident that the attacks on the majority group that cuts across all equity groups -- women -- was the first to be attacked, defunded, demobilised (the Janine Brodie 3 Ds argument).

First 'they' came for the women... Then multiculturalism but the desire for the 'ethnics' and 'very ethnics' led to a backing off. Then it was the LGBT .... Then last August the specter of employment equity review and more recently the defunding immigrant groups...

We may look at each tree or see this all as a systematic effort to raze the forest, as an attack on the equality and social justice agenda of the past 50 years or so. I would say look at the collective story: This all is bad news and we all need to be part of a broad-based movement, coalition (taboo word) to reclaim the national equity conversation.

Which brings me back to thinking about what is to be done. While I appreciate all of our various conferences, Symposiums, etc on anti-racism, or for Aboriginal faculty, or for women in someways I also worry these reinforce our dilemma as they locate us as this or that (despite commitment to intersectionality). It makes building solidarity more difficult (mindful of time limits, funding and travel limits, etc).

So, what is to be done? May be CAUT, the CFHSS, SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR, AUCC -- etc etc need to be engaged in a conversation about a major gathering on equity, following on the heels of Women World.

2. We need better data profiles of each group in the academy (yes representation and pay equity/disparities) but what are the broader experiences with tenure, promotion, climate? What's similar/different?

What are best practices?

3. Can CAUT work with others to develop an Equity Report Card? Can we consider a way to identify institutions with best practices on harassment and anti-discrimination?

What is to be done?

Malinda S. Smith, PhD  
Department of Political Science, University of Alberta