MUFA Equity Survey 2020

Study and Report prepared by:

Kapiriri L., Anderson C., Sills, A., Culver K., Hassini E., Daniel J., and Krantzberg, G.

on behalf of MUFA executive

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

1. Abstract

Background: McMaster University Faculty Association (MUFA) is committed to equity among its members. In addition to a perception of inequities within its members, the appropriately rapid response to the Covid-19 pandemic has had sizeable consequences for faculty working conditions, the nature and magnitude of which were unknown. This study addressed these two issues. The information gathered through this study provides evidence that will support both the Administration and MUFA to address any existing inequities and those that may have been aggravated during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Study methods: The study was conducted through lime survey. While most of the survey questions were quantitative, respondents had an option to qualitatively expand/explain their quantitative responses.

Findings: A total of 348/954 completed the survey (between Oct- Dec. 2020), for a response rate of about 30% which is consistent with the acceptable response rate for online surveys. Respondents represented all faculties, ranks, and appointment types, with the large majority of respondents in tenured positions for more than ten years. We provide a synopsis of the main findings and related recommendations for the key issues of; hiring, career progress and merit, university processes, conflict and complaint resolution, equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) and COVID-19.

Hiring: Respondents indicated that faculty hiring decisions made in recent years were primarily fair and equitable. Gender equity and diversity in selection committees were perceived as a sign of fairness in the recruitment process. However, women respondents perceived less fairness on average in hiring processes than men did. Many of the challenges that respondents mentioned related to transparency in the processes and especially in negotiating for salaries; which introduces salary inequalities.

MUFA Recommends:

(a) *That the Joint Committee seek information from the Deans of Science and Engineering on their initiatives to reduce salary inequality by reducing or eliminating scope for salary negotiation during hiring.*

(b) *That the Joint Committee requests that the scope for negotiation and a typical standard offer is communicated clearly to all candidates receiving offers.*

(c) That MUFA Council have departmental representatives act as negotiation advisors for new faculty hires s in all departments.

(d) That, for those already hired, MUFA connects with new members near the end of their first year to find out how MUFA could support them.

Career Progress and Merit CP/M*:* The survey responses made it clear that current practices of determining CP/M awards are not contributing to a collegial culture and equity among faculty. The perception of arbitrariness and unfairness has led to a disproportionate level of resentment.

MUFA Recommends:

(a) *That the Joint Committee instruct Chairs to give specific information about how each member's score was determined, rather than just general guidelines. In particular, reasons for a score changing should be stated.*

(b) *That MUFA Council have departmental representatives act as CP/M advisors to explain Departmental norms and procedures for determining CP/M. This is especially important for new members.*

(c) *That MUFA Council hold a special meeting of MUFA Council devoted to CP/M to get a clearer understanding of practices throughout the University.*

(d) *That chairs should be instructed to give specific information about how each member's score was determined, rather than just general guidelines. In particular, reasons for a score changing should be stated.*

(e) *Chairs should define their means for assessing service, research and teaching and the metrics associated with each*

University Processes: There remains considerable unhappiness among our respondents about the fairness of other university processes that involve selecting among a group of candidates, e.g. selection processes for leadership positions (Chairs, Deans, etc.), and nominations for internal and external awards.

MUFA Recommends:

(a) *That MUFA and Joint Committee should ensure that member's rights regarding leave (research, parental, medical, compassionate, …) are clearly communicated.*

(b) *That MUFA emphasize the seriousness of Human Resources' repeated errors in correctly calculating salaries and members must be treated fairly when the errors are discovered.*

(c) *MUFA could advocate at Joint Committee for teaching buyouts or other compensation for teaching faculty who made especially large contributions.*

(d) *That MUFA consider negotiating improved PDA or a specific fund for home office expenses to provide additional support for COVID-related impacts.*

(e) *That MUFA consider negotiating to enrich CP/M for junior faculty to account for the large impact of COVID on this cohort*

Discrimination and Unfair treatment: A sizeable portion of respondents reported *experiences* of discrimination or unfair treatment at the hands of other faculty members, Chairs and Deans. This was along the dimensions of mostly: Sex (56%), Family status (21%) and Age (19%), Pregnancy, Place of origin, Race and Ethnicity (15-16%). Furthermore, a good proportion (40%) had *witnessed* another faculty being discriminated against (commonly by sex and race).

MUFA Recommends:

(a) *That MUFA communicates to all members that discrimination and harassment of our colleagues is unacceptable.*

(b) *That MUFA develops more extensive practices for connecting and communicating regularly with members about their rights and about the supports MUFA offers*

(c) *That MUFA collaborates with the Vice-Provost Faculty to create and support a culture of collegiality and equity among all MUFA members, revise the Faculty Code of Conduct, including clear, unambiguous policies about e.g. faculty sexual relations with students.*

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI): Most work places were evaluated as supportive of EDI. While the respondents indicated awareness of the various EDI resources available at the university and in the community, fewer respondents indicated having accessed these resources: Chair | Dean | Provost (35%), Employee and family assistance program (29%), Human resources, MUFA, & security (18-21).

MUFA Recommendations:

(a) *Collaborate with the Equity and Inclusion Office (EIO) to enhances the visibility and profile of EDI-related university programs and services, as well as EDI stakeholder groups.*

(b) *MUFA should support efforts to build capacity among faculty to integrate EDI in teaching practices and research programs, and resolve apparent conflicts between undergraduate course management policies which may introduce inequities.*

(c) *The Joint Committee and MUFA should support department and faculty initiatives that support EDI and are in line with the university EDI pillars*.

COVID-19: All MUFA members have experienced increased workload during the pandemic, with more than half of respondents reporting 1-2 days per week of additional work in the last academic year. It was reccomended that MUFA negotiates for fair compensation for the additional work associated with conducting teaching and research; and adequate reimbursement of additional expenses incurred to set up home workspaces during the pandemic.

2. Introduction:

The vital role of McMaster University Faculty members in the university's education and research missions depends crucially on their wellbeing. The university's appropriately rapid response to the Covid-19 pandemic has had sizeable consequences for faculty working conditions, the nature and magnitude of which are not yet known. This project investigates the immediate and longer-term impacts of the pandemic on McMaster faculty, generating a body of evidence that can inform institutional and academic planning in a manner that appropriately considers the relevant accessibility, equity, wellness, and inclusion issues facing faculty during these difficult times. Our findings will be valuable as the university plans for recovery and staged reintegration of campus operations, and in longer-term preparations for future pandemics.

Among the rapid decisions made was the closure of McMaster followed by, but not limited to moving all courses into a virtual/online context. This new reality meant that faculty were expected to move their offices from campus into their homes while managing the challenges of pivoting to a virtual/online teaching/learning environment. Faculty also had to balance personal, familial and community impacts of COVID-19 within an unprecedented context of work/home enmeshment. Having barely wrapped up winter term courses, many faculty members were concurrently expected to prepare

for online teaching for the Spring/ Summer semester – not to mention considerations for maintaining their research and student supervision.

In designing this survey, we suspected that the demands of working from home, unexpected virtual teaching, and lab closures, among others, were unequally distributed among faculty depending on factors such as career stage, discipline, gender, caregiving responsibilities, and health status. Early findings from a recently completed faculty survey from another Ontario university found that teaching-track and women professors seem to have been more impacted by the changes in terms of perception of job security, workload and concerns about reduced remuneration. The findings also suggest that some equity-seeking populations also seem to have been more impacted. The responses to our survey of MUFA members indicated that pandemic conditions had adverse effects on all McMaster faculty, and that, furthermore, women and members of equity-deserving groups regularly experience conditions that make their work more difficult and more demanding. Honoring the university's commitment to inclusive excellence entails offering support for faculty's diverse needs and experiences.

MUFA is committed to equity and sought to understand the extent and nature of any potential inequities among its membership. Inequities among faculty members may be present in various forms and within various contexts such as during the hiring process, when negotiating for work conditions, when allocating teaching load or lab space, providing start-up funds, and the Career Progress/Merit scheme (CPM). We further hypothesized that the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the existing inequities among faculty members, but the nature, distribution and extent of this impact has not to date been systematically analyzed. We postulated that COVID-19 has unequally impacted faculty members based on their research, discipline, workload, care-giving responsibilities, disability status, gender, etc. This study addressed these two issues. The information gathered through this study provides evidence that will support both the Administration and MUFA to address any existing inequities and those that may have been aggravated during the COVID-19 pandemic. The overall goal of this project is to identify and mitigate the negative impacts experiences of inequities and of the COVID-19 pandemic on McMaster University Faculty.

2.1. Specific objectives:

- To establish areas and process where MUFA members have experienced inequities and unfairness.

- To identify the immediate impacts of COVID-19 pandemic in general and more specifically on different faculty groups (gender/ sex, faculty or program, equity-seeking status, career stage and any other relevant dimensions).

- To make recommendations through which the negative experiences can be mitigated.

2.2. Study methods:

The study was conducted through an online survey. Respondents were asked about their experiences at the university, ranging from their hiring, their CPM and experiences of inequality during COVID-19. Using an equity and inclusion lens, the questions attempted to explore respondents' experiences with discrimination and /or unfair treatment. While most of the survey questions were quantitative, respondents had an option to qualitatively expand/explain their quantitative responses. The qualitative responses were associated with 25 interview questions, from which the themes discussed below emerged.

2.3. Data Analysis:

All responses were anonymized to protect the privacy of participants. Survey data was cleaned and analyzed using STATA. Initially, frequency tables were developed to identify variables for further statistical analysis. Since the main aim of the survey was to understand if there are any inequities in the faculty members' experiences, further analysis focused on assessing how the explored variables differed along the different dimensions, e.g., gender, race/ ethnicity, etc.

The open-ended component of the survey was hand coded. An independent researcher read through and identified emerging ideas which were coded and given code labels. Related codes were, at an abstract level, grouped into categories. Related categories were organized into overarching themes. The results section is organized according to the themes that emerged from the analysis with anonymized illustrative quotes, where appropriate.

After presenting an overview of the respondents' characteristics, the results section is organized according to the six overarching themes that emerged from the findings namely; *(i) Experiences with hiring, (ii) Career progress/ merit, (iii) Salary adjustment, (iv) Fairness, equity and inclusion in University processes, (v) EDI resources at the university, and (v) the Impact of COVID-19 pandemic*. For each theme, we present the related sub-themes, including related challenges and recommendations for improvement from the respondents' perspectives.

3. Results

3.1. Respondents' Characteristics

A total of 348/954 completed the survey, for a response rate of about 30% which is consistent with the acceptable response rate for online surveys. Respondents represented all faculties, ranks, and appointment types, with the large majority of respondents in tenured positions for more than ten years.

Table 1 shows the proportion of respondents who are members of social groups historically experiencing barriers to employment. Note that an individual member might belong to more than one group.

Table 1: Survey respondents' self-identification (N=129)[1]

Characteristic	n (%)
Women	78 (60%)
Indigenous People (First Nations, Inuit, Métis)	<1%
People with disabilities	16 (12%)
Member of a Racialized Community	24 (18%)
Transgender or Non-binary	<1%
2SLGBTQ+	10 (8%)

4. Hiring and Negotiations

4.1. Hiring

Of 156 respondents, 81% answered Yes to whether the recruitment process was transparent and fair, but only 73% of the 70 women respondents answered yes. When discussing the hiring process, the respondents talked about *Recruitment, Transparency and Fairness,* as well as *the challenges* they experienced during the recruitment/ hiring process.

4.1.1. Recruitment, Transparency and Fairness:

Respondents recounted both positive and negative experiences during their recruiting and hiring. They identified transparency as essential to ensuring fairness and equity in recruitment, starting from the time a position is advertised until a hire is finalized. In addition to ensuring equity, a

---

[1] We present information on only the respondents that self identified

transparent process was thought to help new hires understand the process and expectations for the new position.

Respondents identified several hiring related challenges including decision timelines, diversity in recruitment, interview scheduling and condition, and gender equity in the committee set up and the hiring process.

4.1.2. Decision Timelines

With regards to decision timelines, several respondents were "dismayed" at the duration of the recruitment process. For one respondent, decision making took over 5 months to be communicated. The delays, in this case, were attributed to internal politics and left the candidate feeling confused and disconnected from the process, resulting in long lasting bitterness of the experience:

"It took the department 5 months to get back to me with a decision." (Response ID 314)

"...took a very long time. As a result, I was not sure at times if I was even still being considered." (Response ID 118)

4.1.3. Diversity in Recruitment:

When speaking to diversity in recruitment, there were differing opinions as to whether being an international candidate could be considered a challenge or barrier in their recruitment. The legal requirement to give first consideration to Canadian citizens and permanent residents is perceived by some as barring non-Canadians. One respondent stated that as an international hire they felt they had equal opportunities as a North American candidate, while another suggested that fear among current faculty led to hiring decisions that are low in diversity.

"I am an international hire. I felt that as someone coming from outside Canada, I had equal opportunities as North American candidates." (Response ID 22)

"I think their is a lot of "inside" choices and in my experience - a fear of hiring someone "different" - leading to low diversity." (Response ID 305)

4.1.4. Interview Scheduling and Conditions

Additional challenges were related to the issues with interview scheduling and the type and nature of questions that were asked. Respondents pointed out that it was unfair/unethical to be asked about their marital and family status, as well as other topics unrelated to their skills, ability and the position in discussion. Some experienced inconvenient and demanding expectations related to interview

scheduling, and others expressed the inappropriate questions, comments and experiences which impacted their hiring experience.

"At a lunch during my interview days with a male faculty member told me what a brilliant presentation one of the other (male) applicants had given. It was a 'bullying' encounter that I chose to brush off." (Response ID 147)

4.1.5. Hiring Committee Composition and Gender Equity

Furthermore, respondents discussed the importance of the hiring committee composition, and its influence on their perception of fairness. Here gender equity and diversity of the hiring committee was believed to promote perceived fairness;

"The selection committee had representation by women and visible minorities." (Response ID 15)

4.2. Negotiations

On a 100-point scale from *very dissatisfied* to *very satisfied*, respondents rated their satisfaction with the outcomes of their negotiation.

Table 2: Respondents' mean satisfaction ratings of negotiation outcomes

Outcome	Percentage Mean: all respondents	Percentage Mean: women
Starting Salary	57	58
Rank and Tenure	67	73
Start date	75	84
Spousal/partner dual career appointment or support	49	47
Reimbursements for visits to find housing	54	51
Travel and home relocation reimbursement	60	62
General benefits (health, tuition, etc.)	68	76
Contract renewal and tenure	65	69
Retirement and pension	64	69
Distribution of time for teaching, advising, research, service	59	59
Course release time	54	52
Research and teaching assistants	56	57
Research support (creative work and lab start-up funds)	55	53
Travel and discretionary funds	56	58
Research leaves	61	62
Administrative support	56	56
Office and/or lab space, equipment and supplies	59	62
Mentorship	51	50
Parking	43	36
Overall	**62**	**64**

The respondents of the survey outlined their impressions on the conditions of the appointment including how the logistics of the position were both decided and communicated. The respondents that provided qualitative explanations stated that transparency in the selection process and information regarding salary and negotiation were valuable, enabled trust and clarity, while many others wished they had had access to more information, felt rushed in making a decision, and/or felt penalized for following up on concerns. Some were unaware they were able to negotiate and in addition, did not know what was appropriate to ask for.

"Information about the appropriate starting salary was not available and was somewhat misleading." (Response ID 119)

"I was never given an opportunity to negotiate the conditions of my appointment, be it the salary, or the teaching load. I requested a meeting with the Dean to discuss these issues, but my request was denied. I requested another

appointment when I was already hired to renegotiate, and my request was denied".
(Response ID 130)

"…I did not realize that salary was negotiable, and I did not know many
starting assistant professors received teaching breaks (I started on a full load).
(Response ID 49)

4.3. Enablers

Participants who described enablers to their negotiations seemed to report a greater sense of satisfaction with the final agreement. Again, transparency and fairness seem to play a large role in the outcome of the negotiations. When the chair or dean was willing to consider the faculty member's years of experience, or even just appeared to have an openness to negotiation, commenters reported this as an enabler to their negotiations. Commenters shared:

"I felt like I gained some important things in negotiation and I appreciate that
there was flexibility and a true spirit of collaboration so that all parties were
satisfied." (Response ID 86)

Other factors that respondents mentioned as enabling a satisfactory negotiation were their years of experience and their network of mentors.

"The dean was open to negotiating with me and took me seriously when I
mentioned that I had a bit more experience than he had been accounting for, which
resulted in a higher offered salary." (Response ID 110)

"I relied heavily on my network when it came time for negotiations –
particularly with respect to developing a strategy for negotiation, setting out what
was 'reasonable' to request and ask for, and prioritizing the elements of my package
that I wanted to negotiate." (Response ID 24)

"My mentor helped me negotiate start-up funds." (Response ID 259)

4.4. Barriers

Table 3 shows the proportion of respondents who encountered specific barriers in negotiating. Many of the comments related to barriers that the faculty members faced, which ultimately impacted their ability to ask for what they wanted and felt they deserved.

Table 3: Proportion (number) of respondents who encountered barriers in negotiating

Barrier	All respondents	Women
Did not know one could/should	29% (51)	32% (25)
Did not know certain items were negotiable	43% (77)	53% (41)
Did not get a sense that there was openness to negotiation	38% (68)	49% (38)
Did not think it was necessary/ was satisfied with the terms	38% (68)	12% (9)
Did not know how to negotiate in this context	17% (31)	41% (32)

4.4.1. No Room for Negotiation:

Some participants indicated that they felt as though there was no room for negotiation, either through a lack of transparency in the reasons for what they were being offered or what they could ask for, or through outright denials of their requests. Salary offers were seen to be opaque and even adversarial. Some commenters shared:

"I found the chair I was negotiating with to be rude and dismissive. When I tried to negotiate salary, he lambasted me about my gall at asking for more money and said I wasn't worth it." (Response ID 170)

"there was no negotiation ... it was essentially 'we are the world-renowned McMaster; you are lucky to be working here'." (Response ID 39)

"There was no explanation about the pay scales and why I was being offered the amount offered. There was no room for negotiation." (Response ID 103)

4.4.2. Gender Prejudice:

Many women reported that gender prejudice impacted not only what they were offered in relation to male colleagues, but also the willingness of the chair/dean to negotiate, which led to a sense of distrust.

"I was denied any negotiation…I learned only later that all male colleagues hired around the same time were given a negotiating opportunity and were offered a significantly higher salary and significantly lower teaching load." (Response ID 117)

"I was wondering whether the Dean was taking advantage of me because of my junior/gender status." (Response ID 250)

"…I felt like McMaster was condescending and patronizing…It caused me stress, inability to trust/respect my colleagues (initially), and humiliation, to be honest." (Response ID 257)

16

4.4.3. Information asymmetry:

Another factor which played a role in the ability for faculty members to effectively negotiate was a lack of information on what is available and negotiable. For example, one respondent described how a lack of information contributed to shortcomings in their negotiation since they were not made aware of what they could ask for, how funds were allocated, and where the funds were coming from:

"Lack of transparency of how the funds were allocated and where they came from, as well as lack of provision of some of the agreement (laboratory space) in writing." (Response ID 11)

"Lack of information about what was negotiable and what was not, in particular salary and teaching release." (Response ID 47)

4.4.4. Pressure to Accept an Offer Quickly:

When an offer was provided, faculty were often asked to approve it immediately, without time to consider their options, consult with others, or engage in negotiation. This pressure can lead to forced decisions and long-term consequences; one respondent felt they accepted an unreasonably low salary.

"In the same phone call that I was notified I was selected for the position; I was provided with a verbal start-up offer which I was asked to approve of at that moment for drafting an offer letter. This was incredibly rushed and did not provide me with an opportunity to negotiate." (Response ID 65)

"...I said no at first, but he persisted and as I was pre-tenure I was scared to say no again." (Response ID 212)

4.4.5. Lack of Experience, Confidence, New to Canada and Oversight Due to Excitement:

Many faculty members commented that they just did not feel empowered to negotiate their offer. Some noted that they lacked the experience in academia, awareness, or confidence to negotiate, while others cited unfamiliarity with the Canadian system as a barrier to their negotiations.

"My lack of experience in academia - I did not know anything about negotiating in this context." (Response ID 155)

"Since I come from outside Canada, it was very hard to judge what was reasonable or rational numbers for those things I was told I could negotiate." (Response ID 264)

"I was just starting out and was just thrilled to have this job offer." (Response ID 121)

17

4.4.6. Lack of External Support/Mentorship:

Respondents without external mentorship/support cited this as a barrier for negotiating. Some also noted a lack of support from MUFA. Without this support, some felt they had nowhere to turn for reference points, assistance or suggestions for negotiation, and someone who would have their best interest in mind.

> *"I had no reference point for comparable salaries or mentoring about what other benefits I could request. The chair did not provide any suggestions for where I could go for support, and I didn't have support from my home institution." (Response ID 128)*

> *"MUFA was completely absent for new hires. During the early years after I was hired, my impression was that MUFA was a cabal of senior faculty who were most interested in getting their generous share of the pension payout." (Response ID 301*

4.5. Negotiation Recommendations

Through their own experiences and observation, participants offered some recommendations on how the negotiation experience could be improved. This included things that were positive, or things they wish were available when pursuing their own negotiation process at the University.

4.5.1. Reliance on Professional/Non-Professionals, Guidance, Mentorship, HR and MUFA:

Many commenters felt that information, access, and improved mentorship would improve the negotiation experience. They pointed to the availability of fact sheets on salaries and appointments, and many noted that access to knowledgeable individuals (including professionals, non-professionals, McMaster HR, and MUFA) to consult had been or would have been extremely valuable during their own negotiations. Only 25% of respondents reported being aware of MUFA and its resources during negotiations. Commenters stated:

> *"I consulted with a colleague who was familiar with McMaster." (Response ID 255)*

> *"I reviewed publicly available McMaster salary information. My doctoral supervisor pointed these data out to me." (Response ID 148)*

> *"…someone with good strategies for helping women and other underrepresented groups negotiate effectively." (Response ID 123)*

4.5.2. Negotiation Promotes Inequality:

One participant commented that negotiating should not be done at all, as it promotes inequity. They stated:

"I don't believe in negotiating for salaries – It will always be unfair. I think that starting salaries should be based on years of experience and have nothing to do with your ability to negotiate…" (Response ID 296)

5. Career Progress/Merit (CP/M)

The responses revealed considerable unhappiness with the CP/M process. Only 61% of all respondents estimated that their annual CP/M had been fairly assessed since their hire, and only 56% of women respondents. Furthermore, overall ratings of the transparency and appropriateness of the CP/M process show widespread dissatisfaction. Table 4 reports respondents' agreement with the statements listed on a 100-point scale from *strongly disagre*e to *strongly agree*:

Table 4: Mean agreement ratings

	All respondents	Women
The tools used for evaluation were appropriate (e.g. CV, Record of Activities, etc.)	47	41
Criteria used for evaluation were clear	31	26
Criteria used for evaluation were appropriate	36	30
Assessments were applied clearly and consistently	28	26

Many faculty members took the opportunity to comment on the perceived shortcomings of the current system. The common themes that emerged are summarized below:

5.1. Lack of Recognition of Meaningful Achievements

Faculty members noted that their accomplishments were not always recognized in their CP/M evaluations. Some pointed out that their evaluations remained the same despite large differences in publishing and grants through the years. Additionally, it was lamented that the on-going work into research/publications is not valued, and that the work is only recognized in CP/M once it is published. Further, commenters were frustrated that quantity appears to be valued over quality. Participants reflected:

"…CP/M only really rewards the historical definition of success - dollars in, papers out. It gives no consideration of how effective a grad supervisor you are, and generally zero value to a lot of really important service work…" (Response ID 97)

"You get paid more for publishing more papers. So, I could get paid a lot more if I published loads of bad papers instead of doing real research. So, I get paid less to do better work. The system is rewarding quantity, not quality of research. It's bonkers." (Response ID 202)

5.2.   Unfair Advantage/Disadvantage

Respondents offered a variety of ways in which the CP/M process is more advantageous to some groups. Some of the commenters stated that the evaluation system puts junior faculty members at a disadvantage because many of the activities in place that guide CP/M aren't established yet. Others felt that the subjective nature of CP/M in their area leads to favouritism and noted that those who are the voices of dissent in their department pay the price in their CP/M evaluation. Commenters shared:

"…this is an excellent example of a seemingly neutral rule that produces unequal outcomes because of the unequal conditions that people work in. We know that some people have to do far more unpaid labour than others, whether at work or at home, and this significantly interferes with their productivity. These structural inequalities are made invisible by CP/M and embedded into unequal pay structures. This is only going to worsen with the impact of COVID over the next several years, which to me exposes the deep problem with this approach to compensation." (Response ID)

"New faculty, especially those in their first couple of years seem to be at a disadvantage because their university activities that guide CP/M have not been fully established as of yet." (Response ID 309)

"Our dept has a CP/M committee, elected by the dept, who collectively decide on CP/M recommendations to the Dean. It's at that point that fairness becomes questionable, since the Dean imposes a quota on departments for how much of the overall faculty budget they can draw upon for CP/M. This means that if the quota is full, people who have made remarkable contributions or achievements cannot be recognized adequately, even if our dept CP/M committee recommends them for it." (Response ID 288)

5.3.   Breeding Competition

Since CP/M is a zero-sum system, it is not surprising that participants outlined that the CP/M process often breeds competition within a department. Not only is there the perception of favouritism that leads to an unfair advantage for some, but it creates anxiety and frustration among faculty. It establishes an environment which is unhealthy to productivity and team building. Commenters shared:

"I would like to get rid of CP/M because it rewards selfishness and creates competition and conflict that I believe is unhealthy to working as a team." (Response ID 25)

"CP/M also fosters anxiety and unhealthy competition for a fixed pie. The vast majority of academics are self-motivated to engage in their work, and CP/M does not really function to enhance motivation…I strongly favour ending CP/M altogether." (Response 367)

5.4.   Gender Inequity

Many participants identified the common gender biases that women are especially disadvantaged by the CP/M process. The consensus among the participants is that female faculty are often overburdened by extra service, requested of them as a result of gendered stereotypes related to being more generous and helpful. This extra service work that female faculty are asked to do is then valued less than teaching and service and is reflected as a decreased value in their CP/M scores. Commenters stated:

"there is so little room to work with, the CP/M process is structurally unable to appropriately recognize the gendered/racially inequitable ways in which service and supervisory labour in particular are distributed amongst faculty (certainly in my department, and across my faculty). It is routinely true that women, and especially BIPOC, faculty carry the heaviest service and supervisory loads while often also being incredibly research active; such discrepancies are difficult to recognize consistently within the current CP/M framework." (Response ID 159)

"…every instance of this has been gendered, with women colleagues being overburdened by extra service. The gendered nature of service is also that women are expected to do more, be more generous and 'helpful' when there's work to be done, and not display the hyper masculinized stance of lone researcher… Structural problems are downloaded to individuals, who are then punished. It's truly an inequitable and vicious system." (Response ID 272)

5.5.   Frustration, Misplaced Priority and Discrimination:

Faculty expressed their frustration in not knowing how their CP/M scores are determined. The criteria at times seemed unclear and subjective, and some found that their scores varied depending on which of their peers sat on the CP/M committee. This lack of clear criteria meant that faculty often felt as though they've worked hard for little reward.

"Marks allocated to teaching versus research versus service seem random. Little consistency from year to year. Lack of transparency from my area. Unfair that there is no relationship between CP/M and tenure and promotion decision." (Response ID 148)

"The decision matrix for CPM was not disclosed and changed year by year. I never knew which metrics were weighted more important than others (i.e. number of papers, students, grant dollars, service). This meant I placed my time into efforts of being a good colleague and helping the department, mentoring young students, which did not reward me." (Response ID 62)

"It's been frustrating. No transparency, no feedback, and a complete waste of time." (Response ID 257)

5.6.   CP/M Recommendations

Participants noted that transparency and consistency is valued in the CP/M process, so it is not surprising that many commenters expressed:

"There needs to be constructive feedback explaining how you can do better the next year." (Response ID 223)

"I think it could be improved if there was a way to track how points are decided in things that are "grey areas." For example, one year I was told that a peer-reviewed book chapter didn't count as a publication, but in other years it was. If things like that could be tracked year-over-year and from chair to chair, there could be consistency." (response ID 282)

Adjusting the way that performance is assessed or adjusting the value placed on various items was suggested to improve the inequities that arise with CP/M.

"It would be helpful if gender, culture, diversity, emotional service/mentorship are taken into consideration." (Response ID 336)

Some participants indicated that the CP/M system is too flawed to properly address the issues, and as such they called for the process to be scrapped completely.

"I wish we could abolish the whole CP/M system and just give across the board pay increases.   I know for sure that it decreases the productivity of those who have to do all of the ratings and administer the process. I would like to see some solid evidence that demonstrates that the CP/M system actually improves faculty members' productivity. If there is no such evidence, I really question why McMaster hangs on to this system. It makes me feel like there's some kind of "old boys club" operating here." (Response ID 254)

6. Salary Adjustment:

Nearly one-third of respondents reported feeling that they are unfairly paid. Table 5 illustrates the perceived reasons for this unfairness

Table 5: Perceived reasons for unfair pay

	All respondents	Women
Gender gap	48% (24)	72% (18)
Race ethnicity gap	24% (12)	16% (4)
Age gap	16% (8)	16% (4)
Other	32% (50)	17% (13)

Besides CP/M, occasionally salary or other elements of a faculty member's contract are adjusted or renegotiated. Some 45% of respondents had adjustments made to their salary other than CP/M, about half of these as a result of their own renegotiation efforts.

6.1.   Adjustment by Administration:

In some cases, salaries were adjusted without the faculty member having to request it, normally for one of three reasons: for gender pay equity, at promotion to be in line with the salary floor, or through a salary anomaly adjustment after a pay disparity was identified.

> *"Automatic anomaly adjustment: I may be one of the few people at the university who had to have an adjustment to get my salary to the floor of Associate when I was tenured and promoted." (Response ID 29)*

> *"There was a one-time adjustment when a new Dean came and saw the extant inequities and pushed for the market adjustments with the Provost's office." (Response ID 23)*

> *"The Provost made an adjustment to my salary…as it seemed to be out of sync (too low) with where it should be. I never asked for the adjustment. The Provost acted on his own when he reviewed salaries." (Response ID 121)*

6.2.   Renegotiation Attempts by Faculty Members

Some respondents requested changes to their contract after they had started their position, for example, after discovering that their salary wasn't in line with their comparator colleagues, or in response to a higher offer from another university. These requests were often lengthy and unsatisfying and some opted to leave.

> *"To be transparent: renegotiation only came as a result of an outside job offer (which I accepted in the end -- I will not be working at McMaster for much longer) and was extremely dissatisfying." (Response ID 148)*

6.3. Factors That Promote Unfair Salary Allocation

Commenters pointed to a variety of factors that promote unfair salary allocation. These factors occur at all stages of the faculty member's career. Factors include higher authority, power differentials and poor initial negotiation. Responses indicated adaptations taken to offset these factors, adjust behaviour and manage the situations which result in unfair treatment.

"At this university you get more if you complain and suck up to Deans/VPs."
(Response ID 30)

"I tried to negotiate and had limited success and since starting when I have brought it up I have been told it is too late and can only be negotiated before you start." (Response ID 12)

Departmental bias and bias based on the area of specialization was also noted as an influential factor which could result in unfair salary allocation. This was shown in comments about preference for certain types of research, certain types of education, and certain types of appointments. It was noted by one respondent that certain specializations are unfairly valued through higher pay than others, including fields proposed by another participant in which research generation including publications are slower and take longer.

"…there is discrimination in our School, along research faculty teaching."
(Response ID 100)

"Some specializations are paid more than others." Response ID 41)

"I work in a field in which research generation is slower, especially publications, than those in my faculty. Publications also take longer. In addition, much of what I do I do gratis to support the projects of others. I feel this reflects in my salary, which was also lower than others hired at the same time in the same department." (Response ID 111)

7. Fairness, Equity, and Inclusion in University Processes

7.1. Transparency and Fairness within Hiring, promotions and awards:

Participants reported that their experiences on hiring committees have been fair and equitable, and that the hiring of equity-seeking groups has improved. Of 156 total responses, 81% reported that hiring processes are fair; 73% of women respondents said that hiring is fair. Some respondents expressed positive improvements made with regards to transparency and equality within hiring.

"The junior (i.e., Assistant Professor) hires in my department have been fair,
equitable and inclusive." (Response ID 29)

"In my experience on one hiring committee I found the process to be
transparent and equitable." (response ID 13)

7.1.1. Racial Discrimination and Hiring Practices:

The topic related to racial discrimination within hiring practices had mixed feedback. On one hand, some participants felt that the hiring of minority and/or people of colour has improved, while others are still disappointed in the amount of racial discrimination that exists in University hiring processes. These comments were backed by personal experiences within their own departments and shed light on the continuing issues of uneven treatment, distribution, and inequalities in the hiring of certain positions.

"The hiring of people of colour has improved dramatically over the years. I
am quite satisfied with the current situation in my department but was less satisfied
in previous decades." (Response ID 166)

I think the numbers speak for themselves: at McMaster, very few (if any)
BIPOC faculty occupy higher administrative roles or are getting hired by departments
across the faculties I know best. My own department has not hired in several years
(this in itself points to inequities in the allocation of hires across
departments/faculties). But what I know about the workings of recent searches for
deans/associate deans suggest that racism and sexism continue to play not just tacit
but overt roles in hiring at McMaster." (Response ID 160)

7.2. Promotions and Awards within McMaster

On a 100-point scale from *very unfair* to *very fair*, participants rated the extent to which the following McMaster-internal processes are fair, equitable and inclusive, shown in Table 6. Note that in nearly every case, women's perception of the fairness of these processes is lower than the mean for all respondents.

Table 6: Mean fairness ratings of promotion and award processes

	All respondents	Women
Hiring senior academic administrators, institutional executives, AVPs, VPs, & the president	49	47
Appointment of acting interim academic leadership roles	50	42
Hiring of faculty level academic leaders, associate Deans, Deans	55	48
Selection of Department Chairs	62	56
Selection for internal awards	49	48
Selection for internal research grants	51	56
Nomination and allocation of internally funded research chairs	43	39
Nomination and allocation of externally funded research chairs e.g., CRCs	47	43

Participants reported that in many cases, it seems as though the successful candidate for an administrative position is chosen before the search begins.

"In the faculty I am in, males get positions, males 'are groomed' (actually words used) for positions; people already have individuals in mind who are wanted for certain positions and search committees are 'for show'." (Response ID 40)

"Feels very disconnected from solid academics and swamped by "who you know" and a few overly hyped figures, gives extraordinary and unjustifiable privileges. Feels like it undermines meaningful work." (Response ID 20)

"Selection processes lack transparency, and it seems candidates have already been selected prior to position postings." (Response ID 77)

Likewise, some participants suggested that award recipients are decided ahead of time (stated as a "back-room deal") and that other faculty are discouraged from even applying. Further, the process was described as unjust through practices including subjective evaluation and going to the extreme of waiving deadlines to accommodate those in senior positions. Participants shared:

"I have been told that research chairs and awards are mostly decided through backroom deal and decision rather than open application processes that are equitable. That has been my experience as well." (Response ID 4)

"There is a lack of transparency on how internal awards (and external award nominations) are allocated." (Response ID 11)

8. Unfair treatment, harassment and/or discrimination on the basis of protected grounds

Unfortunately, many of our members' report having experienced unfair treatment, harassment, or discrimination. The greatest number of these reports identified their sex as the basis of their unfair treatment. Other top causes felt were family status (21%) and age (19%). Note that while 11% (15 respondents) experienced unfair treatment on the basis of their race (Table 7), this is almost exactly the total number of respondents who self-identified as racialized/visible minority/non-White (16 respondents, Table 1).

Of the 25 respondents who identified as racialized or Indigenous, 13 (52%) reported having experienced discrimination on the basis of their citizenship, race, ethnic origin, place of origin, color, ancestry, or creed.

Table 7: Proportion (number) of respondents who experienced unfair treatment, harassment and/or discrimination by a member of the McMaster community.

Protected Grounds	All respondents	Women
Citizenship	7(5%)	-
Race	15(11%)	3(4%)
Place of Origin	16(12%)	3(4%)
Ethnic Origin	12(9%)	3(4%)
Colour	14(10%)	4(5%)
Ancestry	8(6%)	8(6%)
Disability	15(11%)	7(10%)
Age	26(19%)	16 (22%)
Creed including religion	15(11%)	6(8%)
Sex	56(40%)	40(53%)
Pregnancy	16(12%)	14(19%)
Family Status	29(21%)	20(27%)
Marital Status	13(9%)	8(11%)
Sexual Orientation	5(4%)	2(3%)
Gender Identity	9(7%)	5(7%)
Gender Expression	7(5%)	3(4%)

8.1.   Nature of unfair treatment

8.1.1.   When did the unfair treatment occur?

Our survey highlighted that those that felt unfairly treated, harassed or discriminated by another McMaster University community member had experienced the related incident, mostly, during the past 10 years. Hence, this phenomenon peaked at 47% over the past 6 years (Table 8).

Table 8: Occurrence of the unfair treatment, harassment and/or discrimination experience

Time of occurrence	All respondents	Women
during the past 1 year	25(25%)	15(25%)
during the past 3 years	42(42%)	24(40%)
during the past 6 years	47(47%)	28(47%)
during the past 10 years	32(32%)	18(30%)

8.1.2.   Where did the unfair treatment occur?

Our survey highlighted that those that felt unfairly treated, harassed or discriminated by another McMaster University community member had experienced the related incident, mostly, during meetings (50%), Table 9.

Table 9: Location of unfair treatment, harassment and/or discrimination incident(s)

Location	All Respondents	Women
In a classroom or teaching space	23(23%)	16(27%)
During a meeting	51(50%)	28(47%)
Campus community context	34(34%)	20(33%)
Off campus with a nexus to the University	8(8%)	5(8%)
In a research space	15(15%)	9(15%)
Online or by email	21(21%)	16(27%)
Other	-	7

8.1.3. Witnessing unfair treatment of someone else

Our survey highlighted that the highest proportion (40%) of faculty saw/witnessed someone else being unfairly treated, harassed or discriminated by another McMaster community member because of their sex and then, by Race (34%). Other top causes seen/witnessed was unfair treatment, harassment or discrimination were due to Color (26%), Age (23%), Ethnic Origin (22%) and Disability (21%), as seen in Table 10.

Table 10: Cause of unfair treatment, harassment and/or discrimination incident(s)

Protected Grounds	All respondents	Women
Citizenship	18(14%)	10(15%)
Race	44(34%)	25(36%)
Place of Origin	25(21%)	12(18%)
Ethnic Origin	28(22%)	14(21%)
Colour	32(26%)	17(26%)
ancestry	11(9%)	6(9%)
Disability	26(21%)	20(30%)
Age	28(23%)	17(25%)
Creed including religion	14(12%)	10(16%)
Sex	50(40%)	31(45%)
Pregnancy	18(15%)	12(18%)
Family status	14(12%)	10(15%)
Marital status	8(7%)	6(9%)
Sexual orientation	14(12%)	12(18%)
Gender Identity	16(13%)	11(17%)
Gender Expression	16(13%)	12(18%)

8.1.4. Source of unfair treatment

Our survey highlighted that those that witnessed/saw someone unfairly treated, harassed or discriminated by another McMaster University community member were incidents mostly (65%) initiated by a faculty member. Other top initiators include 34% Chair or Dean (to through whom person reports), 27% by undergraduate students, and 25% by graduate students (Table 11).

Table 11: Identified initiator of unfair treatment, harassment, or discrimination (by position)

Role of Initiator	All respondents	Women
Undergraduate Student(s)	27(27%)	21(35%)
Graduate Student(s)	25(25%)	19(32%)
Staff	14(14%)	9(15%)
Faculty	66(65%)	40(67%)
Chair or Dean to through whom person reports	33(33%)	20(33%)
Other Senior Administrator	20(20%)	11(18%)
Other (Postdoc)	1	-

8.1.5. Disrespect:

Disrespectful occurrences were experienced by participants in a range of circumstances including by other colleagues, students, and those of authority. Experiences described can be categorized as sexual comments and attention, unfair and/or demeaning treatment, as well as rudeness. Some mentioned experiencing it regularly, and others explored specific one-off experiences which have stuck with them. For example:

> *"I routinely experience relatively small but unfair treatment by colleagues*
> *and students. These occur on a near daily basis and I find them incredibly frustrating.*
> *In my opinion they are demeaning and negatively impact on my career. For example,*
> *in an event where my male colleagues are introduced as "Dr" and I am not. Or when*
> *I'm referred to at a faculty meeting as "young lady"." (Response ID 12)*

> *"I received persistent and unwanted sexual attention from a person who had*
> *held a position of significant authority in my Faculty." (Response ID 310)*

> *"I have had students giving me sexist comments." (Response ID 22)*

8.1.6. Discrimination and Religious Discrimination:

Respondents were open to sharing the discrimination they have both experienced and witnessed on the basis of having a disability, accommodating a disability, race, ethnicity, religion and gender and more. For example, discrimination was described as occurring due to not having a child, and this resulted in having after hour service duties that were not assigned to those who do have children. These described types of discrimination seem to occur often, slip through the cracks, and result in a culture of discrimination which appears as acceptable.

> *"I have a disability and use a service animal. A faculty member in my dept*
> *has repeatedly complained about my service animal." (Response ID 32)*

> *"A TA insulted me online, many students distributed note saying I was an*
> *equity hire and the white guy should have been hired." (Response ID 110)*

> *"It is quite acceptable in a university environment to make derogatory*
> *remarks about persons of the Christian faith." (Response ID 156)*

8.1.7. Demotion and Pressure to Retire or Resign:

Some participants noted experiences meant to force retirement and/or resignation. Despite no mandatory age requirement for retirement, respondents have experienced tactics which attempted to

get them to retire by for example increasing workload, creating challenging work conditions and directly asking when they will be retiring.

> *"I was asked my age in my career review when I planned to retire. As I have gotten older, my workload has been increased and retirement has been mentioned to me several times. Seems like I am being forced out." (Response ID 75)*

> *"Asking about when I plan to retire, making working conditions so difficult that I will retire." (Response ID 71)*

8.1.8. Bias Against Maternity and Medical Leave:

Another experience and observation of unfair treatment was a result of bias against maternity leave and denied medical leave. The bias against maternity leave was described by commentators as a disregard for communicated leaves (ex. requested to return to teach earlier) and unprofessional comments including questions about length of time off and about future child-bearing such as "When I first disclosed my second pregnancy to my vice-dean, the response was, "I expect this will be your last one though, right?" (Response ID 127)

> *"I was required to return to teach a course following the birth of my child despite the fact that I stated that I wanted a full maternity leave." (Response ID 322)*

One participant explained their experience of working through a chronic pain condition, depression because they did not realize they could have requested a medical leave. No one had said anything about time off while recovering.

8.1.9. Supervisor/ Student Relationships:

One participant described their unfair treatment during a supervisor/student conflict. They described how in their experience, the treatment by the department, faculty and university administration was inequitable. Based on this, it could be assumed that others have held back from bringing their issues forward in an attempt to avoid this kind of situation.

> *"Unfairly treated by the Department, faculty and university administration during a conflict with a doctoral student when I was his Research Supervisor."*
> *(Response ID 78)*

8.2. Impact of Unfair Treatment

8.2.1. How unfair treatment affects faculty members

Participants rated the degree to which they were affected by unfair treatment, on a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 100 (*a great deal*). The average scores of how unfair treatment(s) affects faculty members (individually/personally) ranged from averages of 41 to 70/100. See Table 12.

Furthermore, only 38% of respondents (30% of women) felt able to pursue any options for responding to an incident of unfair treatment, discrimination or harassment.

Table 12: Mean ratings of affectedness

	All respondents	Women
Socially, culturally, spiritually, community isolation, inclusion and sense of connectedness/belonging	64	69
Mentally, stress, anxiety, etc.	70	73
Physically, health, and wellness	41	46
Academically and Vocationally, productivity, career development, and progress	53	59

8.2.2. Mental and Moral Injury:

In response to their unfair treatment, respondents recounted the effects and impacts on their mental and moral well-being. Many described the stress and anxiety felt in response to their treatment and felt that it spilled into their professional development including preparing for classes, questioning abilities to teach and feeling as though they had to fake being okay in order to be accepted. The fear of reaction was a large theme and was exhibited through hidden emotions in response to being misunderstood or mistreated.

> *"Extreme mental stress, anxiety before each class and during the class, over preparing for classes, lack of confidence in my authority, believing in some of the racist remarks and questioning my abilities to teach well, retreating into a shell, effects on physical health, sense of helplessness and deep sadness." (Response ID 181)*

8.2.3. Unfavourable Working Environment and Culture:

Rather than an actual mistreatment, the effect of ignoring or not acknowledging a situation was also exemplified in responses to cause an impact on working conditions and productivity. For example, one contributor described how the lack of acknowledgement on the impact of childcare stresses puts

those struggling at a disadvantage. COVID was identified as exacerbating this situation. For example, those unable to find or utilize childcare affects their ability to work.

> *"This isn't an incident per se, but rather an omission. By not acknowledging that pregnancy and childcare affects performance, it puts faculty members that are struggling with these issues at a great disadvantage. This has come up particularly during COVID times when faculty members have been struggling at home to work without any childcare services." (Response ID 247)*

8.3.   Aspects Requiring Improvement:

After describing the current challenges, and past events at the University which impacted their experience for either the better or worse, many put forth some helpful improvement categories which could significantly impact the overall culture at the university and increase productivity. These included: *Inclusion of a standard salary scale, gender equity, improved racial equity, equity for LGBTQ+, increased mental health supports for staff, increased leadership opportunity, placing talk into action, creation of an independent mediational panel, and the reduction of administrative appointments.*

8.3.1.   Transparency about how salaries are determined

In response to the challenges put forth during salary decisions in hiring, one participant stated that the creation and provision of a standard salary scale, which outlines specifically how salaries and start-up funds are decided would be helpful during the negotiation period. The standardization of a scale could also be interpreted as ensuring pay equity and fairness during salary allocation.

> *"It would be nice to know if there are standard scales and how the Dean is coming up with the salary, start-up funds, etc. based on those standards." (Response ID 250)*

8.3.2.   Gender Equity:

A large theme which was suggested for improvement was gender equity and the hiring of women in positions of power. Gender equity and the resulting fairness would assist in alleviating the current issues raised regarding existing biases resulting in unequal pay, hiring, consideration and respect.

> *"I feel that men fare better in everything that requires negotiation and push from the applicant. There seems to be an inherent bias to consider men more competent. This is reflected in men often having more confidence. Many men may also be able to negotiate in a more forceful manner than many women." (Response ID 275)*

*"…We're also REALLY sick of upper level men saying "give it time" to correct
gender imbalance challenges. It's been years. Stop blaming time and do something
about it, like pick a woman associate dean." (Response ID 99)*

8.3.3. Improve Racial Equity:

EDI and the shift towards more racial equity was discussed by many participants as a suggestion for improvement. Within this, acknowledgment was raised about the talk versus actual implementation of diversification (especially those in more senior roles). Concern was voiced towards taking racial equity more seriously through changing "how and what is valued".

*"The ingrained whiteness of the institution…there is no desire to diverse the
pool of senior administrators or academic leaders." (Response ID 176)*

*"EDI is not yet taken seriously. We need to actually change how and what we
value. We especially need to hire and support BIPOC faculty. We need to mentor,
support, and value mid-career faculty who are women and BIPOC faculty." (Response
ID 271)*

8.3.4. Equity for LGBTQ+:

One participant explored their experiences as queer and stated that they feel there could be more visibility and support for the LGBTQ+ community on the university campus. Support in the form of networks and visibility would increase awareness and ultimately acceptance of all people, positively impacting the culture and environment at the University.

*"As a queer woman I find there is little to no visibility, networks or support for
LGBTQ+ community on campus." (Response ID 254)*

8.3.5. Mental Health of Staff:

One participant expressed their concern with the current mental state of staff at the University:

*"For example, some senior faculty members are struggling more with the
shift to technology than others; racialized faculty members often end up providing
care for parents in other parts of the world; Black faculty members are carrying the
grief of racism and police violence more than others during the pandemic; women
faculty members are carrying a larger childcare responsibility; single faculty members
might be struggling more with isolation and loneliness than those with families; some
faculty members with underlying health conditions are more at risk during the
pandemic and these might add to their anxiety; while others might have lost family
and friends at this time and are dealing with grief and loss." (Response ID 171)*

35

8.3.6. Increased Leadership Opportunity:

The availability of opportunities to better ones' self, in the form of leadership participation, graduate education, awards and promotion was raised as something which the University could benefit from. This involves not only creation of such new opportunities, but fairness in utilizing and excelling within existing opportunities.

> *"…But generally, opportunities to participate in leadership, in graduate education, to apply for awards and to be considered for promotion, research chair positions, fair CP/M." (Response ID 4)*

8.3.7. More Action:

Having more transparency, and an action-oriented approach to issues will increase the confidence that people have in the Universities ability to address such issues. Some noted that past attempts to pursue these issues have resulted in either talk, long lags, or ending with nothing happening, this leads them to lose trust in the process and impacts their future responses to similar or new issues.

> *"I've lost trust in fairness of the university system or community. The more talk about equality I hear the worse the violations seem to be. Looks like window dressing to me." (Response ID 18)*

> *"Whenever I pursue any of these incidents, I end up wasting months before anything really happens. The last time, it took three years to resolve one of these issues." (Response ID 301)*

8.3.8. Independent Mediation Panel:

One respondent proposed the formation of an independent mediation panel which could assist with internal conflicts (for example between graduate students and research supervisors) and would create a non-bias, impartial and just process to handling these kinds of situations, rather than relying on those within a department whom already have established relationships with those involved. This would remove bias as well as uncomfortable for those having to become involved.

> *"In case of research conflicts between graduate student and research supervisor, an independent panel of professors outside of the department should be formed and the root cause of the problem should be identified. The recommendation/decision of this panel should be enforced on the student or the faculty member even if panel's findings are differing from that of the Department."*
> *(Response ID 74)*

8.3.9. Reduce Administrative Appointments:

The suggestion to remove some administrative appointments was raised by one commentator as a response to increasing new faculty, improving and the construction of new buildings, and infrastructure at the university. As stated by the participant,

> *"We need to cut our Administration (and their associated staff) by at least 30% and divert these resources back to the main mission of the University so we can continue to recruit and expand our Faculty so that it is possible to offer better opportunities for our students." (Response ID 221)"*

9. Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Resources

This section of our survey focuses on the EDI support structures available to faculty.

9.1. Workplace Culture

Participants rated the extent to which their workplace supports a culture of equity, diversity and exclusion on a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 100 (*a great deal*). Our survey highlighted average scores of 66-72 out of 100, as the extent of workplace support of a culture of equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Table 14: Mean rating of workplace culture of equity, diversity, and inclusion

	All respondents	Women
Department/Area/Program	72	71
Faculty	68	63
University	66	65

9.2. Awareness of EDI resources

Table 15 shows the proportion of respondents who were aware of EDI-related resources available at McMaster ranging from 28-97 out of 100, in multiple offices, associations, and accommodations.

Table 15: Number (proportion) of respondents aware of McMaster EDI-related resources

	All respondents	Women
Inclusion and Anti-Racism Education Program in the Equity and Inclusion Office	115(77%)	57(75%)
Human Rights and Dispute Resolution Program in the Equity and Inclusion Office	113(77%)	59(78%)
Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office in the Equity and Inclusion Office	131(89%)	66(88%)
Accessibility Program AODA Compliance in the Equity and Inclusion Office	119(80%)	63(83%)
Faculty Development Program in the Provosts Office for Leadership Development	83(57%)	41(55%)
Student Accessibility Service for Academic Accommodations	146(97%)	75(97%)
MacPherson Institute Programs for Instructor Development	145(97%)	75(99%)
Accessibility Program in Human Resource Services for Workplace Accommodations	75(52%)	33(%)
Employee Labour Relations in Human Resources for Employee Related Grievances	81(56%)	40(55%)
Employment Equity Program in Human Resource Services for Hiring Processes Accommodations	79(55%)	36(49%)
Employee Accessibility Network	39(28%)	15(21%)
Indigenous Education Council	74(51%)	36(47%)
Presidents Advisory Council on Building an Inclusive Community	94(64%)	47(61%)
African Caribbean Faculty Association of McMaster	95(64%)	56(72%)

Our survey also showed the proportion of respondents who were aware of and had made use of supports available to faculty who experience harassment, discrimination, and/or sexual ranged from 8-97 out of 100, depending on the type of office or association one consulted (Table 15).

Table 16: Number (proportion) of respondents aware of and use of faculty supports

Support	Aware: all respondents	Aware: women	Accessed: all respondents	Accessed: women
Human Rights Program, Equity and Inclusion office	110(76%)	59(77%)	16(13%)	9(13%)
Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office EIO	120(83%)	62(81%)	9(8%)	7(10%)
Human Resources Employee Labour Relations	121(86%)	59(80%)	25(21%)	15(22%)
Chair | Dean | Provost	124(89%)	66(89%)	43(35%)	25(36%)
Ombuds Office	105(76%)	55(75%)	9(8%)	8(12%)
MUFA	138(97%)	71(96%)	22(18%)	15(22%)
Campus Security	127(91%)	68(92%)	23(19%)	14(21%)
Your lawyer	94(69%)	55(75%)	7(6%)	3(4%)
Hamilton Police	110(80%)	63(86%)	6(5%)	5(7%)
Employee and Family Assistance Program	105(75%)	57(77%)	34(29%)	23(34%)

9.3. Workplace EDI initiatives and recommendations

Participants shared that their departments are working on various groups and committees to review policies, structures, and systems. Discussions surrounded the establishing policies, structures, and systems to support EDI. Some reflected on the great work of their departments, others were unsure if anything specific had been initiated within their own department.

> *"This year the department has established an EDI working group." (Response ID 22)*

> *"We have initiated a discussion of policies for field work around EDI. The goal being to ensure that individual labs are thinking of more than basic health and safety. It is not in place yet, but the discussion has started." (Response ID 252)*

> *"Not really sure there is anything specific we have done beyond university policies in any of the categories below." (Response ID 153)*

9.4. Programs and Practices to Support EDI in Teaching and Research:

In addition to the policies and structures of EDI, respondents spoke about the programs and practices available to support EDI within teaching and research, specifically involving student development, support of BIPOC, and discussions on EDI within departments. Some current initiatives include:

> *"My department has been working hard to establish ways of gathering feedback and creating lines of dialogue with students on the topic of EDI." (Response ID 248)*

> *"…recently set up a bursary for Black students." (Response ID 248)*

> *"… regular dept meeting discussions of EDI and anti-racism teaching strategies, mentorship of BIPOC students." (Response ID 261)*

9.5. Individual and Team Development of EDI Competencies:

Training and team development of EDI competencies was addressed by the participants. This topic led to further discussion related to leadership training, and the impact of curriculum which initiated and helped with the commitment to EDI. Training was described by some as available through workshops, lectures, cultural competency, and equity training.

> *"I have been offered Indigenous cultural competency training by my Chair, which I hope to undergo this Winter term." (Response ID 82)*

*"Equity facilitator training, equity training on hiring committees, general
equity training." (Response ID 250)*

*"We were able to hire three faculty members a few years ago who all teach
in areas related to race, religion and/or diversity more broadly and this has helped us
with the commitment to EDI overall." (Response ID 248)*

9.6.   Recruitment and Retention Initiatives to Support EDI Among Faculty:

Participants offered information regarding what is offered, as well as suggestions to adopt equitable best practices related to EDI. For example, one participant noted the compilation and distribution of equity issues in the university to all new hires, having rigorous and careful consideration during hiring, and considering EDI when planning seminar speakers and award nominations to fully support minority researchers.

*"EDI criteria incorporated into hiring and tenure/promotion." (Response ID
46)*

*"We have recently updated our equity document in advance of a new
hire. We discuss equity issues in the university and in teaching regularly in our school
faculty meetings." (Response ID 144)*

*"EDI considerations for seminar speakers and award nominations, ongoing
discussions in department and field work policies to support minority researchers."
(Response ID 262)*

9.7.   Recruitment and Retention Initiatives to Support EDI within the Student Body:

Another topic of discussion surrounded EDI support for students and specifically equity during the admission process, as well as when training TAs. Only a few respondents acknowledged this component but felt it was an important, bottom up approach to supporting EDI. This is something currently ongoing, and in progress:

*"our program is trying to implement EDI strategies in the admissions
process." (Response ID 12)*

*"We lack diversity within our profession, so this is difficult and needs to start
with student recruitment." (Response ID 120)*

"…specific EDI training for TAs." (Response ID 122)

9.8.   Suggested EDI support Pillars:

In addition to what is already being implemented, a few participants felt it was important to include that more can be done and should be done to provide support at a departmental level for faculty. For example, to invest more in recruitment/ EDI systems that have not to date been supported.

"although there is a desire at the departmental level to invest in recruiting
and retaining BIPOC/LGBTQ2S+ faculty as well as faculty in EDI-related fields, we
have not been supported to do so at the faculty level." (Response ID 147)

10.   McMaster Response to COVID-19 and its Impact:

In contextualizing the responses on the impact of COVID-19, we sought to understand how many of our respondents taught during the fall/ spring and winter. The majority (72%) of faculty taught in Winter 2020 but only 19% taught in the Spring/Summer semester 2020. There were not significant differences between the male and female respondents. As part of the new normal, and in response to the current pandemic, participants examined McMaster's response to COVID-19 and the new or worsened experiences exacerbated by the pandemic. Respondents talked about their own experiences as well as those of their students and colleagues. The emerging themes a presented below.

10.1.   Increased Workload and Stress:

The burden of the COVID Pandemic on faculty workload. Our survey highlights that 96% of faculty experienced additional work as a result of the COVID pandemic. The additional work has been increased by both the proportion of increased number of working hours, as well, as an increased number of additional student cases requiring faculty members' time and energy. This seems to have impacted more female professors (Table 17).

Table 17: Number of respondents (women respondents) who reported additional time spent working or on additional student cases

Theme	None	< 3 hours	4-7 hours	8-14 hours	> 15 hours
Additional time spent working each week compared to a typical work week before the pandemic	5(3)	17 (7)	39 (19)	49(31)	26(10)
Additional time spent overall learning software and skills or troubleshooting technological issues in order to carry out your duties remotely	2(1)	27(14)	30(12)	28(19)	48(25)
	None	1-2 cases	3-5 cases	6-10 cases	more than ten
Number of additional student cases that required your time and energy compared to before the pandemic	20(10)	34 (19)	41(16)	25(13)	14(10)

Some described that though their workloads have increased, their salary and recognition on their work has remained the same (therefore implying that work and pay in the current state are not balanced). In addition to workload, stress was felt as a result of factors including: a lack of available support available while working remotely, and stress from online teaching.

"I am working more than ever before, and my salary/compensation/recognition has not increased." (Response ID 4)

"Isolation and being asked to figure out endless problems without support has been hard." (Response ID 19)

"Support for virtual and online teaching still left much for the instructor to have to work out -- took much more time to prepare." (Response ID 30)

10.2. Additional effects of the pandemic restrictions

In addition to the increased time and stress from students, the respondents also reported that the pandemic has negatively impacted their research. Some described that their research is completely halted, for others stalled.

"Research is halted. Can't work with grad students to help them in their projects. Zoom/Teams calls are only so good." (Response ID 16)

"Research Productivity, adversely affected." (Response ID 31)

Respondents also discussed the impact the restrictions have had on their students' wellbeing and productivity, since they are unable to come to campus. This was also discussed in relationship to the increased workload (Table 19), whereby the inability to meet in person with the graduate students

was thought to have impacted the students' wellbeing; and necessitated the instructors to do a lot of "hand holding".

"The lack of in person meetings is taking a heavy toll on productivity. Personally my own need for research productivity is the least of my worries. I am way more concerned about my grad students who do need to be productive." (Response ID 16)

Beyond the direct impact on their academic work, respondents discussed the impact of the pandemic on other aspects of the respondents' lives. The impact was mostly faculty mental wellbeing , with stress, anxiety, etc. the most at 71/100 , followed by social isolation at 69/100; academically at 68/100; physically at 58/100 and lastly financially at 21/100 financially. Notably ¾ of the 71 respondents that indicated effects on their mental wellbeing, were female. To some extent, the negative mental health impacts were attributed to reduced social and professional contact as well as juggling family and work; as well as shared work spaces.

"Being unable to work in my office I now work at home where I share space with other family members, without access to my working material and without collegial contacts." (Response ID 23)

Respondents were also concerned about the negative impact that the isolation might have on the students

"I am also concerned about the difficulties that students face in their home lives, be they open to distractions that make it hard to concentrate during classes and during times at which they wish to study, or be they completely isolated from in-person human contact." (Response ID 198)

Respondents were also asked about the degree to which the pandemic had impacted their ability to do their job effectively. Reliable home internet (61/100), private work area (60/100) and ergometric work space 60/100 (with 70% females) affected the respondents the most. Respondents were least affected by the possession of a quick and reliable computer (41/100) and affordable home internet (41/100). Surprisingly, caring for children or others at home as well as home schooling were not strongly implicated since they were identified by 48/100 with the number of female respondents at about 50%.

When asked about the respondents' transition to online teaching, 77/100 of the respondents reported the transitions to remote interactions with their students to have generated a greater workload for faculty. This was followed by the efforts involved in maintaining relationship and

communicating with students (75/100). Less than 50/100 respondents identified online teaching as easy, that students transitioned well, and observed or experienced more inappropriate or unprofessional behavior from students in remote online courses.

10.3. Mitigating Inequities in the University's Pandemic Response

In an attempt to explore inequalities, respondents commented on how the University's pandemic response plan has mitigated, exacerbated or uncovered new inequalities. Within this section, comments were made on how the University could better alleviate inequalities during the pandemic through their response strategy. Respondents discussed issues related to unequal distribution of responsibilities, workload, and financial responsibilities and proposed strategies for dealing with these challenges; summarised below

Table 18: Recommendations for addressing the COVID-19 related challenges

Issue	Recommendation
The shift in responsibility e.g. completing the SAS forms increased faculty workload	Stop Improper Reassignment of Responsibility
Increased workload in addition to the increased personal workload related to caregiving	Encourage Course release Clear Guidance on when " it is enough" TA supports "no email Fridays" or "no meeting Fridays" Provide reduced teaching/service loads to people with caregiving duties
Increased expenses	University should cover the Extra Costs for setting up a home office financially support equity seeking faculty who are new faculty, first generation faculty, faculty from lower-SES backgrounds, faculty who have had many low-paid and transient work contracts before now, as well as immigrants to Canada who are barred from home financing
Communication challenges	Encourage clear and consistent essential communication between the university and faculty, staff and students
Gendered inequalities, experienced predominantly by women and BIWOC.	Acknowledging and addressing these existing gendered/racial inequities
Inequalities in technology access for students and faculty	Bridge Technology Gap for faculty and Students e.g. a loan for students to purchase the appropriate technologies
Fear of funding for graduate students running out.	Graduate student funding extension

10.4. MUFA's role in mitigating the University's Pandemic Response:

Respondents were explicitly asked about how MUFA could mitigate the negative impact of COVID-19 on their members. Respondents suggested roles that MUFA should play in mitigating the negative impacts of COVI-19 response on their members. These included: advocating for increased funds, support and information on tax claim eligibility, pay equity, action against unequal experiences for members, better access to resources, admin member communication and the suspension of CP/M.

10.4.1. Advocacy and communication:

Respondents proposed that MUFA should advocate for additional funding for the faculty members to respond to their increased needs especially in relationship to technology. Some, in view of the inequalities discussed in the report, thought that MUFA could advocate

" for race-based pay equity…" (Response ID 4);

"By being alert to the intersectional identities and different experiences of faculty members during the pandemic." (Response ID 163)

They also specifically asked for clarity from MUFA in their tax claims as explained below;

*"I think that MUFA could help to drive this conversation to be more instructor-centered and about **providing supports, ideas, technology, templates, etc... to assist**. we are the ones on the front lines and some of the messaging is from people who are not that well informed and have their own agendas." (Response ID 111)*

In addition to the information related to taxes, respondents indicated MUFA as a dependable and neutral source of information and expressed a desire to get more guidance and clear information about issues such as the available resources from MUFA during the uncertain times. These recommended that MUFA should;

"Gather the useful information together so we don't have to read reams of emails. Send an email to members with advice on whether there are any services or accommodations to help with various problems." (Response ID 320)

The last role that MUFA should play, according to the respondents was advocacy about CP/M. The recommendation ranged from temporal suspension for either this year (due to the circumstances not allowing to meet expectations), a few years, to abolishing the entire process (which these particular respondents thought to be discriminatory).

"I'd like to see MUFA seriously challenge the CP/M process and advocate for it to be set aside for the next three years for equity reasons." (Response ID 347)

"MUFA should pursue the elimination of McMaster's reliance on statistical evaluation of teaching, which is discriminatory." (Response ID 267)

11. Conclusions and recommendations:

11.1. Hiring and Negotiation

Overall, survey respondents indicated that faculty hiring decisions made in recent years were primarily fair and equitable. We conclude that the work over the last few years surrounding SPS A1 is beginning to bear fruit. Gender equity and diversity in selection committees were perceived as a sign of fairness in the recruitment process. It is important to note, however, that women respondents perceived less fairness on average in hiring processes than men did. Many of the challenges that respondents mentioned had to do with transparency in the processes and especially in negotiating.

We recommend that MUFA advocate for the following enhancements of to hiring processes:

- Ensure that selection committees are gender-balanced and diverse. If necessary, invite members from outside of the Area, Department or School.

- Augment the Equity training for hiring committees to ensure that equity factors are considered in preparing an offer, not just in selecting a candidate.

- Deans (or Chairs, as appropriate) should make transparent the factors that influenced their initial offer, including whether the offer is governed by a standard scale for the Faculty.

- The process should include a standard, adequate length of time for a candidate to consider an offer before accepting.

- Offers should be made in writing and should include adequate time for the candidate to consider the offer.

- Offers should include either the MUFA advice package or contact information for the MUFA negotiations advisor. This is particularly important for equity reasons, since there is sector-wide evidence that members of equity-deserving groups are less likely to have received adequate mentoring during their doctoral or post-doctoral training.

- Recommend to the School of Graduate Studies and MacPherson to develop job negotiation training workshops for PhD students.

Furthermore, we recommend that MUFA implement the following practices:

- Appoint a MUFA member from within each faculty to be the negotiations advisor for candidates who request advice.

- Prepare a guide for job candidates that includes information about what elements can and cannot be negotiated, the defining features of our non-unionized association, and the relevant characteristics of the Canadian university sector.

- Connect with new members near the end of the first year of their appointment to find out how the association can improve its support of new members.

11.2. Career Progress / Merit

The survey responses made it clear that current practices of determining CP/M awards are not contributing to a collegial culture among faculty. While the monetary differences between CP/M awards of 1 vs. 1.25 vs. 1.5 are relatively small, the perception of arbitrariness and unfairness has led to a disproportionate level of resentment. We recommend that MUFA undertake the following:

- Prepare effective communication for all members that explains the system's components and goals.

- Collaborate with the Vice-Provost Faculty to offer workshops for faculty members (both junior and senior) on how to complete the Record of Activities effectively.

- Advocate for Faculty Deans to publish standard guidelines for how Chairs are to allocate CP/M. (link to Humanities example; do other faculties do this?)

- Ask the Vice-Provost Faculty to require training for Chairs on how to assess CP/M. This training should include an equity lens.

- Although the current policy requires that Chairs report not only a member's annual award but also the basis for how the award was calculated, this is not common practice. The Vice-Provost Faculty should prepare a standard form that all Chairs use for reporting the basis of the award.

- Given the inherently comparative nature of CP/M, it is inevitable that a strong performance in a strong department will receive a lower CP/M award than a medium

performance in a weak department. Consider consolidating units, at least for CP/M purposes, such that the base of comparison is larger and more diverse.

- In the longer term, consider replacing CP/M with a differently designed system.

11.3. University processes:

While the new policies have led to more equitable hiring decisions, there remains considerable unhappiness among our respondents around the fairness of other university processes that involve selecting among a group of candidates, such as selection processes for leadership positions (Chairs, Deans, etc.), internal research awards, and nominations for external awards. We recommend that MUFA advocate that:

- The equity-facilitating practices of SPS A1 should be implemented across all competitive selection processes. In particular, clear rubrics for evaluation should be created early in the process, all candidates at a given stage in the search must go through the same assessments, and at least one member of each committee should have completed the Equity Facilitator training be charged with ensuring an equitable procedure is followed.

- The university should augment efforts to build EDI capacity among academic leaders.

- The university should augment efforts to hire women and members of racialized communities into faculty ranks and disciplines where they are underrepresented and into academic leadership positions.

- The university should increase opportunities for access to academic leadership development and advancement opportunities.

11.4. Conflict and Complaint Resolution

The survey responses indicated that a sizeable portion of respondents' experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment occurred at the hands of other faculty members, and of Chairs and Deans. While MUFA has the responsibility to support our members who experience discrimination, we also must send the message to all members that discrimination and harassment of our colleagues is unacceptable. We recommend that MUFA advocate that the university should:

- Improve the timeliness and transparency of processes and accountabilities for addressing EDI-related concerns.

- Engage impartial (e.g., arms-length from the department) supports to assist in mediating and resolving departmental conflicts.

- Implement a fair and equitable process to support negotiations between Deans and faculty members who are anticipating retirement.

- Recognize that parking is a highly contentious issue among all members of the university community, and therefore work closely with the City of Hamilton to improve public transit and bicycle options for commuting to campus.

Furthermore, we recommend that MUFA undertake the following:

- Develop clear, effective communications to our members, including Chairs and Deans, about members' rights in respect of medical, parental, compassionate, and other leaves.

- Collaborate with the Vice-Provost Faculty to create and support a culture of collegiality and equity among all MUFA members. This might involve creating mandatory training sessions or other measures.

- Collaborate with the Provost to revise the Faculty Code of Conduct, including clear, unambiguous policies about faculty sexual relations with students.

- Develop more extensive practices for connecting and communicating regularly with members about their rights and about the supports MUFA offers.

11.5. Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Resources

While the survey results indicated that most members of are aware of the various EDI resources available at the university and in the community, the rate of respondents who have accessed these resources is lower that the rate of awareness, and is also lower than the rate of respondents who reported experiencing or witnessing discrimination. We recommend that MUFA advocate that the university should:

- Enhance the visibility and profile of EDI-related university programs and services, as well as EDI stakeholder groups (e.g., Employee Accessibility Networks, Indigenous Education Council, President's Advisory Council on Building and Inclusive Community, African & Caribbean Faculty Associate of McMaster, for example)

- Augment efforts to build capacity among faculty to integrate EDI in teaching practices and research programs

- Resolve apparent conflicts between undergraduate course management policies, e.g., between MSAF, RISO, SAS policies on the one hand and the promotion of principles of Universal Design for Learning on the other hand.

11.6. COVID-19:

The data make it clear that virtually all MUFA members have experienced some amount of additional work under pandemic circumstances, with more than half of respondents reporting 1-2 days per week of additional work in the last academic year. Given that McMaster was already very highly ranked on national and international metrics of research and teaching, it is clear that our already highly productive faculty have been stretched beyond what is reasonable during the pandemic. We therefore recommend that MUFA:

- Bargain for fair compensation for the additional work associated with conducting teaching and research under ever-changing pandemic conditions.

- Bargain for adequate reimbursement of additional expenses occurred to set up home workspaces during the pandemic.