

Campus Culture Report DRAFT

BACKGROUND

In May, 2019, Chancellor Kim A. Wilcox appointed the Campus Culture Task Force, co-chaired by Associate Vice Chancellor Mariam Lam and Dean Christopher Lynch, as part of a larger effort to foster a more supportive campus culture that reflects UCR’s [Principles of Community](#). The Chancellor’s charge was simple and straightforward: propose concrete, clear recommendations for individual and collective changes based on best practices; and define what success will look like.

Previous campus climate surveys have highlighted the importance of creating and sustaining a healthy campus culture. Its importance was recently heightened by egregious violations of UC policies by a former senior administrator. The Task Force was asked to review previous data, develop recommendations, and offer guidance on implementation with a goal toward improving campus systems, processes, and protections for members of our community.

PREVIOUS DATA

The Council of UC Staff Assemblies (CUCSA) administered engagement surveys in 2015, [2017](#), and 2019. The most recent survey showed selective, modest improvement. However, UCR remains below the U.S. norm across the range of categories included in the instrument, and below the UC system in most categories. A summary overview is included below.

**University of California System
Staff Engagement Survey (UCR Results)
2019**

<u>Strengths</u> <i>(highest % favorable)</i>	<u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> <i>(lowest % favorable)</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I believe strongly in the teaching, research, and public service mission of the UC system (94% agreed; equal to UC average; 3 points above national average). 2. My supervisor is supportive of my participation in health or wellness-related initiatives and programs offered at my campus/location (75% agreed; 1 point above UC average; custom question, no national benchmark available). 3. I am proud to be associated with the UC system (88% agreed; 1 point above UC average; equal to national average). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most of the time it is safe to speak up in this organization. (50% agreed; 9 points below UC average; 19 points below national average) 2. At the present time, are you seriously considering leaving the UC system? (53% agreed; 6 points below UC average; 19 points below national average) 3. I think I could report instances of dishonest or unethical practices to the appropriate level of authority without fear of reprisal (60% agreed; 7 points below UC average; 19 points below national average).

In 2014 Sue Rankin, Ph.D., of Rankin & Associates Consulting, was engaged by the University of California to conduct a system-wide climate study. Dr. Rankin’s [findings](#) included four areas of strength and three opportunities for improvement at the Riverside campus, that are summarized below. In her analysis, Dr. Rankin stated, “The findings for the University of California are consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country based on the work of the consultant.”

**University of California System
Campus Climate Project Final Report (Rankin)**

March 2014

<u>Strengths</u>	<u>Opportunities for Improvement</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High levels of comfort with the climate at the University ● Faculty and Staff - Positive attitudes about work-life issues ● Students - Positive attitudes about academic experiences ● Students and Trainees – More than half of all Student and Trainee respondents found the courses offered at UC contained materials and information that reflected diverse perspectives and experiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some members of the community experienced exclusionary conduct ● Several constituent groups indicated that they were less comfortable with the overall campus climate, workplace climate, and classroom climate ● A small but meaningful percentage of respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact

Although the two studies were not intended to accomplish the same goals, they provided useful reference points for the Task Force in identifying issues and specific problems, and crafting recommendations that aimed at improving campus culture in the years to come.

DEFINING THE FUTURE STATE

UCR seeks to embody best practices in addressing abuse of power dynamics inherently present among campus constituencies, including senior leadership, middle management, supervisors, individual staff members, faculty members, and students. The future state would align UCR’s [Principles of Community](#) and core values (integrity, excellence, accountability, and respect) with employee and student behaviors, in ways that are universally understood, continually reinforced, and observable in daily campus activities. What follows is a more detailed description of the desired future state.

Leaders, managers, and supervisors will be responsible and accountable for fair, respectful treatment of faculty, staff, and students. The atmosphere will be constructive, collegial, and respectful of shared governance. A commonly defined code of conduct will guide interactions in every area of campus, and will be introduced to new faculty and staff members upon joining UCR. Leaders will create an environment where mentoring relationships naturally develop between and among generations, races, genders, orientations, disciplines, ideologies, and perspectives. Campus leaders will work closely with each college, school, or administrative unit

to develop accountability processes and mediating structures where all faculty (including lecturers, adjuncts, and junior faculty), staff, and students can safely report uncomfortable or inappropriate behaviors to departments, with confidence that the behavior will be addressed and without fear of retribution.

People will seek to learn from others with different life experiences. These professional and collegial relationships will encourage constructive feedback and hold individuals accountable for inappropriate behaviors without fear of retaliation. The employee performance review processes for faculty members and staff members will provide timely feedback to employees. These feedback opportunities will be tools for change in which everyone participates with confidence that their voice is heard.

Faculty members participate in mentoring of junior colleagues and students. Faculty members at all levels will receive ongoing support in navigating evolving expectations and norms. This mentoring is part of their responsibility to demonstrate a strong teaching and mentorship portfolio in addition to a strong research and teaching record during the merit and promotion process. Students are aware of the resources available to them for reporting abusive behavior and for advancing their own wellness. They participate confidently in providing constructive feedback.

ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force identified three major categories of issues and created recommendations to address each. Some of the recommendations will speak to multiple issues, but are listed below under the main problem each is primarily intended to address. A larger list of tactics is included as an appendix to this report.

I. The Role of Senior Leadership: Trust and Accountability

The current campus culture has been shaped by many factors. There has been significant senior leadership turnover during the past decade, as well as a recent case of a former vice chancellor's malfeasance. There has also been growing cynicism associated with a perceived lack of transparency, leading to declining trust in leadership and management. Many campus organizations are structurally deep; and multiple layers of management create line-of-sight challenges between leadership and front-line staff. Moreover, accessibility and visibility of leadership has been described as a major concern among students, staff, and faculty. It has become increasingly common to suspect the motives of those in authority; and that dynamic appears particularly relevant to UCR's present culture.

The university's senior leaders are ultimately and collectively responsible for fostering a positive culture across the campus and, importantly, within their respective divisions and organizations. Senior leadership in this context is broadly defined as the Chancellor and Provost, Vice Chancellors, Associate/Assistant Vice Chancellors, Deans, Vice Provosts, Associate/Divisional Deans, Associate/Assistant Vice Provosts (generally administrators who are senior to a department chair role or director role). There are times when specific observations and

recommendations will be directed at unit heads, and others when it is the tier of management who report to those leaders.

Managing a broad diversity of employees – faculty, staff (represented, non-represented), students – defies a single approach, but the Task Force agrees all senior leaders must be held to a shared set of values and principles. Shared governance places additional complexity on decision-making and culture-building. Consultation and deliberation are prized and valued by our community, but can be confusing for those joining UCR from outside the UC system.

For leaders, multiple pressures distract from focusing on building a healthy culture. Competing demands reduce time to reflect and attend to the needs of teams. Yet, [research](#) has shown that culture and performance are linked; and these connections are reinforced in UC [Personnel Policies for Staff Members](#). Students are held to distinct expectations of behavior, adjudicated by [Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs](#).

Sample Recommendations & Action Steps for Campus Leaders (see also the full table in appendix)

- Regular communication with direct reports and one level down
- Explicit discussion and definition of culture and climate goals
- Focus on one value per year and develop speakers, resources, communication at all levels
- Define and develop mechanisms to monitor signs of abusive power
- Identify why leaders fail to act, and provide resources to help assess situations and respond to complaints
- Collect and share data in a systematic way

II. The Role of Supervisors and Faculty: Strategies to Address Misuse of Power

The power differential in relationships between supervisors and staff, faculty and students, and senior and junior faculty, are characterized by inherent power imbalances and opportunities for impropriety. Unfortunately, this power differential can further lead to real and perceived misconduct. While the campus compiles and releases statistics on formal misconduct complaints, such as Title IX and whistleblower statute violations, the extent to which more subtle or insidious behavior pervades campus culture is only known anecdotally. Such incidents must be addressed by professionally-trained staff to provide resolution, in order to prevent future misconduct and to educate faculty, students and staff on expected behaviors in the workplace.

At the root of dissimilar treatment of and consequences for misbehaving faculty and staff is the faculty tenure system and the different standards of evidence used in senate disciplinary proceedings that elevate faculty roles to a more privileged status. These realities can be perceived to mean faculty are held to more lenient cultural norms and are entitled to differential treatment, which can lead staff and students to view faculty members (and physicians) as being “untouchable,” or normalizing of uncivil behavior (“that’s just how ‘they’ are”).

Academic Senate members’ behavior is governed by the Faculty Code of Conduct, [Policy 15](#) of the [Academic Personnel Manual](#), that describes processes and procedures different than those for

other employees, as well as the *UCR Principles of Community*, which apply to the entire campus. A key distinction for Academic Senate members is that findings of misconduct are not considered in professional advancement determinations – a privilege unique to faculty members, and one difficult for those not governed by the same rules (staff, students) to embrace.

Faculty workload is extraordinarily high at top tier research institutions and the pressure to establish a high-profile research program and secure external funding under fierce competition is intense. This pressure is felt acutely, particularly for untenured assistant professors who are also in a relationship with an inherent power imbalance with senior faculty. This pressure to succeed can directly or indirectly create strain on students. Among graduate students this can lead to real or perceived unreasonable workload expectations and among undergraduate students a sense that faculty don't care about teaching and only value research. Graduate students' uncertainty, and surprise, about what a normative workload for success in academia entails can create frustration and resentment, ultimately leading to low morale and potential micro-aggressions. This can lead to acrimony and demoralization within the research group and throughout the workplace.

Faculty members are not immune to mistreatment, particularly when they belong to a minority group; for example, junior women of color, queer faculty, and trans faculty are vulnerable to discrimination by students in lectures, labs, discussions, anonymous student evaluation surveys, and by faculty across all facets of academic life. Such discrimination based on race and gender sometimes occurs under the guise of academic reasoning or freedom. Women and underrepresented minority faculty members report heightened expectations of faculty workload where they are expected to expend greater emotional labor in mentoring graduate and undergraduate students (Moore, Acosta, Perry, and Edwards, 2010).

Students and junior faculty members have expressed a justifiable concern that complaints through formal or informal channels could damage their professional careers. These fears are stoked by the confidentiality surrounding faculty misconduct charges and resulting sanctions; a common view is that faculty “protect their own.” The Task Force acknowledges that there are times when discipline may not be disclosed under [Appendix 5.3.1](#) of the UCR Academic Senate Bylaws, which provide a high level of protection for the privacy of faculty members whose cases are reviewed by the Charges and Privilege and Tenure committees.

Across the US, students are reporting [unprecedented levels of anxiety and depression](#). Graduate students across the United States report experiencing depression and anxiety at levels [six times that of the general public](#), while 27.8% of undergraduates report a degree of anxiety and 20.2% a degree of depression that affects their studies—increases from 18.5% and 11.5%, respectively, of a decade ago ([American College Health Association](#)). Much of this anxiety and depression can be attributed to the high-stakes nature and pressure of college education which can mean the difference between economic security and a lifetime of crushing debt. These trends [disproportionately affect](#) students from poor and middle class backgrounds, and this is a challenge for the university as we fulfill the mission.

In a recent survey 20.4% of UCR graduate student respondents noted that they had experienced hostile or exclusionary behavior in labs from faculty, other students or staff. Behaviors range from obvious cases of misconduct (bullying, sexual harassment, sexist/racist/homophobic

behavior) which have avenues for formal complaint, to less overt misconduct such as passive aggressive behavior, disrespect, lack of professionalism, and exhortations to develop a “thick skin” – micro-behaviors that build up over time. Undergraduate students associated with underrepresented groups report experiencing disrespect and microaggressions from faculty or TAs in the classroom as well as from campus authorities.

Sample Recommendations & Action Steps for Supervisors and Faculty (full table in appendix)

Training and support for staff supervisors, academic leaders, and faculty:

- Effective meeting facilitation
- Power/gender/race dynamics
- Succession Plans
- Mentorship and professional development

Accountability:

- Feedback loop - regular 360 reviews, surveys, exit interviews, merit/promotion (for faculty)
- External reviews
- Communication following complaints

III. The Role of Individuals: Misconduct and the Reporting Process

We know that bad actors on campus sometimes seem to remain unchecked. In some instances, this is because the misconduct has not been detected or established through a formal investigation and due process. In cases where the misconduct is established but not visibly or acceptably addressed, the campus appears to tolerate behavior defined by our own standards as intolerable, such as harassment or retaliation.

Anecdotally, there are organizations in which it can appear that small infractions are amplified and immediately addressed while addressing more egregious behavior is avoided or handled in a confidential process, creating a confusing environment where discipline seems more common for less serious misconduct. This may reflect supervisors’ reluctance to manage conflict or implement corrective action or progressive discipline in proportion to infractions – an abrogation of a manager’s core duty. The campus response to misconduct can appear disproportionate and inconsistently applied.

Misconduct may go undetected due to reporting barriers or failure to effectively intervene or investigate. Communication and reporting channels must be clear and safe, and the culture must support and encourage reporting of behaviors that do not align with UCR’s values and policies. When a report is made, it must be promptly and thoroughly reviewed, or we risk failing to identify bad actors. Interventions must be consistent, decisive, and effective, and may include performance improvement plans, training, or more serious discipline if circumstances warrant.

Culture and climate are impacted by infrastructure, particularly staff and systems. By any measure, UCR’s staff ratios are substantially lower than at sister campuses (UCR Institutional Research, 2019). If resources are not invested in staff capacity or if reductions in workload expectations do not occur through such mechanisms as process improvement, increased use of

automation, or reducing or eliminating low priority/low impact activities, tension will increase and culture/climate improvement may be hindered. Honoring standards, including providing supervisors with training and resources necessary to hold people accountable, requires adequate staffing.

Defining abusive behavior and distinguishing it from appropriate managerial actions such as addressing poor performance, is essential. There are compounding factors of power and authority that indicate a need to clarify the points of accountability for leadership. Leaders should have clearly defined policies for managing performance and reporting significant misconduct. They should also be prepared to regularly communicate positive expectations for work culture; this may include providing informal interventions and continuous feedback as they see harmful behaviors that may not rise to the level of an official complaint but do not promote a healthy culture.

Sometimes bad actors may be peer colleagues, and part of improving campus culture is learning how to appropriately and constructively call out behavior that contributes to a toxic work culture among co-workers. While the focus in this section is largely on improving reporting, much of toxic behavior needs to be addressed by broad use of conflict mitigation strategies, such as the facilitator moving the discussion from the individual to the issue.

Recommendations & Action Steps for Individuals

Clear rights and responsibilities

- Create communication norms in departments
- Rights & responsibilities documents (e.g. for graduate students)
- Improving performance management process

Clear process for reporting abuse, including improved communication about the grievance process for students

Clear resources and tools (mental health resources, resolving interpersonal conflicts, bystander training)

RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION STEPS

Recommendations	Action Steps
<i>How do we get to the recommended state?</i>	<i>What we do first?</i>
<p>Create institution-level accountability by holding campus leaders responsible for a healthy campus culture (1 - trust and accountability)</p>	<p><u>Short-term (within one year and ongoing)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regularly communicate with the next level down (Accountability: Unit Heads) ● Incorporate elements of culture management into annual performance management process for senior leaders (Accountability: Chancellor and Provost) ● Identify ways in which levels of power and other university processes can be misused by campus leaders and others with power to perpetuate a toxic culture of control and develop intervention strategies when warning signs are observed (Accountability: HR/Ombuds/Compliance/DEI/VPAR) ● Establish a list of modeled behaviors to provide clarity on the Principles of Community and how to exhibit acceptable behaviors/norms (e.g., How would respect for all people look and feel like? What does civil discourse look and sound like?) (Accountability: TBD) ● Identify reasons that leaders fail to act or do not act quickly, identify appropriate responses to abusive behavior, and identify campus resources to help leaders assess, weigh options, and respond (Accountability: HR/Ombuds/Compliance/DEI) ● Provide guidance to leaders in order to more quickly assess and react to complaint (Accountability: HR/Ombuds/Compliance/DEI/VPAR) <p><u>Mid-term (1-3 years)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop mechanisms for monitoring signs of abuse of power (manipulating HR processes, high turnover) (Accountability: HR) ● Distribute regular surveys to provide upward feedback (Accountability: TBD)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide suggestion boxes (physical and email) (Accountability: Unit Heads) <p><u>Long-term (3+ years)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 360 reviews (Accountability: HR) ● Establish a standing culture “transformation committee” (Accountability: TBD)
<p>Improve communication and morale (1 - trust and accountability)</p>	<p><u>Short-term (within one year and ongoing)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sharing lessons learned from books, articles, conferences, or other settings that can contribute positively to culture (Accountability: TBD) ● Providing executive coaching aligned to core values and the Principles of Community (Accountability: HR) <p><u>Mid-term (1-3 years)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Selecting one leadership-led value per year to focus on; how to model it appropriately/effectively (Accountability: TBD) ● Generate realistic messaging about expectations for service delivery that are consistent with our resource constraints ● Define climate and culture goals and integrate them into UCR’s strategic planning process and all areas of campus business. ● Promote opportunities for mentorship.
<p>Collect and share data in a continuous and organized way (1 - trust and accountability)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create or adopt a shared survey instrument ● Establish an ongoing small group to monitor campus culture ● Create a dashboard where benchmarks and progress toward culture/climate goals can be shared ● Conduct climate surveys every two years (alternating with existing CUCSA and Senate surveys) ● Promote qualitative research on campus climate ● Demonstrate and publicize improvements in infrastructure and culture
<p>Establish systems, structures, and processes for clearer communication of expectations for faculty, staff, and students alike (1 - trust and accountability)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review the faculty code of conduct (APM 015) - communicate its expectations clearly ● Align comparable expectations for staff and students ● Clarify and articulate range of sanctions for violating code of conduct ● Make well-informed individual decisions that align with institutional values

<p>Training and support for staff supervisors (2 - Addressing Misuse of Power)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop retreat toolkits ● Educate community on bystander interventions for any form of inappropriate behavior ● Define and train on skills such as improving emotional intelligence and psychological safety ● Develop assessment and accountability measures ● Develop new ways to show appreciation for staff and faculty beyond those already provided in policy ● Offer training on optimal and effective meeting facilitation ● Educate community members on power/gender/race dynamics and on understanding roles and microaggressions ● Create tools to develop a clear mission, shared values and communication norms for a unit ● Address problematic conduct directly, firmly, and in a timely manner ● Escalate response to more serious behaviors quickly ● Incentivize managers (staff & faculty alike) to engage in training as part of their professional development ● Develop active listening and feedback skills ● Create departmental succession plans ● Conduct 360-degree reviews of supervisors or otherwise solicit employee feedback regarding supervisors' performance and conduct ● External peer reviews of units/departments ● Improve process for and participation rate in exit (or "stay") interviews
<p>Training and support for academic leaders (2 - Addressing Misuse of Power)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Disseminate National Academies of Science (NAS) report on faculty-graduate student interactions, departmental toolkits, references, social norming prevention initiatives ● Extend structural discrimination and/or implicit bias training (for faculty hiring) to department chairs and deans

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide department chairs with assessment timeline for meeting learning outcomes with students ● Encourage leaders (and faculty members) to define and assess one outcome next year (build buy-in) ● Ensure clarity around campus resources for both faculty and students (e.g., including list of resources for students on syllabi) ● Separately evaluate managerial competence along with evaluations of teaching and scholarship. ● Clarify accountability for faculty supervisors
<p>Training and support for faculty (2 - Addressing Misuse of Power)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Including letters from alumni who worked with a faculty member, along with current student letters, in the merit/promotion process to make the process more holistic and mitigate the current challenges of students feeling threatened ● Encourage development of faculty mentoring programs within departments and share best practices for implementation ● Create anti-oppression resources and programs for faculty that emphasize ongoing support, assessment and normalized accountability ● Institute faculty mentor training with hiring process for graduate students ● Trainings/tool/modules from National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity ● Develop checks and balances for faculty members as they determine the fate of individual students ● Provide clear definitions of academic freedom
<p>Improve faculty onboarding (2 - Addressing Misuse of Power)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create new faculty orientation that is more of a normalized and integrated process of initial introduction, deep check-ins w/ department chair, and intentional mentorship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In initial orientation, use case studies for hands-on training + role-playing scenarios ○ Emphasize importance of teaching + mentorship alongside research + publication

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Propose onboarding mentorship “circle” that includes different people (department faculty like chair, campus leader/dean + external mentorship through NFCDD’s signature program?) ● Work with each college/school and department to create a clear set of guidelines and expectations for student mentoring and creating a healthy class climate via an anti-oppression framework. Propose some abbreviated version in course syllabi ● Articulate learner expectations - for time in the lab - for moving into candidacy, etc. ● Uniformly include in syllabi lists of support resources
<p>Create an expectation that campus community members will come forward when behaviors violate our Principles of Community, shared UC values (excellence, integrity, accountability, respect) and organizational values (3 - Misconduct and the Reporting Process)</p>	<p><u>Short-term (within one year and ongoing)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify reasons campus community members choose not to report or do not request help quickly ● Providing anonymous reporting options (Accountability: TBD) ● Highlight mental health resources to overcome the fear, paralysis of reporting (Accountability: HR/CAPS) <p><u>Mid-term (1-3 years)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Make the grievance process clear and lower perceived barriers to reporting (Accountability: HR/VPAR) ● Review student grievance process to make it less opaque (Accountability: VCSA) ● Identify resources for those who witness abusive or dysfunctional behavior, including bystander training (Accountability: TBD) ● Provide guidance in how campus community members can bring forward their concerns effectively (Accountability: HR) ● Improve transparency - communicate results to the parties impacted to the level allowed by employment law
<p>Strengthen support for graduate students (3 - Misconduct and the Reporting Process)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create list of resources already available to student <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Writing Center ○ GSAs + graduate div. liaison and div. training and ten-week training (two quarters)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Each department has explicit accountability pipeline in place where students can share uncomfortable situations without fear of retribution, esp. in situations that don't meet the threshold for Title IX ● Clearly share policy information during student orientation and in departmental handbooks ● Train graduate chairs on accountability structures, mentorship and anti-oppression frameworks ● Create rights and responsibilities document (like https://grad.ucla.edu/asis/library/academicrights.pdf) ● Cultivate a “mentorship map” that is less about a single mentor and more about creating a robust network or matrix of mentors responsible for different things
Continue improving Employee Performance Management Process (3 - Misconduct and the Reporting Process)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ensure consistent evaluation criteria that fairly rates employees across departments. ● Create fair and equitable evaluation process that rewards excellence, rather than making “excellent” reviews impossible to achieve
Improve staffing levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Invest in the Human Resources and Academic Personnel offices

COMMUNICATION RECOMMENDATIONS

There are a number of stakeholder groups that can provide important feedback in the development of these recommendations, as well as the eventual implementation of the finalized recommendations:

- Employee Labor Relations
- Campus Leadership retreat
- Subset of staff/faculty - to ask for feedback on the list of reasons people do not report
- Academic Senate (faculty welfare and executive council)
- Staff Assembly
- Department chair forums
- Compliance Office Team
- ASUCR / Dean of Students office - organizing student groups
- 5 year review or check-in on the progress on these recommendations

TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

Mariam Lam (co-chair)	Chris Lynch (co-chair)		
Mary White	Karla Aguilar	Ertem Tuncel	Kiersten Boyce
Dan Jeske	Drew Hecht	Helen Regan	Georgianne Carlson
Peter Hayashida	Liz Mondragon	Crystal Baik	Ross French
Andrew Larratt-Smith	Boniface Fokwa	Katina Napper	

TASK FORCE ORGANIZATION

The main committee consisting of all members met every two weeks.

The main committee was divided into four sub-committees that each met two weeks to address topical issues in key areas of:

1. Campus Leadership: Setting the tone for shaping culture and power dynamics
2. Department Chairs / Directors: Creating healthy micro-cultures in departments and units
3. Faculty and Students: Interactions at all levels including UG, G, TA, lecturers, faculty
4. Supervisors and Staff: Interactions both horizontally and vertically across units

CAMPUS CULTURE TASK FORCE GOALS

The campus culture task force was established with three broad goals:

1. To foster a “Thriving Campus Community”, reinforced by our Principles of Community and a collective commitment to creating a safe and welcoming environment in which each person has the opportunity to grow and develop.
2. To strengthen our commitment to addressing and eliminating all instances of sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH), and other forms of abusive and inappropriate conduct, such as discrimination, incivility, bullying, retaliation, and favoritism.
3. To hold ourselves and each other accountable to achieve the above goals, by communicating our formal policies and procedures, as well as providing informal strategies, resources, practices, and interventions.

REFERENCES

Helen A. Moore, Katherine Acosta, Gary Perry & Crystal Edwards (2010) Splitting the Academy: The Emotions of Intersectionality at Work, *The Sociological Quarterly*, 51:2, 179-204, DOI: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2010.01168.x

APPENDICES

Case studies prepared by the sub-committees will be available upon request.

DRAFT: Feedback Welcome