



University of Colorado **Boulder**

January 31, 2014

## **Summary of Report by the American Philosophical Association to the University of Colorado Boulder**

### **Background**

In April 2013, the American Philosophical Association's Committee on the Status of Women was invited and approved to conduct a full review of the climate for women in the department. The invitation to conduct that review was issued by the philosophy department, Dean Steven Leigh of the College of Arts & Sciences, and Provost Russell Moore. That review was conducted in late September 2013. The report from that visit was submitted to the University in late November.

The administration began a review of the report's recommendations in late November and that review continued through the winter break and into mid-January. The consensus of the leadership was that the report should be made public as quickly as new leadership could be secured for the philosophy department.

Based upon the report and input from the department, Dean Leigh, in consultation with Provost Moore, suspended in early December graduate admissions to the department for fall 2014. This was to allow time for new procedures and processes to be developed for the recruitment and effective management of graduate students before new ones were accepted. Dean Leigh and Associate Dean Mary Kraus began the process of searching for new external leadership of the department in December that would work to transform the culture of the philosophy department into one that would be supportive of faculty generally, and more supportive of a safe, productive and healthy environment for women.

### **Summary of the APA Report Findings**

- Faculty and graduate students alike are pleased with the academic quality of the philosophy department;
- Faculty are pleased with the high quality of undergraduate and graduate students;
- Undergraduates are enthusiastic about the department; their interactions with faculty and accessibility of faculty;
- However, the committee found that the department has maintained an overall environment "with unacceptable sexual harassment, inappropriate sexualized unprofessional behavior, and divisive uncivil behavior";
- The committee noted that this environment has harmed women and men and members of "every stakeholder group" in the department;
- It was further noted that much of this behavior has resulted in female faculty avoiding the workplace and opportunities to socialize with colleagues and in their leaving or "trying to leave" in disproportionate numbers;
- The report stated a climate of incivility in the department that has resulted in an unprofessional environment that is teaching graduate students inappropriate methods for handling harmful or unprofessional behavior among students;
- The report made many recommendations for changes in culture and practice and recommended that "recovery processes be both rigorous and guided."

### **Next steps**

- CU-Boulder has suspended graduate admissions until policies and procedures can be reviewed and standardized to create a consistent, fair and collegial environment;
- The dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, with the support of provost and chancellor, is implementing the majority of steps recommended in the APA's report, as well as a number of other measures, starting with the announcement today of a new chair, Dr. Andrew Cowell, who is external to the department;
- Other key steps that the chair is reviewing include:
  - Bringing in internal and external experts for training on ODH policies;
  - Initiating bystander training for faculty, staff and students to enable them to report actions hostile to women or others in the classroom and work environment and to challenge those who contribute to that environment;
  - A strategic planning process facilitated by an external expert to set goals and actions to improve the overall climate in the department, transforming it to one of openness, mutual support and collegiality;
  - A review of all practices and procedures for interactions with and management of graduate students, and ensuring all social functions in the department are safe, controlled, and "family friendly."
  - Creating a process for the department to expand its current concepts of sub-disciplines within philosophy to be more inclusive;
  - A process of clarifying policies relevant to resolving differences and disputes, including making use of the university's ombudsperson;
  - Creating an external advisory committee of campus faculty to guide the role and mission of the philosophy department.

## **Report on Site Visit**

Conducted by  
The American Philosophical Association (APA)  
Committee on the Status of Women (CSW)  
Site Visit Program  
at  
University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Philosophy  
on  
September 25-28, 2013

### **Site visit team:**

Valerie Gray Hardcastle (Team Leader, Professor, Past Department Head, Associate Dean, and Dean, Executive Director of the UC ADVANCE institutional transformation grant, University of Cincinnati)

Peggy DesAutels (Professor, Director of the APA CSW Site Visit Program, University of Dayton)

Carla Fehr (Associate Professor, Associate Director of the APA CSW Site Visit Program, and Wolfe Chair in Scientific and Technological Literacy, University of Waterloo)

### **Site visit program background and goals:**

The Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) of the American Philosophical Association (APA) has a clear interest in and responsibility for improving the climate for women and members of other underrepresented groups in philosophy departments. Moreover, working to improve the climate for women improves the climate for all. Good climate makes a difference for job satisfaction and productivity. The Program has been created in recognition of these goals and responsibilities.

Specific goals of the Program include the following:

- Helping departments analyze the climate issues particular to their own settings.
- Making recommendations for improving departmental climates based on proven best practices.
- Informing departments, where necessary, about challenges women and philosophers of other underrepresented groups face, drawing on social science and first person accounts.
- Gaining information in a systematic way about the range and variety of women's and minorities' experiences in philosophy that contribute to their ongoing

underrepresentation in the field.

### **Site visit procedures:**

**Prior to the visit**, the Chair of the CU Boulder Department of Philosophy submitted to the Site Visit Team Leader a report providing information about the Department, which included the following:

- the undergraduate and graduate curriculum with sample syllabi
- demographic data for undergraduate classes, majors, graduate student admissions graduate placement, and faculty appointments

In addition, the Department's faculty, students, and staff were asked to complete an online confidential survey, for the Site Visit Team's use only.

**During the visit**, members of the Site Visit Team met in separate meetings with:

- The Provost (Russell Moore) and the Associate Dean for Natural Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences (Mary Kraus)
- The Director of the Office of Discrimination and Harassment (Katherine Erwin)
- The Chair of the Department of Philosophy (Graeme Forbes)
- Departmental Climate Committee members
- Professors
- Associate Professors
- Assistant Professors
- Female Faculty
- Female Graduate Students
- Male Graduate Students
- Female Undergraduate Students
- Male Undergraduate Students
- Departmental Staff

Opportunities were made available for anyone to speak to the Site Visit Team individually, if requested.

**After the visit**, the Site Visit Team members jointly compiled their notes, conducted a quantitative and qualitative analysis, identified themes, applied known best practices, and produced this report. The team members will keep the content of their findings and of this report confidential. This report was submitted as an attachment in an email to the Chair of the Department of Philosophy (Graeme Forbes) on November 18, 2013. At their request, this report was also submitted as an attachment in an email to the Provost (Russell Moore) and the Dean of Arts & Sciences (Steven Leigh) on November 18, 2013.

## **Summary of Findings:**

The philosophical community at University of Colorado Boulder is proud of its high quality. Faculty and graduate students alike are pleased with the academic quality of the Philosophy Department and of individual members in the Department. Faculty are pleased with the high quality undergraduate and graduate students, and they are pleased with the high quality undergraduate teaching. Both graduate students and faculty highlighted the diverse interests in the program as a particular strength. Undergraduates were very enthusiastic about the Department, their interactions with faculty, and the accessibility of the faculty.

There is also evidence that the members of the Philosophy Department are generous with their time. Faculty read and comment on papers for their colleagues and for graduate students. Graduate students mainly report liking their non-competitive and supportive interactions with each other and the accessibility of the faculty (though there is some concern with MA students not feeling as supported; see below).

However, it is our strong conclusion that the Department maintains an environment with unacceptable sexual harassment, inappropriate sexualized unprofessional behavior, and divisive uncivil behavior. Members of most groups we talked to report directly observing inappropriate behavior. This behavior has harmed men and women members of every stakeholder group in the Department.

Some assistant and full professors (both male and female) report responding to this situation by working from home, dropping out of departmental life, and avoiding socializing with colleagues. Several faculty members' reputations for bad behavior place a higher service work burden on colleagues. Women are leaving or trying to leave in disproportionate numbers.

The female graduate students report being anxious, demoralized, and depressed. Some female students report that they avoid working with some faculty members because of things that they have heard about those faculty members. Some female students report avoiding working with faculty members because they directly witnessed or were subjected to this harassment and inappropriate sexualized unprofessional behavior. There was and is a lack of support for students who lost their advisors or instructors due to sanctions. The female graduate students would like more women in the department but they cannot recommend this department as a good place to come.

In addition, male graduate students report being extremely worried about the climate of harassment. They are worried that they will be tainted by the national reputation of the department as being hostile to women. They are worried about

getting a job letter from someone who has a bad reputation when the student does not know exactly who has a bad reputation. They are concerned that the lack of administrative support for the Department resulting from the climate of harassment [i.e. “provost saying, ‘no more departmental support until the department shapes up”] will negatively affect their abilities to succeed. They avoid some faculty because they do not want to have a reputation that might come with being advised by a harasser (a problem exacerbated by lack of certainty about who the harassers are). And some are angry in discovering the severe problems in the department that they didn’t know about before they arrived.

Some faculty are unaware of how much their incivility towards one another and other types of unprofessional behavior harm their graduate students. Graduate students lack appropriate professional development programs, as well as are being socialized into an unprofessional environment. And they are learning inappropriate methods for handling harmful or unprofessional behavior among students.

Moreover, we find that there is a lack of ownership from top to bottom regarding solving the problems and addressing unprofessional (or worse) behavior, and those who have tried on their own to fix things feel unsupported by their colleagues. Finally, there is a clear lack of appreciation at all levels that recovery, if it is to happen at all, will involve taking drastic measures. After close-knit communities, such as a department, have been seriously damaged, recovery processes should be both rigorous and guided.

Finally, we note that the department has a reputation in the international philosophical community for being extremely unfriendly to women. This has hampered the Department’s ability to recruit women faculty and graduate students and will ultimately impact their rankings.

At this point, there are three issues that need to be addressed:

- (1) The sexual harassment and other inappropriate and unprofessional behavior must stop.
- (2) The Department needs to recover from past instances of sexual harassment and harmful behavior, which means earning the justified trust from students and faculty that these activities will no longer happen, and providing assurances that no one will continue to be complicit with these behaviors. This recovery process and rebuilding of trust will include taking drastic measures.
- (3) The Department must rehabilitate its reputation: it must restore the trust of the rest of the profession, such that members of the profession would feel comfortable sending their undergraduate students to study, their graduate students for job interviews, and hiring graduate students from CU Boulder’s program.

What follows are a discussion of eight major themes that we have identified as well as suggested best practices that the university, the college, or the department could employ if they wish to ameliorate the issues that are currently damaging to the

departmental climate. It would be most useful if the Department, in consultation with the Dean's and Provost's office, used this document to develop:

- (1) A set of priorities, including a plan regarding which of these recommendations they will employ
- (2) A timeline for implementing changes
- (3) A mechanism for holding all parties accountable to the plan for change.

## **Findings and Suggested Best Practices:**

### **1. An environment with unacceptable sexual harassment and inappropriate sexualized unprofessional behavior**

There have been at least 15 complaints that have been filed with ODH, and a significant number of faculty and graduate students have directly witnessed or been subjected to this harassment and inappropriate sexualized unprofessional behavior. We observed that many faculty members are not knowledgeable about the harms of sexual harassment on the person being harassed, on all women in the department, and on all department members through the extreme negative effect this behavior has on the department climate. Also, it is clear that many faculty members are not sufficiently familiar with university policy, and state and federal law regarding sexual harassment and discrimination.

### **Suggested Practices:**

The Department could employ the following practices:

- **Mandatory training on the harms of sexual harassment**, on university policies, and on state and federal laws regarding sexual harassment and discrimination.
- **Mandatory training regarding how to report sexual harassment**, on the kinds of investigations that are done, on what the outcomes of the investigations are and mean.
- **Bystander training** for all department members, so people are comfortable intervening in situations that the group has decided that it will not tolerate. This will help remove perceptions that those who are not engaging in sexual harassment are complicit with sexual harassment.
- **Holding the Department and its members to very high standards of behavior.** Departmental practices, policies, and norms must be such that they make it absolutely clear that sexual harassment and inappropriate sexualized behavior are totally unacceptable. Department members must entirely avoid arranging situations where sexual harassment might happen or where people might think that it is happening. This means **no alcohol served at any events** connected with the Department (and this must extend beyond only "sanctioned" departmental events), and **no evening socializing.**

It is far better to think about norms, practices, and policies that work toward your climate and behavioral goals rather than on practices that ought to be prohibited. One way to do this is to focus on being **family-friendly** and **professional**. Events should be held during normal business hours (9-5) and should be such that you would feel comfortable with your children or parents being present. This holds for official department events as well as those attended by individual faculty, on or off campus.

With regard to trust, it is important to **avoid the perception of possible harassment**. The department must not create situations that foster the development of rumors. The department will have to **publicly avow very high standards of professionalism** and a **zero-tolerance policy of failure to observe appropriate boundaries**. There should be clearly delineated consequences and appropriately severe sanctions when standards of professionalism are violated (e.g., dating graduate students means removing yourself as graduate faculty while the student is in the program).

## **2. Lack of civility, collegiality, and respect for members of various groups**

We heard numerous reports of faculty engaging in behaviors that involved incivility, a lack of collegiality, verbalized disrespect for one another, and sexism. These behaviors were often witnessed by graduate students. This prevents teaching graduate students by example the kinds of behavior that are appropriately professional. In addition, this contributes to a stressful and negative atmosphere at a place of work. We found that **it is difficult for some women students to speak up in class**, and **women graduate students perceived class difference between MA and PhD students** (though men graduate students did not). It is important for the Department to **develop a culture in which all of its members feel respected and safe**. Email, in particular, has been a nexus for incivility and disrespect.

### **Suggested Practices:**

- **Dissolve all departmental listservs.** Emails should be used for announcements only, as one-way, purely informational, communication. Any replies need to be made in person, and with professional civility in speech, tone, mannerisms and other behaviors. Both students and faculty need better training or information regarding appropriate email etiquette.
- Avoid cheap and easy jokes in class or in other professional settings. **Individuals must call out disrespectful comments** as they occur and those called out should receive the correction without being defensive. The department should agree that so-called humor that depends on stereotyping or denigrating some group is inappropriate in a work environment, where multiple identities, some of them deeply hidden, must co-exist.
- **Realize that there is plurality in the discipline.** If some department members have a problem with people doing non-feminist philosophy or doing feminist philosophy (or being engaged in any other sort of intellectual or other type of pursuit), they should gain more appreciation of



and tolerance for plurality in the discipline. Even if they are unable to reach a level of appreciation for other approaches to the discipline, it is totally unacceptable for them to denigrate these approaches in front of faculty, graduate or undergraduate students, in formal or informal settings on or off campus.

- **Bystander training** could help members of the Department both understand their obligations to one another and give them the tools they need to manage uncomfortable exchanges.

### 3. Bullying

We believe that we cannot discuss any of the bullying instances without revealing the perpetrators; however, we do believe that those engaged in this behavior are largely unaware that they are perceived as bullies.

#### Suggested practices:

- The Department should **appoint an ombudsperson**, a senior and respected faculty member from another department, to serve as a mediator regarding any cases of unprofessional behavior. All behavior should be reported immediately to the ombudsperson, who will then work with the appropriate channels to manage the situation. Responses include, but are not limited to, talking to the offending party, talking to the Chair of the Department, reporting the behavior to the Faculty Affairs office, reporting the behavior to ODH.
- **Bystander training** could help members of the Department identify and respond to instances of bullying, and hence to avoid being complicit with this behavior.

### 4. Lack of boundaries/lack of professionalism

Many of the incidents of **alleged sexual harassment and assault** have occurred while faculty and graduate students were socializing after hours. We found that there is **excessive drinking** when faculty and graduate students socialize, and that there is an **inappropriate expectation that graduate students and faculty should socialize together** after hours (e.g., in bars in the evening). Our surveys indicated that there are **differential levels of participation and comfort for social events** across men and women graduate students. Some graduate students report feeling caught in the middle of faculty disputes. In addition, some male faculty have been observed ogling undergraduate women students.

The Department uses pseudo-philosophical analyses to **avoid directly addressing the situation**. Their faculty discussions revolve around the letter rather than the spirit of proposed regulations and standards. They spend too much time articulating (or trying to articulate) the line between acceptable and unacceptable behavior instead of instilling higher expectations for professional behavior. They spend significant time debating footnotes and “what if” scenarios instead of discussing what they want their department to look and feel like. In other words, they spend time figuring out how to get around regulations rather than focusing on how to make the department supportive of women and family-friendly.

Standards of professional collegial behavior are higher than the legal and policy requirements. Perhaps as a result of the history of harassment in the department, people have set the bar low. Just because a behavior was not egregious enough to avoid a finding of sexual harassment, does not mean that it meets the standards of professional collegiality.

#### **Suggested practices:**

- The Department should **discuss and agree upon family-friendly policies** for the Department, including recognizing that community members with small children or other obligations cannot attend after-hour social events.
- Because of its history, the Department should recognize that **it is inappropriate for faculty to socialize with graduate and undergraduate students** outside of departmental events, which should be held during normal business hours.
- The faculty should discuss what sort of department they want to have – what would it take to attract the sort of women scholars they want? What would it mean to have a positive learning environment for everyone and a professional workplace? **Spend time considering a set of positive goals for the department.** It might be best to have meetings of these sorts of under the direction of a **professional facilitator** to keep people on track.
- Finally, the Department will have to devise **very specific and targeted plans for recruiting** more women graduate students and more women faculty. A cluster hire for women should be considered. It is our considered opinion that it is unethical to bring an individual woman into the current environment. Moreover, given that there are several ‘camps’ of faculty members, a new cohort would have a better chance of successfully abstaining from unhealthy departmental politics.
- **Develop relationships with climate committees at top departments** at other universities that have addressed similar issues in order to get a sense of the range of professional standards out there.

#### **5. Lack of transparency regarding disciplinary processes, procedures and outcomes**

The lack of transparency contributes to an extremely harmful **rumor mill**. We found **common misinterpretations of what ‘no finding’** means when issued by ODH. There is no clear understanding of what referring matters back to the department entails, there is **no institutional memory regarding history of bad behavior**, and there is **no progressive discipline**. Finally, there is no clearly understood mechanism for addressing **unprofessional behavior that does not rise to the level of discrimination or harassment**.

Many faculty believe that **insufficient sanctions were given** in response to bad behavior. The perception is that the perpetrators were given a slap on the wrist for even the most well-known cases in which there was a finding. Most of the groups we interviewed reported that they think that some faculty members ought to be

fired. These attitudes contribute to the lack of trust and problems with leadership (see also below).

**Suggested practices:**

- **Progressive discipline steps should be clarified** for faculty and chairs as well as standards for when discipline should be implemented and by whom.
- **Mandatory training as described in Finding 1 and Finding 6, can help address this issue**

**6. Lack of faculty trust in university judicial institutions, practices and procedures**

There is a high level of **distrust of ODH**. (The Climate Committee felt that this has been resolved, but questionnaire data suggests that they need to revisit this issue. See Table 3). There is a **lack of effective training** regarding the disciplinary system, how to access it, how to make it function within a department, faculty rights and responsibilities, and standards of professional behavior

**Suggested practices:**

- **Department members should be trained in face-to-face sessions** on policies and procedures governing disciplinary procedures as well as standards of professional behavior (ideally, the latter would be taught by someone external to the institution).
- **ODH needs to speak to the entire department** about the number of complaints, what a complaint is, how complaints are investigated, what a finding or a lack of a finding means, and the connection of ODH to other university institutions and practices.

**7. Lack of transparency in the administration of the graduate program**

There is no formal systematic teaching evaluation, nor is there clarity regarding how funding and other decisions are made, including TA's, RA's, class assignments, and scholarships (see Tables 1 and 2). Moreover, the graduate students report that they don't know what they need to do to be successful on the job market. There are not enough practice job talks for all students.

**Suggested practices:**

- Faculty should **clarify the policies and procedures of the Department**.
- Faculty should **institute greater self-governance** for the graduate students.
- Faculty should develop **explicit criteria for awarding graduate student resources**. These criteria should be public, and the department should be held accountable for following them.
- For each graduate student, faculty should identify teaching/TA/RA experiences that will **further each student's professional development**.

- Faculty should create a systematic practice of **teaching evaluation** by faculty.
- Faculty should develop a **teaching award** for graduate students.
- Faculty should develop **coordinated programs for graduate students** entering the job market, including defined opportunities for practice job talks.

## 8. Lack of leadership

The Provost's Office and Dean's Office are **not providing (sufficient) support** or resources for the Philosophy Department to address these issues. Threats tied to additional ODH reports originating in the Philosophy Department motivate department members to avoid reporting additional incidents. Faculty report frustration with being told to fix problems which they cannot discuss. Especially since many faculty have little to no knowledge concerning the breadth or depth of the problems.

There is a **lack of coordination** among Faculty Affairs, ODH, Provost's Office, Dean, and Department Chair. This leads to cases falling between the cracks and a lack of knowledge about facts of the matter. It also contributes to the lack of knowledge regarding disciplinary procedures and appropriate sanctions and erodes trust in university judicial procedures. There is **no training for faculty or chairs** regarding disciplinary procedures, and **no mechanism for personnel history to be passed** from one chair to the next.

Among the faculty there is a widespread perception that **the current chair has not effectively responded** to issues of sexual harassment and lack of civility. While we agree with this assessment, we also believe that the Department Chair is put in a completely untenable position. It is unclear that the **Dean and Provost have the Chair's back** if the Chair is to institute discipline or make structural changes. Furthermore, the Chair has **no resources from central administration** to address salary inequities or to support counter-offers. In short, under the current configuration, it is very difficult for an internal chair to make the required changes or to hold people accountable.

The Department has been given **no clear guidance regarding ADA accommodations**, which leads to arbitrary exception-making for those requiring accommodations and excuse-making for bad behavior.

Finally, there is **tolerance of bad behavior** that does not break any policy but is unprofessional and damaging nonetheless.

### Suggested practices:

- The Provost's Office needs to **revisit confidentiality policies** regarding faculty discipline as well as provide mediation for the department to help them repair rifts caused by bad behavior.

- The Provost's Office needs to develop **explicit communication procedures for ODH, Chairs, Deans, and Faculty Affairs** as well as expectations for coordination. These procedures should be public, transparent, and training needs to be available regarding how to use them.
- The Dean should appoint **a new chair for the Department from outside the unit**, preferably someone at the university who has had extensive administrative experience and is well respected by the faculty. The Dean and Provost need to be explicit in their support of the Chair, especially regarding difficult actions that might be taken.
- The Dean should also provide **funds for gender-based equity adjustments** in order to be in compliance with Title VII and Title IX. We note that, while we are not lawyers, there are clear legal implications for failing to do so. The Dean should also provide **resources to the department to support counter-offers**. The structure now asks faculty to choose between their own wellbeing and that of their colleagues. Worse, it sends the message that faculty are not particularly valued by the institution, since the only way to scrape together a counter-offer is for other faculty to vote to give up something that they have already presumably earned.
- **Senior faculty and administrators must speak up**, consistently and firmly, regarding what acceptable behavior is. Senior faculty need to network with well-functioning departments to learn about what counts as acceptable behavior.
- **Positions of responsibility and significant department service, especially if either includes working with students, should be confined to faculty members who are widely perceived as having clean hands**. Placing past offenders or those perceived to have been past offenders in positions of power within the department will undermine the department's attempts to heal, including attempts to regain the trust of its members and of the wider university and philosophical community. We recognize that this might place an undue burden on those who now have to assume additional responsibilities. However, the department can manage the potential workload inequity by providing additional relief for those who step up (extra travel funds, course reduction, GA support, etc.) as well as require additional instruction or other from the offenders.
- **Department chairs need training** on disciplinary procedures as part of their on-boarding. Successive department chairs need to coordinate and discuss personnel actions and history.
- There must be clear **accommodation plans on file** with the Department, and the Department (and probably the Dean's and Provost's Office as well) needs clarification regarding expectations of behavior and workloads/work outputs for relevant faculty or students.

## **Conclusion:**

The reputation of the CU Boulder Philosophy Department as a place extremely unfriendly to women is well known in philosophical circles and among prospective graduate students. If the Department wishes to improve its reputation and its climate for women, the Department needs to maintain very high standards of professionalism and publically embrace a zero-tolerance policy of failure to observe appropriate boundaries. Because of its history, the Department needs to sponsor only those events that are alcohol free and are held during weekday business hours. The Dean needs to provide funding to support offers and counter-offers for women faculty at a level commensurate with the profession. And the Department needs to devise specific plans for recruiting women faculty and graduate students.

## **Special note:**

As we were putting this report together, we became aware of a proposal for a departmental spring retreat. We would like to use this proposal to illustrate what must happen for this unit to become functional again.

The proposal in part is as follows: "The idea is that we'll have a full day of talks in Boulder on Friday, and then head to a house or two in the mountains (in the Vail/Beaver Creek/Avon/Edwards area) for Friday, Saturday, and perhaps Sunday nights. There will be unscheduled time Saturday during the day, with more talks Saturday late afternoon/early evening."

While we are very supportive of the idea of departmental retreats, in the light of this department's history, all events, including retreats, need to be held during business hours (9-5) and on campus or near campus in public venues. The proposed departmental spring retreat is an exemplar for a family-*unfriendly* event. Under no circumstances should this department (or any other) be organizing the social calendars of its members. Under no circumstances should this department sponsor or be affiliated in any way with an event that includes alcohol. If there are going to be social events, then they need to be managed such that members of the department can opt out easily and without any penalty. (Please note that best practices for family-friendly speaker events include taking the speaker out to lunch instead of dinner so that participants may have their evenings free to attend to other obligations.) Further, any social events should be open and welcoming to spouses, partners, and children.

To be perfectly honest, we are floored that members of this department would believe that having another mountain event would be a good idea, given the unprofessional behavior that transpired at the last one. This department needs to be on its best behavior and to set itself a high standard of professionalism in order to overcome its reputation. It needs to clearly differentiate business from pleasure, and it needs to understand that it is a place of business. It needs to recognize that,

while there are some bad actors, the Department itself has set the conditions in place that encouraged bad events to happen. It needs to take responsibility for those conditions and correct them.

We are willing and eager to help with this transformation insofar as we are able.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie Gray Hardcastle  
Peggy DesAutels  
Carla Fehr

**Survey data**

Table 1. Lack of transparency of distribution of RA's , TA's and classes among graduate students

Survey item	Strongly or somewhat agree	Strongly or somewhat disagree	N/A
I know how teaching assistantships are allocated	52%	48%	0
I know how research assistantships are allocated	56%	44%	0
I know how graduate students are assigned the courses that they teach	28%	68%	4%

Table 2. Perceptions of fairness in the distribution of RA's , TA's and classes among graduate students

Survey item	Strongly or somewhat agree	Strongly or somewhat disagree	N/A
Teaching assistantships are fairly allocated	48%	28%	24%
Research assistantships are fairly allocated	60%	28%	12%
Courses that graduate students teach are fairly allocated	48%	20%	32%



Table 3. Faculty perceptions of fairness of university judicial process surrounding sexual harassment and discrimination

Survey item	Strongly or somewhat agree	Strongly or somewhat disagree
I am confident that if I were to raise a complaint about sexual harassment or discrimination, the judicial process at my university would be fair	38%	62%
I am confident that if a complaint about sexual harassment or discrimination were raised against me, the judicial process at my university would be fair	38%	62%
I am confident that if I were to raise a complaint about sexual harassment or discrimination I would not be subject to retaliation	48%	52%