

**Committee for Women in the University**  
**(Faculty Policies & Procedures 6.56.)**  
**Annual Report for 2021-2022**

**I. Statement of Committee Functions**

The Committee for Women in the University (CWU):

1. Recommends to administrative offices and governance bodies changes in university priorities, policies, practices, and programs that would improve the status of women
2. Collaborates and consults with administrative offices and governance bodies to more fully support gender equity, employee engagement, an inclusive and respectful culture, and diversity
3. Evaluates and monitors the status of women employees at the university.

CWU's "Operating Procedures" (reaffirmed 22 September 2021) and "Statement on Diversity and Representation in Committee Membership" (adopted December 1999 and reaffirmed 22 September 2021) are available upon request from the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty.

Beth Larson (Kinesiology), and Kate Moran (Facilities Planning & Management) led the committee in 2021-2022. Beth Larson (Kinesiology) and Hannah Silber (Industrial & Systems Engineering) will lead the committee in 2022-2023.

**II. Current Activities**

CWU values partnering with fellow shared governance committees, university offices and programs, and university leadership in an ongoing, collaborative effort to achieve gender equity and create inclusive environments for work and learning. At meetings in 2021-2022, the committee consulted with:

Academic Planning & Institutional Research

Allison La Tarte, Interim Associate Vice Provost for Academic Planning & Institutional Research

Scott Wildman, Institutional Policy Analyst I

Division of Facilities Planning & Management

Brent Lloyd, Director of Space Management; Chair, University Child Care Committee

Office of Child Care & Family Resources

Cigdem Unal, Director; University Child Care Committee

Office of Human Resources

Carmen Romero-González, Director, Cultural Linguistics Services

Marilyn A. Gardner, OHR Communications Manager

Office of the Provost

Beth Meyerand, Vice Provost for Faculty & Staff Affairs

Retirement Issues Committee

Carol Hulland, Promotions Coordinator, Obstetrics & Gynecology (liaison)

**Academic Freedom.** In December, CWU endorsed two shared governance resolutions by unanimous vote: *Resolution in Support of Academic Freedom to Teach Race & Gender Justice, and Critical Race Theory* (Faculty Document 2979, 1 November 2021; ASA #769, 8 November 2021).

**Awards & Recognition.** The committee congratulates and recognizes recipients of UW-Madison's Outstanding Women of Color Awards, for their efforts to achieve social justice and notable contributions to our campus and broader community:

UW-Madison – 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Outstanding Women of Color Awards

Cat N. Burkat, M.D., Professor (CHS), Ophthalmology & Visual Sciences,  
School of Medicine & Public Health

Jennifer Gauthier, Senior Outreach Specialist, Extension Institute of Community Development,  
Menominee County/Menominee Nation, Division of Extension

Sheryl Henderson, M.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor (CHS), Pediatrics,  
School of Medicine & Public Health

Carola Peterson-Gaines, Community Outreach Specialist, Pharmacy Practice Division,  
School of Pharmacy; Badger Care Plus Community Liaison Manager, Quartz;

Community Research Associate, Community Academic Aging Resource Network  
Carolina Sarmiento, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Civil Society & Community Studies,  
School of Human Ecology

Danielle Yancey, M.S., Director, Native American Center for Health Professions,  
School of Medicine & Public Health

Award recipients were announced at the Diversity Forum and recognized at a campuswide [reception](#) on 3 March 2022.

CWU also congratulates and recognizes *2021 UW System Outstanding Woman of Color in Education* recipient Associate Professor of Gender & Women's Studies Sami Schalk and *2021 UW System P.B. Poorman Award for Outstanding Achievement on Behalf of LGBTQ+ People* recipient Gender & Sexuality Campus Center Assistant Director Katherine Charek Briggs.

The committee joins the Women Faculty Mentoring Program in celebrating excellent mentoring of women assistant professors:

2021 Slesinger Awards for Excellence in Mentoring

Tracey Holloway, Gaylord Nelson Distinguished Professor, Nelson Institute and  
Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences

Trina McMahan, Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering

This year's awards were generously supported by the Women's Philanthropy Council Collaborative Giving Project and the Doris Slesinger Award for Excellence in Mentoring Fund. Each recipient designated a gift of \$2,500 to a university initiative.

**Campus Planning Committee.** Liz Sadowski (Radiology) represented the committee as an ex officio, non-voting liaison to the Campus Planning Committee in 2021-2022.

**CWU Survey.** In 2020-2021, CWU fielded a survey to learn what employees of all genders believe are challenges for women at UW-Madison that CWU should prioritize and address. DDEEA Director of Strategic Diversity Planning & Research James Yonker prepared an overview of quantitative survey data and, with Institutional Policy Analyst II Rosie Bae, prepared a technical report for the committee (Appendix A). Beth Larson and Kate Moran led a working group that reviewed, coded and analyzed more than 1,000 text responses to two open-ended survey questions (*Would you like to share anything more about the top challenges for you and for women in the university?* and *What changes do you feel would be helpful?*) and prepared a qualitative data report (Appendix B). CWU has formed three subcommittees to review respondent suggestions and address concerns identified by survey respondents: 1) Unwelcoming Gender and Racial Climates, 2) Impact of Caregiving/Childcare on Careers, and 3) Inequities in Women's Compensation and Promotion. Subcommittees identified strategic short-, mid-, and longer-term priorities to make meaningful impacts and maximize

gains for women in the university. The committee is communicating findings to respondents and partners, including university leadership, through shared governance reporting and other avenues, such as a proposed *Working at UW* item.

### **Gender & Racial Climate.**

Survey respondents identified specific concerns impacting their work and worklife at UW-Madison. These included instances where they felt unwelcome, unsafe, excluded from decision-making, or experienced ageism, sexism, gender or racial discrimination; felt their contributions were undervalued or unrewarded by peers and leaders, or felt over-burdened with undervalued forms of organizational or emotional work allocated predominately to women. They noted some significant barriers to reporting bias, harassment or intimidating behavior, including fear of retribution/retaliation and disincentives in putting oneself in a vulnerable position without visible changes or known positive outcomes. It would be beneficial to find new ways to communicate with employees who come forward, apprising them of the status of their complaint, and with departmental/unit colleagues, replacing guesswork and rumors with more clarity about what to expect. For HIB, adding a mediation option would offer a helpful middle ground between seeking informal resolution and making a formal complaint.

CWU's Gender & Racial Climate subcommittee recommends: 1) addressing inequities in formal and informal service work (committee work, event planning, office "housework") and recognizing the value of and rewarding relational work necessary for well-functioning units/departments (mentoring, supervising, problem-solving) 2) improving transparency and increase ease of reporting and accountability to reporters of bias, harassment, and intimidating behavior including gathering university-wide reports for review; 3) creating universal training for all supervisors on unconscious and implicit bias, diversity, equity and inclusion, gender and LGBTQ sensitivity, sexual harassment, HIB; and equitable management practices, and 4) developing procedures for auditing gender/racial climate in departments/units (e.g. outside climate audits as part of program review, self-assessment, review of service work assignments).

### **Impacts of Caregiving/Childcare on Well-being and Careers**

In the survey, respondents identified multiple core and intersecting issues around childcare/ caregiving that impacted their career trajectories, retention and financial well-being. They recognized the need for university-wide parental leave policy for all employees that was not dependent upon available sick leave; for reasonably priced, high-quality and available childcare for all employees, predictability within work schedules to manage childcare (especially when work exceeds 40 hours) and equitably available flexibility to manage competing work and caregiving demands. The survey clearly points out that without sufficient investments and support that the caregiving parent's capacity to be productive, to continue as an employee, and to engage in high quality maternal work can be hampered by university policies, and childcare availability.

To build on prior work, the committee met with Cigdem Unal, Director of the Office of Child Care & Family Resources, and Brent Lloyd, Director of Space Management and Chair of the University Child Care Committee to learn about their efforts to increase campus childcare capacity to address the very long waitlists for childcare (>500 children) and costs of high-quality care. OCCFR has expanded access by creating a [UW Child Care Network](#) that currently includes six licensed, accredited, high-quality child care programs in the Greater Madison community. Income-eligible student parents receive tuition support through CCTAP, a \$1.2M non-allocable student segregated fee supported program, and CCAMPIS, a \$156,745 DoE grant supporting Pell-eligible student parents. Similar tuition support is needed for employees, including teachers who cannot afford to

enroll their children in campus centers. In the survey, some employees report paying over half their income for childcare. The group also discussed ideas for improving all campus lactation rooms to acceptable and functional standards, parental leave and sick childcare.

An ad hoc Committee on Caregiving, recommended by CWU in Spring 2021 and chaired by CWU member Vaishali Bakshi, collaborated with the UW System Caregiving Task Force and campus subject matter experts developed [workplace flexibility and support guidelines for caregivers](#), including a pandemic-related policy change permitting caregivers to use sick leave before exhausting vacation leave. The ad hoc committee worked with OHR to continuing refining [Workplace Flexibility](#) and proposed a caregiving-focused survey. In future, this ad hoc committee will focus on developing communications, guidance for supervisors, and building a workplace culture supportive of employees who caregive.

This spring, CWU's Child Care Subcommittee is working to identify key elements each lactation space should have, determine efficient methods for assessing the condition of current lactation rooms and identifying gaps, and learn about costs and options for increasing the number of lactation "pods" on campus. The subcommittee will also explore the possibility of moving from a system where lactation rooms are informally designated by individual departments/units to one where they are identified and mapped as campus spaces (like restrooms). The gender inclusive restroom initiative may offer a useful model for this work.

CWU recommendations for addressing childcare and caregiving issues include: 1) development of a university-wide paid parental leave policy following child birth/adoption; 2) development of a consistent university-wide family leave policy 3) development of a consistent and supportive family-friendly workplace policies (e.g. scheduling of meetings within the work week, address outside work hour expectations, and/or flexibility in time and place to complete duties); 4) improve the quality of lactation spaces and manage them as a university-wide resource; 5) act strategically to protect and expand high quality early childhood education and care programs at UW-Madison; 6) identify new funding models that reduce financial burden on divisions providing child care programs/services and that contain tuition costs for families, with a focus on developing tuition support for income-eligible employees, including staff in UW-Madison's child care centers.

### **Compensation & Promotion/Advancement.**

CWU's Compensation & Promotion/Advancement Subcommittee has been focusing on gender pay equity policy and practice and will also study paths to progression/promotion for academic and university staff. Employment benefits are a critically important component of total compensation.

CWU met in February 2021 with OHR Director of Total Rewards Karen Massetti-Moran and (then) OHR Title & Total Compensation Manager Shana Ullsvik to discuss how TTC's job framework and consistent position descriptions/titles will enable UW-Madison to make comparisons with academic peers and private firms working in related areas. TTC will provide a foundation for market-informed pay, equitable compensation decisions, and parity adjustments for individuals and equity analyses for cohorts of employees.

CWU met in October 2021 with Vice Provost for Faculty & Staff Affairs Beth Meyerand and APIR Associate Director Allison La Tarte met with CWU to discuss the current process for evaluating faculty salaries. Faculty salaries are

reviewed at specific career points (promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to professor, coincident with 5-year post-tenure review). An individual faculty member also may request a review that entails identification of three “comparable” faculty and review of their respective accomplishments. Following the review, a chair may recommend an equity adjustment to the dean. Following the dean’s decision, a faculty member may accept or appeal the dean’s decision, following the department’s documented process.

APIR has developed Tableau data visualizations to support salary equity reviews. In past years, Excel spreadsheets were created. These visualizations reflect factors including years since degree, title, and current salary. APIR collects and analyzes data on faculty salaries at peer institutions to assess how patterns of compensation across research intensive universities and to understand how salaries at UW-Madison compare with faculty compensation at peer institutions. A portfolio of pay tools and recent pay plans have helped make UW-Madison more competitive with peers.

CWU members asked how gender differences within and among departments might contribute to apparent gaps and about the review process (e.g., consistency/uniformity of reviews across campus, potential impacts of differences in how reviews are managed, the extent to which decision-making is shared and whether appropriate checks and balances exist to limit and mitigate bias). The committee recommends additional analyses of this data that may more clearly reveal any gender-based inequities in salaries across the university. Current procedures for grouping employee categories, and decisions to limit analysis of smaller subsets of data, that would allow examination of units/departments with gender-based discrepancies, may be limiting our understanding of how gender-bias is impacting equity in compensation.

**Diversity & Inclusion.** CWU strives to act in ways that foster diversity and inclusion.

- In Spring 2021, Elizabeth Jach represented CWU on the 2021 Diversity Forum selection committee. Chariti Gent will represent CWU on the 2022 Diversity Forum Selection Committee.
- Chariti Gent and Suzanne Swift represented CWU on the *2021 Outstanding Women of Color Awards* selection committee. Hannah Silber and Aslı Göçman will represent CWU on the *2022 Outstanding Women of Color Awards* selection committee.
- In January 2022, CWU leadership and members participated in a “Joint C’s” meeting hosted by Chief Diversity Officer LaVar Charleston. This annual meeting brings together leaders and members of DEI-focused shared governance committees (including the Committee on Disability Access & Inclusion; CDCC; Immigration & International Issues Committee; LGBTQ+ Committee; Committee on Undergraduate Recruitment, Admissions & Financial Aid; Committee for Women in the University), divisional Equity & Diversity Committee chairs, Campus Diversity Representatives (formerly MDCs), and DDEEA colleagues. The meeting provides a forum for communicating DDEEA activities, discussing committee priorities and initiatives, suggesting possible collaborations, and community building.

### III. Data on Women Faculty & Staff

In September, APIR Policy & Planning Analyst Scott Wildman presented highlights from the two most recent annual trend reports: [Trends in Women & Minority Faculty &](#)

[Staff Data](#) (October 2020), and [Trends in Faculty Diversity](#) (May 2021). The percentage of women employed at UW-Madison has generally increased over the past decade. The percentage of women in the faculty remains lower than in other employee groups, in part due to rank mix (a small number of assistant and associate professors and a large number of professors) and in part due to hiring patterns and departures.

CWU Committee members discussed how small changes in many areas (hiring a few more women assistant professors, appointing more women with tenure, promoting more women to the rank of associate professor with tenure and to the rank of professor, retaining a few more women, etc.) can have a large effect on overall composition of the faculty. Committee members asked whether UW-Madison is conducting exit interviews, whether APIR is analyzing time to promotion to professor by gender and race/ethnicity, and how UW-Madison can make progress, despite federal reporting requirements, in moving beyond binary (male/female) gender reporting.

#### **IV. Current and Future Issues or Concerns**

In 2022-2023, the committee will continue working to address key concerns identified by CWU survey respondents including:

- improving gender and racial climate, with a focus on:
  - ease of reporting bias, harassment, and intimidating behaviors
  - more transparent communication with individuals and departments
  - offering professional mediation services as a middle ground between informal resolution and formal complaint or grievance processes
  - encouraging department/unit self study and development of procedures for auditing gender and racial climate and to improve equity and recognition of scholarly, teaching, outreach, mentoring and service contributions
- improving supports for families, with a focus on:
  - creation of paid parental and family leave policies, separate from the use of sick leave
  - making high quality early childhood education and care programs at UW-Madison more affordable and accessible
- reviewing anticipated pay equity analyses of academic and university staff
- studying paths to progression/promotion for academic and university staff

**V. Committee Membership, 2021-2022**

		<u>Member</u> <u>Since</u>	<u>Term</u> <u>Ends</u>
<u>Faculty:</u>			
Cécile Ané	Botany and Statistics	2019	2022
Vaishali Bakshi	Psychiatry	2019	2022
Marah Curtis	School of Social Work	2021	2022
Aslı Göçmen	Geography and Environmental Studies	2019	2025
Christina Hull	Biomolecular Chemistry	2019	2022
Beth Larson (chair)	Kinesiology	2018	2024
<u>Academic Staff:</u>			
Jenna Alsteen	Academic Planning & Analysis (GS)	SII	2024
Chariti Gent	Division of Continuing Studies	2019	2022
Elizabeth Jach	Office of the Dean, School of Education	SI	
Liz Sadowski	Radiology	2017	2023
Hannah Silber	Industrial & Systems Engineering	SII '21	2024
Suzanne Swift	Division of Teaching & Learning	2018	2023
Rachael Willits	Dean of Students Office	2016	2022
<u>University Staff:</u>			
Meghan Cramm	Primate Research Center	SII	2023
Lachrista Greco	UW-Madison Libraries	2020	2023
Kate Moran (co-chair)	Facilities Planning & Management	2016	2022
Jenaille Northey	Chazen Museum	2021	2024
Jessica Rivera	School of Veterinary Medicine	SII	2023
Danielle Smith	Facilities Planning & Management	2021	2023
<u>Postdoc:</u>			
Katelyn DeSourcey-Scherer	Nutritional Sciences	2021	2022
<u>Students:</u>			
Stephanie Brandsma		SI	
Sara Park		SI	
<u>Ex officio, non voting:</u>			
LaVar Charleston	Chief Diversity Officer	2021	
Rosie Bae (designee)	DDEEA	2021	2024
Luis Piñero	DDEEA	1999	
<u>Administrative Support:</u>			
Lindsey Stoddard Cameron	Office of the Secretary of the Faculty	1996	



**WISCONSIN**  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

**2020/2021 CWU PRIORITY SURVEY**

**TECHNICAL REPORT:  
CHALLENGES FOR WOMEN EMPLOYEES AT UW**

JAMES A YONKER, PHD, MPH

ROSIE BAE, PHD

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC DIVERSITY PLANNING AND RESEARCH  
DIVISION OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY & EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT



## CONTENTS

Executive summary .....	3
Key findings .....	3
Introduction & Methods .....	4
Sample Characteristics .....	4
Data and Statistical Methods .....	5
Terminology .....	5
Findings .....	6
Overall .....	7
By Employee Classification .....	8
By Appointment Level .....	9
By Age .....	10
By Gender (Sex) .....	11
By Race/Ethnicity Summary .....	12
By Race/Ethnicity Categories .....	13
By Caregiving .....	14
By Experienced Gender Discrimination at UW .....	15

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Between Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, the Committee for Women in the University (CWU) fielded a series of parallel surveys of faculty, academic staff, university staff, and postdoc employees at UW-Madison. The goal of the survey was to “*help the CWU prioritize its short and long-term work, with a view towards affecting change when and where possible.*”

In late 2020, the committee asked the Office of Strategic Diversity Planning and Research (OSDPR) within the Division of Diversity, Equity & Educational Achievement (DDEEA) to compile responses to the survey, prepare the qualitative (open-ended) responses for review by committee members, and analyze responses to select quantitative survey items by respondent characteristics.

**This technical report is a summary of responses to Q11, challenges for women employees at UW. Results are presented as a ranked list for the committee with shaded table results from highest (red) to lowest (green) priority.**

## KEY FINDINGS

The table below shows responses to Q11 sorted from highest to lowest priority (% Yes) for the entire sample.

Top Challenges for Women Employees at UW, Ranked High to Low	All Respondents (N=2201)	
	%Yes	Rank
Childcare	72%	1
Compensation	70%	2
Gender Climate	60%	3
Promotion or Advancement	57%	4
Racial Climate	57%	5
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	6
Discrimination	51%	7
Workplace Climate	45%	8
Sexual Harassment	45%	8
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	10
Workload	40%	11
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	12
Taking Leave Time	36%	13
Professional Development	34%	14
Job Security	30%	15
Safety	30%	16
Accessibility/ADA	28%	17
Performance Evaluation	23%	18
Other	4%	19

- The overall pattern of results was generally consistent across employee characteristics.
- There were few or no differences by Employee Classification or Appointment Level.
- While there were some noteworthy differences in responses to individual Q11 items by Age, Gender (Sex), Race/Ethnicity, and Caregiving, the pattern of rankings was stable, at least for the top 5 to 8 ranked items.
- There were substantial differences in responses to many individual Q11 items by whether the respondent experienced gender discrimination at UW, but the pattern of rankings was generally the same.

## INTRODUCTION & METHODS

Between Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, the Committee for Women in the University (CWU) fielded a series of parallel surveys of faculty and academic staff, university staff, and postdoc employees at UW-Madison. The goal of the survey was clearly stated in the survey introductory text (emphasis added in **bold**).

*The Committee on Women in the University (CWU) recommends changes in university priorities and practices to improve the status of women; collaborates with units across campus to support gender equity, inclusivity, and diversity; and monitors the status of women employees at UW-Madison. **Your response to this survey will help CWU prioritize its short and long-term work, with a view towards affecting change when and where possible.** The survey should take 10 minutes to complete and your responses will remain anonymous.*

The Office of Strategic Diversity Planning and Research (OSDPR) within the Division of Diversity, Equity & Educational Achievement (DDEEA) provides UW-Madison governance committees, such as CWU, with data and analytic support to further the committee's mission. In late 2020, the committee asked OSDPR to compile responses to the survey, prepare the qualitative (open-ended) responses for review by committee members, and analyze responses to select quantitative survey items by respondent characteristics. This technical report is a summary of responses to Q11, challenges for women employees at UW. Results are presented as a ranked list of priorities for the committee. A preliminary version of these results was presented to the CWU committee co-chairs on December 22, 2020, with an update to the full committee on April 21, 2021.

## SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Details of the survey instrument, administration, and response rates are available from the committee. **Table 1** below is a summary of survey respondent characteristics for the sample of completed surveys analyzed in this report.

<b>Table 1: Survey Respondent Characteristics</b>		<b>Total</b>	
Total		2676	
<b>Age</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Missing</i>		12	<1%
18-24 years		69	3%
25-34 years		577	22%
35-44 years		755	28%
45-54 years		651	24%
55-64 years		502	19%
65 years or older		110	4%
<b>Gender (Sex)</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Missing</i>		20	1%
Female		2169	81%
Male		455	17%
Non-Binary/Self-Describe		32	1%
<b>Racial/Ethnic Category (Check All)</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native		24	1%
Asian		157	6%
Black/African American		63	2%
Hispanic/Latinx		107	4%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander		3	<1%
White		2371	89%
Other		57	2%
<b>Racial/Ethnic Summary</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Missing</i>		23	1%
White (Only)		2272	85%
Person of Color		381	14%

<b>(Cont.)</b>			
<b>Table 1: Survey Respondent Characteristics</b>		<b>Total</b>	
Total		2676	
<b>Employee Classification</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Missing</i>		18	1%
Faculty		594	22%
Academic Staff		1533	57%
University Staff		469	18%
Postdoc		62	2%
<b>Appointment Level</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Missing</i>		20	1%
Full-Time		2409	90%
Part-Time		210	8%
LTE (Limited Term Employment)		37	1%
<b>Employment Shift</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Missing</i>		132	5%
1st Shift (Day)		2495	93%
2nd Shift (Evening)		31	1%
3rd Shift (Night)		18	1%

## DATA AND STATISTICAL METHODS

The focus of this report is Q11: “Please indicate challenges **for women employees** at UW.” Survey participants had the option to select either “Yes, this is a challenge” or “Yes, this should be CWU’s highest priority” for each of the 19 listed categories. Preliminary analyses indicated that relatively few participants selected the “Yes, this should be CWU’s highest priority” option, so responses to both options were collapsed for analysis.

Responses to Q11 were analyzed by the following respondent characteristics:

- Employee Classification (faculty, academic staff, university staff, postdoc)
- Appointment Level (full-time, part-time, LTE)
- Age (18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+)
- Gender (sex: female, male, non-binary/other)
- Race/Ethnicity (white, person of color; individual race/ethnicity categories)
- Caregiving (infant/toddler, children under 18, adult child, partner/spouse, parent/elder)
- Experienced Gender Discrimination at UW (no, yes)

**Because female respondents comprise over 80% of the sample, no breakdowns *within* gender are provided here. Additional analyses, available upon request, for only female respondents broken down by other employee characteristics yielded a virtually identical pattern of results.**

For statistical analyses, responses to Q11 were treated as 0=No, 1=Yes to calculate a difference in mean scores (proportion “Yes”) using t-tests, where a group difference was considered meaningful only if it satisfied two conditions: (a) the difference in mean scores was statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  and (b) the Cohen’s d effect size was at least 0.20. Cohen’s d shows the difference in averages between two groups in standard deviation units. Responses to Q11 were also shaded from highest (red) to lowest (green) by proportion “Yes” for presentation.

## TERMINOLOGY

Sex and gender are distinct concepts. Q6 of the survey asked, “What is your gender?” but response choices were: (1) Female, (2) Male, (3) I do not identify in the Female/Male binary, and (4) Self-describe.

**For this report, analyses by “gender” reflect the response options and language of Q6, grouped into (1) Female, (2) Male, and (3) Non-Binary/Other.**

## FINDINGS

The text describes the overall findings and notes differences between groups that are both statistically significant and large enough to be meaningful. Meaningful differences are indicated by **bolded text** and table cells are shaded according to priority, from highest (red) to lowest (green).

As with all survey research, there are a few things to keep in mind when reviewing the results in this report.

First, the results presented in this report reflect the attitudes and experiences of survey respondents, *which may not represent those who did not complete the survey or the greater university population of employees.*

Second, the number of respondents for a particular question may be small depending on the size of the group. It is important to interpret small numbers with caution. Breakdowns by respondent characteristics were not always possible because of the small number of participants. If a category had fewer than 30 individuals answer a question, data for that breakdown were suppressed and the tables display an "S."

Third, differences across groups may be the result of real differences in experiences, different aspects or different perceptions of the same experience, or different expectations. In addition, individuals have many facets to their identity and vary in their configuration of characteristics. This report presents results by major respondent characteristics that were obtained via self-report survey questions. Other important respondent characteristics may impact their experience but were not available for this analysis.

Table 2: Q11, Challenges for Women Employees at UW	All Respondents (N=2201)	
	%Yes	Rank
Childcare	72%	1
Compensation	70%	2
Gender Climate	60%	3
Promotion or Advancement	57%	4
Racial Climate	57%	5
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	6
Discrimination	51%	7
Workplace Climate	45%	8
Sexual Harassment	45%	8
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	10
Workload	40%	11
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	12
Taking Leave Time	36%	13
Professional Development	34%	14
Job Security	30%	15
Safety	30%	16
Accessibility/ADA	28%	17
Performance Evaluation	23%	18
Other	4%	19

- More than two-thirds of respondents indicated that Childcare (72%) and Compensation (70%) are challenges for women employees at UW. These were the top two priorities by rank.
- Half or more of respondents indicated Gender Climate (60%), Promotion or Advancement (57%), Racial Climate (57%), Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump (54%), and Discrimination (51%) are challenges, with priority ranks from 3 to 7, respectively.
- Nearly half of respondents indicated Workplace Climate (45%) and Sexual Harassment (45%) are challenges, tying for rank 8.
- About 40% of respondents indicated Hostile, Intimidating Behavior (43%) and Workload (40%) are challenges, ranking 10 and 11, respectively.
- About one-third of respondents indicated Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor (36%), Taking Leave Time (36%), and Professional Development (34%) are challenges, ranking 12 through 14, respectively.
- About one-quarter to one-third of respondents indicated Job Security (30%), Safety (30%), Accessibility/ADA (28%), and Performance Evaluation (23%) are challenges, ranking 15 through 18, respectively.
- Few respondents indicated Other (4%) challenges, ranked last at 19.

<b>Table 3: Q11, Challenges for Women Employees at UW by Employee Classification</b>	All Respondents (N=2201)	Faculty (N=495)	Academic Staff (N=1297)	University Staff (N=352)	Postdoc (N=53)
Childcare	72%	77%	71%	70%	72%
Compensation	70%	63%	71%	74%	53%
Gender Climate	60%	65%	59%	56%	58%
Promotion or Advancement	57%	54%	59%	59%	51%
Racial Climate	57%	55%	57%	59%	62%
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	55%	56%	51%	47%
Discrimination	51%	53%	49%	55%	57%
Workplace Climate	45%	48%	44%	45%	42%
Sexual Harassment	45%	49%	44%	44%	53%
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	45%	43%	38%	43%
Workload	40%	47%	37%	39%	42%
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	34%	37%	36%	34%
Taking Leave Time	36%	44%	32%	36%	53%
Professional Development	34%	36%	32%	41%	32%
Job Security	30%	26%	30%	36%	40%
Safety	30%	25%	30%	36%	42%
Accessibility/ADA	28%	22%	28%	34%	25%
Performance Evaluation	23%	29%	21%	22%	26%
Other	4%	4%	4%	4%	8%

- There were almost no differences in responses to Q11 by Employee Classification.
- Faculty (44%) were more likely than Academic Staff (32%) and University Staff (36%) to indicate Taking Leave Time is a challenge for women employees at UW.
- The number of postdoc staff that completed the survey was relatively small, so nominal differences in responses to Q11 failed to achieve significance. However, there is a suggestion that they were more likely to indicate Taking Leave Time (53%) as a challenge for women employees at UW and less likely to indicate Compensation (53%) as a challenge.

<b>Table 4: Q11, Challenges for Women Employees at UW by Appointment Level</b>	All Respondents (N=2201)	Full-Time (N=1995)	Part-Time (173)	LTE (N=23)
Childcare	72%	72%	69%	S
Compensation	70%	70%	66%	S
Gender Climate	60%	60%	61%	S
Promotion or Advancement	57%	58%	56%	S
Racial Climate	57%	57%	53%	S
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	55%	51%	S
Discrimination	51%	51%	51%	S
Workplace Climate	45%	46%	39%	S
Sexual Harassment	45%	46%	40%	S
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	44%	34%	S
Workload	40%	40%	37%	S
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	36%	36%	S
Taking Leave Time	36%	36%	32%	S
Professional Development	34%	34%	34%	S
Job Security	30%	30%	35%	S
Safety	30%	30%	29%	S
Accessibility/ADA	28%	28%	27%	S
Performance Evaluation	23%	23%	20%	S
Other	4%	4%	3%	S

- There were no differences in responses to Q11 by Appointment Level.



<b>Table 5: Q11, Challenges for Women Employees at UW by Age</b>							
	All Respondents (N=2201)	18-24 Years (N=50)	25-34 Years (N=502)	35-44 Years (N=641)	45-54 Years (N=525)	55-64 Years (N=400)	65+ Years (N=82)
Childcare	72%	62%	75%	79%	70%	<b>62%</b>	68%
Compensation	70%	66%	69%	72%	70%	67%	67%
Gender Climate	60%	68%	58%	62%	61%	60%	55%
Promotion or Advancement	57%	54%	57%	59%	57%	59%	48%
Racial Climate	57%	70%	60%	56%	55%	56%	52%
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	46%	<b>63%</b>	<b>62%</b>	50%	<b>43%</b>	<b>39%</b>
Discrimination	51%	64%	48%	54%	52%	51%	48%
Workplace Climate	45%	44%	42%	44%	48%	47%	51%
Sexual Harassment	45%	<b>64%</b>	45%	44%	45%	44%	59%
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	56%	36%	41%	45%	46%	52%
Workload	40%	28%	38%	42%	43%	37%	30%
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	48%	35%	38%	35%	36%	35%
Taking Leave Time	36%	30%	41%	39%	34%	29%	32%
Professional Development	34%	32%	33%	37%	36%	31%	35%
Job Security	30%	36%	27%	30%	32%	32%	33%
Safety	30%	<b>52%</b>	31%	26%	30%	32%	39%
Accessibility/ADA	28%	40%	31%	27%	26%	26%	23%
Performance Evaluation	23%	24%	20%	23%	23%	26%	23%
Other	4%	0%	5%	5%	2%	5%	4%

- There were some differences in responses to Q11 by Employee Age.
- Respondents 18-24 years were more likely to indicate Sexual Harassment (64%) and Safety (52%) are challenges for women employees at UW.
- Employees 25-34 years and 35-44 years were more likely to indicate Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump is a challenge (63% and 62%, respectively).
- Employees 55-64 years were less likely to indicate Childcare (62%) is a challenge, and employees 55-64 years and 65+ years were less likely to indicate Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump is a challenge (43% and 39%, respectively).

<b>Table 6: Q11, Challenges for Women Employees at UW by Gender (Sex)</b>	All Respondents (N=2201)	Female (N=1839)	Male (N=327)	Non-Binary/Other (N=28)
Childcare	72%	71%	76%	S
Compensation	70%	<b>72%</b>	<b>56%</b>	S
Gender Climate	60%	60%	63%	S
Promotion or Advancement	57%	<b>60%</b>	<b>45%</b>	S
Racial Climate	57%	58%	50%	S
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	55%	51%	S
Discrimination	51%	51%	53%	S
Workplace Climate	45%	46%	43%	S
Sexual Harassment	45%	<b>42%</b>	<b>61%</b>	S
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	42%	43%	S
Workload	40%	41%	31%	S
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	37%	28%	S
Taking Leave Time	36%	37%	28%	S
Professional Development	34%	35%	30%	S
Job Security	30%	<b>32%</b>	<b>19%</b>	S
Safety	30%	<b>28%</b>	<b>39%</b>	S
Accessibility/ADA	28%	<b>30%</b>	<b>15%</b>	S
Performance Evaluation	23%	23%	21%	S
Other	4%	5%	1%	S

- There were some differences in responses to Q11 by Gender (Sex).
- Female respondents were more likely than male respondents to indicate Compensation (72% vs 56%), Promotion or Advancement (60% vs 45%), Job Security (32% vs 19%), and Accessibility/ADA (30% vs 15%) are challenges for women employees at UW.
- Male respondents were more likely than female respondents to indicate Sexual Harassment (61% vs 42%) and Safety (39% vs 28%) are challenges for women employees at UW.

<b>Table 7: Q11, Challenges for Women Employees at UW by Race/Ethnicity Summary</b>	All Respondents (N=2201)	White Only (N=1885)	Person of Color (N=307)
Childcare	72%	72%	73%
Compensation	70%	70%	67%
Gender Climate	60%	60%	64%
Promotion or Advancement	57%	57%	59%
Racial Climate	57%	56%	64%
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	55%	52%
Discrimination	51%	<b>50%</b>	<b>61%</b>
Workplace Climate	45%	45%	50%
Sexual Harassment	45%	45%	46%
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	42%	48%
Workload	40%	40%	38%
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	35%	41%
Taking Leave Time	36%	36%	36%
Professional Development	34%	<b>33%</b>	<b>44%</b>
Job Security	30%	29%	38%
Safety	30%	30%	34%
Accessibility/ADA	28%	27%	29%
Performance Evaluation	23%	22%	30%
Other	4%	4%	5%

- There were few differences in responses to Q11 by Race/Ethnicity Summary.
- Respondents of Color were more likely than White respondents to indicate Discrimination (61% vs 50%) or Professional Development (44% vs 33%) are challenges for women employees at UW.

BY RACE/ETHNICITY CATEGORIES

<b>Table 8: Q11, Challenges for Women Employees at UW by Race/Ethnicity Categories</b>	All Respondents (N=2201)	Am. Ind/AK Native (N=19)	Asian (N=135)	Black/African Am. (N=52)	Hispanic/Latinx (N=79)	Nat. HI/Pac. Isl. (N=2)	White (N=1969)	Other (N=42)
Childcare	72%	S	70%	71%	78%	S	72%	76%
Compensation	70%	S	68%	77%	66%	S	70%	57%
Gender Climate	60%	S	68%	67%	66%	S	60%	57%
Promotion or Advancement	57%	S	60%	63%	58%	S	57%	50%
Racial Climate	57%	S	66%	<b>79%</b>	58%	S	56%	57%
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	S	50%	52%	54%	S	55%	55%
Discrimination	51%	S	61%	<b>73%</b>	59%	S	<b>50%</b>	55%
Workplace Climate	45%	S	50%	52%	52%	S	45%	52%
Sexual Harassment	45%	S	43%	52%	52%	S	46%	38%
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	S	46%	50%	56%	S	42%	45%
Workload	40%	S	36%	46%	42%	S	40%	33%
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	S	40%	54%	41%	S	36%	31%
Taking Leave Time	36%	S	33%	40%	44%	S	36%	29%
Professional Development	34%	S	41%	50%	47%	S	33%	36%
Job Security	30%	S	36%	44%	35%	S	29%	43%
Safety	30%	S	33%	40%	37%	S	30%	26%
Accessibility/ADA	28%	S	27%	27%	32%	S	28%	33%
Performance Evaluation	23%	S	31%	38%	25%	S	22%	26%
Other	4%	S	4%	10%	5%	S	4%	5%

- There were few differences in responses to Q11 by Race/Ethnicity Categories.
- Black/African American respondents were more likely to indicate Racial Climate (79%) and Discrimination (73%) are challenges for women employees at UW, while White respondents were less likely to indicate Discrimination (50%) is a challenge.

<b>Table 9: Q11, Challenges for Women Employees at UW by Caregiving</b>	All Respondents (N=2201)	Toddler/Infant (N=257)	Child(ren) Under 18 (N=647)	Adult Child (N=72)	Partner/Spouse (N=108)	Parent/Elder (N=115)
Childcare	72%	<b>89%</b>	<b>83%</b>	68%	77%	74%
Compensation	70%	72%	69%	68%	76%	74%
Gender Climate	60%	58%	60%	57%	67%	70%
Promotion or Advancement	57%	53%	56%	68%	60%	62%
Racial Climate	57%	52%	55%	57%	52%	58%
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	<b>77%</b>	<b>62%</b>	46%	52%	50%
Discrimination	51%	50%	50%	54%	53%	54%
Workplace Climate	45%	37%	43%	54%	50%	50%
Sexual Harassment	45%	37%	43%	39%	44%	44%
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	<b>33%</b>	41%	46%	44%	38%
Workload	40%	39%	42%	49%	50%	45%
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	33%	34%	36%	37%	38%
Taking Leave Time	36%	<b>51%</b>	40%	42%	36%	36%
Professional Development	34%	35%	33%	36%	38%	36%
Job Security	30%	28%	29%	38%	38%	42%
Safety	30%	22%	25%	22%	25%	23%
Accessibility/ADA	28%	24%	24%	33%	25%	35%
Performance Evaluation	23%	23%	22%	22%	28%	29%
Other	4%	5%	2%	3%	6%	5%

- There were a few differences in responses to Q11 by Caregiving.
- Respondents caring for Toddler/Infant or Child(ren) Under 18 were more likely to indicate Childcare (89% and 83%, respectively) or Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump (77% and 62%, respectively) are challenges for women employees at UW.
- Respondents caring for Toddler/Infant were less likely to indicate Hostile, Intimidating Behavior (33%) is a challenge, and more likely to indicate Taking Leave Time (51%) is a challenge.

<b>Table 10: Q11, Challenges for Women Employees at UW by Experienced Gender Discrimination at UW</b>	All Respondents (N=2201)	No (N=1509)	Yes (N=689)
Childcare	72%	70%	75%
Compensation	70%	<b>66%</b>	<b>78%</b>
Gender Climate	60%	<b>52%</b>	<b>79%</b>
Promotion or Advancement	57%	<b>52%</b>	<b>70%</b>
Racial Climate	57%	<b>52%</b>	<b>66%</b>
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	52%	61%
Discrimination	51%	<b>44%</b>	<b>68%</b>
Workplace Climate	45%	<b>38%</b>	<b>61%</b>
Sexual Harassment	45%	<b>41%</b>	<b>55%</b>
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	<b>37%</b>	<b>56%</b>
Workload	40%	<b>36%</b>	<b>48%</b>
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	<b>30%</b>	<b>50%</b>
Taking Leave Time	36%	<b>33%</b>	<b>43%</b>
Professional Development	34%	32%	40%
Job Security	30%	28%	35%
Safety	30%	28%	34%
Accessibility/ADA	28%	<b>24%</b>	<b>35%</b>
Performance Evaluation	23%	<b>19%</b>	<b>31%</b>
Other	4%	3%	6%

- There was a consistent pattern of differences in response to Q11 by Experienced Gender Discrimination at UW.
- Respondents who had experienced gender discrimination at UW were more likely than respondents who had not to indicate that Compensation (78% vs 66%), Gender Climate (79% vs 52%), Promotion or Advancement (70% vs 52%), Racial Climate (66% vs 52%), Discrimination (68% vs 44%), Workplace Climate (61% vs 38%), Sexual Harassment (55% vs 41%), Hostile, Intimidating Behavior (56% vs 37%), Workload (48% vs 36%), Difficulty Dynamic with Supervisor (50% vs 30%), Taking Leave Time (43% vs 33%), Accessibility/ADA (35% vs 24%), and Performance Evaluation (31% vs 19%) are challenges for women employees at UW.

University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Committee for Women in the University

CWU Survey Report

**Challenges for Women Employees at UW:  
Analysis of Qualitative Data**

Spring 2022

## Acknowledgements

The Committee for Women in the University wishes to acknowledge members and campus partners who:

- developed the survey instrument
- translated survey questions into Spanish, Hmong, Mandarin Chinese, Nepali, and Tibetan
- fielded the survey in four waves to faculty, academic staff, postdoctoral scholars, university staff
- analyzed quantitative and qualitative survey data
- established working groups to address key challenges identified through the survey

### **CWU Leadership**

Marah Curtis (2018, 2019), Tina Hatch (2018), Ashley Redjinski (2018), Abigail Lindeman (2018), Kate Moran (2019, 2020, 2021), Vaishali Bakshi (2020), Elizabeth Larson (2021)

### **CWU Members**

Sowmya Acharya, Elizabeth Aisenbrey, Jenna Alsteen, Cécile Ané, Rosie Bae (ex officio, designee of CDO LaVar Charleston), Stephanie Brandsma, Roseanne Clark, Meghan Cramm, Lydia Dalton, Katelyn DeSourcy-Scherer, Teri Dobbs, Jenna Furger, Chariti Gent, Aslı Göçman, LaChrista Greco, Jennifer Hanrahan, Molly Horwitz, Christina Hull, Elizabeth Jach, Laura Ketterhagen, Torsheika Maddox (ex officio, designee of CDO Patrick Sims and Interim CDO Cheryl Gittens), Dana Maltby, Jenaille Northey, Kate O'Connor, Kristi Obmascher, Nandini Pandey, Sara Park, Sandy Peterson, Antje Petty, Luis Piñero, Stevie Riddle, Jessica Rivera, Liz Sadowski, April Schaaf-Jozefowski, Hannah Silber, Melissa Skala, Danielle Smith, Suzanne Swift, Rachael Willits

### **CWU Administrative Support**

Lindsey Stoddard Cameron

#### Special acknowledgement:

- Survey development: Marah Curtis, Tina Hatch, Abigail Lindeman, Kate Moran, Ashley Redjinski
- Qualitative data analysis: Elizabeth Jach, Elizabeth Larson, Kate Moran
- Frequency analysis: Elizabeth Jach
- Descriptive analysis, qualitative data report: Elizabeth Larson
- Review/Editing: Marah Curtis, Kate Moran, Lindsey Stoddard Cameron, Suzanne Swift

### **Retirement Issues Committee liaisons to CWU**

Carol Hlland

### **Office of Compliance**

*guidance on questions related to discrimination/harassment  
process for responding to potential allegations of misconduct*  
Lauren Hasselbach, Title IX Coordinator

### **Office of the Secretary of the Academic Staff**

*Wave 1: survey fielded to academic staff (English)*  
Jake Smith, Secretary of the Academic Staff

### **Office of the Secretary of the Faculty**

*Wave 1: survey fielded to faculty (English)*  
Heather Daniels, Secretary of the Faculty

*translation of survey instrument into Spanish*

May Ramirez, graduate student, Rehabilitation Psychology & Special Education

### **Office of Postdoctoral Studies**

*Wave 2: survey fielded to research associates, postdoctoral fellows, postdoctoral trainees (English)*  
Imogen Hurley, Director



**University Relations**

*Wave 3: survey fielded to university staff (English)*

John Lucas, Assistant Vice Chancellor, University Communications

**Office of Human Resources**

*consultation on strategy*

Jessica Karls-Ruplinger, Chief of Staff, Office of Human Resources

Carmen Romero González, Director, Cultural Linguistic Services

Susan Tran Degrand, Interim Director for Equity, Inclusion and Employee Well-Being

*translation of questions and open-ended responses*

*Wave 4: survey fielded to university staff (English, Spanish, Hmong, Mandarin Chinese, Nepali, Tibetan; via WhatsApp)*

Shuwen Li, Translation Coordinator, Cultural Linguistic Services

Yangbum Gyal, Interpreter/Translator/Trainer, Cultural Linguistic Services

Parwat Regmi, Interpreter/Translator/Trainer, Cultural Linguistic Services

Jzong Thao, Interpreter/Translator/Trainer, Cultural Linguistic Services

Anabel Rodríguez, Interpreter/Translator/Trainer, Cultural Linguistic Services

**Division of Diversity, Equity & Educational Achievement**

*quantitative data analysis, technical report*

Rosie Bae, Institutional Policy Analyst II

James Yonker, Director of Strategic Diversity Planning and Research

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Between Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, the Committee for Women in the University (CWU) fielded a series of parallel surveys of faculty, academic staff, university staff, and postdoc employees at UW-Madison. The goal of the survey was to “help CWU prioritize its short and long-term work, with a view towards affecting change when and where possible.”

This analysis addresses two open-ended questions from that survey:

- *Would you like to share anything more about top challenges for you and for women in the university?*
- *What kinds of changes do you feel would be most helpful?*

This report describes a qualitative analysis of narrative comments to the questions. Narrative data revealed the intersectionality of issues for women at UW-Madison; one issue often influenced another or more than one other. The respondents identified the following priorities (from most to least frequent):

### **(1) Gender and racial climate**

In terms of gender climate, respondents described instances where they felt their contributions were under-valued despite their expertise; felt excluded in their departments/ units’ formal and informal networking and interactions; and were expected to do “housekeeping” tasks or “emotional work” necessary for keeping the department functioning well but which did not count towards advancement.

Respondents also described instances of hostile and intimidating behavior where individuals in positions of power were not held accountable, and where current systems did not clearly address these problems nor report on outcomes of complaints. This was felt to be in part due to the onus for change resting on those reporting the discrimination, and “in-house” management of complaints. These issues were amplified for BIPOC individuals, who in addition to experiencing negative workplace climate issues were weathered by ongoing microaggressions, hostility or unfair expectations.

Respondents’ suggestions included increasing the number of women and BIPOC individuals in leadership positions, recognizing the value of complex high-level skill sets that support social and administrative functioning in departments/units, increasing transparency via a centralized data collection of bias/discrimination reports and resolution, managing bias/discrimination claims outside of departments/units where they occurred, and improving supervisor training on these issues.

### **(2) Childcare**

The most prominent childcare issues included the need for paid maternity/parental leave for all employees, prohibitively high costs and limited availability of childcare, too few and poor quality lactation spaces, difficulty juggling working and caregiving due to irregularity in work schedules that infringed on caring for their child(ren) or dependents, and difficulty managing work/family life balance when work demands extend well beyond a 40-hour work week. Respondents noted that current explicit policies and implicit expectations impact women in negative ways – blunting career trajectories and financially penalizing parents currently and in the future.

Respondents felt the university needed to develop more family/caregiver-friendly policies, including paid maternity/parental leave, develop more childcare sites and subsidize childcare. In addition, respondents noted that those who caregive would benefit from a culture where work hours are predictable and reasonable, where equitable accommodations are made when family members are sick or need care, and where these family/caregiver-friendly policies are enacted in a consistent manner across the university departments/units.

### **(3) Compensation and (4) Promotion**

For both compensation and promotion, respondents felt greater transparency and centralization of these important decisions would increase gender equity. Those who reported concerns about compensation described inequities in pay compared to men in their department/units, and that women needed to work harder and provide more evidence to attempt to achieve parity. Some women accepted resource scarcity as a reason for existing pay inequity and many hoped the current TTC process would address this.

Issues with promotions were also felt to be influenced by current power structures which were not always experienced as equitable across the university. Respondents believed that standardization of supervisor training and job performance review processes for university and academic staff could increase equity in promotions. This analysis highlights core issues experienced as challenges by women across the university.

Respondents provided suggestions for addressing these issues and increasing gender equity at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Many potential solutions were suggested by respondents. Briefly summarized, these often included implementing more family-friendly policies and workplace practices, more resources for those using childcare services, and increasing transparency and using data to guide compensation and promotion decisions.

## INTRODUCTION & METHODS

CWU fielded a series of surveys campus wide to capture the experiences and needs of women faculty, academic and university staff, and postdoc employees at UW-Madison (see Appendix A for the survey). The intent of this survey was to gather data to develop and prioritize the Committee’s efforts toward affecting institutional change within the university to improve gender equity, inclusivity and diversity, and the status of women within the university.

This report builds upon the 2020/2021 CWU Priority Survey Technical Report: Challenges for Women Employees at UW, a quantitative analysis of this same survey, authored by James Yonker and Rosie Bae of the Office of Strategic Diversity, Planning and Research. The key findings of that report are noted below. Please see the report for the details on the sample characteristics:

**This technical report is a summary of responses to Q11, challenges for women employees at UW. Results are presented as a ranked list for the committee with shaded table results from highest (red) to lowest (green) priority.**

### KEY FINDINGS

The table below shows responses to Q11 sorted from highest to lowest priority (% Yes) for the entire sample.

Top Challenges for Women Employees at UW, Ranked High to Low	All Respondents (N=2201)	
	%Yes	Rank
Childcare	72%	1
Compensation	70%	2
Gender Climate	60%	3
Promotion or Advancement	57%	4
Racial Climate	57%	5
Capacity to Breastfeed or Pump	54%	6
Discrimination	51%	7
Workplace Climate	45%	8
Sexual Harassment	45%	8
Hostile, Intimidating Behavior	43%	10
Workload	40%	11
Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor	36%	12
Taking Leave Time	36%	13
Professional Development	34%	14
Job Security	30%	15
Safety	30%	16
Accessibility/ADA	28%	17
Performance Evaluation	23%	18
Other	4%	19

- The overall pattern of results was generally consistent across employee characteristics.
- There were few or no differences by Employee Classification or Appointment Level.
- While there were some noteworthy differences in responses to individual Q11 items by Age, Gender (Sex), Race/Ethnicity, and Caregiving, the pattern of rankings was stable, at least for the top 5 to 8 ranked items.
- There were substantial differences in responses to many individual Q11 items by whether the respondent experienced gender discrimination at UW, but the pattern of rankings was generally the same.

## FREQUENCY ANALYSIS

This report addresses the narrative comments provided by respondents to Question 17: *Would you like to share anything more about top challenges for you and for women in the University? What kinds of changes do you feel would be most helpful?*

To assure the qualitative data better explained the challenges identified in Question 11, we worked as a team to code each individual segment/answer using the categories of top challenges identified in the quantitative analysis. Coding entailed: 1) a close reading of all segments by the entire team, 2) dividing the segments into three sections, 3) each coder coding one segment (1/3 of data) in an excel document to identify which issues were noted in the segment, 4) a recompilation of the segments for a frequency analysis of the categories and co-occurring categories, and 5) a sorting of data into the categories/co-occurring categories and a more fine grained descriptive analysis for the main issues in each category. Each answer could be coded into multiple categories (note the total codes was 1434 while there were 1006 responses). We did both a quantitative frequency analysis of the top challenges and a qualitative analysis of the open-ended answers to Question 17. Issues identified by a few individuals as well as those identified by many individuals were included under the relevant sections and illustrated by quotes from participants.

The frequency analysis of the narrative data below confirms that gender climate is the most prominent issue on campus. In addition, Childcare and Compensation were top challenges survey respondents felt needed to be addressed in more detail in their narrative comments. It is also evident, though not clear from the frequency table, that the combinations and intersections of these issues are primary for women on campus. The narratives highlight structural and personal issues described as interacting to impact women's work experiences and opportunities available to them at UW-Madison. For this reason and for clarity of reporting, the qualitative findings and accompanying recommendations are grouped to include: 1) Gender climate/racial issues only; 2) Childcare issues that co-occur with compensation, promotion and climate issues; 3) Compensation issues and 4) Promotion issues. The following sections describe the essential themes noted in each category and provide exemplars from the data illustrating these key points. Exemplars are in italics and are verbatim from the survey answers; ellipses are occasionally used to shorten quotes.

Challenge	Count	Percent
gender climate	411	40.85%
childcare	240	23.86%
compensation	156	15.51%
promotion/advancement	147	14.61%
racial climate	118	11.73%
workplace climate	75	7.04%
hostile, intimidating behavior	75	7.46%
workload	73	7.26%
capacity to breastfeed	49	4.87%
taking leave time	35	3.48%
sexual harrassment	22	2.19%
Discrimination	17	1.69%
difficult dynamic with supervisor	16	1.59%
Total Codes	1434	

## GENDER CLIMATE

Survey respondents describe circumstances they experienced or that they observed in their units or departments. Many shared specific instances of issues where they: felt unwelcome, unsafe or excluded in the decision-making of their unit/department; experienced ageism, sexism, gender, racial discrimination, or hostile intimidating behavior; felt their expertise and contributions were undervalued and unrewarded by peers and leaders; or felt over-burden with undervalued forms of organizational and “emotional” work that was predominately allocated to women. This was not true of all respondents; some took time to note their currently positive supportive work environments. Given this report was aimed at uncovering concerns that may be addressed by the Committee for Women, problematic situations will be highlighted.

### Unwelcome at work

In instances where respondents felt unwelcome, their work environment was commonly and frequently described as an “old boys club” that did not include them in the community as full participating members, and discounted their voice or expertise (even when they possessed the most expertise on a particular subject). This exclusion or discomfort was often experienced in daily interactions in the department.

*I find the subtle microaggressions to be the most exhausting aspect of my day to day job, for example talking over women in meetings, questioning decisions where they wouldn't with a male.*

Behaviors described included being frequently interrupted at meetings before completing their comments or having one’s ideas discarded only to be affirmed if a male in the room also agreed. Some women also noted that when they did engage in the group conversations and discussions, their style of engaging was critiqued—assertiveness being characterized as aggressiveness, passion being viewed as being excessive emotionality and standing up for oneself as whining.

Respondents also noted they were not invited to or welcome at informal gatherings where department business or networking occurred. This marginalization extended to the informal gatherings at the worksite and outside it. One woman described her discomfort of stumbling upon an informal meeting in a public work area where senior department members were hosting a discussion. In another case a woman noted her discomfort at the “dudebros” culture, where informal networking took place in establishments where alcohol was served and where she could not go due to her religious beliefs. Similarly, they reported not learning of opportunities for advancement or rewards until after they were awarded since the opportunities were not publically shared but decided by a few in positions of power.

### Service work: Undervalued and unrewarded job demands

In addition, many respondents noted that service commitments and “women’s work” or “office housework” (e.g. cleaning up after meetings, note taking, composing emails or lists, organizing, event planning) were disproportionately expected of or assigned to women, and that this work was under- or unvalued in terms of promotion and advancement.

At meetings, women described being assigned note-taking duties even when not in their job descriptions. This quote suggests the view that these skills are inherent to women’s capacities, and while trying to suggest men should also develop these skills, it demonstrates the inherent bias that women are best able to do this work:

*I am in a Senior Engineering position, and I observe every day that women (no matter what their position in the immediate organization) are better able to run meetings and take their own notes (meeting minutes) then distribute and follow-up with action related items beyond the initial call or gathering. Thus the males in the organization expect this extra effort from the females since they also observe the females can accomplish these tasks at a much better success rate than the males. The effort is related to how we communicate as articulate, educated persons. I have been in previous industry positions where everyone, (not just the females) are required to enhance their project related communication abilities. I am presently involved in (4) projects of the UW that collaborate with other agencies and universities all over the world. I suggest the UW require ALL engineers/physicists & project managers to enhance their skill sets through better communication training.*

In instances where there were few women in the department/unit, respondents describe being assigned more committee work to assure that women were represented. For women of color, this demand was often doubled since their expertise was sought by many different groups to again assure representation of diverse voices.

Greater parity within units/departments, at all levels of the university was seen as an essential step toward countering these unwelcoming unit/department cultures, understanding the work/life demands that impact women in their work and valuing the work that they contribute. For example, this respondent noted:

*I am a tenured faculty member, and the thing that would help the most in my department is simply HIRING MORE WOMEN. We have about 25% women in our department, so until that becomes more balanced the issues that disproportionately affect women (childcare, being left out of the dominant "boys club" that dictates informal opportunities and connections, receiving less credit for contributions to the department, bearing more of the "soft" service such as mentoring PhD students and organizing things, etc.) just won't go away because they are invisible to the men in my department.*

As the same time, strengths of strong relational skills serve to create a solid foundation for new forms of scholarship. This respondent suggests that community-engaged scholarship which requires strong relational skills set to nurture collaborations, build community, and create impactful research that serves community needs is undervalued in terms of promotion and advancement:

As a university we need to embrace a broader view of scholarship.

*My observations are that female faculty take on much more service work (which is tied to their content expertise and can be viewed as a scholarly endeavor), put more time and emotional energy into mentorship and leadership roles, and in the end are simply compared to their (male) peers on outdated legacy models of productivity (grants and publications). I believe the work that my female colleagues perform often has a greater social impact than that of their male colleagues, but can frequently fall outside the bounds of "what counts."*

Similarly, academic and university staff noted that jobs held predominately by women are viewed as lower status despite the high-level skill sets required to do them well.

*I see a lot of problems with the classification of positions. Many women are in positions of support at the university that require problem solving, supervision of students, and*

*independent decision-making, but these are positions that are typically classified as being less important and lower paid.*

*The perception that if a woman does the work it doesn't pay as much or the job classification is lower. Looking at TTC across the board the classifications my female colleagues believe they are in were all one above what our male supervisor believes us to be in. The starkest example is my colleague who transitioned male-to-female. Before "he" was in charge of, and managed, "his" program. Now he's a "she" now "she's" just in implementation not management. It is so obvious it is laughable yet the men just look puzzled at us when we point out the discrimination.*

Changing culture was believed to require group buy-in as well as strong leadership. Participants note that many leaders across campus are promoted without sufficient training and knowledge necessary for their new position. Respondents recommended increasing the number of women in leadership positions. For women working in leadership, some noted that there were fewer resources and more paperwork for securing the same support available to their male colleagues. However, more women in leadership positions was not seen as a panacea to improving gender climate in units/departments with several respondents noting that some women currently in positions of power at UW-Madison promote inequality and unfair practices, taking on and sustaining current patriarchal practices.

#### Hostile and Intimidating behavior (HIB)

Of those who shared experiences of hostile and intimidating behavior, reporting HIB was experienced by respondents as a risk to one's career at UW-Madison, and was an experience that often led to no or dissatisfying resolutions. Survey respondents identified a number of issues that impacted their experience of community at UW-Madison and belonging in their units/departments. There were specific units/departments on campus that were named by respondents as particularly problematic. (In two cases, where identifiable information was present in responses, these responses were forwarded to the Office of Compliance for review, and redacted from the data.)

Retaliation that threatened their job security following an HIB report was a real concern by those willing to report the HIBs they experienced:

*Personally, I have found through discussing with Ombudsmen, that the hostile and intimidating behavior exhibited [by] my immediate supervisor while on probation offers no recourse at all without the fear of retribution. I have been told that this is a valid concern. Supervisors know this, and treat those attempting to learn a new position poorly because they can. They wave the flag of failure under your nose until you think it's a futile attempt. This has been my experience, and I have heard similar stories from at least 3 others, men and women. I strongly believe this needs to change.*

*The problems related to bullying are of serious concern to me. I have experienced this myself, and I left two positions here for that reason. Fortunately, I was able to find positions that were more supportive, primarily because I did not report these people and did not particularly need the level of compensation I was earning and could take positions at a lower level but without the negativity . . . When I left one of these positions, I was asked by someone at the highest level of the "area" where I worked why I was leaving. I was very frank about the sort of things that were going on. I was told that everyone knew these*



*things were going on, but the person is someone who is well known among certain segments of the community. I pointed out that I was also well known in the community. My leader agreed with that and said the difference is that you will not talk to the press about it.*

As noted above, HIBs can occur at all levels of the university. Those reporting recognized that some individuals were “untouchable” due to their prominence:

*I feel the greatest obstacle to creating equality is that there are a substantial number of white males in high positions of teaching and/or research that are viewed as "untouchable", both by themselves and by women who do not report harassment because they feel no change would come of it.*

*There are no safe ways to report HIB if the perpetrator is your Dean.*

*My wife works in a dysfunctional UW unit that tolerates bad behavior on a wide scale, but we are at the age where it is hard to pick up and leave to get better jobs. The dean is the main problem, but the people who appoint deans rarely glimpse dysfunction at the level of daily work unless something blows up. The problems at UW are not just, or even primarily, gender related. They are much deeper in how factional politics undermine appointments of good and fair administrators.*

Those who pursued reports sometimes found they were ignored if they did not meet certain criteria:

*I've tried to report hostile behavior multiple times to the dean's office coordinator and been totally ignored since sexuality or race were not involved. Same for other employees I work with who tried reporting to our HR staff. This is a problem. There isn't much recourse if the problem is with HR or your boss, especially if race or sexuality are not involved.*

Several survey respondents noted that they had reported hostile and intimidating behavior they experienced and were dissatisfied with the lack of follow through or resolutions of the circumstances by their departments or the Office of Human Resources. In these severe cases, respondents reported that they were required to continue to work with their harassers:

*My boss did not even know that she had a compulsory requirement to report what had happened to me to Title IX. My boss also repeatedly told me that I was not sexually harassed and it wasn't 'that bad' because I was not physically touched by the colleague who was harassing me. This was beyond hurtful and my boss' reaction increased my stress level largely during that time. For some reference: my colleague was saying things like how he couldn't be around me without masturbating in our work bathroom, telling my other coworkers about how much he wanted to have sex with me, he routinely found odd ways to mention to me that he has a gun, and more. I work late hours in our lab during the season it was occurring and often he and I are the only ones in the lab late into the evening, which increased my safety fears.*

*I work specifically with a hostile white male who constantly belittles the women he is in charge of and works with. Despite reporting his actions to higher officials, no changes have been made. I work in a facility in which I was bullied for being new and from a different area of the country. The people around me talked behind my back and tried to discredit me, and nothing was done to help me or support me in this situation. Women are afraid to speak up and share their thoughts and ideas.*

One respondent astutely noted that **discriminations puts the onus for changing these problems on those with the least power**, those experiencing the discrimination:

*We approach all kinds of bias & discrimination on this campus without asking people with the most privilege to change their behavior. We focus on the people who have the least power in the system and put the onus on them to file complaints, advocate for themselves, etc.*

One respondent suggested that the perpetrators of bias, hostile behavior and discrimination should be the one's targeted with training.

The process and procedures for addressing HIB on campus were not experienced by all respondents as effective and responsive, nor was the reporting process clear. One administrator, interested in supporting his department, was unclear on how to report problems and direct inquires:

*When I was department chair I found the procedures for reporting harassment, discrimination, and climate issues to be opaque and for some situations hard to find. This led to a persistent fear that I could not protect my people and could not advise someone with a complaint on what steps to follow. Anything that could be done to clean this up would be very welcome.*

Another faculty member noted that while trainings were important, the training needed to be implemented in the department to make substantial inroads into cultural change.

*Another thing men in our department did to 'cover their behinds' was have Molly Carnes' bias training group come in TWICE and give us bias training after we complained about gender issues. Of course, they didn't actually engage in the training seriously or seem to care about it. It truly just seemed like something the then-director did so he could cover his own butt. So that if anybody asked, nobody could accuse him of doing nothing. "Hey, I had Molly come in TWICE to train people." But the training was never elaborated upon - they never tried to take the things Molly trained us on and make actual changes. It was just a cover, a going-through-the-motions so they didn't look like they'd ignored us.*

### Intersections of gender and racial climate and other issues

Climate issues were viewed as intersectional with other issues and were amplified in the lives of persons of color and those who were foreign-born. This was thought to be due to a confluence of daily experiences of microaggressions or outright hostility, curtailed opportunities and unfair expectations, and life circumstances that conferred less privilege and support to work the long hours necessary for success. As one respondent noted:

*Constant microaggressions and outright discrimination make our UW workplace harder than it should be. It's difficult to bring our 'whole selves' to work when you see or experience negative climate.*

Another respondent suggested that the only way to survive her hostile work environment as a foreign-born outsider was to seek protection of someone with privilege, behave in a servile manner, or lower her standards to act as a reliable ally/vote. In both these cases, workers could not bring their 'whole selves' and diverse perspectives to benefit their work and workplaces.

While this person recognized that others' intentions in her workplace were not malicious, the climate fell short due to coworkers' lack of insight or sensitivity:

*I am a minority and a woman and my very well-meaning co-workers have made comments that I am sure would make someone in my shoes uncomfortable regarding women's abilities to do a job as well as saying hurtful racial things. Thankfully, I know they're well-meaning and don't realize what they're saying, and I know them. But I can see how someone else would feel uncomfortable.*

Respondents noted that women of color were doubly disadvantaged when working and caregiving, and noted the need for diverse leadership to address these inequities:

*Most women colleagues, but especially those with childcare and family responsibilities are still very disadvantaged on our campus. The lack of understanding for women of color makes the disadvantage even more exacerbated, for single and/or partnered women. Our campus also needs a lot of work in accepting people/women of color in positions of power. Their excellence is often under-emphasized, and when they challenge the status quo or stand up for their rights, they are made to suffer.*

*There are intersectional challenges for BIPOC women who are navigating sexism, racism, classism, etc. in the academy where the work expectation is that we forgo time and energy needed to support our families and communities in order to perform as if we are single, white men with intergenerational financial security with no care-taking responsibilities. People act as if they are giving us grace because we have young children or engage in elder care-taking, but that is not how it plays out in our evaluations.*

How and when assistance is offered, and whether it is "acceptable" to utilize this assistance, appeared to be more complicated for BIPOC individuals. In the quote above, while it appears a reasonable accommodation was given in recognition of caregiving responsibilities, penalties were applied later when the performance evaluation was completed. The underlying assumption being that working beyond 40 hours was expected and possible despite life circumstances or responsibilities. By contrast, this respondent notes that resources may be available but not accessed or accessible by employees fatigued by ongoing daily stressors that include race and gender-based ones.

*It's important to highlight the fact that many of the challenges noted in this survey affect BIPOC women disproportionately and simultaneously. I have witnessed how some of the most capable and hard-working black women are talked down, assumed to be less capable and more, especially by white women in leadership or higher up positions. I also feel that the women that may need this type of help the most are the most exhausted, so as an organization you must invest in ways to reach these women and make it easier for them to ask for help. You cannot stand by with resources, you must make them accessible, you must listen to women and help them understand if they have been wronged, and the gravity of the wrongdoing.*

And in some cases, supervisors unfairly applied flexible work schedules based on racial differences:

*I feel like women of color who have high family commitments are not afforded the same opportunity to have a flexible work schedule than non women of color. I have seen this in two offices. Currently in my office, all white women with school age children have more*

*remote hours than me. I am the other women of color with school age children and I have to "be" there 100% and was told NO when asked for a reduced/alternate work schedule. That's not fair.*

In summary, respondents reflected that their work climate included interactions where unconscious and implicit biases were present as well as overt hostility that was sometimes unchecked or remedied by current HIB reporting and procedures. Some felt that many of these issues were “invisible” to many in their community and that with greater awareness the campus communities would work toward improving climate for women and BIPOC individuals. They felt issues could be addressed by the assessment and intentional creation of metrics to examine inequities and disparities in service and assignment of duties; and by training of faculty/staff and unit/department leaders in unconscious and implicit bias, diversity, equity and inclusion, gender and LGBTQ sensitivity, sexual harassment, HIB; and equitable management practices. And, several suggested that diverse leadership is necessary to work toward remedying these workplace issues. As this respondent notes such work will require intentional institutional change:

*I think one of the primary challenges in making meaningful institutional change is that it requires dismantling the status quo. It's not possible to disentangle patriarchy from white supremacy from colonialism from the normative academic culture of higher ed. If we really want women, and people of all genders, to be safe and respected and to thrive in this environment, that will require bigger shifts than most people - especially administrators - will be comfortable with. We need systems that are trauma-responsive, accessible, decolonial, racially just, and equitable. Which means we need to shift the whole culture of this campus - and its use of resources - to one that values people, especially vulnerable people, more than the current image of itself as academically competitive, sports-driven, and alcohol-centric.*

The following list includes respondents’ suggestions to improve gender and racial climate.

#### Respondents’ Recommendations

1. Design and use metrics to gather data to identify inequities in service work (mentoring, committee and organizational work) in the unit/department by gender as well as intersectionality of gender/first-gen/BIOPIC/social class;
2. Continue to intentional increase gender balance in units/departments with disproportionate ratios, attending to hiring and tenure review practices This includes reviewing departments who have a record of denying tenure to or have lower salaries for women and minorities;
3. Increase women and BIPOC leadership across the university;
4. Increase ease of reporting bias, harassment and intimidating behaviors;
5. Centralize collection, transparency and auditing of reports of bias, racism and hostile and intimidating behavior especially in cases of repeated offenses, consider using CASIs as clearinghouses for these reports;
6. Transfer responsibility for management and outcome of workplace bias and HIB reports outside units/departments where they occur;
7. Develop systematic training for all supervisors to assist them in understanding “invisible” and visible unit/department cultures that are unwelcoming and allow them to respond with

appropriate actions to manage group dynamics and norms for interactions in meetings, implicit bias, and conflict resolution;

8. Increase awareness of these issues among employees, especially perpetrators of sexual harassment, bias and HIB;
9. Provide resources and training for women on workplace dynamics, and handling confrontation;
10. Add a mediation step to HIB process in addition to the professional investigator;
11. Examine and address gender and BIPOC bias in teaching evaluation process;
12. Post blind applications for open positions to reduce cronyism and age-bias;
13. Do exit interviews when workers leave their units/departments in internal transfers or when leaving the university to identify gender climate and other issues;
14. Prioritize and value diversity in visible and meaningful ways to create cultural change on campus;
15. Develop proactive messaging and outreach that advertises resources and programs supporting BIPOC individuals and assure that accommodations are provided without penalty; and
16. Have departments develop action plans for addressing issues when identified.

## INTERSECTIONS OF CHILDCARE, PROMOTION, COMPENSATION AND GENDER CLIMATE

These issues were frequently addressed in combination in many respondents' narrative responses. Prominent issues included: the need for maternity leave and a policy that allows all employees to take leave; controversies on tenure clock-extensions and gender; prohibitively high costs and limited availability of childcare; juggling working and caregiving (irregularity in work schedules, meetings during lunch, infringement on daycare pick up/drop off times; covering school days off, sick childcare); and managing work/family life balance when work demands exceed typical time demands.

Twenty percent of all comments by respondents addressed childcare issues. About half of those addressed childcare issues only and the remainder were combined with comments that included breast-feeding, gender climate, compensation and promotion issues.

### Maternity/Parental/Caregiving Leave

Respondents note that maternity leave policies vary by employment category and were inconsistent within categories and across supervisors. The lack of paid leave surprised many new employees who could not believe a progressive institution such as UW-Madison lagged behind others in this regard.

*The one thing that is missing for me is a policy that supports new mothers. From my perspective, UW should be leading the way for progressive parental leave. We know that countries who offer paid parental leave for families have better outcomes for women. This policy should support both mothers and fathers because that's good for women (and babies and fathers). I've noticed we've fallen behind other large organizations within our country. For example, Target, Google, and Apple all have fantastic parental leave. More locally, the City of Madison offers six weeks paid to both mothers and fathers (separate from vacation and sick leave) and American Family Insurance offers eight weeks for new mothers. Any strategy to support women in the workplace that does not advocate for better parental leave is missing a huge part of why women are discriminated against in the workplace. Thus, I strongly encourage you to consider adding this to your strategy.*

Once the current policy was made clear, tenure track employees try to work within the current system that requires banking of six weeks of sick leave in lieu of paid maternity leave. This banking of sick leave however penalized new employees and constrained family planning or discouraged employees from having children. Choices to become or not become a parent were described as being based on the available benefits that often delayed or served as a barrier to parenthood. In answer to our question this person replied:

*MATERNITY LEAVE! The fact that the university does not have paid maternity leave is not only unacceptable, but it's embarrassing. I know that we can use sick time for this - I'm grateful for that. But it takes YEARS to build a bank of sick time that would meet the MINIMUM guidelines for maternity leave. If people want to have children 2-3 years apart it means unpaid or shortened maternity leave. This leads to stress and in many cases alternative employment . . . . I am the sole earner in my family and it's not an option to go without income.*

*The lack of dedicated, paid parental leave is very damaging to people who give birth/adopt. Currently, UW-Madison requires you to use all of your leave time before using income*

*continuation or short-term disability, including your sick hours. In retirement, these sick hours translate to health insurance, which means anyone who takes parental leave after giving birth/adopting during their career at UW-Madison retires with much less of that benefit than those who do not need to take that leave, which seems to be clear discrimination on a financial level. On an emotional and physical level, having no sick leave with a newborn or young child is unsustainable and contributes to the emotional and physical stress/illness of the parent and child, as well as the risk of bringing illness into the workplace because they cannot take time off when they themselves are sick, instead saving what little they have to care for their children.*

Some groups of employees turn to FLMA and WFLMA, but this did not always work when clear policies were not in place and supervisors had discretion to allow or not allow leave.

*At the very least we need consistent and supportive policies for parental and family leave along with more visible resources and better trained HR reps. My experience with parental leave was a mess and my HR rep didn't really know how to help me since I was FLMA and WFMLA ineligible because I was on a fellowship. I had to negotiate it with my PI and he didn't seem to care to follow what we agreed on when it didn't suit him. I felt wholly unsupported. I think if a firm policy was in place, my PI would have followed it and not just blown it off as something so ridiculous I was requesting on my own.*

Respondents noted the need for a *consistent* paid maternity leave policy that addressed all categories of employees. Having a consistent policy that allowed equity across categories was viewed as essential.

#### Tenure extensions for birth/adoption of a child

Tenure extensions were controversial among some respondents. For example this individual notes that in their experience that these extensions negatively impact women's career trajectories:

*For female faculty, I have learned about the differential treatment of tenure clock extension for parenthood compared to male faculty. This, of course, doesn't happen in each and every department, but it happens often enough to merit attention. Female faculty are often punished for choosing to be mothers, despite UW policy. I think the University should have parental leave and teaching release policy for female faculty. I also think the tenure clock extensions should be different for female and male faculty for parenthood.*

Some commented that "equal" parental leave did not provide equal benefit for both parents:

*As a dual-career couple (written by a male), I do see, and understand many of these issues: as one example, parental leave (e.g., tenure clock stoppages), which go to both partners equally have ended up helping men on the TT more than women." And another noted, "Stopping the tenure clock for men with infants does nothing to equalize things when women are up all night nursing and men are using the time to publish. This matters especially for untenured professors. After tenure it is of no consequence.*

One person noted that these clock-stoppages extended the time when women were paid lower wages, making them more vulnerable and insecure in their positions for a longer time, counter to what would be desirable in terms of compensation and career advancement.

### Lactation spaces

The quality and ability to schedule lactation spaces was described as problematic by a number of respondents. In some cases the spaces were not felt to be hygienic or sufficiently private (old shower stalls that did not lock) and in other cases the lack of a published schedule made it difficult to accommodate multiple users. This was more challenging when meeting in buildings outside of one's assigned office. As told by respondents:

*I have been on campus in buildings that I don't usually work in and had to try to find places to pump and figure out if there was a pumping schedule for those rooms. In the building I currently work in, the pump room is an old shower in the basement, and there's no signage or schedule.*

*I think there needs to be a mother's room for women who have decided to pump at work in all buildings. I work at 21 N. Park and the "nursing room" is the room where there is a shower that's it. There's a shower and a bench. For anyone who has had to pump at work, when there is a secure, comfortable space to pump, they are more successful and are less stressed (an important part to successful pumping/ breastfeeding). Since so many employees have a cubicle and not an office, I think an actual space with a comfortable chair, a refrigerator, accessible to an outlet, etc. would go a long way in supporting working moms who have decided to pump upon returning to work.*

Having accessible shared information for lactating mothers was felt to be one option to address some of these issues, as well as the creation of more hygienic secure spaces across all campus buildings.

### Costs of securing reliable high quality childcare

The cost and ability to secure high quality childcare was a major issue for respondents. This represents an intersection between issues of compensation, caring and career advancement. Childcare costs were often the highest or second highest expense for families after their housing and thus the level of compensation was critical to what remained of the family resources and whether employees chose to continue to work at UW-Madison.

*It costs more to send a child to on-campus daycare than it does to send them to college here... and law school!!! It is over \$500 per WEEK for infant care and when pressed, the [Childcare provider] responds that this is the true cost of high quality care (I don't disagree, but it should be subsidized) . . . I have been told that the waitlist is over 100 families long, as if the fact that there is a clear shortage means I am not permitted to point out the insanity of charging over \$2000 per month for childcare. I often think of quitting my job to stay home because the childcare expense and stress is too much to bear. The majority of my take-home pay is used to pay childcare expenses, which come to about \$30,000 per year for our family.*

*I work in the [redacted] building, so I was very excited at the thought of having my child be cared for at the [childcare] next door. I would be nearby and could easily breastfeed during the day and not have to deal with pumping/milk storage. However, the [childcare center] is \$24,225 per year for an infant, which is HALF of my \$50,000 salary. . . . Employees at UW should either have access to good quality childcare that does not cost HALF OF THEIR SALARY, or get paid WAY MORE than they currently do.*



*Older generations and those without kids have no comprehension of the cost of childcare and actually think I'm greedy when it comes to compensation.*

This is also challenging for those on 9-month appointments who must self-fund their summers and at the same time provide care for their children. While 9-month appointments suggest the worker is off, summers are rarely used as vacations for these university faculty who work to be productive in research and publications.

There are emotional costs as well. Just managing to secure childcare can be a major time-intensive task. This respondent shares the big picture of how these issues intersect and impact their family which they note has resources and privileges not available to many.

*Planning for, finding, applying, securing placement, navigating changes, reviewing and vetting providers, interviewing, visiting childcare sites, finding gap coverage, etc. consumes incredible amounts of personal time, consistently causes high stress, and takes a high emotional and mental toll. Our family -- otherwise physically healthy -- has had to seek out (and pay) for counseling services to help recover from emotional and mental damage caused by childcare issues. On top of all this, the childcare itself can represent the highest monthly cost for a family (it is in ours -- double our mortgage), which compounds many of the above stressors. My partner and I are lucky that our employment units and direct supervisors have demonstrated compassion and support as we navigate parenthood (and childcare distractions/needs). But at the institutional level the University has scant support for this critical issue, which undoubtedly hurts productivity of its workers. Wait lists for on-campus care facilities are, at least by reputation, long enough to discourage applicants whose child is already born. Yes, the ability to tax-shelter the first \$5k of childcare costs in state benefits is helpful, but this advantage is likely disproportionately distributed to advantaged families -- it is not easy to navigate all the rules and reporting required to obtain that benefit. Our family would find that benefit to be more useful if expanded to \$30k per year. University policy directives for flexible schedules or accommodations for parents are not clear, nonexistent, or not advertised, and academic culture in general shuns parenting duties and lacks a realistic understanding of what (truncated by survey).*

It appears that the high costs of caregiving allow only the most financially secure single-income earner families or dual earner income families to afford childcare without creating financial insecurity when children are in daycare.

### Balancing Working and Caring

There were many different situations that respondents found created difficulties when working at UW-Madison while at the same time caring for young or dependent children. These included maintaining a regular schedule to accommodate childcare drop off/pickup or school schedules; being able to choose a reduced workload for these same reasons; flexible schedules or other options to accommodate care and especially sick childcare; having time outside regular work hours for family activities; and having or not having opportunities depending upon supervisors' attitudes and assignment of duties based on parenthood status.

In some cases, respondents simply wanted to have regular predictable hours that allowed them to manage pick up and drop off times for children at day care or school. However, not being able to work beyond regular hours and thus miss key meetings could threaten others' views of their

commitment and in turn their career advancement. For example these two quotes note the challenge and then the implications of these meetings for parents:

*Meetings continue to be scheduled/proposed at times that are incompatible with childcare.*

*Policies that discourage required meetings after 4 pm so that parents aren't left with the choice of missing a key meeting or paying for extra child care.*

When there are regular or even irregular expectations to attend meetings before or after agreed upon work hours, parents are left in a quandary as to how to meet their children's needs while still being seen as a committed employee. In addition these meetings, when scheduled after work hours, can require that the parent pay for additional childcare.

Several employees noted that they sought flexibility in their work schedules, while either keeping the same workload or reducing it, to allow them to care for their children. One supervisor noted that the move to part-time impacts women's career trajectories and earnings over a lifetime, and desired the provision of mentorship options to allow these women to continue to work full time rather than lose out. Part-time opportunities when desired were seen as hard to find or develop in one's current position.

The universities policy (or lack there of) on flexible work schedules has been frustrating. I have a supervisor who can't fathom why someone would want a condensed workweek (I am the only parent in the office). I was told the only way I could have a flex schedule was if I took a pay cut by 20%. That wasn't feasible, and she knew it, so I have continued to work full-time.

*It is extremely difficult to find good, part-time work within the university. So many women are balancing family needs with work life, and many have advanced degrees that equip them for high-level work--yet almost all positions advertised are 100% FTE, which I think excludes many from even applying (my own ideal workload is 60-80% FTE). Also, because it's Madison, and so many people possess advanced degrees, competition is stiff, and job security is low: there is always someone else ready to "step up" and take over one's position (for instance, I know that one position I held on campus had 60 applicants at the time I applied). I believe that this creates pressure to put up with higher workloads and unpleasant circumstances rather than being perceived as "difficult" or "unemployable." (And I recognize that these are pressures that women through time have experienced, as have other minorities.)*

In some cases, women were willing to take unpaid leave to better manage their combined work and caring demands, yet they found this difficult to get approved through their supervisors or HR. For example, one respondent noted: "Unpaid leave is incredibly difficult. My HR coordinator was not well informed." This tenure track professor was willing to take unpaid teaching leave to meet the productivity demands for tenure, and still found this option arduous to secure:

*The most difficult thing for me is figuring out how to do what's expected of me as a faculty member while I raise my three spirited young children. I think the process of taking a teaching leave (without pay) while a probationary faculty member should be streamlined. While it is helpful to receive a full salary, the commodity I am most desperately in need of is time. One semester I took an unpaid teaching leave, but doing so involved a lot of paperwork/permissions, and I'm hesitant to ask for this again, however much I need it.*

In cases where supervisor's enactment of sick leave and family leave policies were responsive, employees felt supported; in instances where the process was arduous or believed to be unsupported by others, respondents struggled.

### Work/family Balance

As foreshadowed above, respondents often noted that in these intersections of work and family life they either felt supported or not supported depending upon their workload, flexibility of scheduled hours and supervisor expectations and decisions. In some instances, respondents noted that supervisors expected their work would continue outside of work hours and on weekends.

*I do more work than what I'm paid for and it takes excessive time away from my family."*

This time demand beyond the workday was often seen as an intrusion on family life. And for some, the inability or unwillingness to forgo caregiving and family time was a risk to their career:

*I am unable to maintain a work-life balance. I am working as a postdoc and taking care of my child when I am not working. My boss does not understand that I am an essential employee at home and that I can not commit as many hours to research and night-time or weekend flexibility as others in my group. I am afraid to ask for a vacation. My boss has told me he is evaluating me every few months and then [will] decide if my employment can extend beyond 6 months. I have no job security. My boss has all the power on my compensation, job security, benefits, visa, and vacation time.*

Some respondents with children reported being given fewer opportunities and fewer responsibilities by their supervisors. In some cases this was welcome and appreciated, however others saw this as curtailing their career trajectory and desired opportunities for career advancement. Here are three perspectives:

*Women are expected to work like they have no kids and expected to take care of kids like they have no work/job.*

*I am a single parent and have found very little support from my department - for example my boss recently expressed complete surprise that I am also trying to homeschool my young child during COVID. I felt very unsupported and it spoke again to the privilege men in power have to be oblivious to the circumstances mothers and all parents have right now.*

*The gender related issues I have experienced are less overt, but implicit. If you are a woman, it's expected that you'll be more cooperative and take on more work. If you are a woman without children, it's assumed that you have few challenges in managing the workload.*

Balancing work and caring for children is even more challenging when a child is sick and thus excluded from daycare or school because of their illness. This is workable when there were options or supervisors were amenable to flexible work.

*The ability to work flexibly, work from home, and bring children to the office when needed, were absolutely essential to both of us being able to keep working as teachers and academic staff during [and] before our children started in public schools. However acceptance of this reality varied from supervisor-to-supervisor and unit-to-unit. The costs of raising children in today's economy, and the rigidity of childcare providers in terms of*

*hours and pick up times simply cannot be met without empathy and forbearance by employers.*

Given that the current policy does not allow children with communicable diseases to be brought to campus (see State of Wisconsin DHS chart for communicable disease <https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/publications/p4/p44397.pdf>), this presents a quandary for individuals who must be on campus and do not have back up childcare for even a mildly sick child who has one of these conditions which include many common illnesses.

As this respondent notes, after giving birth to a child and using their sick leave for maternity leave, if the child or parent becomes sick, there are few or no options. And also, they note that the resulting reduction in sick leave impacts their future financial health in retirement (when accrued sick leave can be used for healthcare premiums):

*It is for me, as I imagine for all working women who have children, a huge challenge to balance demands at work with demands at home. I don't have enough leave (vacation + sick) to take off all of the days that my children have off from school/day care, without even beginning to think about summer or if kids get sick or need to go to the doctor, etc. And UW has a generous leave policy for academic staff! But, and this is a big but, I had to use all of my vacation, all of my sick, and still take unpaid leave in order to have a 3-month paid maternity leave. So, I had to start accruing sick leave from scratch again. This is just wrong. Not only does it hurt me, my family, and my workplace in the short term (how can I take time off if I get sick?), but it unfairly disadvantages women from being able to add up sick leave for later use for a family member (even though they are most likely to be the primary caretakers whenever anyone gets sick) or if they should get seriously sick themselves. Plus, we end up with a smaller balance at the end of our careers, which again hurts us. Perhaps I feel this more acutely as the primary income earner of my family, but it is shameful on every level. A paid maternity leave should be standard. It will benefit everyone.*

#### Respondents' Recommendations

1. Develop a university-wide policy of paid maternity leave that covers all employees;
2. Develop a maternity leave policy that does not penalize women by reducing their sick leave;
3. (Re)consider the impact of maternity leave on compensation and career trajectories of women;
4. Develop consistent and supportive parental/family leave policies to guide HR's and supervisors' actions and facilitation of these benefits;
5. Consider differential birth/adoption tenure extensions for mothers and fathers to increase equity for women or the primary caregiver;
6. Improve the quality and privacy of lactation spaces, develop better signage and schedules to coordinate space usage;
7. Create a community for women/parents to share lactation resources;
8. Subsidize/reduce costs of on-campus childcare to be affordable given employee salaries;
9. Allow for less than full-time enrollment (e.g. summers) in childcare to reduce costs;
10. Expand the tax-shelter for childcare costs to \$30,000 per year;

11. Provide institutional support for parents including assistance in finding and securing childcare, gap childcare, and time off to address unexpected emergent needs;
12. Develop an explicit university policy that encourages flexible work schedules, FTE changes, and offsite work, that is handled more centrally, at the department/school level and with an appeals process;
13. Streamline procedures for parents requesting unpaid leave or unpaid teaching leave;
14. Consider a task driven assessment of performance--valuing productivity over time spent at work;
15. Limit scheduling of unit/department meetings to regular predictable hours within the full-time 8 hour day;
16. Set guidelines/expectations that parents are not required or penalized for being unable to attend meetings, social or special events outside of regular work hours especially when this may require paying for additional childcare;
17. Shift supervisors' expectations from valuing overwork to respecting work/life balance;
18. Establish policies that assure all employees who are parents have opportunities for advancement (e.g. choose to travel, or take on additional responsibilities) rather than assuming they are not available or interested; and
19. Increase benefits to include childcare stipends, tuition remission and college savings accounts.

## COMPENSATION

A total of 11% of all responses addressed compensation; of that subset about one-third focused on compensation alone (N=41) and the rest considered it in combination with issues of gender climate and promotion (N=71). Achieving gender equity in compensation, according to respondents, required also addressing the institutional culture of UW-Madison. High achievement and productivity are valued, which often requires working beyond a 40 hour week and having the resources needed.

*We are paid less, work harder, and are less recognized for our achievements than male employees at UW Madison. Our networks don't overlap with men, so it forms a kind of gendered "ghetto". And this continues into our personal lives where we take on care-giving, community service, and defer to the needs of others. For those of us who fall into other categories of oppression - the young, the old, people of other races, cultures, or gender expression, it is more challenging. Worse, many of us have internalized this oppression and replicate it.*

*Women need to be treated and paid equally and fairly. I think women still feel like they can't have personal lives and work - we need to create a better work/life balance. I once saw a saying that is very true: Women are expected to work like they have no kids and expected to take care of kids like they have no work/job. I think this why women are unpaid compared to men - they are viewed as not being as committed to the job as men because they may have a family to take care of.*

Some suggest that universities including UW-Madison have pay structures that are low in comparison to the private sector and unfair to women and minorities:

*I am troubled by the low pay - I am still slightly below 80% of my total compensation in the private sector in 2011 (88% of my actual salary back then). I value the benefits of working at UW but I am troubled by the disparity, and I wonder if at some point in the future it will not reflect well.*

*Higher ed is notorious for underpaying women compared to their male counterparts. Equal pay is critical as this affects everything from lifetime earnings to pension value, social security benefits, etc. Gender wage gaps have been documented at Princeton, Arizona, UConn and many other institutions where pay discrimination is happening:*

*<https://www.usatoday.com/story/college/2017/03/08/theres-a-double-gender-gap-in-higher-education-and-heres-why/37428139/> and <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/02/15/gender-pay-gap-persists-higher-education-administrators>*

*A former co-worker took the publicly available salaries of Academic Staff employees and conducted a statistical analysis to confirm that women and minorities are not adequately compensated at UW compared to white males. I wish I had the data or that someone would publish it.*

Respondents were able to find data about salary differences between them and male peers and described their personal experiences of pay inequities at UW-Madison and their dissatisfaction at not being able to achieve parity:

*I get paid less than all the males in my department that do the same task. This has been historically true for other females in my office. I am have more experience in my job and*

*have more education in my field but I have been told that for various reasons I am not at the same level as these other males are at.*

*Many of us, myself included, do not make as much as our male counterparts. I have been told I am making as much as others in my position within the UW. However, when the average salary for those in my position (scientist) is calculated, it melds women and men! I'd be absolutely stunned if the average salary for women scientists vs. men is similar. I have also been told by department business administrator that I am being compensated at the top of my level. That's not true, but I am being told this as a way to placate me. My "best interests" and concern for my development are not rated as highly as those of men.*

*I have worked as a 75% academic staff appointment for 8 years at UW after having a 10 years work experience in my field. There are 5 of us around campus who fill the exact same role. I am the only woman out of the 5 of my peers. All of us have the same post graduate degree and similar years experience. I have been paid at anywhere from 50%-75% of my male peers. My supervisor has pushed every year for me to be matched to their salaries, but it never has happened at the move further and further away. I realize we are all in different departments but I am part of a department that historically has paid higher than other departments on campus. It is extremely frustrating.*

*I would like to see a systematic study of women's salaries vs. men's salaries. I was hired in ABD, and paid less than a male colleague in the same position with a BS. The women I speak with on campus, regardless of career track, often talk about salary differences often explained away by leadership as "he negotiated better," or "he's a superstar" when publication records and grantsmanship are comparable.*

Achieving equitable salaries appeared to be even more difficulty for marginalized employees who had to provide additional documentation and reports to even be considered for raises:

*It's deplorable how men in my office are given raises, while I have to submit reports and justification for one for myself. I have been harassed for what I wear in ways that doesn't apply to men, had ethnically charged commentary on what I look like, smell like, and talk like, and have been passed over for opportunities to progress in my office. The harassment comes from women in leadership roles as well. The bias is ingrained and deeply perpetuated. I'm exhausted from it, I honestly don't see it as a priority at UW for women, trans, and non-binary individuals to be supported, valued, and able to fully contribute their talents to their respective roles at UW.*

Resource scarcity influenced women's approach to pay parity. One respondent found success in increasing her salary, which was accompanied by guilt, and another accepted scarcity as a reason to not pursue pay equity. Greater success of incoming employees in negotiating salaries led to inversion and compression of the salary structure, with newer employees making the same or more than current employees with years of experience.

*In this context of resource scarcity it is difficult for us to advocate for greater compensation on par with men in our units. I have successfully done so, but now experience a lot of guilt that I am earning so much more than others in my department.*

*I feel that women are not compensated or provided profession development opportunities equivalent to their male colleagues. If compensation can not be offered due to restrictions, perhaps profession development opportunities could be offered.*

*I have worked at the University for 20 years and new hires are getting paid close to or more than what I make. There seems to be no benefit for the employee who remains a loyal employee. More turnover costs the University more money. Women, single mothers in particular, are tied to their University job due to health care and benefits and fall behind peers in salary compensation due to lack of promotion opportunities and substantial merit raises.*

Multiple respondents described that when they pursued pay equity it required they personally develop justifications for raises that others did not have to complete, rather being generated via the performance evaluations system. Few were successful in obtaining pay equity. Supervisors were key to whether an effort was made to create or not create parity. This supervisor was unable to create pay parity for a supervisee, despite their best efforts.

*Last year I learned that a male employee with less experience and a lower ranking than two of the women I supervise was making about 15-20% more than they were. (He's in a different unit in the same Department.) I've been working to rectify it through gradual pay increases of 10%/year until they're more comparable; however, at the same time he got a promotion to their same level, along with a 10% raise, so we're back where we started in terms of salary inequity. So much is supervisor dependent, with little attention to equity issues. And, I think, in general white male employees are more highly valued, even in areas where we have strong women administrators. Someone needs to be looking at the big picture in terms of race and gender.*

*A male colleague that does [the] same job, but has less job experience and education than me gets paid about \$10,000 more than me. I have communicated this inequity to my supervisor for about a year now, but he keeps "kicking the can." What's most frustrating is that other colleagues in the department have been given promotions and raises.*

*The performance evaluation system is impossible to navigate. Every time I get a new supervisor, I start over, and the new supervisors have no access to prior evaluations. The entire system is too complicated. I think simplifying it should be a top priority.*

*I believe in my department, I am doing the same/similar job to my male counterparts, but they are being compensated salary-wise, much better than I. I have repeatedly asked and shown figures why I should be given an increase in salary and continually denied. I don't know if that has to do with the fact that I am a female or a minority, but recently found out that a caucasian co-worker received an increase in salary last year, but has worked at UW for less time than I have. I am the only minority on my staff. My supervisor seems threatened by strong females.*

A number of categories of employees noted they were less likely get raises: those in lower status position, part-time or hourly positions, and those in “dead-end” positions without opportunities for advancement.

Many hoped that the current TTC project would address the pay inequities and offer opportunities for advancement but not all were satisfied with how their jobs were being classified and felt that gender bias continued to influence job classifications and in turn pay equity.

*[After reforming the performance evaluation system,] the next priority should be the gender discrimination in compensation. The new TTC is almost designed to maintain the income*



*disparity because it will be based on "market" comparisons that will almost surely reflect current discrimination practices.*

*Women's compensation packages are generally smaller and it seems to take longer for promotions to occur. I am hopeful the Title & Compensation Study will help with this.*

Not only was pay equity an issue, but recognition and appreciation for the work that women performed was lacking for employees who make substantial contributions to the university mission:

*Department administrators have huge responsibility, but are underpaid, their staff is often skeletal, and they are expected to guide chairs and faculty through difficult administrative matters. Too often they are not appreciated and belittled. Department support staff, again often women, are also treated poorly by faculty and under-rewarded by our title and pay structure. These jobs keep the university moving forward, and allow faculty to focus on their teaching, research and service responsibilities. Too often the importance of these positions, predominantly filled by women, is minimized and even ridiculed. The staff and the positions are often thought to be disposable. Any kind of support for these positions would be valuable. Publicizing their importance and key role in the functioning of the university would be helpful, especially from faculty allies.*

Respondents provided a number of suggestions for addressing these compensation issues.

#### Respondents' Recommendations

1. New Employee workshops for female academic staff on negotiating promotion and salary, including topics specific for part-time employee;
2. Assess pay equity across titles using multiple indicators (gender, race/ethnicity, gender & race/ethnicity, years of service, education level) in each unit/department to identify inequities;
3. Increase transparency of data examining pay equity, justifications for pay, and promotions;
4. Absolute pay equity with the same pay for same titles across SMPH;
5. Transparency in compensation, objective reviews, transparency/objectivity in promotion & all processes such as assignment of students/residents;
6. Centralize the review of pay equity-- campus OHR should be more proactive in addressing gender inequity in pay (They leave it up to schools/colleges/departments - some are good about ensuring pay equity but some are not);
7. Provide mandatory training to all high level UW leadership roles to reduce negative bias towards women with strong voices who are amazing leaders and who are often set aside solely because of gender; and
8. Have performance evaluations include an ally's voice, or a colleague's. More perspectives instead of just the one supervisor (who most likely has no management training), evals are too subjective and not objective.

## PROMOTION

As in previous sections, some responses described issues with just promotion (39% of all comments coded as addressing promotion) whereas other responses included promotion and other issues such as gender climate (~50% of total comments on promotion), childcare (~5%) and breastfeeding (.3%).

Promotion decisions are made by supervisors or colleagues at the university and are influenced by the local and overall university culture. The process and data used to make these decisions is important to the integrity of the process. Respondents commented on how they experienced these when they sought promotions.

A lack of reflection by the group on the gender balance, as well as concentration of power among men was viewed as critical to imbalances in department make up or leadership on grants. Without seeing this as problematic, this respondent suggests change will not happen.

*In the medical school, at least, tenure track positions (not CT or CHS) appear to be robustly dominated by men; I don't think the same is true for clinical care positions. In my own department, over the last several (8) years, no women have been hired on the tenure track but 6 men have been. The department has 17 tenured faculty who are men and 4 women. Although a ratio like this could certainly happen by chance, my experience in the department for nearly 20 years, first as a student and then as academic staff, suggests otherwise. I don't believe this gender exclusion is done with intent or with malice, but when one group has such an impressive concentration of power, it serves to both normalize and perpetuate the power dynamic. I respect (professionally) and like (personally) my colleagues and in no way do I feel that the men in these coveted positions are undeserving of their roles. I do find it amazing, though, that these bright, sensitive men never look around and say, 'Hey, wait a minute, this is just creepy'. I imagined that as the older male faculty were replaced by younger, this would happen, but it seems it's not the simple. A watershed will never come without a thoughtful consideration of the medical school's values and an assessment of whether or not it really cares about promoting women. Even if, at the highest levels of leadership, UW cares about this issue, that value set doesn't seem to trickle down to the people who make the decisions about hiring and promotion. Any assessment of the problem, though, has to go beyond developing yet another committee of a few female faculty who feel fully enfranchised and who are invested, likely without realizing it, in maintaining the status quo.*

*Cannot get promoted or into a leadership role, despite success and service. There are certain roles for "women" and others for men. Just had a 3-week prep for a grant submission for the UW and then at 3rd session, was announced that a male would be the PI, even though much of the contribution in thinking and innovating came from women in the sessions.*

In a variety of circumstances, some women felt there were no real pathways to promotion for available to them. This could be due to the “bar” being much higher for women, because there were no advancement opportunities from their current position or because language skills were required.

*Expectations placed on women often are higher than they are on men, yet their contributions often are valued less. Women feel the need to be superstars . . . The HR structure at UW-Madison doesn't enable any career advancement after a certain point, and productivity is valued more than professional development. Professional development is viewed as filling gaps in skills/capabilities for doing an employee's existing job, not in enabling her to gain new skills to move up in the ranks.*

*I've watched women who have US [university staff] positions constantly be told they can't do more by supervisors and then I watch the 'games begin'. They'll apply for positions and be turned down, rather than be given additional training. Maybe they can't do the work (I can't say), but I watch it demoralize them. I think AS [Academic staff] have more opportunity than US, and I'd like to see more assistance in prof dev. for US.*

*Still glass ceiling exists in departmental positions. No clear pathway for promotion to leadership jobs. Most filled by men in my division.*

*The new TTC will change position descriptions and many of those descriptions funnel women into "like" positions and offer little room for advancement. Creating many silos for women and difficult for advancement and clear direction for women to move forward on this campus.*

*It's impossible to move beyond being classified staff. You can't be considered for an unclassified position unless you already are. It's frustrating to know that those doors are closed, regardless of ability. I have worked with very ineffective people in well-paid unclassified roles who, due to their inability to do the job correctly and well, push work off onto others, myself included. Beyond frustrating that there's no recourse. How can a person advance???*

*[Language is my challenge! And I think it might be the same for many women who work and would like to improve and have a better job! I know that it's essential to learn English to be able to aspire to a better position but there is a saying 'practice and experience makes the perfect teacher' and it's possible that there might be places within the university that would be 50/50, well that is my opinion. Thank you.] (Translated)*

In some case, women noted that men were promoted with greater ease; not requiring submission of any additional documentation on their performance.

*I have no way of proving it, but it seems that men are promoted with more frequency and ease than women. After 2 years, I had to beg for a 3% raise, while my male counterpart received a larger raise after a year without asking.*

It was often unclear what specific credentials, experience or performance criteria were used to determine who would or would not receive promotions. These were more difficult for first-generation or diverse individuals to discern and work to address. In some cases the information is obtuse or held close by those in positions of power.

*My challenges have been based on cultural and age-bias I think. I can say I have experienced this as a person who happens to be a woman. The cultural bias is related to my being a first-gen college grad, not understanding or having the natural professional connections a person would if their parents were professional already, and the age-bias related to my finishing college and tech school later in life and not looking like a lot of other*

*individuals in my field. I also feel a challenge in the University environment competing for a promotion with others where credentials mean more than experience. I don't feel the years I have given to UW-Madison have as much value as the credentials others have coming in as newer staff.*

*I am not a woman. I served on a tenure committee for a junior faculty that was non-renewed that broke my trust with the faculty in my department. I was appalled to hear the Department Chair state that the junior faculty member was uncollegial because she would not have coffee with him. I was called the chair's statement and actions against this junior faculty member into questions. As a result, I am now have been marginalized in my department. My colleague (women) and me (POC) voted to support her. The junior faculty member had outperformed all senior faculty members in grants received and publications. She earned her place as a UW faculty member and was unjustly, in my opinion, non-renewed.*

*Decisions are made behind closed doors with very limited communication. Leaders and influencers believe communication is good because they themselves know what is going on, but they ignore requests from outsiders for better communication. The unit often ignores its own and university codified procedures, rules, and processes without warning, with explanations of "that is not what we do here" or "we don't actually do that." There is no enforcement of policies and codified rules at the university level, leaving a system where power determines outcomes, with attributes of merit often described in vague terms so just about any outcome can be assessed as either positive or negative. Hiring guidance from department chairs typically includes the directive to reach out to professional networks and contact faculty who you know to see who might be interested instead of making an effort to search broadly for people with new ideas, different life experiences, and backgrounds. Codified professional guidance is purposely vague to avoid "constraining options" in the future. This leaves individuals with an incorrect understanding of what is required for professional development. I believe the result is an environment that is very difficult for minorities and creative individuals to navigate. As far as I can tell, the university does not have the means to address these fundamental issues hence these patterns are likely to persist. I think best for the university to remove rules that are not enforced, to provide greater clarity for staff and faculty.*

Data ideally serves as the basis for assessing where and if inequities in promotions exist. And this respondent notes that HR data if analyzed could address this as well as identifying problematic workplace environments, and salary parity in units and departments. The current system makes generating this data difficult and thus serves as an obstacle to parity work. Without clear data, this respondent noted, inequities could be ignored.

*Our systems and processes are very outdated so there is much inefficiency. This contributes to the workload - especially in Human Resource systems and processes. If the data were more easily accessible and manipulated it would show inequities from promotion to salary to workplace climate. Without the data it is all conjecture and we can't get to the root cause. There is also a huge gap in Management and Supervisory skills - and since there is not a consistent expectation across the university, the Divisions and Schools are given freedom to do something or nothing. And since there is no visibility to data, there is no ability to get to the root cause of salary, promotion or workplace culture issues. Specific expectations that are backed up by 360 evaluations should be the norm for managers and*

*supervisors. Otherwise, there is no ability to have performance management that is tied to any rubric. And again - the burden falls to Divisions and Schools which creates duplication of effort or no effort at all.*

Data guiding promotion decisions should ideally be rigorous and objective. But respondents suggest that the current processes vary widely and lack standardization.

*The second relates to performance evaluations. While this is a requirement for each position at UW-Madison, it is NOT standardized in any way. The models I've experienced (three different models) were incredibly ineffective and more of a waste of everyone's time than helpful/constructive. One organization required completion of a 6-8 page document every six months, which was to be completed by the supervisor, but was ultimately delegated to individual employees for completion. Regardless, I think it would be helpful to push for UW to create and mandate a standardized employee performance evaluation process that incorporates goal setting and constructive feedback from supervisors and peers (maybe SWOT analysis style).*

Supervisors' competence and decision-making were core to equity in this process. In cases where respondents were dissatisfied, they often described their supervisors as lacking experience or training in management.

*I think the fact that my manager is not a good manager and that there's no opportunity for advancement in my role, it feels personal, not systemic. Are we still at "the personal is political?" But maybe hiring poor leaders IS systemic. I don't know.*

*Most leaders at the university are trained to be faculty. There needs to be more robust training for faculty interested in transitioning to administrative roles (or staff advancing in leadership roles as well). As leadership skills are improved, I believe there will be improved support for women as well.*

As noted previously, some see bringing more women into leadership roles as helpful, increasing sensitivity to women's and minorities' issues, and fairness in these personnel and promotion decisions. However other suggested that increased women leadership may not be a panacea to address these issues if these women leaders lacked resources or maintained the patriarchal structure:

*Leadership that controls resource/recognition decisions is overwhelmingly white and male, and moves individuals similar to themselves into these positions (as a result, women that move into "leadership" positions have substantially fewer resources than men who previously filled those positions; in essence the position has the same name but the resources available for re-allocation has substantially diminished)*

*Discrimination doesn't always come from men. I've seen my own HR pay more and hire a man instead of a woman. Women aren't empowering women. A good number of women on this campus are insecure in their roles that they have to knock other women for pole position.*

These comments provide a wide array of potential issues that could be addressed at the institutional level. This is a collated list of respondents' suggestions.

### Respondents Recommendations

1. Study promotion rates of women vs. men;
2. White privilege, bias, anti-racism, sexism training for supervisors;
3. If we are having professional development opportunities on campus, it should be a cross section of identities, not just areas. To hold a number of spots for women, minorities, those with disabilities and also offering versions for 2nd and 3rd shift employees that doesn't interrupt their sleep cycles;
4. Continue to develop clear pathways for career development and provide the training and resources necessary. More awareness of opportunities;
5. More training available about managing your personal finances and self-advocacy within the university system as well, to help us know how to be more mobile within the system and continue to move in to better, higher-paying positions;
6. Increase leadership training for women;
7. Address the problem of gender discrimination with better hiring. We need to hire people for managerial positions who are committed to the advancement of women. That's a longer-term solution, but this is one place where it starts. Sharing best practices for screening for this propensity could be offered to campus;
8. Equitable treatment of women and minorities in their tenure decisions;
9. Mandatory training for faculty, especially those in STEM fields. Better monitoring of old school faculty who still think women are secretaries. Sensitivity training so that faculty don't mansplain or assume women are not smart enough to understand them;
10. Increase the number of women working in all roles within STEM-related departments and accelerate their advancement to leadership;
11. Be inclusive of trans women in the women's mentoring committee or create one for trans people;
12. Dissolve the difference between university and academic staff in terms of benefits, flexibility in working remotely, and respect; and
13. Allow employees to evaluate their supervisors.

## CONCLUSION

For an overall summary of this report, please see the Executive Summary. CWU will review both the quantitative and qualitative reports generated from this survey to develop short-term and long-term recommendations to address the challenges identified by respondents in: 1) Gender climate; 2) Childcare; 3) Compensation; and 4) Promotion/advancement at UW-Madison. To that end, we have developed work groups who will review these findings and participants' recommendations; gather information on work/initiatives already addressing these issues to identify collaborators, resources and continuing gaps; and draft recommendations for action within the next year, five years and long-term to be presented to UW community stakeholders.

## Appendix

### 2020 UW-Madison Committee on Women in the University Survey

English – Hmong – Mandarin Chinese – Nepali – Spanish – Tibetan

#### Cover Text

Dear Colleagues,

The Committee on Women in the University invites you to participate in a pulse survey that will help committee members identify and prioritize areas for effort. The survey takes less than ten minutes to complete and all responses are anonymous.

#### Survey

[Pull-down arrow at top right enables participant to select chosen language]

- Q1 [Preamble] The Committee on Women in the University (CWU) recommends changes in university priorities and practices to improve the status of women; collaborates with units across campus to support gender equity, inclusivity, and diversity; and monitors the status of women employees at UW-Madison. Your response to this survey will help CWU prioritize its short and long-term work, with a view towards affecting change when and where possible. The survey should take 10 minutes to complete and your responses will remain anonymous.
- Q2 What is your employee classification?
- Faculty
  - Academic Staff
  - University Staff
  - Postdoc
  - Graduate Assistant
- Q3 Do you work at UW-Madison full-time or part time?
- Full-time
  - Part-time
  - LTE (Limited Term Employee)
- Q4 What shift do you work at UW-Madison?
- Day 1<sup>st</sup> shift (7 am to 3 pm or similar hours)
  - Evening 2<sup>nd</sup> shift (3 pm to 11 pm or similar hours)
  - Night 3<sup>rd</sup> shift (11 pm to 7 am or similar hours)
- Q5 What is your age?
- 18-24
  - 25-34
  - 35-44
  - 45-54
  - 55-64
  - 65 or older



- Q6 What is your gender?
- Female
  - Male
  - I do not identify in the Female/Male binary
  - Self-describe: \_\_\_\_\_
- Q7 Which race(s) and ethnicity best describes you?  
(select all that apply)
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
  - Asian
  - Black or African American
  - Hispanic or Latinx Origin
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  - White
  - Other
- Q8 Do you spend a significant amount of time caring for someone's physical, emotional, and developmental needs (i.e., providing assistance for daily living, including support for activities such as bathing, preparing food, feeding, toileting, medication, finance management, etc.)?  
(select all that apply)
- Infant/Toddler
  - Child(ren) under 18
  - Adult child
  - Partner/Spouse
  - Parent/Elder
  - Not applicable
- Q9 **[Instructions]** In the next two questions, we are interested in understanding the top challenges (A) for you, and (B) for women employees at UW-Madison.
- Q10 Please indicate challenges **for you, personally**.  
**[Pull-down arrow yields 4 possible responses:** Yes, this should be CWU's highest priority  
Yes, this is a challenge for me  
No, this is not a challenge for me  
Not applicable
- Accessibility/ADA
  - Capacity to breastfeed or pump
  - Childcare
  - Compensation
  - Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor
  - Discrimination
  - Gender Climate
  - Hostile, Intimidating Behavior
  - Job Security
  - Performance Evaluation
  - Professional Development

- Promotion or Advancement
- Racial Climate
- Safety
- Sexual Harassment
- Taking Leave Time
- Workload
- Workplace Climate
- Other (Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**Q11** Please indicate challenges **for women employees at UW-Madison**.

[Pull-down arrow yields 4 possible responses: Yes, this should be CWU's highest priority  
 Yes, this is a challenge  
 No, this is not a challenge  
 I don't know

- Accessibility/ADA
- Capacity to breastfeed or pump
- Childcare
- Compensation
- Difficult Dynamic with Supervisor
- Discrimination
- Gender Climate
- Hostile, Intimidating Behavior
- Job Security
- Performance Evaluation
- Professional Development
- Promotion or Advancement
- Racial Climate
- Safety
- Sexual Harassment
- Taking Leave Time
- Workload
- Workplace Climate
- Other (Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**Q12** Have you experienced gender discrimination or gender bias as an employee at UW-Madison? *(Your survey response is anonymous and is not a report. However, if you describe misconduct and include the name or identifying information of a person or department/unit, the university may have to respond.)*

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

[Conditional logic: IF *Have you experienced gender discrimination or gender bias as an employee at UW?* Yes is selected, display Q13]

Q13 Did you report your experience?

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to say

[Conditional logic: IF *Did you report your experience?* No is selected, display Q12]

Q14 [Open ended text response] Why didn't you report your experience?

[Note: In Spanish language version we adapted to "What factors impacted that decision?" in English or "¿Cuáles son los factores que afectaron esa decisión?" in Spanish. We used appropriate neutral construction for Hmong, Mandarin Chinese, Nepali, and Tibetan versions of the survey.]

[Conditional logic: IF *Did you report your experience?* Yes is selected, display Q13]

Q15 [Open ended text response] Is there anything you would be willing to share about your experience of reporting gender discrimination or bias in the workplace?

Q16 [Removed. We added open ended responses to Q10 and Q11]

Q17 [Open ended text response] Would you like to share anything more about top challenges for you and for women in the university? What kinds of changes do you feel would be most helpful?

#### Thank You/Exit Message

Thank you very much for completing the Committee on Women's survey to identify and prioritize areas for effort.

For information about rights, reporting options, and resources for employees who have experienced sexual harassment or sexual violence, please visit:

<https://compliance.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/102/2019/09/Employee-Resource-Guide-1.pdf>