

Thirty Years Later: Initial Updates to Recommendations from the  
1989-90 Report on the Status of Women

A Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women  
Special Project Committee

Final 9/11/2020

Terri Armstrong, MS

Nina M. Flores, PhD

### Special Project Committee 2018-2020:

Terri Armstrong, Nina Flores, Mindy James, Lynisha McDuel

### Scope of the Project:

Spring 2018 – Project Preparation

- Bi-weekly meetings of Special Project Committee
- Careful review of original 1989-90 report
- Breakdown of project components and approach

Summer 2019

- Weekly meetings at CSULB library archives to review PCSW historical documents
- Interview former and current PCSW members, and other key personnel
- Compile a written history of PCSW based on archival research and interviews
- Based on archival research and interviews, make initial updates to the original list of 24 recommendations detailed in the 1989-90 Report
- Prep work for future focus groups on present-day (update to the 1991-1992 Needs Assessment report)

Potential Future Special Project Phases:

- Focus groups with staff, faculty, and administrators (repeating the methodology of the 1991-1992 Needs Assessment)
- Salary and Professional Advancement Analysis (focus on equity issues)
- Final Report Card and updated recommendations (based on this report, plus the aforementioned project components)

Acknowledgements:

The Special Project Committee would like to acknowledge PCSW members, past and present, for their service to the Commission and their interest in this project. We also would like to thank Carol Menard for her valuable role in providing organizational support and facilitating relationships as we worked to complete this phase of the project.

Lastly, we thank President Jane Close Conoley for seeing value in this project and for supporting the Special Project Committee.

*What follows is the first-known documented history of the President's Commission on the Status of Women at California State University Long Beach. Drawn from archival research and interviews with those who have historical and institutional knowledge, this history begins with the lead up to the Commission's inception in 1989, highlights the action-driven 1990s, and reviews efforts in the 2000s and beyond. Note: Although the University Archives have ample documentation of the Commission's first 15 years on file, the sharp decrease in materials from the past 15 years reflects both reduced activity and what our campus archivists describe as the shift away from paper documents.*

### *Commission Origins*

The late 1980s at California State University, Long Beach echoed sentiments seen across the country: a focus on issues affecting women, and acknowledgement that the ongoing movement for women's rights had reached higher education. In 1988 a forum was held at California State University, Long Beach about issues affecting women staff, faculty, and students. According to materials from the CSULB archives the event was highly attended, which signaled a new era on campus in which women were joining together, actively mobilizing around issues of inequality, and looking to the future.

By the time Curtis L. McCray became president of the university later that year, the faculty who attended the forum were ready for change. They organized a presentation for him about key issues, including the need for a sexual violence survey, interest in developing a non-sexist language policy on campus, and ideas about outreaching to women students to major in non-traditional fields. In response, President McCray offered his support for forming the President's Advisory Commission on the Status of Women (PASCW).

The Commission was officially formed in 1989 with two goals: 1) examining the ways in which campus policies and practices might restrict the full participation and advancement for women in the CSULB community, and 2) developing policies and practices designed to enhance opportunities for fair and equal treatment of women.

Interestingly, archival materials suggest that the Commission was initially funded through Associated Students, Inc., but that the funding was then reallocated to come from the President's Office.

### The Early Years

At its inception, the President's Advisory Commission on the Status of Women consisted of three committees: The Campus Climate Committee, the Employment Committee, and the Curriculum Committee. The Campus Climate Committee focused on long term issues such as the treatment of women on campus, as well as short term issues such as immediate safety concerns. Within the Campus Climate Committee was a sub-committee on sexual harassment, which was tasked with working with hired legal consultants from Ehrlich & Oaks to review and update the campus sexual harassment policies. A second sub-committee called "Chilly Climate" was focused on improving the campus environment for women faculty, staff, and students, and put together a 1988 document titled "Some Women's Concerns", which day-to-day experiences of women staff and faculty across the campus related to safety, discrimination in the workplace, and more. Handwritten notes (presumably by committee members) found on archival documents--agendas, meeting notes, and memos -- related to the sub-committee are forward thinking, recognize the need for an organized structure, and reflect serious concerns about individual versus institutional efforts. For instance, one handwritten note cautions against "depending on the good intentions and commitments of individuals, instead of developing [campus] procedures that transcend them."

A more detailed examination from documents at this time reveals some common concerns among women campus employees, along with two distinct sets of concerns that emerged from women staff versus women faculty. For example, of concern to both women faculty and staff was the issue of childcare. For instance, a transcript of a 1988 interview with the chair of the Women's Studies department revealed that the Isabel Patterson Child Development Center was overwhelmed with demand, particularly care for infants and toddlers. Recommendations to remedy this situation included allowing for flexible work schedules and starting childcare referral services.

A concern routinely raised by women staff members was an overall concern of facing a “glass coffee table”, meaning that they could see a career beyond their position, but had no meaningful paths forward to promotion and advancement through the university. Many described this a lack of a pipeline, which led to recommendations that the university develop staff development programs for skill acquisition, cross training across departments, and a leave policy to allow staff to pursue advanced degrees. Additionally, staff advocated for having a voice on university committees, and better policies around release time in order to fulfill their committee responsibilities. When it came to salaries, women staff members were acutely aware that there were clear divides between female-dominated job categories and male-dominated job categories, and with them significant salary differentials.

Meanwhile, women faculty expressed concerns about the low number of women serving in academic leadership positions, such as deans, as well as frustration with the limited number of women serving in academic administration positions, noting the low number of women at the VP level. Women faculty pointed to the fact that at the time there was nowhere on campus where the inequalities between women and men were demonstrated more clearly than among faculty. Additionally, women faculty rejected the idea of a universal experience among women and were open about discussing the “hegemony of white males” on campus, which they saw as creating a sense of fear and vulnerability among women, but especially among women of color. There were ongoing suggestions for implementing better recruitment and retention efforts for women of color, and better support systems.

#### *1989-1990 Report on the Status of Women*

During the 1989-1990 academic year, the Commission produced a report on the Status of Women. Archival documents show that around the time when this report was released on campus, an April 1990 Commission meeting between Commission leadership and President McCray included requests for hiring an ombudsperson along with calls for affirmative action in hiring. Remarkably, it was these Commission leaders who advocated for and later secured the hiring of a university Ombudsperson. A handwritten note from the meeting with President McCray shows that Commission

members were “looking forward to the day when affirmative action would be a natural part of the hiring process...” Records show that President McCray was receptive to the meeting. In fact, in response to suggestions from members of the Curriculum Committee, he suggested adjusting the University 100 curriculum.

Another moment during this meeting is worth mentioning: At this time, six units of assigned time a year was requested (and granted) for the person serving as Commission chair to acknowledge their workload and leadership responsibilities. During the meeting, President McCray apologized for the delay in issuing funds for these units. Despite the ongoing workload, this policy no longer exists, and it is unclear when the university decided against providing assigned time for commission leaders.

Meeting notes from 1990 as the report was being compiled show incredible momentum as Commission members held health events such as mammogram screenings, called for the development of a brochure on appropriate language, made requests for training programs about sexual harassment, and put together an end of the year document proposing future plans. Later in 1990 the Escort Service project was launched, based on a successful version of the project at California State University Northridge.

By early 1991 the Commission was engaged in projects on multiple fronts. They issued a Lighting Improvements Status Update after completing a “lighting walk” of the campus, parking lots, and housing. They issued a Preliminary Report for Pay Equity, which focused on step salary ranges, on-campus training for advancement, and classification review. Included in the report were calls for salary to be comparable to the private sector, and a recognition of what was perceived as male bias in the unions. However, the biggest undertaking during the 1991-1992 academic year was putting together a campus Needs Assessment, which came to fruition after Commission members were alerted to widespread campus reports of low morale among women staffers.

### *1991-1992 Needs Assessment Report*

During the 1991-1992 academic year the commissioners completed a Needs Assessment for Female Staff Members. The Needs Assessment was conceived as a way to evaluate how staff experienced management practices and was seen as a step towards developing new programs to assist women staff members on campus. Importantly, Commissioners did not want this to be a one-off project – they wanted the Needs Assessment to center the experiences of women, and to guide campus policy and program changes for women employees.

The Needs Assessment was based on a research study written by Jill Hubley and Dr. Cher Thomas, in which 106 female employees on campus participated in one-hour focus groups. Researchers were able to secure a high number of participants in part because the President’s Office issued a letter to both staff and supervisors announcing the study. The focus groups were comprised of six to 12 employees, ranging from entry level to administrative positions. Participants answered questions such as:

- “What do you like about working here?”
- “What types of programs and services do you use?”
- “Are there things that prevent you from doing your job as well as you’d like to?”
- “What types of general problems do you have at work?”

The Needs Assessment recognized programs and incentives that were working well for women staff members, such as the fee waiver program, and recreational amenities. However, it also addressed ongoing areas of staff concern such as questions about whether managers received proper training, the prevalence of personal safety issues, routine experiences with sexual harassment that were ignored – or worse, perpetuated – by management, continued childcare needs, limited opportunities for staff career advancement, salary disparities between men and women staffers, and increasing stress from a rapidly growing workload. For instance, staff noted clear discrepancies between their job titles and the job duties they were asked to perform – with no recognition, change of title, reclassification, or pathway to advancement.

The report was also meant as a way to evaluate management practices and to take steps toward developing new programs that could assist female employees at CSULB. Staff suggestions from the report included being able to make use of the fee waiver program without manager approval, a university policy on flex time, a “re-orientation” for longtime employees about policy updates, more access to childcare, more advancement opportunities, and workshops for staff with a focus on ways in which to approach management issues.

A sentiment about the Needs Assessment that is echoed in both meeting notes and other archival materials is the Commissioners’ desire for this report to create meaningful change, and not be viewed as simply another project.

### *Early Evolution of the Commission*

By the 1991-1992 academic year the Commission had evolved and was now organized into three committees: Campus Climate & Safety Committee, Impact & Visibility Committee (focused on increased communication to the campus), and the Faculty & Staff Employment Committee. Meeting agendas found in the archives show that the Commission also conducted a childcare survey during this time, which agendas show was presented at an Academic Leadership conference in an effort to sensitize on-campus leaders to women’s concerns. The report members issued about childcare was based on a survey completed by 1071 out of 3362 CSULB employees and resulted in Commission leaders forming a six member Child Care Committee as a means of directing time and resources to the issue.

The early 1990s was a productive time for the Commission, and also a time with immense support from the President’s Office. For instance, the Commission held annual day-long retreats supported by the President’s Office, which were meant to organize the overall vision and areas of action for the year. Each retreat resulted in a report. During the 1992-1993 Retreat Report to President McCray, the Commission made clear their goals to seek better understanding of how budget cuts affect women (especially single mothers), and the ongoing challenge of university-wide usage of inclusive language. Additionally, members questioned ways in which they could prevent the Commission



from being seen merely as an extracurricular service when a significant amount of dedicated time was needed to develop and implement both ongoing and new projects. A main recommendation stemming from the retreat report was building deeper coalitions across campus, growing a network of women mentors, and ensuring that there were opportunities to work together.

During the 1992-1993 year the Commission issued a set of broader recommendations for the university that built on their collective work in previous years. Recommendations included developing a women staff mentoring group, establishing a staff professional development program, creating a way to celebrate women's accomplishments on campus, maintaining relationships with the then-active ASI Women's Commission as well as unions, and a system-wide suggestion to examine pay equity across the California State University system. Calls to examine pay equity drew on findings from several research reports by the Department of Labor Women's Bureau, which analyzed issues such as increasing pay for working mothers, gender and racial pay gaps, breaking the glass ceiling, and the experiences of women clerical workers.

In 1993 the Commission held a pre-semester retreat called "Day of Revitalization and Goal Setting for the Women at CSULB". In the post-retreat report they included a focus on the attrition rate among Students of Color (especially Black students), the idea that the campus climate reinforces the 'beauty myth', and the perception on campus that improving the status of women is extra-curricular, and not seen as essential. The report also focused on the impact of diversity programs. For instance, Commissioners noted that although some women had advanced into management roles, the staff pipeline was not being replenished. Additionally, they pointed out that there were no gains for Latinas in management positions and questioned whether women were represented in all levels of administration. The retreat ended with goals to include women in more leadership roles, addressing the ongoing challenge of implementing inclusive language on campus, and how to encourage more women-to-women mentoring across campus.

### *Commission Activities During the Mid-to-Late 1990s*

By the mid-to-late 1990s the Commission had moved away from the committee model and turned to a collection of task forces. For instance, a Childcare Task Force overseeing the development of an on-campus childcare facility, and then-President Robert Maxson committed to a \$150,000 loan to complete construction on the facility. An Employment Equity Task Force examined discrepancies between men and women in tenured/tenure-track positions as well as part-time positions. The Sexual Harassment Task Force conducted interviews to hire an Ombudsperson.

### *1997 Sexual Harassment Report*

By 1997 the consultants hired from legal firm Ehnrilch and Oaks delivered the long-awaited report on sexual harassment at CSULB. The report was commissioned to survey the campus climate, assessed university policy implementation, and the extent to which the university recognized sexual harassment as an issue on campus. The report findings about campus climate showed that knowledge of sexual harassment was varied across the campus community, with no organized system for acquiring information. With regard to education and resources, the report found that there was no system for training students, staff, or faculty beyond minimal offerings by the Office of Affirmative Action (now Office of Equity & Diversity). As a result, there was widespread confusion about policies, and a lack of procedural consistency. The consultants found issues with timeliness in dealing with sexual harassment complaints and a pattern of people being drawn into formal processes when an informal process might have sufficed. Importantly, there was no evidence that the university engaged in systemic, campus-wide data collection with regard to sexual harassment.

The report included two categories of recommendations: prevention policies and procedures. In the area of prevention policies, the consultants recommended a strong recurring message from campus leadership that sexual harassment is a serious concern. The consultants suggested consolidating all policies into a single document that also contains the rights of both the survivor and the accused, wider dissemination of policies to the campus community, and including retaliation as a form of harassment. Complaint response time was also a focus of recommendations, with notes to establish

investigation timelines, concluding complaints promptly, and creating an Ombudsperson position. Data collection and dissemination was also a focus, with recommendations to make sexual harassment data available to the university and to survey the campus for areas of risk. By 1998 the Commission had put some recommendations into action, focusing their attention on campus sexual violence and working with the Women's Resource Center on joint programming on sexual assault prevention.

### *Turn of the Century and the 2010s*

In a pattern echoed at archives across the nation, by the turn of the century, documents were increasingly digital-only. Unfortunately, that resulted in a sharp decrease in the available Commission meeting notes, physical report copies, event flyers, and other ephemera. Although these materials may still exist on forgotten floppy disks, on outdated html web links, or hidden in files on long discarded computers, they sadly do not exist in the CSULB archives. Efforts to contact past Commission members in search of digital materials proved fruitless.

From the existing materials it is clear that in the early 2000s the Commission renewed their focus on life and family balance, initiating a mom's support group on campus, and taking an inclusive approach to the issue with the creation of a "Family Friendly Committee" for families with same sex parents. By 2002 the Commission was refining their mission, stating a desire to advocate for women on campus, removing inequalities, and providing a supportive educational working and social environment. Of note is that pay equity continued as a pressing concern both among campus women, and between men and women doing similar work.

At the time of writing, the President's Commission on the Status of Women continues supporting women on campus. Interviews with past members confirm that the Commission continues to engage in an established set of annual programming which include granting the Ruth Dennison Guthrie Award, funding programming in support of women, giving the campus-wide Advancement of Women Awards, and hosting the annual Women's Research Colloquium in the spring.

Discussions began during the 2017-2018 year about the future vision of PCSW, with members coming together in affinity groups as staff, students, faculty, and administrators to share ideas about the ways in which the Commission might better serve women and women-identified students on campus. At this time there was a sense among members that as a Commission, they should be doing more as a campus entity, especially given the power in the room at each monthly business meeting. This same year a copy of the 1989-1990 report was uncovered, which prompted curiosity about the origins of the Commission. Reviewing their early projects inspired current PCSW members to acknowledge a deeper responsibility to engage in advocacy and activism on campus in support of women and women-identified students. Many of those conversations sparked this update.

## Original 24 Recommendations from the 1989-90 Report & Initial Updates from Phase I

Each of the original 24 recommendations from the 1989-1990 Report on the Status of Women is quoted below in italics. For each recommendation we have provided a progress assessment based on archival research and interviews from Phase I of this project, as well as suggestions to update the recommendation.

1. *“An administrative and faculty commitment should be made to ensure the infusion of gender, race, and ethnicity into the curriculum. This commitment will make a significant contribution to the ability to generate both internal and external funding.”*

Meeting notes and agendas from the early days of PCSW reveal that curriculum infusion remained a key priority for commissioners for several years. However, over the past thirty years this has become less of a focus for the commission, which appears to have moved away from matters of curriculum. Instead, the responsibility appears to fall on individual faculty, department curriculum committees, and even the academic senate to ensure that studies of gender, race, and ethnicity are infused into the curriculum.

It is worth noting that the move toward 4-year degree initiatives has meant that suggestions to include courses focused on gender, race, and ethnicity are often perceived as “adding a class” to the degree – taking the add diversity and stir approach -- rather than a scenario in which studies of gender, race, and ethnicity are truly infused throughout curriculum.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains applicable for 2019-2020, and could also apply to an expanded range of areas including ability, class, sexuality, nationality, age, immigration status, and more.

2. *“Some part of Women’s History Month should continue to act as a forum for curricular change, generating discussion on the relationships between race, ethnicity, and gender. Other forums for discussion of curriculum change should be implemented and coordinated on a master calendar.”*

Archival documents suggest that there was limited programming during Women’s History Month in the following years to specifically meet the goal of discussing the relationship between race, ethnicity, and gender. Unfortunately, even after reviewing several years of PCSW meeting notes from this time, we are unsure what the commissioners were referring to with regard to coordinating discussions about curriculum change with a master calendar. However, given the recent

efforts by Academic Senate to change general education curriculum, we believe this is likely the appropriate university-level forum for these discussions.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains applicable for 2019-2020 in the sense that there are certainly opportunities for using Women's History Month as a forum for providing additional curricular experiences (versus curricular change) through programming, services, events, lectures, activities, and more. Perhaps this could be coordinated across campus with interested faculty, applicable departments, and the Women's, Gender & Equity Center. Although it may seem obvious that this would include the Women's Gender & Sexuality Studies Department, we want to avoid suggesting this should fall solely as their responsibility because there are many faculty across campus who study and teach about these issues who may be interested in participating or leading these efforts during Women's History Month.

3. *“Curriculum infusion should be coordinated more effectively to guarantee that each academic unit currently working on curricular change does not become a competitor for limited University resources.”*

Although we support curriculum infusion efforts, and agree that competition for University resources remains an issue, clear shifts in commission priorities show that curriculum infusion is no longer a key focus for this commission. However, we are open to commissioners proposing curricular projects that may bring this back on the agenda.

Phase I update: While this recommendation may not be the focus of PCSW 30 years later, it does remain applicable for 2019-2020. For instance, perhaps this would be most effective as a goal for the Joint Commissions to pursue, bringing together the resources and impact of PCSW, the President's Commission on Sustainability, and the President's Commission on Inclusive Excellence.

4. *“The committee recommends that the University provide a narrative description, to be distributed immediately, of the statistics published earlier this year from the 1986 Sexual Harassment Survey.”*

We could not find evidence in the archives or from interviews with past Commission members of the university disseminating statistics from the 1986 Sexual Harassment Survey. However, in the years that followed the 1989-1990 report there was considerable effort on the part of PCSW to develop a Task Force on Sexual Harassment, to rework existing policies, and in working with a hired consultant team (Ehrlich & Oaks). In fact, sexual harassment remained an official committee title and focus in PCSW for years.

As a campus our policies have changed with the times over the past 30 years, including recent shifts specifically regarding Title IX and campus sexual assault (i.e. in reference to the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter by the U.S. Department of Education).

Phase I update: This recommendation remains applicable for 2019-2020. PCSW recently invited the Title IX team to present on policy procedure updates, and the Commission is interested in reviewing the materials on sexual harassment as well. Given that the university will soon embark on a Campus Climate Survey, PCSW is also interested in potentially writing a report based on any sexual harassment information from the survey. Lastly, we are unaware of any sexual harassment studies since 1986 and suggest that an updated study could help us truly understand the campus climate experienced by women, women of color, and trans women, whether students, staff, faculty, or administrators.

5. *“The campus Sexual Harassment policy includes procedures which identify persons to contact on campus to report, formally or informally, any incident of sexual harassment. These contact persons must be trained to understand harassment and to be able to refer victims of harassment. Resources should be given to a university employee to begin training personnel so that the procedures can be operational as soon as possible.”*

Thirty years after this recommendation was written, we now have an official Title IX coordinator who handles harassment and assault reports. Although Title IX policies are continuously in flux, appearing to change from administration to administration, our campus maintains a mandatory video/online training program about sexual harassment and assault policies and resources for students, staff, and faculty.

Additionally, our campus has seen recent efforts such as the five-year California Office of Emergency Services (Cal-OES) grant, which funded the Not Alone @ the Beach (NATB) project. This project has supported sexual assault prevention and awareness programming, the hiring of a Sexual Assault Victim’s Advocate who provides confidential support to survivors, and detective services support. According to one of our interviewees, the Not Alone @ the Beach project has become a model for the California State University system.

Currently, there is sexual assault prevention and response programming at orientations for students in athletics, on-campus housing, and who participate in Greek life. R.A.D. (Rape Aggression Defense) training is offered each semester

to train people on self-defense. As of 2014, campus officers have also received trauma informed care training for working with assault survivors.

Phase I update: Although the campus has made significant efforts since this recommendation was developed, the recommendation remains applicable for 2019-2020 with regard to faculty safety concerns. A faculty safety forum hosted by the California Faculty Association in recent years revealed fear among faculty members that their concerns about being harassed by rogue students are not taken seriously.

6. *“Members of the campus community should be educated about sexual harassment and intolerant behaviors through such means as department meetings, the Council of Deans, staff workshops, and student associations. [Note: This recommendation will be partially implemented in the fall 1990 through the University 100 course where students will discuss an article on “Avoiding Sexual Discrimination in the Classroom” and case studies on sexual harassment.]”*

Unfortunately, University 100 courses no longer exist as an introduction to the university, so we need to consider whether the mandatory online harassment and/or assault trainings for students are as effective as receiving and engaging with this material in person (i.e. have students learned how to quickly pass the online trainings?). Please see notes above for recommendation #5 with regard to additional training efforts.

Our interview with a campus law enforcement representative raised an additional perspective: the need for more education about decision making on the part of both women and men, particularly in social situations. For instance, this might include training students to articulate clearly what they do and don't want, or to agree to engaging in sexual activity because they actually *want* to, and not because they don't want to hurt someone's feelings.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains applicable given that sexual assault is an ongoing concern. An emerging effort through the Cal-OES Not Alone @ the Beach grant includes a pilot curriculum infusion program that would encourage faculty to include modules on sexual assault prevention and response in their classes, which would offer a chance for dialogue and visits from campus professionals.



7. *“In order to increase general awareness of women’s issues at all levels, but particularly concerning sexual harassment, the subcommittee suggest that a presentation should be made before the Council of Deans, that a meeting should be held with the campus community at least once per semester with an opportunity for small group discussion, and that regular updates should be published in existing campus publications.”*

We found no evidence in the archives or through interviews that these meetings or presentations occurred. However, that doesn’t mean that the necessary information is not disseminated to the Council of Deans in other ways.

Phase I update: Although this recommendation may be met as of 2019-2020, it may be beneficial for such a presentation to occur for the larger campus community once per semester to update interested parties about policy changes related to sexual harassment and assault, and to offer chances to discuss any emerging concerns or trending issues.

8. *“In order to complete work on The Guide to Inclusive Language (non-sexist language guidelines), a graduate assistant should be employed to do basic research.”*

We were unable to locate any drafts of The Guide to Inclusive Language in the PCSW archives; however, work may have been completed on this guide and simply not saved or included in the PCSW archived documents.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains important in 2019-2020, particularly as the parameters of what is considered inclusive language have expanded greatly since 1989. As such, this recommendation has been included as one of the goals for 2019-2020 with a focus on gender-inclusive language; examining existing tools and developing training and tools; developing committee-specific tools. These tools can serve as a general education platform for the campus community.

In partnership with PCSW faculty members with expertise in this area (i.e. those currently working with a national anthropological organization and with sociolinguistics researchers, or those with training in critical analysis around multiple systems of oppression) we also suggest this being a student-centered project. For instance, graduate students in the Social & Cultural Analysis of Education or in the Anthropology/Linguistics graduate programs may be ideal candidates for this project.

9. *“Since students and staff frequently have no one to turn to with specific complaints not covered by existing campus services, or do not know which office is appropriate to handle those complaints, the Advisory Commission strongly suggests that an ombudsperson position be created so that these complaints or concerns may be handled or referred in a timely manner.”*

We’re pleased to note that this position was created in large part due to commissioners advocating for a campus Ombudsperson.

Phase I update: Our only recommendation would be ensuring that students (and other members of the campus community) know that we have an Ombudsperson, where their office is located and how to contact them, and what their role can be in addressing complaints or handling conflict.

10. *“An examination of the physical environment of the campus (e.g., lighting of walkways, building security at night) should be undertaken immediately and a member of the Commission should be appointed to the Physical Planning Committee of the University.”*

There is no evidence that a member of PCSW was appointed to the Physical Planning Committee, or that there is any relationship between PCSW and Facilities & Planning. We know that examinations of the physical environment have happened in the past, but this does not appear to be part of a campus-wide effort involving staff, faculty, and students. One of our interviewees noted that Community Service Officers (CSOs) walk around campus to note issues with lighting, for example by issuing work orders if they notice lights out; however, this is different than a group of campus stakeholders walking around the campus systematically noting their perceptions on safety.

Additionally, we’re aware of Community Policing efforts through environmental design, such as strategically placing cameras across campus. We acknowledge that this could also be read as controversial by some people with regard to surveillance issues. Another physical environment safety concern is the blue lights on campus, which mostly serve as a potential deterrent to crime. It is unclear who initially installed the blue lights, and who is responsible for fixing them. Many people can recall the months several years ago that a blue light in front of LH-150 was broken and remained covered in a garbage bag.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains relevant in 2019-2020. We are aware of discussions that occurred in the development of the new campus map. We suggest involving campus community members in assessments of the physical environment so the voices of those working, living, and studying in the

environment are heard. For instance, engaging the campus community in a safety audit might be one option. This is an event where students, faculty, and staff volunteer to walk the campus and note locations where they feel safe, where lighting could be improved, and areas of concern. Another idea could be to attach safety audit components to an event such as Take Back the Night where students and campus community members are walking around campus at night.

11. *“Since current guidelines for tenure are unclear and ineffective in terms of specific, detailed criteria and objective ranking systems which will allow more controlled and equitable evaluation by RTP committees of women and people of color, the Academic Senate through the Faculty Personnel Policies Committee should examine the RTP criteria and procedures in all nine schools.”*

One of our interviewees noted that the RTP process has been streamlined significantly since 1989, and that Faculty Affairs now offers several workshops for faculty related to the RTP process each year (workshops about the process of compiling files for Mini-Reviews, Retention, Tenure, and more). It is unclear whether this has allowed for more equitable evaluation by RTP committees of women and people of color.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future.

12. *“A greater effort must be made to ensure that a women and/or person of color sits on every RTP committee possible, especially at the school level.”*

Given the faculty numbers on campus, we can assume that there are more women and/or people of color sitting on RTP committees today than in 1989. However, although the idea posited in this recommendation appears equitable in theory, in practice this can mean that for departments or schools with few women or few people of color, these faculty will be burdened by more mandated service responsibilities, and will be required to serve on far more committees than their white and/or male peers, etc. Unfortunately, an idea that starts off in support of equity has the potential to turn into an inequitable division of labor. We welcome ideas that would both include the input of women and people of color on RTP committees, while at the same time ensuring that they are not unduly burdened with more service than their peers.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future.

13. *“Early tenure guidelines should be established and incorporated into existing CSULB RTP documents and in Academe.”*

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future.

14. *“Data in usable form on applications and awards of research grants (both internal and external) by gender, rank, and ethnicity and for the total number of faculty employed by the University ought to be made available to the Commission for analysis next year.”*

It is unclear whether PCSW received information about applications and awards of research grants by gender, rank, and ethnicity in 1989, and this issue did not appear again in the archives.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future.

15. *“The University has been successful in recruiting more women for tenure-track positions in the last several years. While this has yet to significantly affect the ratio of female to male permanent faculty, especially at the associate professor and professor ranks, continued efforts in this area will increase faculty diversity in the coming years. To facilitate the integration of junior women into the middle and upper faculty ranks, serious attention must be paid to retention and career development issues for faculty women.”*

From the archives it is unclear whether any specific efforts were driven by PCSW, or whether any programs to support women junior faculty were started after this recommendation. To their knowledge, two of our interviewees could not recall any such programming in the 1990s or early 2000s beyond camaraderie found in informal affinity groups. We want to acknowledge recent efforts to support women and people of color who are junior faculty members, such as the Faculty Development Center’s 2019 Discussion Group on Faculty Development and Diversity.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the

future, perhaps as a joint priority shared with the Inclusive Excellence Commission.

16. *“Since a full-time lecturer position is often the first step toward a tenure-track appointment, special effort should be made to recruit women as full-time lecturers. Assigning female part-timers more courses to teach in a single department will aid them in becoming more familiar to permanent faculty and with department operations an advantage to tenure-track job candidates.”*

The landscape for tenure-track jobs has changed significantly in the past 30 years and the university relies on adjunct labor far more than in 1989. It appears increasingly unlikely that lecturers will later be hired on tenure-track lines. However, future phases of this project may focus on the differences between women and men with regard to part-timers and being offered more classes.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future, perhaps as a joint priority shared with the California Faculty Association.

17. *“The vast majority of women faculty members continue to be employed as part-time lecturers. The pattern of assigning female lecturers fewer courses than their male colleagues places an additional, unnecessary burden on faculty employees with the least job security. Efforts aimed at rectifying this situation should be made immediately along with an investigation into its causes.”*

It is unclear from the archives and our interviews whether there was an investigation into this issue after 1989. In terms of the present day, we again recognize the crisis of contingent labor present in 2019, which simply wasn't the case when this recommendation was developed. However, future phases of this project may focus on the differences between women and men with regard to job security, within the context of adjunct job insecurity.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future, perhaps as a joint priority shared with the California Faculty Association.

18. *“The salary step system is gender neutral thereby protecting continuing faculty from wage discrimination. Further comparative investigation into salary differentials at the time of appointment is required to fully evaluate patterns of faculty remuneration at all levels.”*

It is unclear from the archives and our interviews whether PCSW engaged in a comparative investigation into salary differentials following this recommendation, but our interviewees referred to later analyses. Future phases of this project may focus on salary differentials at the time of appointment as well as faculty remuneration at subsequent levels.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future, perhaps as a joint priority shared with the California Faculty Association.

19. *“Since starting salaries are significantly higher for traditionally male entry-level staff positions, (e.g., laborer, painter, carpenter), consideration should be given to starting female employees in entry level positions (e.g., clerical, secretarial) at Step 3 or 4 of the salary schedule or at higher classifications (e.g., Clerical III rather than Clerical II) in order to partially rectify the inequities inherent in female vs. male salary differentials.”*

Aside from the gendered assumptions about who does what jobs, we anticipate that future phases of this project (i.e. salary analysis) may reveal places in which salary differentials for entry-level positions have been remedied, or in which disparities between women and men remain.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future, perhaps as a joint priority shared with the staff union.

20. *“Supervisors in all offices should be encouraged to create descriptive working titles for women employed in clerical and secretarial positions. These working titles should reflect their actual job duties (e.g., budget coordinator, assistant to the department chair). A list of the proposed working titles should be developed by the Office of Staff Personnel in consultation with the staff representatives to the Commission and distributed to supervisors.”*

One of our interviewees noted concern that titles often dictate the future professional trajectory of an employee, and that external candidates may be hired at higher rates than internal candidates seeking promotion. Future phases of this research (i.e. focus groups with staff members) may be helpful in revealing disparities between job titles and the job duties performed, as well as ideas for proposed working titles that more accurately reflect duties performed.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future, perhaps as a joint priority shared with the staff union.

21. *“Reclassification workshops should be developed and offered regularly by the Office of Staff Personnel to help demystify the classification review process. Supervisors and staff should be invited to attend the workshops together, particularly those from departments and divisions scheduled for review during that academic year. The Staff Handbook should be expanded to clarify politics and outline step-by-step instructions for staff to how to initiate and follow classification review procedures.”*

It is unclear from the archives when reclassification workshops were developed, and whether PCSW commissioners had a role in their development. Currently a staff member or a department can request to have a reclassification reviewer come to talk about this process. One of our interviewees suggested reviving a past program from the 1980s or 1990s that allowed current staff to “intern” in their desired positions on-campus as internal fellows. Staff members were nominated for such internal fellow positions and were able to explore different career paths within the university. For managers and administrators, this was also a way to increase their internal candidate applicant pool.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020 with regard to the potential to create new ways for staff to move through their professional trajectories on campus. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future, perhaps as a joint priority with human resources.

22. *“All staff employees in a division should be notified before a reclassification audit is to take place to enable them to review their job descriptions with their supervisors and update those descriptions where appropriate. [Note: The Office of Staff Personnel has already acted on this recommendation. A list of Divisions being reviewed this academic year was published in the July issue of Staff Scene.]”*

It is unclear from the PCSW archives whether commissioners played a role in changing this on campus. Currently, staff are notified before reclassification audits occur. Additionally, staff have the ability to prepare for their audit and compile information about their role to make their case. Future phases of this

project (i.e. focus groups with staff) may reveal ways in which the audit process may be improved.

Phase I update: This recommendation may remain timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future, perhaps as a joint priority with human resources.

23. *“The Office of Staff Personnel should create some clearly defined career paths for interested staff members.”*

It is unclear from the archives whether any programs were developed to assist in the development of better-defined career paths for interested staff members, and currently no such program is available. Future phases of this project (i.e. focus groups with staff) may help provide some ideas for what potential career paths staff are interested in, and the types of programming from which they would benefit.

Phase I update: This recommendation may remain timely in 2019-2020. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future, perhaps as a joint priority with human resources.

24. *“The Office of Staff Personnel should offer workshops and seminars to provide training, the acquisition of new skills, and information on career opportunities.”*

It is unclear from the archives whether PCSW commissioners played a role in offering workshops and seminars for staff professional development. One of our interviewees noted that these workshops did exist at some point after this recommendation, and that the campus is hoping to restart them in the future. At one point there was a master calendar that staff could review and then RSVP for trainings of interest. Currently, staff attend a new staff orientation, but additional professional development opportunities appear limited.

Phase I update: This recommendation remains timely in 2019-2020, particularly with regard to offering staff professional development. We remain open to the possibility that the commission once again takes this issue up in the future, perhaps as a joint priority with human resources.



## APPENDIX A

### Key Themes

Recommendations 1-3: University commitment to ensure infusion of gender, race, and ethnicity into the curriculum and programming during Women's History Month.

Recommendations 4-7: Sexual harassment, reporting procedure, incorporation of Title IX office

Recommendations 8-10: Safety and examination and creation of non-sexist language guidelines.

Recommendations 11-17: Review of faculty RTP process/Diversity and Inclusion practices

Recommendations 18-24: Staff, professional development, salary analysis and salary step system, reclassification, career advancement.

## APPENDIX B

Updates as of September 2020

Pg. 11 “Efforts to contact past Commission members in search of digital materials proved fruitless.”

Recommend: Review PCSW BeachBoard files for historical documents dating back to the 2000s

Pg. 13 “Meeting notes and agendas from the early days of PCSW reveal that curriculum infusion remained a key priority for commissioners for several years. However, over the past thirty years this has become less of a focus for the commission, which appears to have moved away from matters of curriculum. Instead, the responsibility appears to fall on individual faculty, department curriculum committees, and even the academic senate to ensure that studies of gender, race, and ethnicity are infused into the curriculum.”

Update: Recent pass of AB 1460 will require students in the CSU to take an ethnic studies course before graduation

Pg. 16 “The landscape for tenure-track jobs has changed significantly in the past 30 years and the university relies on adjunct labor far more than in 1989. It appears increasingly unlikely that lecturers will later be hired on tenure-track lines. However, future phases of this project may focus on the differences between women and men with regard to part-timers and being offered more classes.”

Update: CFA in discussion with Academic Senate regarding Lecturer conversions to tenure/tenure track positions