Systemic Racism Towards Faculty of Colour and Aboriginal Faculty at Queen's University

Report on the 2003 study,

Understanding the Experiences of Visible
Minority and Aboriginal Faculty Members at
Queen's University

For the
Queen's Senate Educational Equity Committee and
Suzanne Fortier, Vice Principal Academic

By Dr. Frances Henry, Professor Emerita, York
University

April 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background to the Study:
A few years ago, a faculty woman of colour left Queen's University alleging that she had experienced racism. Several others followed, bringing the total to six. The Senate Educational Equity Committee (SEEC) was therefore asked by the Vice-Principal Academic, Suzanne Fortier, to form a sub-committee to examine the issues and to assist the University to "get a better sense of the experiences of visible minorities and First Nations persons at Queen's by preparing a survey... to gather their views." Accordingly, a questionnaire survey was prepared by the sub-committee and sent to 1748 persons.[1] The survey elicited a response rate of 270, or 15.4% faculty. Of this number, however, 53 individuals identified themselves as belonging to a visible minority or as Aboriginal. In addition to the questionnaire survey, two focus groups of three persons each and seven individual interviews were conducted by Stephanie Simpson.[2] I also conducted one interview with a former member of Queen's faculty now employed at another University. And Audrey Kobayashi conducted one interview with two former members of the faculty.

I - SURVEY FINDINGS:

Survey Demographics:
Although more men (59%) than women (40%) responded to the survey, more women responded relative to their overall numbers in the faculty population.[3]   The majority (52%) of the respondents fall into the 30-49 age categories; however, 44% were aged 50 and over. One quarter of the sample had been at Queen's between four and ten years and the same number had been there between eleven and twenty years. Not quite one third (31%) of the survey respondents had been at Queens for a relatively short time, zero to three years. While all faculties of the University were represented, the Faculties of Arts

----

1 The survey was sent to all Faculty who have an email address in the human resources system. This list includes faculty with full range appointments, special and non-renewable appointments, adjunct appointments and sessionals. However, the group normally referred to as faculty consists of those covered under the QUF A/Queen's Collective agreement and consists of about 1000-1100 persons.
2 The survey response rate is relatively low. While there may have been some resistance to participation on the part of some faculty, I have been told that there were problems with the timing of the survey that may have prevented a larger response. The focus group participation rate is also rather low but apparently there were some faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty who feared the possible consequences of participation.
3 According to the Employment Equity Report, 2003, 65.9% of the faculty is men and 34.1% women.

and Science and the Faculty of Health Sciences accounted for 71% of the survey respondents. In terms of current status at the University 9% were heads of departments.

Opinion Questions

The survey contained a number of opinion questions (see Appendix 1) including: Do colleagues treat me with respect? Do colleagues value my knowledge and work? Is everyone accepted as an equal member? Is there an equitable tenure process? Are hiring selections procedures fair? Is anti-racism research is valued?[4] What is extremely interesting about these questions is their consistency of response. In examining only the bottom end of the scale, that is, persons who answered 'strongly disagree and disagree' to the opinion questions, we find that:

Table 1 - Persons Who Answered Strongly Disagree or Disagree To Opinion Questions:

	2.1-2-10
My colleagues treat me with respect:	25-9%
My knowledge and work valued:	29-10%
In my dept, all accepted as equal members:	43-16%
Equitable T/P process:	45-17%
Fair hiring process:	41-16%
Anti-racism research supported:	18- 6%
Queens has difficulty retaining vm's	27- 10%
Ab and vm's adequately represented	125?-46%
Queen's is inclusive for V.M. and Ab. Fac.	68-25%
Climate at Queen's supports diversity	65-24%

The first five questions deal with general values that this University as well as most other universities would consider foundation principles and values on which their institution is built. Yet, a small but important group in this sample of faculty does not believe that these principles and values are being practiced at Queen's.   Question 6 would primarily affect the relatively small numbers who do anti-racism research and the

----
4 See questionnaire in appendix 1

lack of knowledge on this issue is reflected in a 72% "don't know" response to this item. Similarly, the question of retention of visible and Aboriginal faculty is an issue not widely known about, and received a "don't know" response rate of 59%. The last three questions deal with issues of representation and inclusiveness and achieve a much higher rate of divergence. These questions yielded a much higher rate of disagreement of faculty who do not believe that Queen's is inclusive, representative or supportive of diversity. It probably reflects a significant number of White mainstream 'liberal' faculty who are aware that this University, as others, does not reflect the multicultural and multiracial reality of the Canadian population.

When these data are disaggregated according to minority status, the results change on a few of the items. Table 2 reports the findings:

Table 2: Opinion O's 2.1-1.10 by Aboriginal/Faculty of colour Status and All Others. *(%)**

	F.of C/AB		OTHERS	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
My colleagues treat me with respect:	**62****	25.5	**75.4**	21.4
My knowledge and work valued:	**53.4**	39.5	**65.7**	31.1
In my dept, all accepted as equal members:	**55.8**	37.2	**68.4**	22.8
Equitable T/P process:	**37.2**	32.5	**55.2**	25
Fair hiring process:	53	37.2	60	25.4
Anti-racism research supported:	14	13.5	16	11
Queens has difficulty retaining vm's	30.2	16.2	22	15
Ab and vm's adequately represented	14	72	11	95.6
Queen's is inclusive for V.M. and Ab. Fac.	21	60.4	25.4	38
Climate at Queen's supports diversity	**34.8**	44.7	**55.8**	45

* Agree includes both 'strongly agree' and 'agree'; disagree includes both 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree.'
** bolded figures show a ten point or more percentage difference between the two groups.

White faculty tend to agree with several of these propositions more frequently than do faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty. The most obvious differences are in regard to equitable promotion and tenure practices, with more than half of the White respondents agreeing that the process is equitable whereas only slightly more than one third of the faculty of colour faculty agree. The other proposition that elicited a strong difference between the two groups was that of the University supporting diversity. Again, more than half of the White faculty agree to this statement whereas only slightly more than one third of the faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty do. (1-Endnote)

The next series of questions deals with 'experiences of discrimination' at Queen's University. All told, 109 of the total sample of respondents said that they had experienced discrimination at Queen's. Among the most frequently cited forms were: double standards (80-30%); stereotyping (68-25%); isolation/exclusion (62-23%); derogatory language or condescension (61-23%); other, including two cases of physical violence (20-8%). Of this group, 44 or 40% cited gender discrimination whereas 23 or 21% cited ethno-racial status, disability or sexual orientation. Other reasons for discrimination included political views, seniority and research area. (37-34%)

A series of questions was asked specifically of Aboriginal faculty and faculty of colour:[5]

"Do you feel that your Aboriginal or visible minority status had/has a positive, or negative, or no effect on ..."

Table 3: Effects of Aboriginal or Faculty of colour Status on (n=43??)[6]

	Positive	Negative	No Effect
Your initial appointment	9-17%	7-13%	37-70%
Progress thru ranks	0	16-31%	36-69%
Relations with colleagues	5-10%	16-32%	29-58%
Relations w.persons of authority	4-8%	17-33%	31-60%

----

5 According to the Federal Contractor's reporting, there are 117 self identified Aboriginal and faculty of colour at Queen's out of a total of 1378.

6 The responses add to more than 43 so multiple responses or multiple coding was allowed.

Receiving merit assessment	2-4%	19-37%	30-59%
Relations with students	10-17%	19-32%	30-51%
Departmental participation	3-7%	12-29%	26-63%
University community	5-10%	8-16%	38-74%

Fifty-three faculty of colour responded to one of the opinion questions on the survey. However, the tabulated results of this series of questions is based on 43.

The first comment that must be made in regard to this table is that the majority of Aboriginal and faculty of colour said that their status had no effect or played no role in these issues. Secondly, however, very few thought that it had a positive effect. What is of interest for our purposes, however, is that there is a nucleus of persons, ranging from 7 to 19, depending on the specific issue, who answered that their status had a negative effect. The issues that received the highest number of negative effect responses relate to some of the most important issues facing academics, that is, their relationships to their peers and those who have authority over them and to their students. Career progress is measured by merit assessments of work and progress through the ranks. Important determinants of professional academic life were also perceived to have been negatively influenced by minority status.

Moreover, nearly half of this sample of forty-three persons, or 45%, said that they had experienced overt discrimination or harassment at the University. Department heads (11); colleagues (10) and students (5) were most often cited as being the source of the discriminatory treatment.   Of those who experienced discrimination, more than half, (56%) sought advice and assistance from a wide variety of persons, but primarily colleagues and QUFA. Twelve respondents said they had received support at this time and seven said the situation was resolved to then- satisfaction. Thirteen persons or 29% of the sample said that they had experienced systemic discrimination at the University whereas the majority of thirty-two, or 71 %, answered in the negative.

Questions in regard to whether teaching style was constrained by "other's perceptions of," revealed that gender was the most frequently cited reason (forty-two persons). Other frequently cited reasons were cultural background (including accent) mentioned by thirty persons, and status as faculty of colour and Aboriginal status were mentioned by fourteen persons. A question that asked whether respondent's authority was challenged by students revealed that again most persons (fifty-one who responded positively cited gender as the reason. Age was cited by forty-five persons and cultural background by 18. Ethno-racial status was cited by 13 persons. Generally speaking, these results continue to indicate that among faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty there is a nucleus of about fifteen respondents whose perceptions and experiences lead them to assess the University as an inhospitable work environment for them. Nearly half of the Aboriginal and minority faculty report experiences of discrimination. Moreover, since gender is frequently mentioned in these survey responses, it would appear that there is also a group of disenchanted and alienated women faculty who view the University as a 'chilly' work environment.

II - FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

To augment quantitative survey findings, a series of focus group discussions with minority faculty were also held.   The numbers of participants is fairly small but apparently some persons who did participate in this process mentioned that they knew others who refused to volunteer because they feared some form of retaliation and did not trust the confidentiality of this process.

Major Themes:
The focus groups were facilitated by Stephanie Simpson and guided by a series of questions. [7]
The following major themes can be identified in these discussions.

1.   Hiring Decisions: Equity Hiring and the Potential For Backlash
It has often been noted in the literature on employment equity that persons who fall under employment equity hiring guidelines are led to wonder if they were hired to satisfy

----
7 See questions in appendix

the equity policy mandate of the institution or because they are meritorious in their fields. This question sometimes leads to self-doubts about their abilities and can act as a constraint on their productivity. Resistance to more pro-active and inclusive hiring practices appears to be pervasive and systemic in many academic institutions. This issue was clearly of significant concern to discussion participants and was therefore discussed in some detail.

For example, one respondent said of her appointment: "What I am not sure of is, is it because of my racial identity and that I was a member of a target group or because I was known to have a good review as someone in the field, I don't know." Another faculty member in her department kept questioning her appointment and "kept asking me, why you? Why you? I did not retort why not me, but it made me wonder whether it was an equity appointment." Although re-assured that her appointment was not for equity reasons and that she was hired because she was the best person for the position, she still experienced some self-doubts. On the same issue, another individual said: "I was perceived as an affirmative action hiring by a number of people in my department." Apparently, an incumbent who had also applied for the same job was viewed as the 'more deserving.' "So clearly I was viewed as someone that had skimmed in on affirmative action, and undeservedly because I was mixed blood, I think was the perception." Although told by a member of the hiring committee that she was "hands down the best person; you had us wowed - but for years I did think that yes, it was an affirmative action hiring, and that certainly affects your sense of how good you are, especially for the long term." Another mixed race person said that she didn't think she was hired for equity reasons because she does not look like a person of colour. After finding out, however, "people in my department were a bit taken aback, because they hadn't figured it out before." She also discussed her membership on hiring committees and recalls one in particular where the decision was to hire the woman of colour over five male candidates who met all the requirements of the position whereas the woman did not. "I was the only person on that committee to say this is wrong... and I was convinced that at least one (of the members of the committee) felt like saying 'you see, this is what we have to do. You give them a woman at the same time you get her to be a visible minority. Now we don't have to hire anymore." In discussing how other faculty speak without restraint in front

of her because her racial identity is not immediately visible, a respondent recounts how she frequently hears comments such as: "Oh, this department is hiring, we will have to set up a selection committee, I suppose we'll have to hire a lesbian cripple... that's the standard... I've heard that at least ten times." Another focus group participant raised the question of whether equity hiring really helps and concluded that: "I don't think that kind of proactive hiring really helps anything. In fact, it probably sets things back because it is reinforcing the assumption that they can only get in that way.   I would agree strongly that if we can find whatever equity hire we're after on the basis of merit, by all means."

Another person who also does not look visibly different stated quite definitely that "I think that some of the women who hired me felt that I was safe because I looked White enough, you know, I would fit, I wasn't too visibly different. But as I said there was considerable resentment by some people on the other edge when I was hired... "

Fears about equity hiring not only pervade the focus group data but were also raised in the comments made at the end of the survey questionnaire. One person said that only "good teachers and good researchers should be retained" regardless of their ethnic status. This person thought that other forms of diversity including "religion, political philosophy and theoretical orientation" should receive more attention in selection procedures. The respondent also noted that there was a marked hostility towards members of "more traditional religious faiths".

In contrast to the comments made by minority faculty members, another commentator, using especially powerful language, writes that:

> Aboriginal persons and members of visible minorities have political power with the University that is disproportionate to their numbers. Persons who are clearly not performing well cannot be disciplined nor denied promotion simply because they are members of visible minorities. The trump card in any disagreement is racism; in the long run this situation will do far more harm to acceptance of members of visible minorities.

What is noteworthy in this strong comment is the implicit assumption that such persons are not performing well and that equity hiring has led to a pool of non-meritorious employees. Moreover, the phrase 'acceptance of visible minorities' implies that they are indeed perceived as 'others,' and that perhaps special measures limiting complaints about racism are required for 'acceptance' to take place.

On the issue of equity hiring, there is a general agreement among focus group participants as well as persons who wrote comments to the survey that while more Aboriginal and faculty of colour representation on campus is required, the first criterion of hiring should be merit. However, there also appears to be the belief among some faculty that merit is sometimes ignored in the hiring process because of 'political correctness'. As one participant stated: "... when it comes time to decide who comes and when it comes to talking about invoking various provisions of equity agreements - that sort of tends to get their backs up... there was just a lot of odd resistance to hiring faculty of colour... it's a big problem." The issue of "quota" hiring was also discussed and there was agreement that this was not something the University should pursue because potential faculty should not "fit an equality measure,' but "we should measure whether that person is equally good at delivering what's required... you don't water down the academic excellence of our University."

There was also some discussion of specific cases. In one example, already referred to above, the 'wrong' person was hired; and in another a faculty member who did not apparently meet tenure requirements was granted tenure. These special cases are singled out as sending out the wrong message and making it difficult for other minority group members. As one respondent suggested: "This faculty has to think really hard if they are going to hire another visible minority into this faculty ... because in that case, it is spoiled for lots of others; opportunities for other visible minorities.". What is notable about these comments is the assumption that one or two bad decisions involving minority faculty will make it difficult for entire categories of present and future faculty hiring. Every University has had the experience of making wrong choices in hiring, promotion and tenure as it relates to the selection of White male faculty, which might later be regretted. However, these mistakes are rarely viewed as reflecting a systemic and

pervasive problem to be analyzed and avoided. On the other hand, when such decisions involve minorities, these individual cases are often generalized and contextualized in racialized discourse including the discourse of "otherness" and the discourse of "political correctness. (The discourse of the 'other' involves marginalizing events or persons because they are not part of the standard, traditional or normative. 'Political correctness' is often used as a reason for rationalizing decisions or making judgments involving persons of colour, the disabled, Aboriginals and women. Its underlying assumption is that decisions, especially positive ones such as hiring, would not have been undertaken were it not for employment equity policies.)

What is evident in some of these statements is the acceptance of popular myths about the nature of employment equity. Employment equity is a concept, policy and program that is either consciously or unwittingly misunderstood by those who benefit from their unexamined status as a bone fide member of the White, non-Aboriginal, male, able-bodied, population. Employment equity policies require only the establishment of flexible goals and timetables. The policy does not mandate fixed quotas. Moreover, equity programs do not require the abandonment of the merit principle or the undermining of standards and qualifications. The most salient aspect of employment equity is that the policy eliminates selection, promotion and tenure decisions based on irrelevant criteria such as colour of skin, gender, and disability. Nevertheless, the myths and erroneous assumptions as reflected in the above discussion are pervasive in academic institutions, as well as in other sectors. These myths serve to reproduce the invisible power and privilege of Whiteness and maleness within the cultural values and norms of the system. They act as the fuel that ignites resistance and backlash and is apparent from some of these comments.

This next question probes the respondents' views on the experiences of racial minority and Aboriginal faculty once they are hired. One of the most important issues discussed at length is various aspects of the institutional culture at Queen's, which can essentially be characterized as a "culture of Whiteness." This theme is related to the power of the myths surrounding employment equity and represents a core issue for the respondents. Before discussing some of these more general issues related to this subject

as identified by focus group participants, a brief analysis of some of the results of the survey are pertinent as it relates to racism. The survey results described above found that more than one hundred respondents had experienced discrimination. However, the majority of these were gender related. Issues related to ethnic status, disability and sexual orientation were identified by twenty-three respondents, just over half of the faculty of colour and aboriginal respondents. There was general agreement in the focus group discussions that racism and discrimination are not usually overt or direct, but are manifested in more subtle and elusive forms of bias and differential treatment at Queen's. This view was expressed by one person who said "I've never really heard of any cases of open discrimination or harassment against a minority faculty member... I think lots of things are very subtle... like a smile or a lack of politeness." She expressed the opinion that people will leave rather than fight racism because they feel that there is so little that they can do to challenge the system. Respondents also expressed the view that when minority faculty experience difficulty, the issue is almost always contextualized in terms of personal inadequacy or failure, rather than racism. Here we see a third rhetorical strategy incorporated into the dominant discourses that circulate through the culture of the University. Above, we identified the discourse of "otherness" and "political correctness" as discursive currents that support the status quo and reproduce cultural hegemony. The discourse of "blame the victim" is also present. However, one of the problems in identifying and linking these discursive practices with racism is that the more traditional or "old" forms of racism have mutated into more subtle and less overt manifestations. As one person cautiously put it: "before taking it forward... I would like to make certain that race is the case... many times you see people of different background usually fall back on racism...". When asked where people would take issues of racism and discrimination, there was also agreement that while an equity office exists and does good work, there was not much of an informal support structure for resolving grievances of this kind. The union was also mentioned as a possible avenue of redress. While overt or direct examples of racism were not discussed, indirect examples related to teaching, research and administration were frequently mentioned almost in passing. For example, in discussing departmental politics and the role of the head of department, a participant noted: "They didn't want anybody different. The head of the department came in, she was a woman of color; she instituted a level of

"professionalization" and that was resented - and that was doubly resented because as a woman of color she was seen as an interval." (meaning perhaps, a temporary interloper) The resentment stems from not only the changes she wanted to institute, but the fact that she was seen as a temporary chair." The implication appears to be that a person of colour is not fit or suited to be a chair.

2   Student Rejection/hostility

Respondents identified significant manifestations of racism in the context of interactions between White students and faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty. Student hostility directed at faculty members was viewed as one of deep concern. As one respondent succinctly put it: "... the students play a very important role in this. They can make us very happy or very unhappy or completely unsettled." Almost all respondents commented on their relationship with students and how unsatisfactory their experiences have been. (Only one person said that she/he had absolutely no problems with any of the undergraduate students.) One very careful and soft spoken person seems resigned to the reality that "every year I will have a few people who feel really strong about some aspect of the teaching that they don't like." One of the most significant indicators of barriers identified by participants is the lack of ethno-racial diversity within the student population of Queens. As one respondent commented:

> There is this perception that you go to Queen's that it will be all White ... most students here are either from small towns or the white suburbs... you know what's scary; many of my students have said in their learning journals that they have never encountered a multicultural experience before Queen's...." "I had no idea how mono-cultural the classes were and how much I had to tone down the classes for them.

Their homogeneity goes beyond Whiteness and their socialization in small towns; it also affects the way they have experienced learning. Some respondents mentioned that their diverse backgrounds have also led them to styles of teaching and learning that differ markedly from the pedagogical models that many of these students experienced in school. These concerns are reflected in the following comments.

> Students grow up in little towns in Ontario and they are very homogeneous... they way they learn is kind of like a formula in certain ways. So anything different, they feel a little bit uncomfortable... for some people it's threatening to

the things they are familiar with... find it very hard to cope with this diversity thing. Our students have been taught by the same stream of teaching so its very difficult for them to have a professor who has experienced differently and who will give them a slightly different way of teaching and learning activities.

In speaking about student culture and its lack of exposure to diversity and multiculturalism, one participant noted in terms of student interactions with ethno-racial minorities that: "You can still get through your entire experience at Queen's, and if you decide not to have contact with the "others", you don't need to.

In addition their reaction to different styles of teaching, some students appear to be upset by the accented speech of non-Canadian-born faculty. In commenting on how her racial diversity affects students, one respondent also noted that: "I know that professors with accents must face an even more difficult time." Others noted that accent should not be a problem because "good teaching is a matter of skill."   Citing an example from his/her own University experience, one faculty member recounted that her best professor was a heavily accented Latino. Another participant noted that "educating the students on the need to converse with and learn to listen to speakers from other parts of the world regardless of their accent" is an important part of the educational process; learning how to value difference and diversity is a critical skill that the University should provide to students. On the issue of accent, another respondent discussed a common situation in one field of applied science. He commented: "In applied science, in certain disciplines it is very difficult to find anybody White, electrical engineers for example... but then they say they don't understand a damn thing that all those foreigners over there are saying to them. They didn't use the word foreigners, they used immigrants." The matter of accent comes up even when there is recognition that there are few White Canadians who specialize in this area.

A further example of the issue of student hostility is demonstrated by the fact that some students are also unwilling to study particular subjects taught by faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty. This is especially true for course work that deals with racism.

Some students will take a course of this nature without really being committed or engaged by the subject matter. As one professor in this situation noted "Some of them want to take my courses so that they can tell me that the stuff I teach is not really that important. They constantly challenge the paradigm that [certain] groups have experienced, or have been through a certain hardship, and some of them get quite defensive."

In regard to dealing with issues of race and racism, a former faculty member questions the role of students in a particular department and although she cannot offer solutions, states that "something should be done to help the students to be a little bit more open and less critical towards women of colour faculty." Apparently the issue here is that some White female students feel threatened when they are taught that racism is as important as sexism.

Overt racist reactions from students were not encountered, or at least not discussed, by focus group participants, with one important exception. Recounting her experiences as a new faculty member, a respondent described how in the first few weeks of her course, she had a "student revolt", including formal complaints made to the head of the department. The teaching assistants assigned to this course, who were all White, called her in a panic saying they did not know how to handle the situation. She notes that "by the beginning of my teaching career, I was labeled as someone who can't teach." One of the main reasons for the overtly hostile student reaction to her teaching was that she was a minority person teaching a subject area that students found of little interest, as reflected in their comments: "I had six students in each of my five tutorial groups saying we don't want to hear anymore of this fucking... Stuff." (The exact nature of the subject is omitted here because it might identify the speaker). This incident appears to have strong racist overtones because the students reacted not only to a teaching style that may have been unfamiliar to them but also to a subject area that involved the study of cultural patterns different to their own.

Thus, the concerns around student rejection and even, in at least one case, strong antagonism revolve around unfamiliarity and discomfort with difference reflected in the

ethno- racial identity of the professor. Tensions also reflect a resentment of any cultural approaches that depart from the Anglo-Eurocentric models that dominate curricula and pedagogy. In the next set of questions the more general issue of how the racialization of minority faculty impacts on teaching and research is addressed

3. The Interrelationship between Ethno-Racial Status and Teaching and Research
One of the most striking concerns of faculty members teaching courses on racism and anti-racism is the feeling that they must lower their level of teaching. This comes as a surprise in a University whose reputation is that of attracting undergraduate students with very high academic standing. A participant makes a very clear and pointed argument on this point so it is quoted at length:

> You more or less have to do remedial work when you're teaching race work. You have to lower the bar, frankly. You can't hold students here to the same standards - in terms of their analytical prowess - that you would in other places. I'm sorry to have to say it, but it's true. There are things that I would take for granted in Toronto that have to be carefully thought out in this context" In further elaborating on this point, the same person notes that there is no overall University context for this kind of subject matter and therefore "students come to you with just a complete ignorance of the literature, with the sort of modes of analysis we engage in... so its difficult to do it... Never mind that we are teaching courses on race in a class literally filled with White students. That's weird in and of itself.

Lowering the standards of their teaching if their subject matter deals with race, racism or diverse cultures seems to be a major concern for professors of colour at this University. As mentioned earlier, another professor also had problems of a more overt nature when her subject matter was challenged by students. To a certain extent, this concern also carries over into the area of research. One faculty described his/her welcome after his/her appointment and mentioned that she/he had been cautioned by a colleague about not publishing too much in the areas of racism and anti-racism. Clearly the message was that this is not a legitimate field of research and that it would not be taken seriously in terms of future promotion and tenure decisions. In a similar vein, another person commented on the disdain with which certain areas of research are viewed by other colleagues and how they impact future promotion and tenure decisions.

Yes, indeed, I think I have heard many people talk about the treatment of people as a mediocrity, that if your articles are not being printed in North American journals and perhaps in some African, Asian or Far Eastern journals your research isn't merit worthy.... All of a sudden the research is not up to par because it has been published in some eastern obscure reader or research journal.

Another concern expressed by some participants was the difficulty in developing courses or modules that deal with diversity issues. Noting that in his/her area, diversity has become an instrumental issue, one participant described how she/he finally managed to develop some teaching modules on the subject but it "was a struggle itself to get it into the curriculum." Diversity is in the curriculum in "bits and pieces' but what this University with its high stature in this field should be doing is "taking our stature and using it influentially, more than in little bits and pieces."

4. The Dominant Institutional Culture: The Culture of Whiteness
The quantitative survey findings of this study demonstrate that a fairly significant number of faculty believe they have experienced discrimination at this University. Of particular concern are inequitable hiring, promotion and tenure decisions. Many of the faculty experienced discrimination based on gender, but nearly two dozen persons reported that their ethno-racial status was the basis of differential treatment. The survey also indicated that there is a nucleus of about fifteen faculty members of colour and Aboriginal faculty, about a third of those from these groups who responded to the survey, who are extremely disillusioned with their work environment and their everyday experiences at this University. As cited above, the focus group discussions also revealed a consistent pattern of similar concerns. These include: doubts about their initial hiring as a function of equity practices rather than merit; the impact of diversity on teaching, research, and relations with students, colleagues and administrators. Given the fact that Queen's already has some history of alienated faculty of colour resigning from the University, there is a strong possibility that further resignations could occur. Therefore, the question of how to retain minority faculty should be viewed as an urgent matter.

All of the specific concerns and issues that are experienced by some faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty at Queen's University are a function of the dominant

institutional culture of the University, that is, the Culture of Whiteness. Overriding all their specific concerns, faculty of colour, both men and women (as well as some White women faculty) feel detached, alienated and marginalized from the dominant White malestream culture that has largely defined the University. Queen's is perceived by many to be an old WASP University dominated and shaped by the attitudes, beliefs and values of White men. As one respondent commented: "It is so Upper Canada here, I mean Anglo WASP." It is located in an old town settled primarily by migrants from the U.K and the U.S. that was - and still is today - relatively homogeneous in its population. This was described by another focus group member as "that particular irritating Kingston colour blindness." The comparison is made to other universities such as McGill where the competition was intense but "Queen's is a different place", the difference is: "Well there are a lot of White professors."

The network of faculty of colour in Ontario is still relatively small and people tend to know, or know of, each other. Consequently, experiences and stories are exchanged and one respondent specifically mentioned that "all kinds of horror stories" relating to faculty of colour are told about Queen's. The problems involved in retention of faculty of colour at Queen's are also apparently well known because "exile stories about Queen's" are told within the network.

It can be argued that the views of the respondents reflect a fundamental dissonance in academic life at their University. On one hand, Queen's has developed new policies and implemented some equity initiatives in an attempt to represent some of the realities of a racially and culturally diverse society. For example, there is a University Advisor on Equity, a Human Rights Office, an Employment Equity Council, a Joint Sub-Committee on Employment Equity and a Senate appointed Educational Equity Committee that maintain equity statistics and design policy as the need arises. An effort has been made to recruit and hire more faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty. This University is also one of the first to have studied the concerns and experiences of racialized faculty and its Report on Race Relations, published in 1991. This report still stands as a landmark in policy recommendations designed to create a more equitable environment. Thus, at the formal structural level, it appears that Queen's has taken steps to create a more positive and equitable work environment for its faculty. However, there

are some strong indicators that a significant number of faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty are concerned with the ways in which their presence and contributions are marginalized from the mainstream culture and structures of the University. Racialization processes reinforce feelings of stigmatization, inferiorization, and marginalization. Many participants in the focus groups suggested that there is a basic problem of "communication in the University - lots of things are lip service." The University still appears to be seen by some minority faculty as a culture defined by White power and privilege. The core values, beliefs and attitudes of many of its individual members reflect patterns of Anglo- Eurocentric dominance. Queen's, like many other universities, appears to be an institutional site where dominant everyday discourses continue to reinforce the racial divide between majority and minority faculty. It is against this background, that the problems and concerns of racial minority and Aboriginal faculty can be understood. Almost with a single voice, the focus group narratives centred on how bias and differential treatment as a lived reality are embedded in the culture of the University. They described how racialized assumptions, beliefs as articulated in everyday discourses, impact upon their interactions with colleagues, students, and administration. Curricula reflect in its most overt racialized expression by valuing particular kinds of knowledge and devaluing other forms of knowledge. Traditional pedagogical approaches are viewed as limiting the possibility of developing critical skills that challenge the construction of White Eurocentric knowledge. Research opportunities are seen to be limited by the need to conform to sometimes inflexible standards and procedures. Career aspirations and mobility are limited by racialized promotion and tenure decisions.

The following comments reflect how the culture of Whiteness impacts on the student body but it can be generalized to the climate of the entire University.

> There is the perception that you go to Queen's it will be all Canadian or all White; that's because the students here are used to all White ideas, they were used to having their values reflected... they did not want to see anybody that had different values. .We also have to address the teaching club.

There is widespread recognition among the racialized faculty that the **core problem** is not so much interpersonal relationships with colleagues, students and

administrators nor inadequate grievance procedures, but rather the dominant hegemonic institutional culture of the University. The culture of Whiteness at Queen's is even reflected in the way in which gender issues are measured. For example, in discussing women's studies at the University, one person noted that "We have often had the situation where men are recruited for sciences and their spouses are offered to women's studies. What it keeps doing is filling the complement of White women.... Women is not the issue in women's studies, it's Whiteness that is the issue in women's studies". The culture of Whiteness is pervasive.

The following comment points to the important role that the discourse of denial of racism plays within the walls of academia as it does in the broader society.

> As a person with an awareness of racism I think that if an acknowledgement of the existence of racism in this culture was understood then there would be more support for the faculty here and people wouldn't be leaving. You wouldn't be reinventing the wheel with the serial hiring and leaving scenario.

Unfortunately, the fact that certain institutional measures against racism are in place means that it is too easy for White faculty to believe that racism does not, indeed cannot, exist hi the liberal university setting of the 21st Century. As a result, their very belief in the absence of racism blinds them to the experiences of faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty. And their very whiteness - rather than their racism - makes them unable to understand what those experiences might be.

There is also an understanding of the power of the Anglo-Eurocentric culture" which has a long legacy at Queens as well as at other universities. As a result, it is not surprising that White students, faculty, staff and administrators find it confusing and threatening to have to address the need for systematic and sweeping forms of organizational, institutional and culture change.. One faculty member summarized the feelings of many participants on this issue:

> I think this University has been really proud of their traditions, long history ... and for lots of people who work for this University, they have been here forever, and I think the trends in terms of equity issues and minority diversity issues, its not really catching up. They have a hard time to comprehend what diversity means ... I think that anywhere if you have a group of people who have never

seen anything different from what they have experienced in their life - its beyond their understanding and I find that very frustrating.

Another person makes a similar comment when she/he says:

There's a lot of emphasis on congeniality but in terms of dealing with it or accommodation to difference, there's no effort. There are only a couple of people who have to deal with the problem its not like its front and centre on everybody's agenda.

This, for many faculty of colour, is precisely where the problem lies. Issues relating to equity and diversity are not on the mainstream of the University's agenda and therefore they attract little attention. One person related this issue to the general culture of the University describing it as a culture based on "you win, I lose.. .we have that kind of problem, so the issues of visible minority gets put on the backburner." This, of course is not unique to Queens. Many institutions, including universities, are apt to act on a problem only when a specific event or crisis occurs, and they are indifferent to the issues of diversity and equity on a day- today basis. This situation allows for a fairly smooth functioning of the dominant culture as a whole but it ignores the stigmatization, pain and humiliation of those who feel outside the "imagined community" of the University. This phenomenon is described by minority faculty as of living in a constant state of "frustration", as they attempt to fulfill their academic responsibilities, as well as work towards their professional and career advancement.

Aboriginal faculty encounter additional barriers. They too are affected by the culture of Whiteness and its value system, but the Eurocentric aspect of that culture has a particularly powerful affect on Aboriginality. Recognizing the power of the "whole Eurocentric focus in this University, a participant noted that "I really think the prevalence of colonialism and colonialist attitudes is just so profound." Aboriginal faculty feel that their culture is not at all understood in the University atmosphere. Colour or race is better understood than culture and as an Aboriginal faculty person said: "You're [we're] not brown enough." There are also complaints about the need for education about Aboriginal culture before students reach the University level. Neither students nor faculty know much about Aboriginal culture and what they do know is frequently stereotypic.

Academic faculty are therefore measured against a stereotype of the drunken Indian. This sentiment is strongly reflected in this comment:

> It is really ironic that after thousands of years of forced contact that we get blamed for it. I find that is something that affects how Aboriginal faculty are treated. Their Aboriginality is measured; it is measured against the drunk on Main Street. It is being measured against the very dark and the very poor, and the very linguistically challenged person they have in mind as the Aboriginal person.... The weighing and measuring of Aboriginality is so second nature in this society... And how it affects Aboriginal faculty who arrive here is there is this discomfort around sameness and otherness that people can't get a handle on.

Although the issue here is similar to one that other racialized faculty have also identified, that is, the inability of the institution and its incumbents to incorporate difference and diversity as a positive attribute in academic life. The profound differences in cultural orientation that Aboriginal people, both faculty and students bring to the University goes largely unrecognized.

There is also recognition that employment equity hiring is not enough to change an institutional culture as "it is the whole culture not just the hiring of people; hiring more is not enough... you have to look at the curriculum." Although this person does not go into greater detail, several other participants have already noted the difficulty in developing race-based courses and the student hostility to such subject matter.

The institutional culture of dominance and Whiteness is also manifested in the dynamics of departmental life. Most of the participants in this study acknowledged that for the most part, their departmental life was congenial: " I was made to feel very welcome"; ".. .on a day to day [level] I have been welcomed at Queen's by my colleagues.. .never had any problems, directly related to me"; "within my department I think it is fairly good." Nevertheless, there is also the sentiment expressed in the following comment that indicates that departmental congeniality is often superficial.

> Collegiality exists within my department.. .having said that though collegiality does not rule out discrimination. They are our friends but some are more friends than others. ..if you look at the body it is made up of a group presenting one side of the population therefore it will be one sided and so will the decisions.

Another very forthright person spoke about this in very definitive terms describing the departmental atmosphere as:

> Hostile, very hostile and it's harder for me to know for people of other ethnic groups but I would say that it is an extremely hostile environment. It is a very superficial facade of welcoming to people of minorities but very hostile in reality.

The departmental level is probably the most important focus for faculty since many of the issues that immediately affect their academic responsibility and performance are decided there. It is also, however, the focus of most controversy, conflict and tension and universities are well known for the problems associated with departmental politics. The issues surrounding difference, diversity, equity as well as racist attitudes and behaviour associated with a culture of Whiteness are exacerbated by 'normal' departmental friction and factionalism. Thus, many participants, while discussing the superficial nature of congeniality within their departments also describe the intense conflicts which characterize their departments. Many racialized faculty therefore find themselves in conflicted departments which aggravate their concerns and issues. Departmental politics therefore worsen or enhance the culture of Whiteness.

The institutional culture of Whiteness also strongly affects the student body. One of the common criticisms made by racialized faculty is the relative absence of diverse students. Although there was little discussion on how to make the student population more reflective of Canadian society a few comments suggest that any such efforts are doomed to failure. The image and perception of Queen's as a White University is still so strong that in some fields, students of colour prefer to apply to "inferior" programs at other universities rather than come to Queen' which has outstanding programs in many fields. This assessment applies especially to science-related faculties such as engineering and medicine. Such preferences do not reflect the possibility of discrimination at Queen's but rather a concern about studying and living in such a homogeneous community. One participant said that the image problem is compounded in the recruitment of faculty because "it's a question of image that keeps applicants away. So, in most job applications, we present this image to the rest [of the world] and the administration is not even aware of it. Its all part of the belief system that has to change."

Finally, another telling observation is that several of the participants in the focus group discussions emphasized that in the early stages of their appointment at Queen's they did not have many negative experiences around racialized issues. One explanation offered was that their "mixed race" identity was not highly "visible" as they are phenotypically White. This point was made by several 'white' looking faculty and is apparently a highly contentious issue. Being taken for 'white' meant that colleagues would often make negative comments about people of colour in their presence. One person whose mixed race background is not immediately apparent said that "I have heard things I probably wouldn't have heard...people have been more open with me than perhaps they would have been... I had heard very hostile comments about *** people." This pattern reflects the culture of Whiteness that begins with the recognition that people who look like 'me' also have similar values, whereas those who look different do not share these values. It also implies an assumption that the non-racist is one who 'welcomes others' to be just like himself or herself, without the recognition that perhaps it is the dominant culture that needs to change. This is a strong indicator of 'otherness' and of marginalization based on visibility or its absence. (Furthermore this dynamic ignores the fact that Canadian born or socialized persons of colour despite their outward appearance share similar values.)

The institutional culture of the University is acknowledged by some respondents to have changed in the last few years. One participant who had been at the University for some years says: "(The institutional culture) certainly has changed in the past eight years that I have been here. When I got here in 95, the...department had twenty-five or twenty-six faculty members. All of them were White. I would say that a good chunk of them were very resentful... [because] there was a need or perceived need that they should hire others." Now there are apparently some faculty of different ethno-racial backgrounds in this department.

Other people, however, still maintain that "We simply cannot find any truth to what their belief system is and we have to change that and change that belief system somehow." Or there is the view that policies may not be sufficient to change the

institutional environment but one has to wait for "a generational shift of people that are used to the current system, until they exit the system, change may be hard to reach".

Since there is so much agreement that the belief system of the culture of Whiteness is to blame for the chilly climate at Queen's experienced by many racialized faculty, the key question is: What can be done about it? Although participants addressed the area of strategic recommendations to improve working relations at the University, few addressed the institutional problem. Those that did seemed to feel as one participant did that "the way to handle the institutional culture is to keep quiet and lose voice." The fear of challenging the institutional order involves the possibility of retaliation through loss of job for contract or adjunct faculty and denial of tenure and promotion for those in tenure track positions. There is apparently some feeling that if one does not want to suffer the humiliations of retaliation, keeping a low profile and keeping quiet is the strategy one must adapt. This feeling was even implied by participants who said that they knew racialized faculty who deliberately did not want to cooperate in this study for fear of retaliation. One person put it bluntly when he/she maintained that the only reason they cooperated with the study was because they trusted the confidentiality measures.

5. Recommendations Emerging from the Focus Groups:
Many of the participants responded to the question on recommendations. Although very few were specific, several comments indicate that the University needs to take a broader and more wide-ranging perspective on some of the issues that it faces now which includes positioning itself more firmly in the multicultural and multiracial society that Canada has become.

1. Acceptance of the Reality That Defines Canada:
> It is accepting those of different race as equal partners, it doesn't have to have any special value or benefit. It is a reality, this is a multicultural country. And any where you turn, any area people are going to face people with different colour, whereas Queen's has become an exception. Subtle, discrimination, it doesn't have to have an interactive value but we should conform to what is happening with the country... You should seek more in terms of qualification that diversity brings like first hand experience in another nation for a political studies professor.

[Provide] an opportunity and a venue for us to know each other and for visible minorities to mix confidently and amicably with the rest of the community; as well as opportunity for us to feel that we are given due respect, and opportunity to require the position for which we have the training and necessities.

2. Targeted Recruitment Of More Diverse Students:

I imagine for people with different race or ethnicity that the comfort level of having more of their colleagues around... you must feel very isolated on this campus with fewer people to associate with. If you can increase the comfort level of the people at this University you can increase the quality of the University.

3. Targeted Recruitment of More Faculty of Colour and Aboriginal Faculty

More representation is required especially in some areas of engineering and other disciplines in which few such persons are represented. Recruitment should be aimed at achieving a critical mass of faculty of colour so that they can play meaningful roles in all aspects of University life.

3. Implementation of an Employment Equity Strategy through Better Training

I think it is the responsibility of the University to ensure that the department heads and the people on hiring committees are trained and do understand what is involved in the employment equity act. You can't let loosely hang the employment equity act over their heads, you have to give them a proper orientation.. ."you have no women, hire her tomorrow.

It took us a lot of effort to say no, I think that people's motives aren't the right motives. The administrators are just trying to play the number game.

4. Stronger Leadership at Senior Administrative Levels

Several persons expressed the view that an organization is only as effective as its top level administrators. It was felt that the current Queen's leadership has not been assertive enough in providing an equitable environment for faculty of colour.

5. More Training for Heads and Deans on Issues of Diversity

It was generally recognized that some Heads are more sensitive to these issues than are others, but there was widespread agreement that further training on the issues was required of people in middle level leadership positions.

6. Administrative Staff Need Further Training
There was some concern that administrative staff are not helpful to people who come from diverse backgrounds. One person said that even those who come to Queen's from other provinces found administrative staff unhelpful in settling in to the new University environment.

7. Institutional Processes to Deal with Grievances Need Improvement There were general complaints about the individual grievance procedures that are in place because, like the human rights model, they depend upon individual complainants. Several participants saw the need for an institutional process applicable to all rather than an individually driven complaint procedure. It was recognized that the grievance procedure established by the Human Rights Office is useful but in addition, informal mechanisms were also required. The human rights and equity offices also need to be more visible. There was also a perception that if people are to complain, they need support.[8]

A variety of recommendations were made by participants in this study. Some are probably more strategic or implemental than others. For example, one of the most important is to instill a greater sense of commitment to equity issues on the part of senior and middle management. It has been demonstrated in the organizational research literature that equity related changes in large-scale institutions do not occur without the direct, overt and highly transparent commitment of senior managers. In the case of the university this would include the Principal, members of the governing body, Deans and Department heads. In order to facilitate greater commitment, several persons recommended more equity and anti-racism related training be offered to senior and middle level administrators. If equity and anti-racist training is to be considered an option, great care should be taken in the recruitment and selection of trainers. In this area as in others, trainers vary in their depth of experience, backgrounds, knowledge and approach to the issues. This is particularly crucial in an institution such as the

----
8 Ironically, this recommendation directly contradicts another faculty member who stated unequivocally that in order to maintain one's position, "They must learn the Queen's system and stay within it... learn its institutional culture and stay within it., learn to act that way if you want to keep your job especially if you don't have tenure."

University where the trainees are high-powered intellectuals who are more likely to challenge not only the training process but also the credentials of the trainers.

Although greater recruitment of minority and Aboriginal faculty is strongly desired, financial hiring constraints as well as the specific hiring needs of departments have an influence on the recruitment process. There can, however, be a more concerted effort to recruit minority and aboriginal students to come to Queen's University.

Conclusion

It has been over a decade since Queen's produced its Report on Race Relations (1991), in which it articulated its vision and plan for a more inclusive, diverse and equitable academic institution. The findings of this somewhat limited study provide one means by which the University can begin to measure the extent to which it has achieved or failed to deliver on the goals set out in the Report. According to one university source, apparently few of the recommendations of that report have been implemented and there is no one in place to monitor the developments. An obvious first step, therefore, might be to review that earlier report with a view to finding out the extent to which its many recommendations have been acted on.

The central narratives that emerge from the results of the survey and focus groups suggest that Queen's, like most other North American universities, is still struggling to overcome deeply entrenched cultural beliefs, values, norms and structures that preserve the continued dominance of Whiteness and maleness. Minority faculty members are faced with a multitude of experiences that reinforce their sense of "otherness", marginality and exclusion from the mainstream of University life. These forces probably expose minority faculty to significant levels of mental and physical stress. It is important to note that the sources of their isolation, humiliation, and vulnerability, are found in multiple sites. White privilege and power continues to be reflected in the Eurocentric curricula, traditional pedagogical approaches, hiring, promotion and tenure practices, and opportunities for research. It is reflected in the everyday interactions between minority

faculty and their White students, who challenge their expertise, authority and competence. It is manifested in the normative discourses of colleagues, hiring and tenure committees, University administrators, who commonly employ the discourses of reverse discrimination, loss of meritocracy, political correctness, colour-blindness, neutrality, and freedom of expression - all of which act as a cover for the persistence of racial bias and differential treatment.

The findings of this study, supported by a huge body of Canadian scholarship on the subject of racism in academia, suggest that the vision of a more just, equitable and inclusive institution remains largely unrealized. While there are some signs of positive change, the scope and pace remain glacially slow. Standards and measurement of progress need to be grounded in a more concrete and accountable framework for action.

ENDNOTE:

Whiteness and the Culture of Whiteness

The field of 'whiteness studies' emerged as an area of study only a few years ago. It is the result of the growing recognition among scholars that so called "race studies" have focused only on people of colour while excluding the whites who have traditionally held hegemonic positions of power over all other racialized groups. This new field of study recognizes that although race is a social construct with little or no genetic viability, it is still used to categorize people, particularly in the U.S. It becomes important therefore to racialize whites and thereby call attention to their role in constructing hierarchical structures of exclusion and marginality. White-studies scholars contend that whites must accept a race category for themselves but one which does not include the assumption that they are biologically superior to other 'races'.

Whiteness becomes another socially constructed identity, but one which has held the dominant position in perpetuating social inequity. This field of study owes much to literary figures such Toni Morrison, popular culture scholar Richard Dyer and others including Ruth Frankenberg (1993) whose seminal work succinctly defined the field of study. Whiteness to her consists of three interlinked dimensions: it is "a location of structural advantage;.. .it is a 'standpoint' or place from which white people look at ourselves, at others and at society"... and it refers to a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed". This shifts the onus in studies of institutionalised racism, racism in popular culture and racism in society generally from the disadvantaged groups of colour to those who are white and privileged and whose views are considered natural, normative and basically raceless. Whiteness studies racializes this group and critically examines their role in fostering exclusion.

Whiteness studies are scholarly examinations of the role that white privilege has played for generations. Such privilege confers benefits in almost all sectors of society whereas people of colour are often disadvantaged, excluded and marginalized because of their skin colour and its associated stereotypic constructs. Whiteness contests the often held view of colour-blindness - the notion that one does not see skin colour - as untrue and inaccurate. Whites see the 'colour' in others in the same manner as they are seen as

'white'. Most white people do not, however, recognize themselves as a racial category and their self-identification rarely includes the descriptor 'white'. Such people are often not even aware of being white and without that essential self-recognition, find difficulty in recognizing and accepting their role as perpetrators of racial discrimination and exclusion. Most whites see themselves as raceless but the power of whiteness is manifested by the ways in which racialized whiteness becomes transformed into social, political and economic social and cultural behaviour. White culture, norms and values in all these areas becomes normative and natural. It becomes the standard against which all other cultures, groups and individuals are measured and usually found to be inferior. Whiteness conies to mean truth, objectivity and merit.

It is against this background, that critical race scholars of whiteness are now attempting to gain insight and perspective into these dynamics with the ultimate aim of exposing the power of whiteness in order to dismantle some of its overwhelming hegemony over those who are 'non-white'. In an equitable social environment, white people and the culture of whiteness they create must learn to share their space with rather than control and exclude others from it.

References:
Dyer, Richard 1997. *White*. London: Routledge

Frankenberg, R. 1993. *White Women Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gabriel, J. 1998. *Whitewash: Racialized Politics and the Media*. London: Routledge.

Morrison, T. 1992. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Toronto and New York: Vintage (Random House).

Bibliography:

Bannerji, H. 1991. "But Who Speaks for Us? Experience and Agency in Conventional Feminist Paradigms." In H. Bannerji, L. Carty, K. Dehli, S. Heald, and K. Himmanji, *Unsettling Relations: The University as a Site of Struggle.* Women's Press, 67-108.

Bernard, Thomas W. 2001. "Claiming Voice: An Account of Struggle, Resistance and Hope in the Academy." In *Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal Women of Colour in the Academy*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAW), 61-72.

Calliste, A. 2000. "Anti-Racist Organizing and Resistance in Academia." In G. Dei, and A Calliste (ed.) *Power, Knowledge and Anti-Racism Education: A Critical Reader*. Halifax: Fernwood, 142-161.

Carty, L. 1991. "Black Women in Academia: A Statement from the Periphery." In H. Bannerji, L. Carty, K. Dehli, S. Heald, and K. Himmanji, *Unsettling Relations: The University as a Site of Struggle*. Women's Press, 6-13.

Dua, R. and B. Lawrence 2000. "Challenging White Hegemony in University Classrooms: Whose Canada is It?" *Atlantis 24*(2): 105-122.

Green, J. 2002. "Transforming at the Margins of the Academy." In E. Hannah, L. Paul, S. Vethamany (eds), *Women in the Canadian Tundra: Challenging the Chill*. Montreal and Kingtson: McGill-Queen's University Press, 85-91.

Henry, F., C. Tator, W. Mattis and T. Rees. 2000. *The Colour of Democracy*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Harcourt.

James, C. 1994. "The Paradox of Power and Privilege: Race, Gender and Occupational Position." *Canadian Women Studies* 14(2): 48-54.

Kobayashi, A. 2002. "Now You See Them, How You See Them: Women of Colour in Canadian Academia. In S. Herald (ed.), *Feminist Issues: Selected Papers from the WIN Symposia, 2000-2001*. Ottawa: Humanities and Social Sciences Federation of Canada, 44-54.

Luther, R., E. Whitmore and B. Moreau. (eds) 2001. *Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal Women of Colour in the Academy*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAW), 7-14.

McCarthy, C. 1993. "After the Canon: Knowledge and Ideological Representation in the Multicultural Discourse on Curriculum Reform." hi C. McCarthy and W. Crichlow (eds), *Race, Identity and Representation in Education*. New York and London: Routledge.

Mojab, S. 2002. "Equity Coordinator: Change Agent in an Unyielding Power Structure." In E. Hannah, L. Paul and S. Vethamany-Globus (eds), *Women in the Canadian Academic Tundra: Challenging The Chill.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 162-167.

Monture Angus, P. 2001. "In the way of Peace: Confronting 'Whiteness1 in the University." In Luther et al. (eds), *Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal and Women of Colour in the Academy*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRJAW), 29-50.

Mojab, S. 2002. "Equity Coordinator: Change Agent in an Unyielding Power Structure." In E. Hannah, L. Paul and S. Vethamany-Globus (eds), *Women in the Canadian Academic Tundra: Challenging The Chill*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 162-167.

Monture Angus, P. 2001. "In the way of Peace: Confronting 'Whiteness1 in the University." hi Luther et al. (eds), *Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal and Women of Colour in the Academy*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAW), 29-50.

Ng, R. 1994. "Sexism and Racism in the University: Analyzing a Personal Experience in the University." *Racism and Gender* 14(2) (Spring):41-46.

Razack, S. 2001. "Racialized Women as Native Informers in the Academy." In Luther et al. (eds), *Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal and Women of Colour in the Academy*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAW), 51-60.

St. Lewis, J. 2001. "In the Belly of the Beast." In Luther et al (eds), *Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal and Women of Colour in the Academy*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAW), 73-84.

Shahrzad, M. 2002. "Equity Coordinator: Change Agent in an Unyielding Power Structure. In E. Hannah, L.Paul and S. Vethamany-Globus (eds), *Women in the Academic Tundra: Challenging the Chill*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's Univrsity Press, 162-167.

Sweet, L. 1993. "Academic Angst: The Professional Privilege of Tenure — A Job for Life." *Toronto Star* (July 18):B1.

APPENDIX A

Senate Educational Equity Committee

Survey

This survey is in five parts, concerning the retention of visible minority and aboriginal faculty members at Queen's, You may choose to not answer or leave blank any of the following questions.

Part 1

1.1 Gender
Male   Female   Transgendered   Transsexual

1.2 Age
20-29   30-39   40-49   50-59   >=60

1.3 How long have been working at Queen's?
Since _____ (year)

1.4 Where in the University are you currently employed?
Faculty of Applied Sciences
Faculty of Arts & Sciences
School of Business
Faculty of Education
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Faculty of Health Sciences
Faculty of Law
Queen's Theological College
other:

APPENDIX A

1.5 Current status?
Continuing Adjunct
Tenure Track, initial or renewed
Tenured Associate Professor
Tenured Assistant Professor
Tenured Full Professor
Non-renewable
other:

1.6 Are you the Head of your Department or Unit?
Yes   No

Part 2

Rate the following statements, using a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly disagree and 5 is strongly agree.

2.1 At Queen's University, my colleagues treat me with respect.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

2.2 At Queen's University, my knowledge and work are valued.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

2.3 In my Department, every individual, regardless of his or her visible minority status, Aboriginal status, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability is accepted as an equal member.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

2.4 In my Department, the renewal/ tenure/ promotion process is equitable for all faculty members.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

2.5 In my Department, the process for selecting a person for a faculty position is done fairly.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

2.6 Anti-racism research conducted by faculty members is adequately and fairly supported at Queen's.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

APPENDIXA

2.7 Queen's University has difficulty retaining Aboriginal faculty and faculty from visible minority groups.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

2.8 Aboriginal faculty and faculty from visible minority groups are adequately represented on campus.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

2.9 Queen's University is an inclusive place for Aboriginal people and members of visible minority groups.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

2.10 The climate at Queen's is supportive of diversity.
1   2   3   4   5   Don't know

Part 3

We invite your comments

3.1 Are you concerned about retention of Aboriginal and visible minority faculty members at Queen's?
yes   no

Please comment on your answer:

3.2 If you could make your single most important recommendation for improving the University environment for Aboriginal faculty and faculty of visible minority groups, what would it be?

Part 4

4.1 A) Have you experienced any of the following here at Queen's?
Isolation/Exclusion
Stereotyping
Derogatory Language or Condescension
Hostility
Double Standards
Physical Violence
other:

4.1 B) For those that you have experienced, please indicate if you have reason to believe the treatment was based on your gender, Aboriginal status, visible minority status, disability, or sexual orientation, or if the cause was unknown to you.

4.2 Is your teaching style constrained by other's perception of your:

Gender
Yes   No

Disability
Yes   No   Does not apply

Seniority
Yes   No

Cultural background (including accent or religion)
Yes   No

Visible Minority Status
Yes   No   Does not apply

Aboriginal Status
Yes   No   Does not apply

Sexual Orientation
Yes   No

Other (Please specify below)
Yes   No

4.3 Do you feel that your authority is challenged more frequently by students because of your:

Gender
Yes   No

Disability
Yes   No   Does not apply

Age
Yes   No

Cultural background (including accent or religion)
Yes   No

Visible minority status
Yes   No   Does not apply

Aboriginal status
Yes   No   Does not apply

Sexual orientation
Yes   No

Other (please specify below)
Yes   No

APPENDIX A

4.4 Please specify if you belong to either of the following groups:
Aboriginal
Visible Minority

If either of the above apply, we invite your voluntary participation in the next section which asks specific questions concerning your experiences as Aboriginal or visible minority faculty. Results will be held in strictest confidence. If you are not participating in Part 5, we would like to thank you for participating in this survey. Results of the survey will be announced in the Gazette and on the web as soon as they are available. If you have any further questions, please contact the SEEC Co-chair.

Part 5

5.1 Please assess the following statements on whether the effect was positive or negative:

Do you feel that your Aboriginal or visible minority status had/has a positive, or negative, or no effect on...

Your initial appointment
Positive   Negative   No Effect

Your progress through the ranks or promotion
Positive   Negative   No Effect

Your relations with colleagues/peers in the university
Positive   Negative   No Effect

Your relations with persons having authority over your position
Positive   Negative   No Effect

Receiving adequate merit assessment
Positive   Negative   No Effect

Your relations with students
Positive   Negative   No Effect

Your participation in (the community of) your Department
Positive   Negative   No Effect

Your participation in (the community of) the University
Positive   Negative   No Effect

APPENDIXA

5.2 A) Here at Queen's University, because of your Aboriginal or visible minority status, have you experienced overt discrimination or harassment? (Overt discrimination refers to an obvious and specific case of unfair or differential treatment, whether intentional or unintentional.)
YES   NO

If you answered "NO" please go to question No. 5.4.

5.2 B) Who was the source of the discrimination and/or harassment?
Department Head
Administrator
Colleague
Student
Staff
Other (please specify title or position):

5.2 C) Did you seek advice/assistance?
YES   NO
If no, why not?

If you answered "No" to 5.2 C) please got to question No. 5.4.

5.3 A) From whom did you seek help/advice?
Department Head
Dean or Associate Dean
Colleague
University Advisor on Equity
Human Rights Advisor
Queen's University Faculty Association (QUFA)
Employee Assistance Program
Human Resources
Other (please specify title):

APPENDIX A

5.3 B) Did you feel you were supported at this time?
YES   NO

5.3 C) Was the situation resolved to your satisfaction?
YES   NO

5.4 Here at Queen's University, because of your Aboriginal or visible minority status, have you experienced systemic discrimination? (Systemic discrimination refers to unfair or differential treatment that is built into institutional policies or practices so that it is perpetuated automatically.)
Yes   No

If yes, please explain and/or comment:

Conclusion

You are invited to participate in a focus group discussion concerning your experiences and views as an Aboriginal or visible minority faculty member. Your participation is voluntary and participants will be free to withdraw at any time without consequence. If you are willing to participate, please include your name and contact information in the form below. A member of the Office of the University Advisor on Equity will contact you regarding focus group procedures.

We ensure full confidentiality of your survey responses, your contact information and any comments subsequently shared during the focus group sessions.

APPENDIX B

Understanding the Experiences of Visible Minority and Aboriginal Faculty Members at Queen's University

Focus Groups Questions:

1. How do you think Queen's does in its ability to:
   - Hire and retain Aboriginal and visible minority faculty members?
   - Create a welcoming environment?
   - Create diverse curriculum?
   - Value the participation of Aboriginal and visible minority faculty   in the community?
   - Respond to racism?
   - Ensure the safety of Aboriginal/visible minority faculty?

2. How would you describe your departmental culture?
   E.g. Collegial/divisive? Regarding issues of discrimination or harassment? Regarding differences in communication/decision making styles?

3. How has being an Aboriginal person or member of a visible minority group had an impact on:
   - Your teaching?
   - Your interactions with colleagues?
   - Your relations with students?
   - Your research?
   - Obtaining funding?
   - Renewal, tenure, promotion or merit?
   - Community relations?
   - Your service responsibilities? Other?

4. In what ways has being an Aboriginal person or person from a visible minority group made a difference to your career at Queen's?

5. Please tell me about experiences you've had at Queen's in which you either have or have not felt supported and valued in your career.

If you could make your single most important recommendation for improving the university environment for Aboriginal faculty members and faculty members from visible minority groups, what would it be?