



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

Office of the Senior Vice President  
for Academic Affairs and Provost  
213 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

**DATE:** December 13, 1990

**TO:** The Honorable Wendell R. Anderson  
The Honorable Charles H. Casey  
The Honorable M. Elizabeth Craig  
The Honorable Jack P. Grahek  
The Honorable Jean B. Keffeler  
The Honorable Elton A. Kuderer  
The Honorable Alan C. Page  
The Honorable David K. Roe  
The Honorable Darrin M. Roshia  
The Honorable Stanley D. Sahlstrom  
The Honorable Mary T. Schertler

**FROM:** The Rajender Salary Settlement Committee  
Margaret Davis  
Sara Evans  
Janice Hogan  
Sally Jorgensen  
Virginia Katz  
Jennifer Sue Oatey, Chair

The Rajender Salary Settlement Committee was created by the Settlement Agreement and Consent Decree and charged with the allocation of the third, and final portion, of the \$3,000,000 settlement award. The task of the committee was to review applications from individuals and groups who were members of the class who believed that the (first phase) 3% across-the-board and (second phase) regression formula increases had not sufficiently adjusted their salaries, and to make appropriate awards. Applications were based on merit and productivity in relation to comparable males. In addition, manifest inequity applications were reviewed and recommendations forwarded to the Provost.

The committee was comprised of six members of the class who were determined as a result of negotiation by the attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the University. The Rajender Salary Settlement Committee reported directly to the Special Masters and operated under the conditions of the Consent Decree. The amount of funds available for distribution by the committee was \$500,000.

The committee began meeting in January, 1990 to develop procedures for the application and other committee processes. The deadline for applications was April 16, 1990 and the committee finished its task on June 14, 1990. Two hundred and fifty-three applications were reviewed; there were 1369 members in the class. Total awards amounted to \$537,455 which were added to 1990-91 base salaries.

The materials received from women indicated that, in many cases, men were consistently given greater credit for prior work experience; men were given greater monetary rewards for similar performance ratings, and men were given higher starting salaries than women.

The committee recommends the following actions by central administration:

1. Action by the President and Provost sets the tone for the entire University and continued action is therefore essential for change in the climate for women at the University.
2. Additional attention must be paid to equity pay raises for women. High quality women faculty and professional/administrative staff are still not receiving equal wages. The administration must monitor salaries and continually correct them instead of waiting for lawsuits.
3. The administration must deal with comparable worth issues.
4. The administration must hold deans and department heads accountable for progress in affirmative action. Progress must be monitored and incentives/sanctions applied as appropriate.
5. Systemic problems which disadvantage women in the Minnesota Extension Service must be corrected.
6. Stronger oversight must be applied to coordinate campuses in relation to comparable worth and exploitation of overqualified women hired into temporary instructor or lower level professional/administrative positions.
7. Professional/administrative positions must not be used for faculty responsibilities without faculty status.

We believe that, with the appropriate attention, great strides can be made at the University to eliminate the sexism which still exists and enable all faculty and staff to contribute more effectively to the University's excellence. We are encouraged by the commitments made by the Board of Regents to create a better climate at the University of Minnesota. The materials reviewed by the committee have given us insights which we feel will be of assistance in this effort and we are pleased to share the attached with you.

## THE CLIMATE OF THE UNIVERSITY

It should be no surprise that the climate for women at the University of Minnesota is enormously variable given the size and complexity of the institution. The numbers of applications to our committee and the anger and pain which infused their narratives indicate that sexism--in both overt and covert forms--remains deeply imbedded in the culture of the university. That there have been many good-faith efforts to change this situation, and that some areas of the University have been relatively successful in doing so, is surely the case. Yet the nature of the task we were given meant that we learned more about the difficulties women face than about success stories. The problems point to several areas in which administrative leadership can generate change. We also suggest that more information about successful change efforts (which could perhaps come from the Office of Equal Opportunity and the Minnesota Women's Commission) might offer important models for action.

As President Hasselmo and others have said, the culture of the institution must change. Climate has everything to do with morale, productivity, and a sense of community which enhances people's capacity and willingness to work together for the common good. It cannot be created simply with words. We are aware that the University of Minnesota has been saying a lot of the right things for a long time. Its espoused institutional values include equal opportunity and diversity as keys to excellence. A failure to take decisive action which would operationalize these values has resulted in a tremendous waste of female talent and productivity and the embitterment of far too many valuable faculty and staff. We are struck by the fact that in 1976 the estimated cost of rectifying salary inequities was \$200,000. The settlement in 1988 was for three million dollars, and even so many salary inequities remain. Between 1976 and 1988 there were: no centrally directed and systematic monitoring of salaries, no education of administrators, and no guidelines issued to department heads and deans to keep inequities from developing. Indeed, Minnesota is the only University in the Big 10 without a systematic method in place to monitor salaries and prevent inequities.

We are paying dearly for this "hands off" policy, not only in dollars but also in the loss of productivity and good will. The adversarial climate generated by the settlement of the salary equity claim placed many women faculty and staff in a difficult position. Many who clearly should have applied simply chose not to do so. Men resented and frequently misunderstood the initiatives of those who did apply, and it seems likely that gains may soon be eroded if administrators fail to give raises to women who have received equity raises.

## RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

What is required at this point is action which produces visible results so that our institutional commitment to equity can take on concrete meaning (and not just more paperwork). What kind of actions do the applications to our committee suggest?

**OPENNESS OF INFORMATION:** Much of the anger in the applications to our committee derived from a new recognition of existing inequities. On the other hand, we are also aware of some who had planned to apply and did not once they understood their standing in relation to comparable men. Open information regarding salaries will allow an ongoing process of adjustment which is essentially healthy for two reasons. On the one hand, it empowers individuals who wish to make a case for redress. On the other hand, it enhances administrative accountability not only to individuals but to the community as a whole. Therefore, we recommend that the budget books made available during this process continue to be available in University libraries and updated at the beginning of each budget year.

**INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON HIRING:** The University's commitment to affirmative action goals must be communicated more effectively down to the level of the search committee. Bureaucratic check points are useful as a mechanism of accountability, but until the broader vision itself is widely shared, too many searches will honor the letter while violating the spirit. It is just too easy to justify any specific hire on an individual basis. In some instances, departments may have to be told that unless their record changes, future position allocations will be in jeopardy.

**RETENTION as well as hiring:** While there are still areas within the University which continue to resist hiring women, we find that hiring is only the first step. If they are to remain and to be productive, women must receive basic support for their work from the moment they arrive. Some of that support involves resources. For example, scientists cannot pursue their research if they are denied adequate lab facilities. Much of it, however, has to do with institutional culture at the department level. Younger scholars require the intellectual nourishment and prodding that comes from participation in a community of scholars. When they feel like outsiders, when they lack mentors, we can expect a residue of bitterness and a loss of productivity that harms the institution as a whole. A similar case for mentoring and support can be made for younger professionals in P and A classifications. We find, in addition, that distinguished women are likely also to be disadvantaged. Thus, at all levels we are in danger of losing many of the very best to other institutions.

**DON'T HIRE CHEAP:** Long-standing salary grievances which are among the most difficult to rectify can often be traced to an initial hire in which the person was not offered a salary commensurate with her qualifications and experience. Such an inequity, once established, is extremely difficult to change using the small increments available from year to year without immediately creating additional problems. While this provision would apply to men as well, we suggest that it is especially important for women who are much less likely to bargain for higher salary at the time of hire. This is true within key subcategories as well as across the board. For example, while minority candidates are in a particularly good bargaining position at this time, we found that minority women were rather consistently disadvantaged relative to minority men.

This issue has an additional twist in some P&A, coordinate campus, and temporary positions which employ overqualified women and make no effort to assist them toward a more appropriate career path.

**DEPARTMENT HEADS ARE KEY:** It is clear to us that department heads are the key to improved climate at the department level. They need to understand that faculty development and the mentoring of younger faculty is a critical part of their administrative responsibility. They have the capacity, as no one else really does, to create norms of professional behavior. Specifically, they can model and expect others to take women seriously as scholars, advocate for equity issues (rather than overworking women on committees in the expectation that only women will speak up for such issues), recognize that the isolation many women experience harms productivity and requires proactive intervention to overcome, see that younger women receive the kind of mentoring and inclusion in informal networks that younger men receive, and place a positive value on diversity (challenging a pervasive and deeply undermining belief that diversity--of faculty, staff, students, and curriculum--is somehow opposed to excellence).

The behavior of department heads can be shaped in two ways. The first is a process of administrative training (which might have a number of additional benefits) which can broaden their vision of their responsibilities and provide them with specific skills and capabilities in meeting them. The second is to hold them accountable for the consequences of their leadership as spelled out in the next paragraph.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY:** We suggest that the University of Minnesota's institutional values regarding equity need to be operationalized in such a way that administrators can be held accountable for implementing them. Administrative evaluation is, we realize, already a major issue under discussion. Behaviors will change when responsibilities are

clearly negotiated, so that Deans and Department Heads must commit to carrying out equity policies and to being held accountable (in specified ways) for their actions as a condition of their employment. With that groundwork of mutual negotiation and commitment, results can be expected and evaluated. This has an added benefit of making it possible to reward administrators and units from the department level on up which in fact produce results. Accountability can be a positive process if communication lines remain open, if expectations are clear, and if responses are predictable.

Finally, we suggest that the issue of institutional climate for women is linked to the morale of the faculty and the staff as a whole. Issues of mentoring and support which are acute for women exist for many younger faculty and staff, male and female alike. Traditional institutional "sink or swim" practices harm productivity and cause us to lose our very best. A university which is equitable to women will be a better place for everyone.

#### SPECIFIC PROBLEM AREAS

Because of the complexity of the University, there are a number of specific areas which have come to our attention and which we would like to explore in some detail. We include sections below on the coordinate campuses, Minnesota Extension Service, and Professional and Administrative job classes. We would also like to note the following more specific issues:

Inequities in the medical school appear to need systematic attention even more than most areas. We found problems in the areas of salary, set-up funds, patient referrals, and in particular the practice of private geographical billing. With regard to the latter--that is, income generated by clinical patient care which does not appear on the University's books--we recommend that the Regents require the outside firm which monitors these funds to monitor them with regard to equity on the basis of gender and race and to report any problems it finds to the proper university authority.

Many specific schools and departments have long histories of difficulty in achieving equity goals. Because our information is clearly partial (for example, we received no complaints from departments which have no women!), and because the most blatant examples are already well known to the administration, we simply wish to point out the increasing cost of a failure to intervene. Long-standing grievances are deeply corrosive to the institution as a whole.

Some departments, schools, and job categories--often those with disproportionate numbers of women--are seriously underpaid. It is not possible in such areas to deal with salaries solely on an individual basis. Instead, there must be an across-the-board effort to bring salaries more into line with comparable salaries in the University as a whole.

#### COORDINATE CAMPUSES

Each of the four coordinate campuses is different in nature and this impacted on the nature of the petitions the Committee received. At Crookston and Waseca, there seem to be "comparable worth" issues, namely that so-called "women's work" is not rewarded at the same level as "men's". The Morris campus in particular appears to have problems with regard to the treatment of women; there are undoubtedly similar problems on the Duluth campus, however the geographical isolation of the Morris campus exacerbates the problem.

The problem of women being "over-qualified" for their positions exists on all coordinate campuses. Some of this may be related to the relative geographical isolation of each campus; being located in a town lacking in job opportunities is a problem. Typically the partner of a male faculty or staff member has some level of graduate work or even a graduate degree. The male accepts a position at the University of Minnesota, Morris, for example, and the female partner accompanies him to Morris, hoping to find employment. The female is then hired by the university as a temporary instructor, or in a lower level P&A position. There is no job security, few if any benefits, and a type of "second-class" citizenship emerges. Women in these positions are aware of the vulnerability of their employment at the University and of the lack of other employment appropriate to their background, training, and interest in the geographical area. The situation is ripe for exploitation.

Realistically, the University cannot be expected to commit hard-line money for tenure-track and permanent P&A positions in all such cases, yet ways must be found to eliminate misuse of such people, to provide benefits and some job security and stability. In addition, some form of protection in the nature of access to grievance procedures, liaison and support personnel to provide grievance and career counseling, roll-over contracts, etc., must be in place if exploitation is to be eliminated. This problem exists in the Twin Cities as well, but seems to be more pronounced at the coordinate campuses, particularly at Morris. Distance from the offices of central administration may exacerbate the problem as the women feel that they have no access to central university procedures and administrators may feel more free to misuse personnel as they are "out of range" of daily oversight by central administrators.

## MINNESOTA EXTENSION SERVICE

Similar to the coordinate campuses, MES needs to address comparable worth issues. The evaluation process is demonstrably gender biased. Administrators, especially district directors, need training on gender sensitive evaluation and supervision and to be held accountable for their behavior. Lack of promotion of well-qualified women into administrative posts is also an issue. Currently, promotion favors men with less credentials and hiring practices include crediting males with work experience inequitably (called "exceptions") so that higher salaries are often awarded for new hires to less qualified males.

## ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

The individualized nature of many Professional and Administrative (P&A) appointments and the vast diversity of job descriptions for those with the same title made it difficult for some women to find valid male comparables. In this instance the parameters of this phase of the Settlement favored faculty women.

The problems brought to the attention of the committee by women who hold P&A appointments include:

**P&A APPOINTMENTS DOING FACULTY JOBS:** It is important that the University clarify the process for classifying positions. Women are disadvantaged when they are hired on short-term, non-tenure track appointments to serve the same functions as others holding faculty appointments. Salaries and benefits accorded to faculty are not available, nor are the opportunities for supported research.

**BONUSES:** If the granting of bonuses is an acceptable practice at the University then this should be communicated to all who are eligible. Guidelines should be developed to insure that this practice would not negate the progress made in the adjustment of women's salaries. The process and the decisions must be accessible information in order to assure accountability.

**LACK OF WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS:** The University of Minnesota needs more women in administrative positions. We are troubled by the fact that women already in such positions perceive a glass ceiling. Administrative interships for women could begin to address the lack of opportunity for women to acquire appropriate administrative skills. Changes in the broader climate, addressed above, would generate further opportunities for women to develop administrative capacities. This is another area in which there is enormous potential which too frequently is wasted.



COLLEGIATE DIFFERENCES: Specific job classes, for example, "research associate", have widely varying pay scales in different collegiate units. We suggest a review of such differences.

#### CONCLUSION

We expect our University to be a leader in the region and in the nation. We are embarrassed by its failure to do so in the area of gender equity and as we have outlined above we believe the cost to the University, both monetary and human, is unconscionably high. Unredressed grievances have wasted the talents of highly valuable faculty and staff and the resulting adversarial processes have created an atmosphere of antagonism and mistrust. The lesson of the recent settlement is clear: words alone will not erase the ongoing effects of discrimination. Equity and diversity are among the keys to excellence, and proactive leadership on these issues will strengthen the University as a whole.

## BIOGRAPHIES

### RAJENDER SALARY SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

**Margaret Davis**, Regents' Professor, Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior. A.B. in Biology from Radcliffe College, 1953; Fulbright Fellow, Danish Geological Survey (University of Copenhagen), 1953-54; Ph.D. in Biology, Harvard University, 1957. Previously held tenured faculty positions at the University of Michigan and Yale University. Came to the University of Minnesota in 1976 as Professor and Head, Ecology and Behavioral Biology. Member, National Academy of Sciences, 1982. Regents' Medal, University of Minnesota, 1983. Research interests are in the quaternary period, from paleoecology to more recent global climatic changes.

**Sara M. Evans**, Professor of History, is the author of four books and numerous articles in the field of U.S. women's history. Her most recent books are Born for Liberty: A History of Women in America (NY: Free Press, 1989) and Wage Justice: Comparable Worth and the Paradox of Technocratic Reform (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), coauthored with Barbara J. Nelson. Wage Justice recently received the 1990 Policy Studies Organization Award for the best policy studies book in 1989. Professor Evans was a Kellogg National Fellow (1983-86), and has received research grants from the National Academy of Sciences, the Northwest Area Foundation, and the University of Minnesota. She served as director of the Center for Advanced Feminist Studies, 1987-90.

**M. Janice Hogan**, Associate Dean, College of Human Ecology and Professor of Family Social Science. She has served as Head of the Family Social Science Department and Director of Graduate Studies, having been a faculty member of this department since 1976. Her academic credentials include a Ph.D. in Family Ecology and distinguished alumnus in 1988 from Michigan State University. Currently President of the National Council on Family Relations and project director for USSR collaboration. She has published gender role research in numerous books and periodicals, including Home Economics Research Journal, Family Relations, and Family Economics Review.

**Sally Jorgensen**, Associate Dean, College of Biological Sciences and Associate Professor, Department of Veterinary Biology, College of Veterinary Medicine. B.A. in Philosophy from Wellesley College, M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from University of Minnesota Medical School, Department of Biochemistry. Two year post-doctoral position at UCLA. Joined U of M faculty in College of Vet Med in 1968 and chaired Department of Veterinary Biology 1983-1988. Teaching responsibilities in veterinary biochemistry and ruminant nutrition. Research interests include metabolism of nucleic acids and proteins; toxin production by pathogenic bacteria. Served on numerous committees in various colleges at U of M. Major roles as Associate Dean in CBS (appointed September 1988) are to help strengthen undergraduate education and to increase numbers of women and minorities in biological sciences.

**Virginia T. Katz**, Associate Professor and Head, Department of Communication at UMD. B.A. in English and History from Wellesley College, 1960; M.A. in Speech and Education from Case Western Reserve University, 1965; M.A. in Theatre and Speech from University of Michigan, 1966. Ph.D. in Communication from Kent State University, 1984. Came to UMD in 1966; was one of the last people at UMD tenured without terminal degree (1972) but completed the doctorate 12 years later. Author of a textbook and editor of a book of seminal readings in the communication field; articles, convention papers, and presentations on women and leadership. Was active in the University Education Association, the faculty union at UMW and UMD (third president and first woman president); currently active in Minnesota Education Association.

**Jennifer Sue Oatey**, Ph.D., Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs. Received a B.A. and M.A.T. from New Mexico State University and a Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota. Came to the University in 1977 and held positions in Recreational Sports and Student Activities. Currently she has administrative supervision of the International Study and Travel Center, Student Organization Development Center, University Student Legal Service, CMU, SPSC, and WBU. Member of AACD, ACPA, MCPA, ACU-I, NIRSA and the National Wellness Association. Most recently served as the assistant editor of the NISA Journal and received the Outstanding Leadership and Service Award from NIRSA in 1990, and has authored numerous articles.