

EQUITY, ACCESS & DIVERSITY
MINUTES OF MEETING
NOVEMBER 21, 2011
Morrill Hall Room 300

[In these minutes: committee orientation; sexual harassment and nepotism policy; letter to President Kaler; update on MLK Day proposal; statement on salary equity study; equity and diversity training]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Irene Duranczyk (chair), Kris Lockhart, Lauren Beach, Raul Marrero Fente, Michael Goh, Charmaine Stewart, Katie Ballering, Susan Cable Morrison, Dominique Tobbell, Kimberly Hewitt, Anne Gair, Mandi Stebbins

REGRETS: Michelle Page, Janet Thomas, Richard Graff, Greg Sawyer, Dorothy Schlesselman, Dabitna Chung, Echo Maki, Neil Anderson

GUESTS: Jay Hatch and Stacy Doepner-Hove, Committee on Committees; Anne Phibbs, director of education, Office for Equity and Diversity

OTHER: Liz Eull, Office of the President

Professor Irene Duranczyk called the meeting to order and welcomed those present.

Committee Review

Jay Hatch and Stacy Doepner-Hove members of the Committee on Committees (ConC) explained that the ConC is charged to conduct a review of Senate committees to ensure that their charges are current and of the right scope to reflect committee concerns, that the committees are functioning effectively, and that the committee membership and composition allows the committee to carry out its charge. Ms. Doepner-Hove stated the review is an opportunity for the Equity Access and Diversity Committee (EAD) to communicate with the ConC, and provide feedback for how to improve the effectiveness of the committee. Mr. Hatch indicated those committee members who wanted to share information privately could e-mail him or Ms. Doepner-Hove. Ms. Doepner-Hove further explained that the ConC members would draft a report, and share it with EAD. If the report recommends any changes in committee structure, charge, or membership, the recommendation would be sent to the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) and then to the University Senate.

Professor Irene Duranczyk asked if there was any relationship between last year's discussion about eliminating committees and the four committees selected for review this year. The ConC members indicated there was no relationship between the two reviews.

Professor Duranczyk indicated that this year the ex officio composition of EAD had changed. A member of the Women's Faculty Cabinet now has an ex officio seat on EAD, and due to the Office for Equity and Diversity's (OED) restructuring, representatives from the Gay, Lesbian, Bi-sexual, and Transgender Ally (GLBTA) Programs Office, Women's Center, and Multicultural Center for Academic Excellence no longer hold ex officio seats. Instead, there is one representative from OED and one representative from the Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA).

Lauren Beach expressed concern that no members of EAD are also members of the University Senate. She suggested that all Senate committee should have members of the University Senate so there is an avenue for committee members to present issues at University Senate meetings.

Professor Duranczyk noted that committees could speak to the Senate through statements and resolutions. But she expressed concern that statements and resolutions must first pass through the SCC and the SCC at times acts as a gatekeeper rather than a facilitator. Ms. Beach stated there should be some clarification of charge section "d" (to bring concerns to the Senate, as appropriate) and section "e" (to recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate). Professor Duranczyk suggested perhaps the chairs of each Senate committee should have a seat on the SCC in order to ensure committee representation.

Ms. Beach suggested the EAD duties should include addressing campus climate rather than promoting compliance.

Professor Duranczyk asked the ConC representatives how committees should build their agendas, and noted that currently it seems that it is the committee members and their networks that inform the agenda. She wondered if all committees are working similarly to EAD or if there is a systematic set of guidelines that inform the process. Mr. Hatch responded that this is a question for ConC.

Kimberly Hewitt commented that it is important for the EAD to capture the issues that are of concern to equity and diversity climate. She also noted with regard to policies, EAD can advise on their impact, but cannot adjust the language.

Professor Duranczyk indicated she is going on leave in the spring and asked if a decision had been made about who would chair EAD in the spring. Mr. Hatch and Ms. Doepner-Hove indicated they did not know but would bring this issue to the ConC.

Update on Changes to University Policies Against Sexual Harassment and Nepotism

Kimberly Hewitt, director, EOAA stated she looked into EAD's suggestion that additional instructional procedures for handling sexual harassment situations be included in the Board of Regents Policy against Sexual Harassment, and learned that there was no corresponding administrative policy for sexual harassment. She explained an administrative policy is where the type of information suggested by EAD would typically

be included. She, therefore, proposed to the Board Committee that OED develop an administrative policy including the procedural information recommended by EAD. Ms. Hewitt also indicated she is still waiting to hear when the Board policy will be presented to the Board of Regents, but believes it will be in January.

Professor Duranczyk asked if EAD would also have an opportunity to review the new administrative policy on sexual harassment. Ms. Hewitt explained that administrative policies are handled differently than Board Policies and move through the Office for Institutional Compliance, but she believed EAD would have an opportunity to provide feedback.

Letter to the President Kaler

Professor Duranczyk provided EAD members with a copy of a draft letter to President Kaler requesting that he begin the search for a new chief diversity officer and that he keep this position at the vice presidential level. But she noted the letter is now moot because between the time the letter was drafted and the EAD meeting, the President announced that the chief diversity officer would remain a vice presidential level post, and he was beginning the process to fill the position. In light of the President's announcement, Professor Duranczyk asked for Associate Vice President Lockhart's advice on whether the letter should be reframed to highlight the characteristics and qualities EAD would like the President to keep in mind as he conducts the search. Associate Vice Provost Lockhart suggested that rather than write a letter EAD should take advantage of the existing search process. She recommended that committee members apply to be on the search committee, and she stated she is currently forwarding names to Vice President Jones for committee membership. She indicated committee membership would be announced in the near future and a website for the search would be established. Associate Vice President Lockhart also stated the search would be nationwide and the President is interested in moving the search forward as quickly as possible.

Update on Submission of Martin Luther King (MLK) Day Proposal to Public Engagement Council (PEC)

Lauren Beach reported that she, Professor Richard Graff, and Professor Duranczyk met with Andy Furco, associate vice president for public engagement, regarding EAD's proposal to PEC to make the MLK holiday a day of service. She indicated that Professor Furco was very receptive of the idea and embraced the recommendations in EAD's MLK Day Resolution and proposal to the PEC. He suggested partnering with public engagement offices throughout the University on a pilot day of service in 2012, and stated the Office for Public Engagement could create and operate a central website. He stated he could reach out to the University public engagement departments and they would in turn contact their community partners to determine their volunteer needs. Professor Furco thought that working through PEC would be a good way to bring the report to the attention of the President. It was also suggested that President Kaler might make statements in support of the day of service and that it could possibly be tied to the 150-year land grant celebration.

Professor Duranczyk stated the proposal would be submitted to PEC this week and EAD would then receive feedback. She stated the pilot would have a limited number of volunteers who would participate on a first-come-first serve basis. She also asked committee members to recruit volunteers to participate.

Professor Michael Goh asked whether the pilot needed to be coordinated with the MLK Day concert. Associate Vice Provost Lockhart replied that this year, the concert would be on the holiday weekend. Professor Goh asked how human resources issues would be handled for the University staff manning the sites doing community service on the MLK holiday. Professor Duranczyk stated that Professor Furco is looking into the logistical considerations. Associate Vice Provost Lockhart noted that one of challenges to having student engagement in the day of service is that the students would not yet be back from the semester break. Professor Duranczyk recognized this but cited examples of how a day of service had worked at universities in Michigan and how the University of Minnesota adjusted to Welcome Week, which takes place before the start of the semester.

Update on Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) Salary Equity Study Statement

Professor Charmaine Stewart reported that she spoke with the members of the Women's Faculty Cabinet about drafting a joint statement from the WFC and EAD addressing the salary equity study. Rebecca Ropers-Huilman who chairs the Institutional Research and Data Assessment Committee, the committee that initiated this study, is interested in participating in the preparation of the statement. The WFC also felt that the statement should be drafted after the meeting with Professor Murray Clayton on December 2. Professor Stewart, Professor Ropers-Huilman and Ms. Beach will work on the statement and plan to have it completed by the end of January. It will be on the February EAD agenda.

Equity and Diversity Training Discussion

Anne Phibbs, director of education, OED, stated she is the former GLBTA programs director, and has been in her new position as Director of Education for about three months. She noted the education director position was recently created by OED to oversee all training. She is currently identifying the equity and diversity training that is occurring, and working to develop training across all units. She stated, in this work, it is important to consider all constituencies and understand how multiple identities effect people. She also noted the importance of building allies by educating all members of the University community.

Currently, she is beginning a new initiative to create an equity and diversity certification. This will have two aspects 1) a series of training sessions and 2) dialogue circles. The certificate will be awarded after completion of a set of six two-hour trainings, a second set of four two-hour training sessions, and participation in the dialogue circles. The topics for the set of six training sessions will be: being an ally, leadership in the context of equity and diversity, working effectively in groups and diversity committees, communicating support of diversity, an evaluation workshop, and having difficult conversations. The trainings are beginning this fall, and are intended to be taken

consecutively, but this is not required. The four two-hour trainings will cover disabilities, women, race, and GLBT issues. These trainings will begin fall 2012.

The dialogue circles will consist of twelve people who commit to meeting once a month for 90 minutes throughout the year. These circles will allow participants to engage in deeper exploration of equity and diversity work.

Ms. Phibbs reported she is working with the coordinate campuses; trained the Crookston and Duluth staff this fall and may train the Morris staff in the spring. She also noted the March 1, 2012 Partners in Change Summit, and stated the Identity Dialogues (faculty and staff discussions about different topics in equity and diversity) will begin again.

Ms. Phibbs then asked the committee for suggestions on educational needs OED should consider. Professor Stewart asked how the trainings are advertised and on whom they are focused. Ms. Phibbs responded that they are advertised in The Brief, using the EAD listserv, and the EAD action network. The audience for the trainings is primarily faculty and staff. Ms. Phibbs noted she is working with Associate Vice Provost Louis Mendoza to determine how best to involve and serve faculty.

Professor Stewart asked how the department chairs and deans are involved, and commented that they set the tone for department processes, and their participation indicates institutional support. Ms. Phibbs responded that she is working on multiple access points, and will have both trainings on request and certificate trainings. Professor Dominique Tobbell pointed out that those who participate in the training are a self-selected group and she asked what plans are in place for reaching those who are disinterested. Ms. Phibbs recognized that this is a problem, but stated she believes that mandatory diversity training is counterproductive. She stated she is most interested in reaching those in the middle of the spectrum rather than those who are recalcitrant or those who already have an understanding of diversity issues. She also indicated she understands the importance of reaching those in positions of power, and that training must be long term.

Professor Stewart stated some training is made mandatory at the University and if diversity is truly viewed as important it should also be made mandatory. Ms. Phibbs agreed that it is important to train everyone, but stated that mandatory training of leaders is beyond the scope of her work, and would need to be taken on at a presidential level. She reiterated her belief that the majority should be educated and this would minimize the effect of those who choose not to participate. Training must take place in a safe and positive space, she stated.

Professor Duranczyk suggested there should be incentives for participating in the training such as making it part of the faculty review process.

Katie Ballering indicated that staff members on sponsored projects could not participate in diversity trainings unless they were mandatory because the sponsoring company would not approve the time for non-mandatory training.

Ms. Phibbs stated she welcomed any additional feedback from the committee.

Old Business

Professor Duranczyk e-mailed committee members a copy of the *Mission and Scope: A Vision for Enrollment Management at the University of Minnesota*. She stated this Report would be part of the University Senate discussion next week and asked committee members to read through the report and send her any comments they would like her to convey at the meeting about how equity and diversity issues are addressed in the report. Professor Tobbell expressed concern about the emphasis in the report placed on National Research Council (NRC) ratings. And indicated these ratings make issues of diversity invisible. Additionally, programs that take into account economic disadvantage and diversity often do not do as well in the NRC rankings, she stated. Professor Goh noted a Michigan study that showed that GRE scores do not always predict the success of graduate students. Professor Tobbell agreed stating there should be a corrective measure that takes into account programs like the Diversity of Views and Experience (DOVE) fellowship. Ms. Ballering discussed a study that showed no correlation between success in graduate school and GRE scores and grade point averages. She stated the study showed that the best indicator was completion of a year of hands-on-training prior to entering the program.

Professor Duranczyk stated Dean Henning Schroeder would be invited to a spring EAD meeting, and the committee could address these issues with him. She also suggested the committee could ask that data on graduate school performance be looked at across the colleges to see how it relates to the metrics.

Hearing no further business, Professor Duranczyk adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office