

EQUITY, ACCESS & DIVERSITY

MINUTES OF MEETING

October 15, 2012

Morrill Hall Room 300

[In these minutes: Discussion with Provost Karen Hanson: VP of OED, graduate school restructuring, salary inequity within the AHC; Promotion and Tenure, and salary equity discussion.]

[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), Katie Ballering, Susan Cable-Morrison, Andra Fjone, Michael Goh, Kimberly Hewitt, Judith Katz, Geoff Maruyama, Charmaine Stewart, Dominique Tobbell, Ellyn Woo

GUESTS: Arlene Carney, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs; Karen Hanson, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

OTHERS: Professor Walt Jacobs for Emily Lawrence; Louis Mendoza, associate vice provost, OED.

REGRETS: Neil Anderson, Jennifer Deane, Tenzin Khando.

ABSENT: John Andrus, Kris Lockhart, Christopher O'Brien, Jeremy O'Hara, Tade Okediji, Mandi Stebbins, Janet Thomas.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

OLD BUSINESS

Professor Duranczyk was happy to report that the Senate passed the Statement Against the Voter ID Amendment.

She asked the committee members if they had requests for speakers or topics for the spring meetings.

- Ms. Cable-Morrison is concerned that there are no longer diverse members within senior leadership. She understands that one always wants the best candidates, however, this conflicts with the University's promotion of diversity.

Professor Duranczyk stated that the search for the Vice President of OED is ongoing. The candidate pool has been bolstered by the position changing to directly reporting to the president. Associate Vice Provost Mendoza informed members that a response to the president's listening sessions for faculty would be posted before the session for students occurred.

Ms. Hewitt added that the response would give more specific answers to the questions that were discussed in the listening sessions.

KAREN HANSON, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PROVOST

Provost Hanson joined the committee to answer questions it had developed at the September meeting.

She began by addressing the first question:

We would like to hear your thoughts on expanding the position for Vice President for Equity and Diversity to also be a Vice Provost position. This was the model at the University prior to this search. The open position is currently being presented as only the Vice President for Equity and Diversity.

She stated that it is an unusual title and has only existed once before. It is difficult to define "dotted line reporting" and she does not see the scope of the position expanding by adding vice provost to the title. She does not have an objection nor is she in favor of changing the title. It is not needed to solve a problem because there are very good working relationships between the offices.

Professor Maruyama reminded the committee that the goal of making the position a vice provost was to ensure that this person was involved with academic affairs, not just student affairs.

Provost Hanson stated that connecting academic affairs with OED is achievable, but does not want the Twin Cities office to overshadow the affairs of other campuses. She agreed that it is important to ensure a close relationship between OED and the provost's office. Professor Maruyama added that the title of vice president and provost is symbolic of the University's focus on the connection between the work of equity and diversity and the work of academic excellence.

There have been discussions regarding resource issues, faculty hiring, and recruitment. There are issues with HR and Academic Affairs, spousal hiring, and OED. This relationship needs to be examined closely to determine whether or not the alignments are clear and movement is in the same strategic direction. She does not know that this is achieved with a title.

The following question was addressed within the discussion:

What are your thoughts on equity, access, and diversity in regard to the restructuring of the graduate school? How is the under-represented student being recruited, admitted, and supported in this new structure? We see many dotted lines of communication but few lines of authority or metrics to ensure equity, access, and diversity at the graduate level of the University.

Professor Duranczyk added that the committee was concerned with the dotted line relationship within the rearrangement of the graduate school. Provost Hanson stated that instead of duplicating the role, it might be best to concentrate on the connections being made. It does not seem necessary to build parallel offices, but it is still necessary to monitor the effectiveness of the relationship between OED and graduate education.

Associate Vice Provost Mendoza stated that he does not see a decrease in service of OED regarding graduate education, however, he fears the values of equity and diversity are diluted as a result of the new structure. Is the graduate school thinking about advancing the work of ODGE and the need to diversify graduate education? He does not feel the message of equity and diversity is communicated consistently from the graduate school. Professor Duranczyk added that equity and diversity did not seem integral to the reorganization of the graduate school in the documents she reviewed last year. Provost Hanson responded that it is important for the Office of Graduate Education to monitor data and discover shortfalls. If the issue is oversight, she believes the graduate education program review is crucial.

Provost Hanson moved on to the next question:

We have many questions about the silence of the University of Minnesota regarding the Supreme Court Case, Fisher v. University of Texas - Austin. Why has the University not taken a position as an institution? Is the admissions policy under question controversial? We would like to know more about how these types of decisions (whether or not to take a stand on a national higher educational issue) are made at the University of Minnesota.

She is concerned about the result of this case. The usual route for the University to make a statement as a whole requires approval from the Board of Regents. There was a lot of discussion and she added that the Office of the General Counsel had worked with other CIC institutions. A decision was reached that it was unlikely to receive unanimous support within the Board of Regents.

Professor Maruyama stated that it is difficult to understand why the University did not sign the Big Ten brief, despite the signing regarding the Grutter v. Bollinger case. Provost Hanson stated that the choice to not sign was related to the local political climate and understands the necessity of the president having Board approval before signing such a brief.

Provost Hanson then discussed the following question:

What metrics are being used to safeguard against salary inequity within the AHC? Examining base salaries does not reflect the additional clinical income. Is there a plan form more transparent metrics under-girding salary decisions across the University?

The AHC has been discussing how to address potential compensation inequities. This is complicated because of the differences in compensation related to clinical income and clinical specialties. There is not yet a fixed plan, but a response has been requested for the fall. The AHC deans and administrative leadership are looking at how peer institutions structure their compensation and national benchmarks. A clear and transparent salary policy is needed, something that will make plain to the faculty that they have been treated equitably.

PROMOTION AND TENURE DISCUSSION

The following question was addressed next:

With regard to promotion and tenure, we would like your interpretation of the data on tenure and promotion by race and gender. If possible, we would like to see the data or PowerPoint you have delivered most recently about tenure at the University. We would also like to explore the definition of scholarship in relationship to tenure and promotion. How is scholarship advancing the understanding and role of diversity and diversity issues in our professional fields valued in the tenure and promotion? Is it implicit or explicit?

Provost Hanson emphasized that this issue must be undertaken at the unit level. She wants to be made aware of issues that exist, but a statement regarding scholarship cannot be constructed from a centralized position. Professor Duranczyk stated that diversity research is valued more by certain colleges than others. Provost Hanson pointed out that the ways in which diversity research relates to the department and field impact the amount of promotion a project will receive within each unit. She emphasized that she wants to be informed of instances of evident dislocation when they arise.

Vice Provost Carney stated that most of the units have completed their revised 7.12 statements and the faculty of each unit decides what areas of scholarship will be considered priority. In some fields, there is specific language about diversity, but it is more common that units will identify venues where work is published. It is not required that diversity is specified in the 7.12 statements, however, the faculty can still pursue this topic in research but it may be regarded as a lower priority if it is not featured in the 7.12 statement. Each unit articulates the criteria for tenure and promotion. Provost Hanson added that contributions in the area of diversity do not have to be research related. What role does attention to equity and diversity play within the entire proceeding of tenure and promotion?

Vice Provost Carney distributed a packet containing a presentation titled, “Promotion and Tenure for Faculty Continuous Appointments for Academic Professionals 2011-2012.”

She stated that the statistics are clear when you look at tenure success. Tenure success is assessed by looking at a cohort of faculty who start in a given year and are examined for seven years after that starting point. The four possible outcomes for the faculty members were: still at the University and have tenure, received tenure and left, left without tenure, still at the University without tenure. The success rate of this population shows faculty that has been more willing to extend their probationary period than ever before.

On page 26, the tenure success rate for faculty that were hired in 2002, 2003, and 2004, seven years later they have achieved a 59%, which includes those still at the University and those who have left. The overall rates are fairly steady from 55% -59% from the year 2000-2004. Vice Provost Carney stated that none of the tenure success rates are significantly different statistically, when examined between men and women. If you look at the next category, women are highly represented in the category of “still employed after seven years, but have not yet received tenure.” More women extend their probationary period than men, and more women remain at the University after seven years. She stated the numbers are very clear and not many people are denied tenure at this institution once they reach their decision year. On an average year, two or three people who have reached their decision year are denied tenure. This year, two white males were denied tenure. Most of the people who are denied tenure are white males, and very few females are denied tenure. She monitors the progress of each faculty member individually who are of color or women to see if they receive tenure in the subsequent years if they have extended their probationary period. She observed that many women extended their probationary period two years or, in rare cases, three years, so they are still on the clock and she continues to monitor their progress. More of the people who are denied tenure and who have extended their probationary period, are males.

, The 2011 tenure policy changed the criteria for extending the probationary period dramatically. For example, in the cases of childbirth, adoption, and foster placement, it is only necessary to give notice; you do not have to receive permission to extend the probationary period. Probationary faculty can extend the probationary period for up to three years. More recently it is more common for faculty to extend their probationary period for caregiver responsibilities, personal illness, or injury. As evidenced last year, several women faculty and faculty of color who had extended their probationary period previously were promoted and/or tenured. One year earlier in the report to the Regents in May 2011, they would have been listed as probationary faculty still on the tenure clock after seven years.

Faculty of color leave during the probationary period for a variety of reasons such as: Other institutions recruit them or they may not like the climate in their department. Everyone who leaves the University receives a questionnaire; however most do not complete it. There was a three-year period in which individual exit interviews were offered by the Office of Human Resources, but many did not want to do them. The most common answer when interviewed was department level issues and this was a general statement outside of color and gender. She does not see significant problems in the procedures for people receiving tenure. She reads the annual reviews of every

probationary faculty member and if there are issues, she discusses them with the provost and intervenes when necessary.

Ms. Hewitt asked if there are data regarding extended probationary periods for people of color or just for women. She explained that this would account for some of the distinction. Vice Provost Carney replied that she has all of these data. Many faculty of color extend their probationary period. She added that the percentages change dramatically because the numbers are so small, so the percentages can look more dramatic.

Professor Stewart asked if there are data on the attrition rate of faculty of color versus white faculty. Vice Provost Carney responded that the University does not have a larger number of faculty of color proportionately leaving than white faculty. These are the data that are presented to the Board every year. Within a year there may be a couple of faculty of color who leave and may be unhappy with their placement or they may have received a better offer from another institution. Talented faculty of color are very sought after by all institutions. She does not see a disproportionate number of negative reviews from faculty of color.

Associate Vice Provost Mendoza stated that OED does not generate this kind of data and commented that to the extent of recruiting sought after faculty of color and the fact that they leave hurts the University. He clarified that their effort to improve the climate and support system for faculty is not to suggest that there is a higher rate of faculty of color leaving the University. Provost Hanson commented that some of the issues are unresolved social norms, like women extending their probationary period more than men. Vice Provost Carney added that the policies regarding probation extension exist to ensure the success of faculty. Provost Hanson commented that the policies are not the issue; it is the larger social system that poses a cultural challenge. Professor Durnaczyk agreed that a cultural change is needed to remove the stigma from extending the probationary period at the department level.

Before leaving for another meeting, Provost Hanson added that in regard to the compact process, the committee should discuss what measures are being taken for recruiting, retention, social support, and cluster hiring. Professor Duranczyk thanked Provost Hanson for meeting with committee.

Professor Maruyama asked Vice Provost Carney if the numbers regarding tenure success rate have been examined over the past 10 years and she responded that they are in the process, however, PeopleSoft was not implemented until 1999. As this is her 8th year as vice provost, she has read the reviews of everyone that has been evaluated for tenure across the Twin Cities, Morris, and Crookston campuses.

There are factors that can skew the data. The medical school has a nine-year probationary period, so some of the faculty are on a nine-year clock but still included with those on a six-year clock. The Carlson School has an eight-year tenure clock, so she explained that it

would be important to extend the data analyses past seven years and look at it at eight, nine, and ten years past original appointment.

The salary equity study is going to be completed again after the 9th pay period of this year. The analysis should be completed by the end of December. They have asked the deans to discuss issues within their unit. The AHC deans have the issue of clinical salaries for tenure and tenure track faculty. The equity adjustment would be a massive project. The gender equity salary study is currently only for faculty on the tenure track. Professor Stewart commented that the clinical faculty salaries could be analyzed if the total salaries are examined within departments. Vice Provost Carney responded that the original study was completed on the tenured and tenure track faculty, but she is not suggesting that it is not important to look at clinical track faculty. Most of the cohort will be the same for the salary equity study, but there will be some change in terms of retirement and turnover. The deans have been asked to provide specific information about new faculty including starting salaries and retention. All faculty will be informed of any salary equity adjustment procedure when it has been agreed upon. She emphasized that on an individual basis the differences will vary among departments. The funding will come from the colleges because they made the decisions each year regarding salaries, merit, and retention. The Clayton model does not take into account merit, but we understand merit is a factor.

Professor Stewart commented that the definition of merit is controversial in terms of salary and often women are disadvantaged. Vice Provost Carney responded that, regardless of gender, some people have a larger output of work than others. She continued by saying that each person considers merit in the context of his or her own unit. There are very few units that define and compensate for merit in the same way. In CLA, for example, the common factors of the departments are the involvement of faculty and the chair does not have more influence than other faculty in terms of meritocracy decisions. The chair reports the final numbers, but there are elected merit committees in almost every CLA department. Some departments have very elaborate point systems that have been agreed upon, while others have ranking or rating systems. In other colleges the head of the unit decides independently, without input from a committee. She continued by stating it will be complicated, but they will strive to be consistent and the goal will be to ensure that all employees are treated equitably. It is most important to establish a transparent meritocracy system for the future. They value the input of faculty and the committee regarding the process.

Professor Duranczyk stated that it would be important for the committee to champion the expansion of the study beyond the tenure and tenure track faculty members. Professor Stewart added that the findings of the culture and climate study should be examined. She stated that the findings indicate that the University as an institutions needs to pay more attention to diversity and culture issues for women faculty as a whole and women faculty of color. She continued to say that Provost Hanson was concerned about the findings and has asked the Women's Faculty Cabinet to discuss possible solutions. The Women's Faculty Cabinet has a summary statement and Professor Stewart offered to share this with

the committee. Professor Duranczyk suggested the committee review the results before the next meeting.

Hearing no further business, Professor Duranczyk adjourned the meeting.

Jeannine Rich
University Senate Office