

If you have comments or suggestions about items reported on in these minutes, please use your "reply" key and the message will be forwarded to the appropriate individual(s).

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, November 23, 2010
2:30 – 4:15
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: George Sheets (chair), Ben Bornsztein, Carol Carrier, Dann Chapman, Richard Cline, Randy Croce, Kathryn Hanna, Frank Kulacki, Theodor Litman, Karen Miksch, Chris Orlic, Geoffrey Sirc, Pamela Stenhjem
- Absent: Marilyn Bruin, Arlene Carney, Vladimir Cherkassky, Barbara Elliott, Valerie Khominich, Jason Shaw, Roderick Squires, James Wojtaszek
- Guests: Associate Vice President and Dean Meredith McQuaid, Stacey Tsantir (Health, Safety, and Compliance Coordinator, Office of International Programs); Professor Pat Frazier (Women's Faculty Cabinet)

[In these minutes: (1) faculty travel abroad and possible policy; (2) Women's Faculty Cabinet salary-equity study; (3) salary instructions]

1. Faculty Travel Abroad and Possible Policy

Professor Sheets convened the meeting at 2:30 and welcomed Dean McQuaid to discuss issues associated with faculty travel abroad and a possible proposal about registering for such travel.

Dean McQuaid began by noting that she is both Associate Vice President and Dean of the Office of International Programs, a central office that provides service to all campuses. As she had noted earlier for the Senate Research Committee:

OIP is a system office that serves all five campuses; OIP has about 100 employees and a budget of about \$22 million (approximately \$17 million of which is funding from students studying abroad, which is then redistributed to the providers of the study abroad opportunities). Dean McQuaid talked about the unique nature of her particular decanal role. Much like Wendy Lougee (Dean, University Libraries), her responsibilities reach across the academic units, requiring cooperative, supportive efforts to accomplish goals. She has been in the position for four years and has seen interest in internationalization grow dramatically, particularly with respect to the types and amount of international research by faculty and among graduate students. She has been in a number of meetings with Vice President Mulcahy about what is occurring with respect to international research funding, the risk and liabilities associated with those projects, and which central offices have responsibility for which aspects of this emerging phenomena.

* 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

This is an evolving and growing field, particularly with respect to the kinds of funding available from around the world, and the types of issues/questions being addressed by the research. OIP has always been responsible for oversight and coordination of international undergraduate student experiences, but over the past 4-5 years there has been more demand on OIP for assistance, support, funding, advice, and coordination from faculty and staff as well. In light of this change, OIP has finalized and adopted a new five-year strategic plan, to better align resources and expectations.

One result of the strategic plan is that the office will change its name, effective January 1, 2011, to Global Programs and Strategy Alliance ("GPS Alliance"). The unit is not really an office, a center, or an institute; it really is an alliance. In order to achieve "comprehensive internationalization," (a term of art in the field), University units, colleges, and campuses must work together, through an alliance of interests and efforts.

When she took this job, she was asked to assess the University's international programs, so she worked with a small committee of key faculty and administrators to consider the range and type of risks and liabilities inherent in this kind of work. One resulting product of that work was a "heat map" charting the risks and liabilities and how well the institution was prepared for harm. For student mobility, the University is well prepared. The question before this Committee today is that of the level of risks and liabilities that arise when faculty travel overseas, Dean McQuaid said. The University often has no idea where faculty members are; faculty MIGHT tell their department head or dean that they are traveling abroad, but the practice varies by department and college. From conversations Dean McQuaid has had with faculty, deans, and administrators and staff around the system, it seems that both policy and enforcement varies widely.

A valid concern, she said, on behalf of the University, is for the safety of faculty members who travel abroad.

The reaction of some faculty to the idea that they need to report international travel is "what do you mean, I have to tell you where I'm going? Mind your own business." With more and more faculty members traveling overseas, however, the risks are increasing. For example, when there were bombings in Uganda, there was good reason to believe that University faculty and students were likely there—but the University had no idea precisely who. There have been incidents in India, Brazil, and Mexico as well (e.g., during the H1N1 outbreak) that put faculty members at risk.

The impact of not knowing ranges from public embarrassment for the University when it does not know who is where (something that also tends to irritate some in the legislature) to a lack of ability to help faculty members who may be in trouble. Things happen; the University wants to be able to help, not monitor. This is NOT "tracking," Dean McQuaid emphasized, because they are not particularly interested in what the individual may be doing or with whom they are meeting when they are overseas. But, she said, their whereabouts are critical to any effort to assist with getting someone home.

One step she has taken in response to the issues raised by assessment of the risks and liabilities is to appoint an international Health, Safety, and Compliance Coordinator, Stacey Tsantir. Ms. Tsantir is doing a lot of work to provide resources to faculty so they can educate themselves about international travel, prior to leaving the country.

The Proposal Routing Form (PRF) has recently been modified for several reasons, and among the modifications is a question that asks whether any of the research work associated with the funding will be conducted over seas, Dean McQuaid said. Her office is apprised of that situation, and can reach out to ask whether OIP can assist with visas, bank accounts, hiring employees, etc.

With respect to purchasing, Cliqbook [<http://travel.umn.edu/onlineres.php>] is currently the University's only travel-booking site and people can obtain deep discounts if they use it. In the future, Purchasing could be able to assist with identifying who was scheduled to have been in a place that is experiencing crisis because of travel arrangements made through Cliqbook. Texas A&M, for example, plans to require use of a single travel agency beginning early in 2011; currently, the University is only encouraging use of Cliqbook.

The question remains whether the University should require more reporting. Texas A&M has adopted a policy which denies reimbursement to faculty who did not report international travel in advance of the travel. That is a discussion that is being held here and it was an issue when Dean McQuaid visited this Committee a year ago. What happens to the information that is collected? That is a good question. Their thought is that only the travel site collects the information, it is not necessarily distributed to the department—and is later purged.

This is an issue for all major research universities, Dean McQuaid related. None of them have any clear idea where the faculty go or what they are doing, so they cannot effectively tell the broader community what their institution is doing around the world—and it cannot help faculty who encounter problems. The University of Michigan, Michigan State, Duke, and the California system are each at different points in considering policies and enforcement. At some universities, these conversations are non-starters, at others there is more compulsory enforcement of policies, and others (like the University) are still finding their way. But, international crises of all kinds are not waiting for higher education institutions to develop a response.

Professor Kulacki asked whether there is a liability issue; if a faculty member is injured abroad, what is the University's liability? The same as it is for domestic travel, Dean McQuaid said. Ms. Tsantir said that there are employee benefits that cover people who are injured. So there is no downside to receiving support from OIP, Professor Kulacki concluded.

There is also the travel-assistance program Medex, Mr. Chapman reminded the Committee—but that is only helpful if the faculty member can get in touch with it. If they are being held incommunicado, it can't help. And if someone does not show up when expected, it may be only the spouse or partner who knows that a person is in trouble somewhere, Dean McQuaid added, and the University would be unable to help.

Professor Miksch reported that she has to fill out a form indicating when and where she will travel. That practice varies by college, Dean McQuaid said, as does the disposition of the form once it is filled out. It may end up in a paper file in an office and it could be that no one knows where it is; the information may be inaccessible to the office or unit that could help someone. Professor Hanna asked if there are units that provide a good model that could be adopted more broadly. Dean McQuaid said that she understands that the School of Nursing ties reimbursement to completion of a travel form. Her concept is that of a travel registry; the college would not own the data, and when the traveler returns, the data would be purged. Some faculty members are unwilling to have their department or chair know of

their travel—something it is difficult to cannot understand—and may make arrangements for their classes and so on, and just go.

Professor Sheets said he was puzzled why this would be controversial. If that could be ascertained, the problem could be overcome. Several Committee members expressed incredulity that faculty members would travel without notifying their department. Professor Sirc commented that perhaps if one is traveling to interview for another job, one might not want the department to know, but otherwise he was flabbergasted that faculty members would travel without letting anyone know. Mr. Orlic said that there could be a problem if the faculty member skips class, but perhaps has the TA teach. That would also be doing something wrong, Professor Sheets responded.

What reasons do faculty members give for not indicating travel plans, Ms. Stenhjem asked? It is not the University's business, they are fulfilling job responsibilities, and the like, Dean McQuaid said. They are doing so on the University's dime, Professor Sirc commented. Dean McQuaid reported that some faculty members said they would not report unless required to do so, but the tenor of the times is more persuasive than a worry about academic jealousy or some such reaction, because more faculty members now know about others who were sick or stuck abroad. A central repository of information would take the matter out of college hands.

Professor Sheets asked if it would be helpful for the Committee to take a position on the issue. Dean McQuaid said that the University must decide what it wants. It is a big issue and the University needs to figure out its response. She has been invited to talk to the senior executives about oversight; she will draft a policy and see if the institution feels strongly enough to take a position. There could be multiple responses: the institution should not adopt a policy, it must adopt a policy, it should further investigate such a policy. But for the four years she's been in this position, the question she is asked most often is "how come you don't know where people are?"

Dean McQuaid said that any policy proposed would go through the normal process, which would include review by appropriate Senate committees. The proposal being developed provides that faculty and staff travel overseas must be reported in advance; she said that no decision had been made regarding repercussions for not following the policy, including but not limited to denying reimbursement if the reporting does not occur. She emphasized that the policy would not call for obtaining permission, only for reporting.

Professor Cline said he supported the idea of a policy but noted that there is a great deal of reimbursement that comes from outside the University. He suggested that people should notify both their college and Dean McQuaid's office. What about when traveling on University and personal business, Professor Bornshtein asked? Dean McQuaid said the policy would cover travel on University business.

The sanction need not be either/or, Professor Sheets suggested. If one is negligent in reporting the first time, expenses could still be covered.

Professor Sirc asked about the 35% figure for UMTC students who have a study-abroad experience. Is that between the time they come to the University and the time they graduate? Or is it per year? In any given academic year 35% of students will be outside the U.S., Dean McQuaid said. Many go without earning credit; the number would be higher if those students were counted. That would be useful information for the University to project, Professor Sheets said; does University Relations know

that our study abroad numbers are this high? They do, Dean McQuaid said, as do the President and vice presidents, and they often use the fact in public remarks. Dean McQuaid reported that her office also has great websites that her staff has developed that are known nationally, and they are asked to provide training nationally on both study abroad procedures and programs, as well as on international recruitment, orientation, enrollment and support. OIP websites can be accessed through www.international.umn.edu.

Professor Bornshtein asked what the policies at other Big Ten schools are. Dean McQuaid said that Michigan State has a voluntary registry (which her counterpart said does not work very well; there generally needs to be either a carrot or a stick approach). The University of Michigan also requires reporting and, for the first year of the policy, there will be no repercussions for failing to report, though that may be added later. She said she does not favor unnecessary or ineffective policies and forms, which is why she wants to keep it simple and clean and have the data destroyed after the travel is complete.

Professor Sheets thanked Dean McQuaid for her report and for bringing the proposal up for discussion.

2. Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) Salary Equity Study

Professor Sheets turned now to Professor Frazier to lead a discussion of the results of the salary-equity study commissioned by the Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC), a report the Committee has been eager to hear about and has been awaiting for some time.

Professor Frazier explained that she is a former co-chair of the WFC and has been working on the study for the past three years; others who were actively involved include Professors Michele Goodwin, Caroline Hays, and Linda Kinkel. Other major contributors include members of the WFC, Provost Sullivan, Vice Provost Carney, and Dr. Goldfine from Office of Institutional Research. Committee members were provided copies of a set of slides reporting the results of the study.

The WFC study reviewed data from 1986 that were gathered in the context of the Rajender sex-discrimination lawsuit in the late 1980s. Data from 2007 demonstrate that there remains a significant wage gap between male and female faculty.

Why do a pay-equity study? Professor Frazier explained that data demonstrate women continue to make less than men in the United States. At the same time, psychological studies demonstrate that people deny personal disadvantage, even though their group may be discriminated against. The WFC concluded there needed to be an assessment of the current state of affairs at the University with respect to salary equity to learn if there is a gender difference, and if so, why and what could be done about it.

The study started in the fall of 2007, using 2007 salary data; the data were not ready for analysis until January, 2010, because it took over two years to gather data on key variables (some of the required data was missing). The results of the analysis were presented to key administrators last spring and the Provost responded to them in September 2010.

Professor Frazier explained the sample used: tenured or tenure-track faculty with 100%-time appointments drawn from nine colleges (Design, Biological Sciences, Education and Human Development, CLA, CFANS, Carlson School, Humphrey, Science and Engineering, Law). The Medical School was not included because it has a different salary structure; there is controversy about excluding it

and some believe it should be included or that there should be a separate study. P&A staff were not included, nor were faculty with administrative appointments, on phased retirement, from the Academic Health Center, or from the coordinate campuses.

Professor Frazier also explained that there are two different approaches to salary-equity studies, the individual and the institutional. The former perspective suggests discrimination results from isolated personal prejudices that cause pockets of disparities; the latter suggests that discrimination is systemic, affects all in the category in question, and is due to cultural bias. The institutional-level analyses examine whether women as a group are paid less than men while the individual-level analyses look for specific people who are paid less than predicted. The WFC decided to take the institutional approach, for a number of reasons: it benefits everyone, including "superstar" women (who perhaps should be paid more); focusing on outliers reinforces the stereotype of women as low performers; adding increments for some women but not others can be problematic; and looking for pockets of bias in colleges or departments can lead to very small samples (even big differences can be non-significant).

What they found was that in 1986, the mean difference in salaries between men and women were these:

8% at the assistant professor level (i.e., men made 8% more than women)
6.2% at the associate professor level
8% at the full professor level.

In 2007, the results were these:

4.4% at the assistant professor level (an improvement over 1986)
6.4% at the associate professor level (no difference)
7.9% at the full professor level (no difference).

In terms of actual cash differences in 2007, at the assistant professor level it was \$3299, at the associate professor level it was \$5332, and at the full professor level it was \$9586. The cumulative consequences are that (1) over a 25-year career, the average female faculty member will earn \$200,000 less than the average male faculty member, and (2) that number does not take into account the differences in benefits accrued by male and female faculty members (e.g., retirement benefits).

The summary, Professor Frazier said, is that women faculty earn significantly less than male faculty, salary discrepancies increase with rank, and the percent differences in salary between males and females at higher ranks are unchanged from 1986. The differences in 1986 warranted adjustments in women faculty salaries as part of the Rajender consent decree.

Professor Sheets asked if there was a temporary improvement after the adjustments were made in 1987. Professor Frazier said it has been difficult to find documentation in the archives. She saw one report that the salary differences were gone by 1990, but there has been no monitoring since then and it appears the differences have crept back. Professor Sheets said it would be helpful to track the differences since a baseline year (e.g., 1990). One of the WRC recommendations, Professor Frazier responded, is that the University at least track the salaries.

Professor Kulacki inquired about time in rank. If the faculty now is mostly senior males, with women catching up, until the older folks retire, there will be differences. There is a general consensus that they have to control for various factors, Professor Frazier said, such as seniority and discipline, and years in rank is one such variable. There is not consensus on what variables to control for. They presented three different sets of analyses to the Provost that controlled for different sets of variables. The results of the three analyses were slightly different; Professor Frazier explained the most comprehensive model to the Committee.

They controlled for 16 variables related to salary, Professor Frazier related, including sex, number of years since highest degree, number of years of external experience (e.g., hired as a full professor versus hired as an assistant professor), number of internal promotions, Regents Professorship, worked at the University prior to faculty appointment, minority status, and 9 indicators for colleges/departments outside "typical" range. In the case of assistant professors and full professors, comparison of the raw salary data (percent difference between men and women) to the multiple-regression analyses suggests that the salary differences do not appear to be due to differences that arise from the variables. There may be a variable effect in the case of associate professors. In other words, the gender difference in salaries was smaller for associate professors when all 16 variables were included in the model, compared to the model without these additional variables. However, the gender differences were still statistically significant with all 16 variables in the model. The same was true for the actual dollar comparisons. Even after controlling for the 16 variables, there remains about a \$10,000 salary gap between male and female full professors. Professor Sheets asked if there are different results if one controls for some but not all of the variables. Professor Frazier said that the most important variable appeared to be discipline.

The WFC recommendations are these:

- Make salary adjustments to correct current salary inequities. If they are as large as they were when the Rajender consent decree was signed, and it was determined that adjustments were warranted then, they should also be warranted now. The adjustments should be across the board, corrected for the number of years someone has been at the University.
- There should be data monitoring, including a comprehensive salary-equity study every 3-5 years, systematic review of the procedures used to evaluate merit and equity and to translate them into salaries, a requirement that deans and department heads/chairs report sex-equity statistics annually to the Provost, make equity statistics and progress public, and evaluate the factors that may be correlated with sex-based salary differences (e.g., retentions, senior hires).

The Provost took these issues very seriously, charged Institutional Research to look into the best practices for conducting salary studies, and in September committed the resources to hire an outside, independent analyst to perform a model study and to evaluate the work that has been done so far. The response from the Office of Planning and Analysis and the Office of Institutional Research to the WFC report suggest that the models may not have adequately taken into account discipline and merit. But it is difficult to take merit into account, Professor Frazier commented.

Professor Sirc said he did not know what "merit" means. Less work for less pay? More work for smaller increases? It could be either, Professor Frazier said. Professor Sirc also asked whether starting salary could be an issue: Do men wrangle more to get a higher starting salary? Starting salaries could be tracked, Professor Frazier said. That is a consideration, Vice President Carrier said, and there is a

BELIEF that there are differences at the start. Another part could be that if one goes into administration for awhile, that could cause the salary to increase; the question is how to look at that phenomenon.

Professor Sheets asked if it is possible to control for retention. Dr. Carrier said the Provost receives all retention offers, which would be any time a dean says he or she is dealing with a retention offer. That could significantly affect salaries, Professor Sheets said; if there is a difference in wrangling and a greater disposition to consider moving elsewhere, salary levels could be affected. Professor Kulacki said that there are quantitative measures of merit that can apply across disciplines, such as books, papers, seminars, students graduated, and so on; the information is in annual reports, and it would be possible to take, for example, 500 reports and evaluate what merit looks like. But it would be a lot of work. They do not have that information in their database, Professor Frazier said; she reported that an NRC study of faculty in STEM fields found no evidence of a gender difference in productivity factors that were correlated with salary (although there were differences in measures that were not correlated with salary, like service).

Professor Sirc said the question is, "how is this happening?" Is it possible to do a stop-action photo? There is a lot of research, Professor Frazier said. It could be bias (e.g., a male faculty member might be given a higher salary or bigger raise because he is the sole provider for a family while a married woman faculty member is not). The studies confirm that married males make more, Mr. Croce said. Proving that could be difficult, Professor Kulacki said. One idea at the forum earlier this year is that people do not know what they can ask for, Professor Miksch said; one dean at another institution provides a list of all the things that were given to other faculty members, such as computer, printer, salary, retirement benefits, etc. That approach was seen as a best practice and makes the process more transparent. It could be that some people know what to ask for and some do not, and men and women start off on an unequal salary path. That sounds logical, Professor Sheets said, but how does one avoid that list then becoming the de facto threshold?

Besides pay equity, there should be consequences for an academic unit if it is in blatant violation of University policies, Professor Bornshtein said. All the University's policy language supports pay equity, Dr. Carrier said, and it would be a violation of those policies if bias were uncovered.

Is this the same problem at all institutions, or is it better or worse here, Mr. Orlic asked? There are AAUP data, Professor Frazier said; she said she did not recall how Minnesota compared with others but said she doubted Minnesota was alone in having the problem.

In terms of next steps, they are working with the Provost to pursue independent analyses of faculty salary data. They do not know if a different picture will result. The consultant is to have recommendations to the Provost by April 1, 2011. The WFC is presenting the data to various groups at the University and will continue to advocate actively for salary equity at the University and for enhanced transparency, accountability, and gender neutrality in salary allocation.

Kathy Hanna commented that she and Dr. Carrier were probably the only women in the room who were at the University at the time of the Rajender consent decree, and it is discouraging to see these data.

Is there discrimination in other benefits, Mr. Orlic asked? Professor Frazier said they focused on salaries, but are now starting to look at family-leave policies. The University has good policies but there may be inconsistency in their application.

Professor Sheets thanked Professor Frazier for the report and said the Committee will want to hear the report of the consultant.

3. Salary Instructions

Professor Sheets next turned to questions that had earlier been raised in the Committee regarding salary instructions this past year, the discretion that was given to colleges, and the choices that colleges made (if it has been provided).

Dr. Carrier said that she had partial information but no analysis of actual increases because they were delayed until mid-year. The question she received was about recurring versus lump-sum increases. The salary memo indicated that the 2% increase was to be used for recurring increases and that lump-sum increases could be delivered from outside the 2% pool. What was different this year was the allowance for exceptional circumstances, allowing colleges to have alternative plans, with the approval of the Provost or Senior Vice President. She said she does not have information at this time on what the colleges did; she will in February or March and will bring the information to the Committee. It will also have an opportunity to review the salary instructions for next year at that time. Professor Hanna said she thought the increases were to be recurring, but they may not be in her college, and she said the Committee should request a list of the colleges that asked for exceptions.

Professor Sheets adjourned the meeting at 3:50.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota