

DRAFT

EQUITY, ACCESS & DIVERSITY  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
October 18, 2010

[In these minutes: MLK Day Events Report discussion with AVP Kris Lockhart; Women's Faculty Cabinet Salary Equity Study, 2010]

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

PRESENT: Irene Duranczyk (Chair), Janet Thomas, Susan Cable-Morrison, Michael Goh, Peg Lohnquist, Anne Phibbs, Lauren Beach, Brad Folta, Richard Graff, Kimberly Boyd

REGRETS: Michelle Page, M.J. Gilbert

ABSENT: Aisha El-Huni, Patrick Troup

GUESTS: Kristin Lockhart, Associate Vice President, Office of Equity and Diversity, Professor Caroline Hayes, Professor Patricia Frazier, Professor Linda Kinkel

Professor Irene Duranczyk called the meeting to order and welcomed those present. She asked the committee members to introduce themselves, and then introduced Kris Lockhart, Associate Vice President of the Office of Equity and Diversity. Professor Duranczyk explained that Associate Vice President Lockhart had reviewed the EAD subcommittee's report and recommendations on Martin Luther King Jr. Day Celebrations (MLK Day Report) and was here to discuss the report and consider ways for OED and the Committee to collaborate on the report recommendations.

**Discussion of MLK Day Events Report, Associate Vice President Kris Lockhart**

Associate Vice President Lockhart began by discussing how OED approaches all aspects of its system wide work. She stated the way they are organized and the actions OED is undertaking relate to action items in the MLK Day Report. Using a handout, she explained the organizational structure. The University Equity and Diversity Vision Framework, Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, and Disability Services fall under the Associate Vice President (AVP). The AVP is responsible for the system wide implementation of the University's equity and diversity vision framework; how it is infused and supported as a core value in the University's transformation.

Next, she addressed some of OED's strategic initiatives and the reworking of the communication aspect of their department because she believes these areas might present opportunities to partner with EAD. She went on to explain that OED has a unique

organizational structure. It is a social justice model that makes individuals in central services available for individuals in protected classes. She explained that this model allows OED to work across identities and be in partnership with faculty, staff, students and the outside community. This is a nuanced way of looking at the work, and it is different from offices that are segmented by identities. Furthermore, she stated OED is working toward enhanced services that take advantage of its unique structure. Right now, however, the work is aspirational.

OED is doing strategic work to examine the services they are offering and the capacity they have in their office. They want to insure that they do not just have a unique organizational chart, but that the University community benefits from the structure. For the last two years, OED has met with every academic dean and chancellor to get their input on how central OED services can support their local equity and diversity goals. OED then examined its offices and realigned their capacity to support the deans and coordinate campuses. Currently, the deans are calling for a shift to greater educational efforts. So, OED is determining what this means in terms of programming activities, and direct individual support.

Associate Vice President Lockhart suggested the Committee could assist OED by acting as a sounding board when OED is looking at the reallocation of its resources in response to what the deans and chancellors are requesting. For instance, the deans and chancellors are seeking support for recruiting students of color and faculty of color. The challenge for OED and the Committee is to help the deans and chancellors think about areas they might not have considered like students, faculty, and staff with disabilities or what the climate is like in the colleges.

Associate Vice President Lockhart recognized that the current OED website does not have information on all of the equity and diversity related events occurring at the University and that they need to find ways to improve this. She indicated that the new communications director was hired to serve as a resource to the entire University on what is happening in the areas of equity and diversity, and was charged with helping OED and the website become a portal into all things equity and diversity at the University.

Professor Duranczyk stated that one of the issues identified in the MLK Day Report was the need to provide greater visibility for equity and diversity events so that new students can see that the University is an institution that honors the multiple identities of its community.

Susan Cable-Morrison asked if this issue was also relevant to coordinate campuses. Associate Vice President Lockhart responded that the consideration of whether resources are being deployed effectively included the coordinate campuses. But because most of the coordinate campuses have local resources as well as local access to emerging issues, OED delivers more services on the Twin Cities campus.

Lauren Beach stated the Committee is concerned about visibility as a tool to demonstrate inclusive campus climate, and MLK Day is a significant portion of that visibility. She

stated that when she was selecting a University the indicators she looked at were celebrations of MLK Day and the visibility and funding of the GLBT office and programs. She went on to state that one of the places for implementing OED's new communications strategy would be creating a new MLK Day website that lists all of the events. This would increase visibility and also address the concern of recruiting students and faculty of color.

Associate Vice President Lockhart responded that OED's choice not to use MLK Day was intentional, and that there is significant conversation within OED and at conferences about looking to a single person versus looking to institutional indications of progress. She did, however, recognize Ms. Beach's point that when new students are looking at a University one of the tools for evaluating its inclusiveness is its MLK Day programming. Associate Vice President Lockhart asked if the committee was concerned about the amount of OED's programming, and Ms. Beach stated they were not concerned about OED's programming, but concerned about communication of the programming.

Associate Vice President Lockhart asked if the entire committee felt that MLK Day programming was the one measure that they would use to determine an institution's inclusiveness. Ms. Cable-Morrison responded that you do not know a climate until you are at a place, and she is more concerned about whether there is actually a diverse faculty and student body then whether there is a celebration of MLK Day.

Professor Richard Graff stated he felt there was no difference in mission or objective between OED and the recommendations in the MLK Day Report. But, he wanted to point out the contrast between the University of Minnesota interface with the outside community in celebrating MLK Day and the University's peer institutions who had more robust programming.

Ms. Beach stated she does not believe MLK Day should be the only or primary indicator but it is an important indicator. There must be some surrogates for evaluating climate when you cannot have the lived experience. She noted that Minnesota does not pursue this as a strategy but its Big Ten peer institutions do.

Ms. Beach recommended creating a centralized resource that would be advertised and promote all MLK Day events whether sponsored by OED, student organization, faculty staff, or co-sponsored activities with community. Associate Vice President Lockhart asked if this would include all programs done to promote social justice? Ms. Beach responded that you could have a calendar that lists everything, but it would be good to highlight or have a subsection for celebrations around particular diversity holidays.

Ann Phibbs, director GLBT Programs Office, summarized, the Committee is stating that it is important for OED to make use of MLK Day, and it is missing out on the opportunity.

Associate Vice President Lockhart restated the concerns expressed by the committee as: 1) Making sure that OED is publishing everything that is happening and doing it in an effective way, and 2) Considering what programming is taking place and whether it is tagged MLK. She noted that one way OED can address the communication issue is with the help of the new communications director. The communication's director is looking at a complete revamp of the OED website to insure it is a resource for everything involving equity and diversity that is happening internally and externally. But, she stated the issue that everything be tagged MLK is a different philosophical conversation.

Ms. Beach stated this is not a question of tag lining. If a program involves MLK then it should be listed on a central calendar. This is a communication issue.

Professor Duranczyk highlighted item D from the MLK Day Report recommendations calling for a day to encourage community service. She stated it would be excellent to start the semester with a day calling for community service. OED could lead the charge on public engagement. She also stated that EAD wants to move forward with a resolution regarding the recommendations in the MLK Day Report, and she will send it to Associate Vice President Lockhart for her input.

### **Women's Faculty Cabinet Salary Equity Study, 2010**

Professor Duranczyk introduced Professors Linda Kinkel, Pat Frazier, and Caroline Hayes from the Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC), and stated they would be presenting the results of the Women's Faculty Cabinet Salary Equity Study 2010. She also noted that the committee would be considering whether to add a representative from the Women's Faculty Cabinet as an ex officio member of EAD.

Professor Frazier began the power point presentation by comparing the results of the 2010 pay equity study to the results of the salary equity study conducted in the context of the *Rajender* sex discrimination lawsuit in the late 1980s. The presentation highlighted the significant wage gap that still exists between male and female faculty and discussed the response of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, E. Thomas Sullivan.

Professor Frazier stated the pay equity study was done because in general we know that women continue to make less than men in the United States, but people tend to deny personal disadvantage. There is also a need to assess the current state of affairs at the University of Minnesota with regard to salary equity. Professor Frazier next provided an overview of the process for the study:

- Initiated in the fall of 2007
- Two and half years to gather the data on key variables
- Data analysis by Institutional Research during Spring 2010
- Results were presented to the Provost in Spring 2010.
- The Provost considered best practices over the summer
- Provost provided a response in September 2010

Professor Frazier discussed the sample used for the research. It included tenured or tenure-track faculty with 100% FTE appointments from nine colleges, but did not include AHC faculty, P&A staff, or Faculty with administrative appointments, on phased retirement or from coordinate campuses

She continued her presentation with a discussion of individual versus institutional perspectives on discrimination. She stated that they lead to different analysis and different remedies, and she discussed some of the arguments for using each approach. The WFC study used an institutional level approach for framing its analyses and remedies.

Next, Professor Frazier turned to the results of the study. She stated the last major institutional-level salary study used data from 1986. It was conducted in conjunction with the *Rajender* sex discrimination lawsuit. In 1986 female assistant professors made eight percent less than their male counterparts. Female associate professors made six percent less and female full professors made eight percent less than their respective male counterparts. The WFC study found that in 2007 there was no change in the salary gaps between male and female full professors and very little change in the gap between male and female associate professors despite the fact that salary adjustments were made between 1989 and 1992. The gap between male and female assistant professors did shrink somewhat. In 2007, Male assistant professors made \$3,299 more than females, male associate professors made \$5332 more than female professors and male full professors made \$9586 more than female professors. Kimberly Boyd asked if the disparity was less for some period of time and then increased. Professor Kinkel stated that they found comments in the minutes of a committee meeting indicating that salary adjustments were effective at some point, but they have not been able to locate the exact statistics.

Professor Hayes commented that a salary study was conducted ten years ago that broke the results down by college, but it lacked university-wide analysis with sufficient statistical power. Professor Kinkel stated the individuals conducting the current study spoke with the *Rajender* lawyers about how the salary adjustments were made. There were across the board adjustments, and then a second tier of adjustments for those significantly underpaid, and then a third tier based on specific merit cases. Men were also allowed to bring merit cases. Professor Frazier summarized that female faculty earn significantly less than male faculty and salary discrepancies increase with rank. The percent difference in salary between males and females at higher ranks are unchanged from 1986. These differences warranted adjustments in 1986.

Professor Frazier next discussed how the study controlled for various factors that may explain some differences in salary when doing equity studies. She noted, however, that there are different opinions regarding which variables to control. The WFC report to the Provost presented three sets of analyses that controlled for different sets of factors. She stated that comparing similar men and women by controlling variables did not decrease the differences in their salaries.

She next presented the WFC recommendations.

- Make salary adjustments to address current salary inequities
  - Across the board adjustments, corrected for number of years at the institution
- Data Monitoring
  - Comprehensive salary equity study every 3-5 years
  - Systematic review of procedures used to evaluate merit and equity
  - Require Deans, Department Head, and Chairs to report sex equity statistics annually to the Provost
  - Make equity statistics and progress public
  - Evaluate the factors that may be correlated with sex-based salary differences

The recommendations were presented to the Provost in May. Institutional Research was charged to look into the best practices for conducting salary studies and concluded that discipline and merit may not have been adequately taken into consideration in the study. The Provost committed resources to hire an outside, independent analyst to perform a “model” study.

Professor Frazier discussed the difficulties in incorporating a faculty member’s discipline into the model. She noted that there are over 200 instructional program codes (CIP codes) and there is not a straightforward way to incorporate discipline nor is there a consistent model nationally. The model the WFC used in its study is a model that is used at other institutions.

Next, Professors Hayes, Frazier and Kinkel engaged in a conversation with committee members about whether merit accounted for gender based differences in salaries. Some issues raised by committee members included:

- Whether bias occurs when professors take leave.
- The impact on men and women of “stopping the clock;”
- The role of department heads in determining salary; and
- Attrition across the genders and bias in retention packages.

Professor Hayes stated that while they could include a finer-grained control for discipline then is already included in the study, how detailed is detailed enough? Some also feel that a salary equity study should control for merit, but there are not uniform criteria for merit, and a recent NRC study indicated that men and women in science and engineering do not differ in merit factors that correlate with salary. She stated we were able to take action 20 years ago without this level of detail. How long do we want to wait?

Professor Duranczyk asked what the Provost’s timeline is for completion of the new study by the outside analyst. Professor Kinkel stated that the WFC is waiting for Vice President of Human Resources, Carol Carrier to put out an RFP. But, she believes it is important for the WFC to establish their own timeline for hiring an analyst and completion of the report.

Professor Duranczyk suggested that a resolution from EAD to the University Senate might help keep things moving. A discussion followed about the process for creating open discussion and debate on the floor of the Senate.

Hearing no further business, Professor Duranczyk adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay  
University Senate Office