

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, April 5, 2012
12:00 – 2:15
262 Mondale Hall

- Present: Chris Cramer (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Elizabeth Boyle, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Carol Chomsky, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Walt Jacobs, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, Jan McCulloch, James Pacala, Richard Ziegler
- Absent: Peter Bitterman, Caroline Hayes, George Sheets
- Guests: Professor Nita Krevans (chair, Graduate Education Policy Committee); Professor Erin Kelly (Women's Faculty Cabinet); Professors James Cloyd and Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (newly-elected Committee members); Professor Michael Hancher (incoming Committee member replacing Professor Jacobs for 2012-13)
- Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) new graduate-education policies; (2) gender-equity faculty salary study; (3) election of the 2012-13 chair of the committee; (4) excused absences on election day]

1. New Graduate-Education Policies

Professor Cramer convened the meeting at 12:00 and welcomed Professor Krevans to present five new graduate-education policies.

Four of the policies are for action (at this meeting and then at the Faculty Senate meeting this afternoon) and one is for discussion, Professor Krevans said. Minor wording changes for clarity will probably be made in the four policies after adoption (through FCC action on technical amendments), based on comments made too close to the Senate meeting to bring them up today. But the substance of the policies as presented here and at the Senate will remain the same. Professor Krevans highlighted the elements of the policies that are new (rather than being a compilation of existing policies and practices).

-- There is proposed a minimum GPA for doctoral [new] and master's students [continuation of old policy].

-- The way that time to degree for doctoral students is calculated is changed (it has been the rule that a student has five years from the point at which he or she passes the preliminary oral exam; that rule has allowed students and advisers to manipulate the date of the preliminary oral—which might be acceptable—but that method of calculating time to degree has played havoc with comparisons with national metrics, because the national standard counts time to degree from the point of entry into a program). There is a national push to reduce time to degree for doctoral students and many graduate

* 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.

programs are already revising their calendars. Professor Krevans noted that a provision for exceptions is built into the proposed policy.

Neither the policy nor the FAQ mention the Leave of Absence policy, Professor Cramer pointed out. It is mentioned in related information, Professor Krevans said; the policy office has strict rules on what is related and what can be mentioned in policies or FAQs. The LOA policy gives students with a true emergency the opportunity to withdraw and come back without having to be readmitted and a LOA would stop the clock. (Committee members later suggested that Professor Cramer contact the policy office about the reference to the LOA policy and urge that it be mentioned more explicitly in the policy or an FAQ.)

Professor Boyle asked if current students are grandfathered and covered by the policies that applied to them when they entered the program. They are, Professor Krevans said, unless they leave the program and seek to return later, but current students may opt to be covered by the new policies. The big moral of these new policies is "don't go inactive." It will need to be made clear to students that they are covered by the old policies—and departments will have to keep copies of them. Professor Krevans said the policy office has copies of all old policies.

-- The former or existing policies and procedures covered only programs that were in the Graduate School; the new policies cover all graduate programs except first-professional degrees, even programs that were not previously under the aegis of the Graduate School. All programs that were under the Graduate School were required to give students a handbook; now the programs that were not previously under the Graduate School are also required to do so; they will publish suggestions about what should be included. Graduate students receive the handbook when they enter the program and it governs the relationship. Departments must maintain archival copies of the handbooks.

Professor Cramer noted that with respect to time to degree, students can seek an exception from the program that would grant them two additional years (beyond the limit of 8 specified in the policy), and under special circumstances could obtain an additional two years with the assent of the provost. How many take 10-12 years, he asked? Many, Professor Krevans said; the average in the humanities across the country is over 8 years. In her field, Classical Studies, students are sometimes asked to take a language that they could not take as undergraduates, so it takes their graduate students a while to complete a degree. The time to degree is also affected by the financial support provided to the student. She said she did not know what the trend in time to degree is but it was growing—to the point that people began to start worrying about it.

Professor Krevans also noted policy language allowing an entire program to seek an exception from the time limit on the grounds that the nature of the program or its students mean students will generally need to take a longer time to obtain a degree.

If 8 years is about the average in the humanities, how did they decide on 8 as a maximum, Professor Chomsky inquired? That is the longest average, Professor Krevans said, and it is shorter in other fields, but 8 is also the national norm. They looked at five peer universities with varying degrees of centralization/decentralization (Berkeley, Michigan, Ohio State, Stanford, and Virginia), and all of them use 8 years and have a provision for extensions. Basically they are proposing that Minnesota do what its peers do. Nor does the proposal really change what was true in the past—the expectation of 5 years after

the preliminary oral assumed 2-3 years of coursework before the oral—but instead changes the way the time is counted.

Another point that could be contentious is the minimum GPA for doctoral students, Professor Krevans said. Her committee members had split views on the requirement. All of the University's peers have the same minimum GPA, 3.0, and when the University graduates doctoral students, it is certifying that they can do research and instruct others, so they must have performed reasonably well in the classroom. She said she did not see a problem with a minimum standard (in master's programs, one cannot graduate if one's GPA is below the required minimum, and that GPA is calculated only for courses that count in the degree program). In the Ph.D. program, a GPA below the minimum is not a bar to graduation, although the GPA will be flagged, but a program may permit someone to obtain a Ph.D. with less than a 3.0.

Since a C grade in a graduate program is THE EQUIVALENT OF failing, is not a 3.0 in a doctoral program about equivalent to a 2.0 in an undergraduate program, Professor Cramer asked? It is, Professor Krevans agreed. She said that faculty in the science departments give a lot of Cs to doctoral students, but they asked the science departments to look at the GPAs of their Ph.D. graduates; most departments have minimum standards greater than 3.0 (typically 3.25).

Some have asked why establish a minimum GPA if it will not be enforced, Professor Krevans related. The students they have spoken with believe it a good vehicle for allowing advisers to intervene and that it provides a mechanism to document a student's unsatisfactory program and perhaps to change the student's financial aid—but it would not be the guillotine like it is in master's programs. Can a program have mandatory expulsion because of a GPA, Professor Ben-Ner asked? It can but does not have to, Professor Krevans said. The new policy covers a broader array of programs than the old one, so they had to balance interests. It seems wishy-washy, but it nevertheless is useful. It does not bar exceptional students from earning a degree because of problems with coursework leading to a lower GPA.

Programs could not pass a rule to nullify the policy, Professor Krevans said in response to a question; programs can be more stringent than University policy but not less stringent. Professor Campbell asked if a DGS could use the policy to kick out a student that he/she did not like. It seems that the DGS could dismiss a student on the basis of the policy. The student could file a complaint if that happened, and if that student were singled out or there were an arbitrary enforcement of the rules, there would be obvious grounds for reinstatement, Professor Krevans said. The policy appears to take autonomy from the program and give it to the DGS, Professor Campbell said. That is technically not true, Professor Krevans said, because the DGS is appointed by and reports to the collegiate dean in consultation with program faculty. Professor Chomsky said it would be preferable to have the policy designate who would have final say over exercising discretion to dismiss a student based on grades rather than leave that open. But if it is understood that the discretion is not individual, that it can't be exercised arbitrarily by an individual DGS, perhaps it is acceptable in this form. Professor Campbell said that a program might not care about grades but the policy allows the DGS to throw a student out if he or she does not achieve a stipulated grade level. If the student is not in good standing, a department could cut off funding for him or her, Professor Krevans said. Professor Cramer said he would not want to see a policy that allowed a DGS no discretion—programs have DGSs precisely so that they *can* make decisions about individual students, and it's not as though any given decision cannot be appealed to some higher authority should extraordinary circumstances warrant.

Professor Pacala asked what would happen, or did the committee talk about what might happen, if the time limit for the Ph.D. were set at 6 years rather than 8. Would there be more truly-achieving students but fewer students overall? Might the lower limit lead to a decline in quantity but an increase in quality? Professor Krevans said her committee would face immediate and vehement resistance to such a change, especially since she herself is a faculty member in a field where degrees take a long time. Programs are free to impose more restrictive time limits than the University policy, and 8 years is a national standard. It is easy to say that there is a huge weight of practice behind the number; the 8-year limit is the result of a national call to improve time to degree for doctoral students. But her committee did discuss the limit.

Professor Kohlstedt reported that in her program they were able to reduce the mean time to degree to 5.5 years. But with respect to quality, they found that some students who went through the program fast sometimes did more workaday dissertations; students who took even a bit more time produced higher-quality dissertations. She said she did not believe a shorter mandatory time limit would necessarily lead to a better outcome.

A lower limit would also scare away applicants, Professor Cramer surmised.

The University is pushing undergraduates to get done in four years, Professor Luepker pointed out, and it is not getting poorer students as a result. It could be that quality of work will decline if students take more time. They will certainly be financially poorer if they take longer, Professor May commented. They discussed time to degree in his college, Professor Luepker related, and concluded that in some cases it takes students more time because they lack financial support. With it, they would get through faster.

In her department, Professor Ropers-Huilman commented, many of the students are principals and school administrators who do not want full support—they want to keep their jobs. If her program is not permitted to serve those students, it would not be serving its land-grant mission. Professor Krevans said that Professor Ropers-Huilman's program is one they had in mind when they allowed the possibility of a department seeking an exception from the policy for an entire program. It has nevertheless been a useful discussion for them, Professor Ropers-Huilman commented, because they do have students who take too long, but they appreciate the flexibility in the policy.

Professor Chomsky noted that the policy said the second preliminary oral exam must be before the exact same examining committee, but one of the FAQs indicates there are extraordinary circumstances under which a substitution may be made (but the FAQ doesn't yet have an answer written out). What is the practice? In practice the Graduate School allows emergency replacements for medical emergencies or death, Professor Krevans said. Professor Chomsky said it would be better if the policy were to say that the same people must be used unless there are extraordinary circumstances that do not permit it. Otherwise the FAQ conflicts with the policy.

Professor Cramer also followed up on Professor Campbell's point about the minimum GPA. If expulsion from the program is authorized, it does not say who should decide. There should be a definition of who authorizes the discretion. Professor Krevans said she is aware the policy language needs to be cleaned up and she will get in touch with Professor Chomsky and others. Professor Ben-Ner asked how Professor Krevans would respond to the issue; it is a significant issue. The DGS is appointed

by the dean, Professor Krevans said, and there is policy that describes the authority of the DGS. The college appoints the DGS and the college would get involved if there were an abuse of authority.

Professor Cramer expressed surprise at the distrust of DGSs that was evident in the questions. Professor Campbell said they cannot find the Medical School policy on the appointment of DGSs, so Medical School faculty are concerned about how the DGS is appointed. Professor Krevans agreed that this is a big issue, and said that many are concerned because there is no University-wide roster of graduate faculty. The colleges were supposed to create rosters so that other colleges could rely on it, but many colleges do not have the staff or resources to create a graduate faculty roster. She would like the job to get done, but her college put staff on the task, and she is sympathetic with smaller colleges that are not able to handle the task.

So for the rules about termination, the students should see the program rule, Professor Chomsky asked? It is supposed to be in the handbook, Professor Krevans said, so the student should be able to know if the DGS did not abide by the handbook or applied the rules differentially. The handbook could say that a student who does not maintain a 3.0 GPA "will" be terminated or "may" be terminated, Professor Chomsky pointed out; what do they envision? It is up to the program to decide, Professor Krevans said; they can make decisions on a student-by-student basis but they have to be able to justify them.

Professor Ben-Ner said he was not aware of the reporting relationship of the DGS to the dean; he thought the DGS reported to the faculty in the program. That relationship puts an entirely different spin on the issues. They meet to evaluate and decide on students, he said, but if the DGS does not report to the faculty, there could be a problem. The language of the policy requires that every program have a DGS, to be appointed in consultation with the faculty, Professor Krevans said. The language about consultation with the faculty was inserted at the insistence of this Committee. But the faculty's views are advisory. Professor May surmised that many departments believe the chair appoints the DGS. That was never true, Professor Krevans observed. The academic responsibility for Ph.D. students is the common ownership of the graduate faculty in a department, Professor Ben-Ner said, so this is a big problem. Is the worry that a program might get a bad DGS, Professor Cramer asked? Professor Ben-Ner said that one is talking about narrow specialties that are far removed from the dean that need a decision by the faculty.

In the past, the DGS was appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, Professor Kohlstedt said, so the appointment was even further removed from the faculty of a program. Pragmatically, it would be an unusual DGS who would act contrary to the wishes of the adviser and faculty colleagues in the program. Professor Campbell said he remained uncomfortable with the discretion allowed the DGS. Professor Cramer said that he would WANT discretion as a DGS.

Professor Krevans turned next to the new policy, "University-Administered Graduate Student Fellowships and Traineeships: Twin Cities and Rochester." What the policy mostly says is that programs and recipients have to follow the rules of the fellowship. So why is the policy needed? It is a combination of providing information and reminding fellowship holders that there are conditions attached to fellowships, and ensuring fairness in awarding the fellowships by requiring departments to publish the criteria and process. This policy only governs University-administered fellowships, not those where the funding goes directly to the student.

Professor Boyle said she assumed the policy would do nothing about fellowships that fail to cover health benefits for dependents. It depends entirely on the funding source, Professor Krevans said. University fellowships such as the DDF provide tuition and insurance as well as a stipend, but not all fellowships do. The requirement is that departments be consistent in the way they award their own fellowships or nominate students for University/ outside fellowships.

Professor Cramer thanked Professor Krevans for her continued good work and for joining the meeting.

2. Gender-Equity Faculty Salary Study

Professor Cramer now welcomed Professor Erin Kelly from the Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) to discuss the WFC recommendations in response to the report and recommendations from Professor Murray Clayton, the outside consultant Provost Sullivan asked to review the faculty salary data for the University.

Professor Kelly began by noting that the WFC has been involved in salary-equity discussions for a number of years and has realized, in light of the discussions at this Committee and at the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, that it does not want to get bogged down in "how" questions. WFC spearheaded the effort, Provost Sullivan retained Professor Clayton as a consultant, and both WFC and Professor Clayton found an unexplained salary gap between men and women. The WFC had a number of discussions with Provost Sullivan and, thus far, one positive discussion with Provost Hanson (with two more scheduled this month).

Professor Kelly said that the current recommendations from the WFC (appended to these minutes) call for identification of key principles; identify what counts as a serious response by the administration that would satisfy the WFC and the Senate Equity, Access, and Diversity committee; and recognizes that schools may customize the recommendations; says that they want the provost and deans to "own" the issue and make a serious effort to address the inequities. They want the administrators to take the principles seriously and say that these recommendations are one possible way to proceed.

Professor Kelly noted that the key principles (#2) include the colleges in the health sciences, even though the report from Professor Clayton did not include them. Principle #3 is central to all of the WFC recommendations, Professor Kelly emphasized. Principle #4 is a call for routine monitoring. The elements of Part 2 (recommended process for case-by-case salary assessments) are more detailed around the key principles offered as recommendations; they recognize that colleges may wish to customize them.

Professor Ben-Ner said that the Clayton study identified two bases for the apparent discrepancy in salaries, gender and rank. Professor Kelly said if "rank" means "years since degree," she agreed that the gender coefficient in the analysis of the assistant professor level of the study was not significant.

Professor May asked about the community of comparison: What happens with senior women in a small department where there is no one with whom to compare her? Who is she compared with? Professor Kelly said that the Clayton report lays out the key criteria for comparisons. Ideally, they are within a department, unless the men and women faculty are so different in what they do that comparisons can't be used, in which case the comparisons are drawn from outside the department using faculty members who do similar work and have similar salaries. Professor May said she was concerned about

comparing units that are composed primarily of women. Such as comparing the School of Nursing with the School of Public Health, Professor Bearinger commented. Professor Kelly said that in some cases of small colleges, school-to-school comparisons could be appropriate.

Professor Jacobs noted that the SEACs (departmental Salary Equity Adjustment Committees) they recommend include only tenured faculty members. In some departments, there is a tradition of including tenure-track faculty members on all department committees except those dealing with promotion and tenure. Professor Kelly said that the WFC felt these could be tough decisions for probationary faculty members to have to face and including them would mean they would be making decisions about people who will be voting on their tenure. Professor Cramer pointed out that probationary faculty members are also the ones with the least experience to evaluate the metrics.

Professor Kelly said that the clinical faculty in the health sciences could be included in the SEACs. The language must be changed, Professor Pacala said. About 55% of the Medical School faculty are non-tenured. This is a case where they thought customization might be appropriate, Professor Kelly said; the Medical School might include non-tenured faculty but CLA, in contrast, might choose not to. Professor Luepker said he was curious about non-tenured faculty in other colleges. Aren't they paid less and don't they deserve the same consideration? That is a different track, Professor Kelly said. Professor Cramer added that the Clayton study did not address adjuncts, P&A instructors, etc.

Professor Ropers-Huilman (who is also a member of the Women's Faculty Cabinet) said that Provost Sullivan wanted to be careful about the scope of the recommendations and Provost Hanson concurs with that view. At one point the WFC wanted to include race/ethnicity and disability and more in the initial SEAC process, but in discussing the recommendations with Provost Hanson and President Kaler, they observed that those concerns went beyond the report's findings.

Professor Bearinger suggested adding the word "faculty" to the title and every other place where "salary study" is mentioned, to make clear the scope of the report and that it doesn't address P&A salaries.

Professor Pacala said he liked the principles and asked about the intent of 3(1). It seems like that could open a can of worms, because anyone with a gripe about his or her salary could request a salary review. Professor Cramer added that a SEAC could not recommend a salary reduction so there would be no reason not to ask for a review; the worst that could happen would be that there would be no change in salary. There is no motivation not to ask for a review. Professor Kelly said that recommendations to reduce salaries would conflict with other policies (e.g., the tenure regulations). It could be that there are other disparities not related to merit (e.g., race). They recommend the automatic reviews because of a gender gap, but they want people to be aware of biases and leave open the possibility of reviews for others, including white males. Professor Pacala asked if a committee could look at other possible dimensions of bias. It could, Professor Kelly said. Professor Pacala said he fully endorsed the concept but wondered if the program could lose its focus if it focused on factors other than gender. Professor Kelly said it is a good question. Provost Hanson has asked if there is an equity-review process available to anyone. Professor Kelly said she did not know the number of faculty members who would request a review but hoped that the number would not "gum up the works." The WFC does call for a review of the process after two years.

Professor Cramer said he has made the point a number of times: The issue is that, in an information vacuum, nearly everyone will feel motivated to request a review because nearly everyone thinks that they are underpaid. But the Clayton report regression could be made public; if everyone has it, anyone can plug in his or her descriptors and see whether his or her salary is above or below the regression prediction—and if they are above it, they would be less likely to complain. If they are below it, they will clearly be more likely to seek review, proportionate to the difference between prediction and reality. The transparency of the Clayton approach will help people. The SEACs will want their own data to make their own evaluations. Professor Kelly said she was in favor of making the data more available in order to identify outliers, but that people should be aware that the 2011 report from Professor Clayton was based on 2007 data, so they are out of date (although, as several Committee members observed, there haven't been much in the way of salary increases since 2007, so the data may not be that bad!).

Professor May said that when she thinks about this subject, she thinks about the Rajender consent decree, which was a class-action court case. This is very different and the recommendations seem to her a way to stay on top of the situation and avoid another Rajender case. Rajender should have fixed what seems to be starting to reappear; how does that play into decisions? The Rajender decree has been central in their discussions and has guided their thinking, Professor Kelly said, and a number of the WFC members were aware that about 20 years had passed since the lapse of the consent decree. The WFC found salary gaps that almost mirrored those found at the time of the Rajender decree (but the WFC study used fewer variables than Professor Clayton, who found a smaller gap than did the WFC). They found variations across colleges and ranks, and for that reason they accepted the Clayton recommendation that an across-the-board adjustment would not be appropriate. At no time has the WFC discussed a class-action suit, Professor Kelly said, but there is an unexplained salary gap that puts pressure on the administration to address.

Professor Chomsky said that Professor Clayton did not find across-the-board discrimination. A class-action suit requires a plaintiff (Dr. Rajender in the earlier instance) and then a court must certify the case as a class-action because of commonality of issues. The data now are not compelling in terms of filing a class-action suit. And the WFC would not be the plaintiff; there would have to be an individual. Professor May said she only inquired because of the point raised by Professors Cramer and Pacala: Why would not everyone request a review? She said she sees this as a very different set of circumstances from those that existed at the time of the Rajender decree.

Professor Kelly said that the WFC recognizes that a case-by-case approach is more cautious for the University and more burdensome for the faculty. She said that she did not want to use a regression model; most departments don't have sufficient numbers of faculty for a regression model and departments differ (as do subfields within departments) on what types of research count and how research is best measured. Applying one model with a count of articles would complicate the salary reviews and could introduce a gender bias if women and men are working within subfields with different types of research products, such as books versus articles. A case-by-case approach allows a more nuanced comparison.

Professor Chomsky said it is unclear to her who the recommendations are addressed to. To the units? The provost? Different recommendations to different people? She suggested the WFC identify to whom the recommendations are being made/to whom they are speaking. She also suggested, apropos of the SEACs, that the language be clear if only tenured faculty members are to be included and that the recommendations suggest the provost coordinate consultation with HR and with Equity and Diversity rather than exhort each department to do the consultation on their own. Professor Kelly thanked

Professor Chomsky for the suggestions and agreed that the effort would more likely be successful if Provost Hanson provides direction to the deans, along with Human Resources and the Office for Equity and Diversity.

Professor Bearinger said, apropos of Part 2, that schools will need help working with other schools and customizing could include faculty from two different schools working together. With respect to Part 3 and Provost Hanson's query about whether there is already a process for equity adjustments: It is her understanding that one makes a case to the dean, and if the response is unsatisfactory, one can go to the Office for Conflict Resolution headed by Carolyn Chalmers. Ms. Chalmers can be very helpful in equity cases. The process must address a mechanism that goes beyond the school level but before a grievance has to be filed.

Professor Kelly agreed. They would like to improve the processes broadly so that one does not have to go from the school to the grievance officer. They would like to have a process that has multiple sets of eyes on a review.

Professor Cramer said that there have been many conversations with Provost Sullivan, President Kaler, and now Provost Hanson, and he has never detected any reluctance whatever to address the problem. The only reservation they have is that they do not want to have to review the salary of every faculty member at the University.

Professor Cramer went on to comment that if one proceeds from the assumption that men and women have equal "merit potentials" (which view he holds), then there are large enough populations of men and women at the University that the average merit of each population should be equal; thus, if all *other* factors are accounted for (which is effectively what the Clayton regression accomplishes), the average salary number should be independent of gender. He assumed—making up a number out of whole cloth—that it might cost \$4 million to eliminate the unexplained salary gap, but hypothesized that the SEACs might be more generous and recommend adjustments that would cost more than the hypothetical \$4 million. Moreover, if the funds to remedy the gaps are coming from somewhere else (outside the department), he would certainly suggest to his chair that his department discriminate against women so that it could then receive additional funds for women faculty members to close the gaps with a pleasant net rise in *everyone's* salaries. Has the WFC thought about how to combat that problem? Make known the total funds available and that the recommendations will be scaled if they exceed the maximum? Ask local units to provide half the funds? That means taking money from men, but, since it was taken from women in the past, that would not be inappropriate.

They have talked about the issue but where the money is to come from is not up to the WFC, Professor Kelly said. They do recommend that any salary adjustments be outside the normal salary process. Provost Sullivan was of the view that the costs should be shared. She said she was concerned about asking departments to bear the entire cost of 15-20 years of accumulated decisions, so she would advocate that some central funds be available, at least for an initial period, after which there would be a legitimate concern about what departments could do because they could obtain money. But they have not done very much work on funding issues because there must be discussions with Provost Hanson first.

In terms of next steps, Professor Kelly said, they would like to move ahead as quickly as possible and would like the key principles to be the focus of discussion, and they would like to have a discussion at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate. They also want to be clear that the details they have presented

are just one set of recommendations that can be customized to the college. Professor Cramer noted that there will be a meeting with the Provost later in the month, at which time it should be possible to put the recommendations in final form an item for the Faculty Senate docket. He suggested that it be for discussion.

Committee members discussed with Professor Kelly (and Professor Ropers-Huilman) the extent to which the recommendations should be in the passive voice and the extent to which they should be somewhat more directive. Professor Ropers-Huilman said that they indicated what they want to happen but were reluctant to tell people how to do it. They also realized that colleges might do things quite differently, so they did not want to be too directive.

Professor Cramer thanked Professor Kelly for joining the meeting and making her report.

3. Election of the Chair for 2012-13

Committee members elected Professor Kohlstedt chair for 2012-13. She received a round of applause.

Professor Jacobs reviewed for Committee members the responsibilities of the vice chair. The Committee agreed to postpone election of the vice chair until a future meeting.

4. Excused Absences on Election Day

Professor Cramer reported that he had received a message from the chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee, Joshua Preston, asking his opinion about a change to University policy that would permit students to be excused from classes on election day. Professor Cramer related that he told Mr. Preston that it was unlikely the faculty would support such a policy change as it had declined to do so in the past. At the request of MPIRG, the Senate Committee on Student Affairs endorsed a resolution to make voting absences excused. MPIRG leadership asked to present the request to the Senate Consultative Committee, but in his view the matter should come to the Faculty Consultative Committee, because the request involves amendment to a policy recommended by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and approved by the Faculty Senate (not the University Senate).

Professor Cramer said he had responded with a proposed compromise. The Faculty Senate could be requested to adopt a statement urging the Provost to encourage faculty members prior to the start of the Fall Semester to think about the election and let students know their own policies immediately, and ideally put a notice on the syllabus. He observed that students would have about two months from the first day of classes to obtain an absentee ballot in cases where a faculty member felt compelled to require attendance.

Professor Chomsky concurred and said that if there is a dramatic change in election laws, the Committee could reconsider its position.

Professor Cramer adjourned the meeting at 2:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

**Recommendations Regarding Salary Equity at the University of Minnesota
Women's Faculty Cabinet and University Senate Equity Access and Diversity Committee
Draft as of April 4, 2012**

Background

The Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) is a body of faculty women with an investment in an equitable and supportive culture for women faculty across all academic units at the University of Minnesota; the WFC acts as an advisory board to the Provost. The University Senate Equity, Access, and Diversity (EAD) Committee includes faculty, staff, and students who advise the President and administrative offices on the impact of University policies, programs and services on equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity from a system perspective.

In light of recent reports on salary equity (conducted by the WFC and external consultant Dr. Murray Clayton) that found unexplained gender gaps in faculty salaries, the WFC and EAD considered a variety of possible University responses. We identified key principles for a thorough response that aims to address current inequities and minimize future concerns.

The WFC and EAD also offer the following recommendations for identifying possible salary adjustments, providing training to department chairs/heads and deans, and continuing to monitor salary equity by gender. See parts 2-4. These recommendations primarily represent an **endorsement** of the suggestions laid out by Dr. Clayton in his December 26, 2011 report as well as **additions** regarding sharing information, providing training to department chairs/heads, and clarification that there would be an initial round of reviews of faculty women's salaries as well as an ongoing process for case-by-case salary assessments open to all faculty. The recommendations may not be implemented exactly as laid out here in each college/school, but we believe that modifications in process should be consistent with the key principles described in Part 1.

Part 1. Key principles for University response

1. The salary equity reports should be taken as an opportunity to review decision-making criteria and processes and to increase the transparency of decision-making regarding salaries within departments and colleges/schools.
2. All units on the Twin Cities campus, including units within the health sciences should participate in the salary review process, with appropriate customization of procedures.
3. There should be a broad process of reviews of women's salaries initially, rather than only occurring if the faculty member comes forward with a request for an equity review.
4. Salary data should be analyzed by gender regularly, with reports available to the University community and public.

Part 2. Recommended process for case-by-case salary assessments: Initial round of reviews

1. Create departmental Salary Equity Adjustment Committees (SEACs) to determine the size of the appropriate adjustment **for each female faculty member**.¹ Departmental SEACs will be formed within large departments and by combining the task for 2-3 smaller departments. The SEAC should involve an uneven number of members, not less than three, and include tenured faculty members in the department(s) and one person from outside the department, normally a faculty member who is serving or recently served on the college/school SEAC.
2. Create college/school SEACs to review the recommendations of departmental SEACs. These committees should include 5 tenured members, at least 2 women, with input on membership from the Dean, WFC, FCC, and Provost's Office.
3. For units that are not departmentalized (e.g. Law), a single SEAC should be formed to determine appropriate adjustments. Members will be appointed in the same way as college/school SEACs.
4. Colleges and departments should consult with the Office for Equity and Diversity, the Provost's Office, and the Office of Human Resources regarding the establishment of SEACs, the determination of procedures, and process adjustments.
5. Colleges and departments may "triage" salary reviews by first examining the full professors (where both reports found larger gender gaps) and then turning to associate and assistant professors in the following year or by using a regression model to identify and review women faculty whose actual salary differs from the predicted salary by a certain amount.
6. Departmental SEACs are to make a recommendation for each eligible female faculty member by examining that person's record and those of three other faculty deemed to be comparable or nearly comparable. **(See Clayton 12/26/11 report, page 3, for more detail on the comparison process).**
7. Once departmental SEACs have determined any recommended adjustments, their recommendations and justifications should be forwarded to the college/school SEAC. Each faculty member reviewed should receive a copy of recommendations and justifications for her case. In addition, each faculty member reviewed should be told that she can make a counterproposal to the college/school SEAC.
8. College/school SEACs should review departmental recommendations and any counterproposals. College/school SEACs will affirm departmental recommendations or make a different recommendation, providing a justification based on the same comparison criteria.
9. Deans will receive departmental and college/school SEAC recommendations and take appropriate action. Faculty who were reviewed, but are dissatisfied with the action taken on their cases may appeal through normal University procedures.
10. The above processes should be conducted outside of usual annual salary adjustment reviews for merit.

Part 3. Recommended case-by-case salary assessments: Requested reviews

1. After the initial round of reviews, **any member of the faculty** may request a salary equity review from their departmental SEAC or from their college/school SEAC. Procedures for the review, justification, counterproposal, college/school SEAC recommendation to the Dean, and appeal will parallel those of the initial reviews of women faculty.
2. Chairs/heads and Deans should identify faculty whose salaries seem to be outliers in light of their performance and productivity and request an equity review on their behalf.

¹ Transgender faculty who do not identify as female (including faculty who do not identify as male or female) are welcome to request a salary equity review as described in part 2.

Part 4. Recommended steps for data collection, monitoring, training, and communications

1. Review current data to determine which factors identified in Clayton 12/26/11 report are currently available in institutional records, whether retrospective data is available, and which factors might be incorporated into systems in the near future.
2. Prepare an annual report for the Twin Cities campus as a whole and also for each college/school separately that compares the following by gender and by race/ethnicity:
 - average starting salary;
 - average starting salary at each rank;
 - number of faculty hired into each rank;
 - dollar value of “start-up” packages;
 - average percentage raise;
 - for faculty promoted in that year, average number of years to tenure and promotion and average number of years between promotion to Associate and promotion to Full Professor;
 - for each retention sought, the gender of the faculty member, the value of any salary increment, other support dollars, other conditions (e.g. provision of staff, lab space, etc.) in a University of Minnesota counter-offer and whether or not the retention bid was successful.
3. Provide these reports to the Provost’s Office and to the relevant college/school SEAC, with feedback provided to Deans and department chairs/heads as needed.
4. Conduct a more comprehensive statistical analysis (similar to that conducted by Dr. Clayton in 2011) every 3 years.
5. Create a University website that serves as a repository of reports related to salary equity.
6. Incorporate additional training related to salary equity into the existing leadership development provided to chairs/heads and provide similar training and support to members of SEACs.
7. Departments should describe their normal merit review process and salary decisions in explicit terms and share that information with faculty, the Dean, and the college/school SEAC in order to increase transparency and minimize inequities.
8. Department chairs/heads should discuss salary equity concerns and remedies with the Dean annually.
9. Evaluate the sufficiency of the salary equity review processes, from the perspective of the Provost’s Office, Office for Equity and Diversity, Deans, and faculty, after two years.
10. Share salary equity review processes and reports with the coordinate campuses.