

EQUITY, ACCESS & DIVERSITY
MINUTES OF MEETING
MARCH 19, 2012
Morrill Hall Room 300

[In these minutes: salary equity recommendations; graduate student collective bargaining effort; MLK community pledge drive; student senate resolution; diversity listening sessions]

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

PRESENT: Richard Graff (co-chair), Katie Ballering, Lauren Beach, Susan Cable Morrison, Anne Gair, Ricky Hall, Kim Hewitt, Dorothy Schlesselman,

REGRETS: Neil Anderson, Irene Duranczyk (co-chair), Michael Goh, Michelle Page, Christopher O'Brien, Greg Sawyer, Charmaine Stewart, Janet Thomas, Dominique Tobbell

ABSENT: Dabitna Chung, Echo Maki, Mandi Stebbins

GUESTS: Emily Lawrence, Office of the President; Professor Erin Kelly, chair, Women's Faculty Cabinet; Scott Thaller, Graduate Students United; Professor Andy Furco, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement

Professor Richard Graff called the meeting to order and welcomed those present.

Salary Equity Recommendations

Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) Chair, Professor Erin Kelly, provided the committee with a brief background of the WFC's salary equity efforts and an update on the WFC's recent meeting with President Kaler and Provost Hanson. She stated the WFC sought salary equity studies examining faculty salaries. Those studies began in 2007 and were completed in 2011. An outside consultant, Professor Murray Clayton, also conducted a salary equity review. The WFC in conjunction with EAD is now working toward salary adjustment reviews in response to the WFC and Clayton studies.

In mid March, members of the WFC met with President Kaler and Provost Hanson regarding the WFC/EAD Salary Equity Recommendations. Professor Kelly reported that the President and Provost were generally supportive of the recommendations but President Kaler expressed concern about the broad scope of the initial automatic salary equity reviews which proposed reviews of transgender faculty, faculty of color, faculty with a disability or veterans in addition to female faculty.

In response, the WFC representatives felt it was appropriate to narrow the initial round of automatic salary reviews to all women faculty. Professor Kelly pointed out that the structure and processes would be in place for any faculty member to request a salary review and the recommendations specifically allow for this. Professor Kelly also noted changes to the format of the recommendations. The revised recommendations integrate Professor Clayton's and the WFC's recommendations, laying out in a step-by-step format Professor Clayton's recommendations and what was added or changed by the WFC.

Professor Kelly stated she would like to continue presenting the recommendations as a joint endeavor between the WFC and EAD, and asked for comments from EAD on the changes to the recommendations. Professor Graff asked about the next step for the recommendations. Professor Kelly stated the recommendations would be presented to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) on March 22 and to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs on March 27. In mid-April, the WFC would meet with Provost Hanson regarding the implementation process and the recommendations would be presented at the Faculty Senate meeting on May 4.

Kimberly Hewit asked if WFC salary equity study included a study of women of color. Professor Kelly responded that it was possible to see this information by rank, but the subgroup analysis was not possible using these regression models. She stated that as the recommendations move forward, it would provide an opportunity to examine the salaries equity of women of color specifically.

Lauren Beach noted that the data monitoring recommendations lay out analysis by gender and the recommendations reference "female" faculty. She stated this is a change from the previous language in the recommendations that took into account faculty who do not identify as male or female. Professor Kelly explained that the study had a female identifier so it would not directly support transgender faculty having automatic reviews. But she stated she was open to suggestions on how to resolve this issue.

Ms. Hewit asked if adding transgender individuals to the group of people receiving an automatic review presents the same concern of broadening scope as adding men of color to the group receiving an automatic review. Ms. Beach stated that this raises the question of how gender is defined by the University and the State. Ms. Beach stated she would like the recommendations to directly address whether individuals who do not identify as male or female should receive automatic reviews, and suggested contacting the chairs of the Transgender Commission. Professor Kelly agreed that this would be helpful, and Ms. Beach e-mailed them a copy of the recommendations.

Professor Kelly further suggested that the recommendations could have a footnote stating that the WFC is investigating how to address the situation of faculty who do not identify as male or female. Katie Ballering agreed that it was important to identify the issue in the recommendations and to give guidance within the

document on how to handle the situation. Ms. Hewitt suggested that the footnote could indicate that those who do not identify as male or female can ask for a review.

Because there was not a quorum present, the committee agreed to vote via e-mail on whether to support the revised recommendations presented by Professor Kelly.

Graduate Student Collective Bargaining Effort

Scott Thaller, a research assistant in the physics department working on the Graduate Students United campaign to unionize graduate students, provided EAD with information on the unionization effort. Highlights from his comments follow:

- This is the fourth attempt at unionization in 20 years
- This attempt is being made under the United Auto Workers (UAW). The UAW was chosen because it represents more graduate students than any other union and is one of the most diverse unions.
- Graduate students are interested in unionizing in order to have a greater say in the workplace.
- They are seeking more input on decisions such as pay and family friendly work policies
- A majority of graduate students have signed union cards and pledged to support the union. However, Mr. Thaller believes that the administration is trying to dissuade graduate students from unionizing.
- Several forums that had been held regarding unionization
- The unionization vote is taking place the week of March 19

Ms. Beach noted that individuals receiving fellowships could not vote on unionization. Mr. Thaller responded that if the graduate students negotiate better health care contracts this would benefit fellows as well.

Assistant Vice President Ricky Hall asked what percentage of graduate students are in favor of unionization. Mr. Thaller responded that it was something over 50%.

Ms. Ballering noted that this is the third unionization effort that she has witnessed and that graduate assistants in the sciences helped prevent previous attempts. She stated there is concern that “pay leveling” will occur and research assistants in the sciences would lose benefits.

Mr. Thaller responded that he is interested in having a seat at the negotiating table to help decide quality of life issues. He noted further that in other Universities where unionization has occurred the pay for all of the research assistants has risen.

Susan Cable Morrison asked why those leading the unionization effort believe that graduate assistants should be exempt from the fees paid by all students. Mr. Thaller responded that he did not believe they should be exempt, but that student fees would be part of the bargainable terms and conditions of employment. He recognizes that fees support necessary functions and that the union could not

negotiate the elimination of fees, but could shift their payment away from the students.

Next Steps for Martin Luther King Day Proposal

Professor Andy Furco, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement returned to EAD to discuss next steps for EAD's Martin Luther King (MLK) Day proposal and his suggestions for an MLK Community Service Pledge Drive. He began the discussion with background on the proposal EAD submitted a proposal to the Public Engagement Council (PEC) to:

- Create a centralized website for all MLK Jr. Day events
- Create strategic partnerships with community organizations hosting MLK Day events
- Put in place a system for the broad communication of MLK Day events
- Establish a day of service on MLK Day

He stated that PEC discussed this proposal and its members were supportive of increasing visibility for the MLK Holiday, but several difficulties were identified with operationalizing the EAD proposal :

- Hosting an event on a University holiday would implicate bargaining unit faculty and staff
- Any activities would have to be voluntary
- If the events were on campus or used campus facilities this could raise issues of liability and would require staff to work on a holiday

Because of the personnel, human resources, and financial issues, PEC suggested two alternatives, 1) hosting a series of events around MLK Jr. Day when the University is open and sponsoring a service pledge drive, and 2) sponsoring a service pledge drive was seen as the most viable and best alternative for meeting EAD's intent. Professor Furco presented the committee with a proposal for the service pledge drive, and walked them through it.

Elements of the service pledge drive include:

- Pledge drive is launched on MLK Day
- A website will list agencies seeking volunteers, nature of tasks, number of hours needed
- Individuals pledge service hours to an organization of the individual's choice
- Individuals will receive a community service packet
- Individuals will perform community service on their own time
- Pledges will be collected throughout the month of January
- A database will be created to track pledged and completed hours
- Incentives such as a raffle would be provided for participants who complete their service hours
- The pledge drive will be done in partnership with the United Negro College Fund/ General Mills MLK Day Collaboration

Professor Furco indicated that PEC would be meeting April 3 and he would bring this proposal to them if it meets with EAD's intent to incorporate service into the MLK Holiday. Ms. Beach stated she liked the idea because it is more than just one day, it emphasizes service, and it is tied directly to the MLK Holiday. She suggested the President's Office might use the program as a talking point in its messages about the importance of inclusion and diversity.

Professor Graff liked that the proposal might encourage individuals to engage in community service beyond the time period set out in the pledge drive and could create positive relationships for the University. He also suggested students could be incorporated into the pledge drive by partnering with the Do What Matters campaign.

Ms. Beach stated the website could have information on the legacy of Dr. King, mention business community partnerships, and provide a comprehensive list of MLK events.

Professor Furco stated that a unit would be needed to move the proposal forward. EAD discussed which University unit would manage and run the program. Some suggestions included the Office for Student Affairs (OSA), the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED), and Office for Public Engagement (PEC), and the Community Service Learning Center. Professor Graff suggested that OED, PEC, and OSA should work out a plan for managing the pledge drive.

Professor Furco indicated that he would flesh out the proposal with more detail, and keep the committee informed of the results of his meeting with PEC.

Student Senate Resolution in Opposition to the Constitutional Amendment Defining Marriage

Committee members were provided with the Student Senate Resolution in Opposition to the Constitutional Amendment Defining Marriage Between One Man and One Woman. Professor Graff stated the Student Senate is seeking support from EAD for its resolution. He suggested three options for committee consideration.

- Support the student resolution in its current form.
- Craft an addendum to the resolution broadening it to include faculty and staff or
- Drafting a separate resolution.

Professor Graff asked if there was any precedent for the University Senate drafting a resolution on an issue addressed by state law. Assistant Vice President Hall stated that the Senate had previously made a statement on the Dream Act.

The committee universally supported the student resolution, but agreed that because the focus of it is on students, the committee should draft a separate resolution with a broader scope. It was agreed that Professor Graff would draft this resolution and the committee would vote on it via e-mail.

Old/New Business

Professor Graff reported that a Listening Session on Diversity would be held for faculty on April 13 at the campus club from 9:30 to 11:30. The President and Provost will be present and Associate Vice Provost Louis Mendoza will moderate. Professor Graff encouraged faculty to attend and to communicate the event.

Emily Lawrence noted that there would be future listening sessions for staff and students to discuss what can be done to increase diversity on campus.

Hearing no further business, Professor Graff adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office