

EQUITY, ACCESS & DIVERSITY

MINUTES OF MEETING

April 16, 2012

Morrill Hall Room 300

[In these minutes: committee on committee's report; equity and diversity in the graduate school; women's faculty cabinet update; MLK Jr. Day community service pledge drive]

[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, Anne Gair, Michael Goh, Kris Lockhart, Michael O'Day (for Kimberly Hewitt), Raul Mario-Fente, Michelle Page, Charmaine Stewart, Dominique Tobbell

REGRETS: Neil Anderson, Susan Cable-Morrison, Irene Duranczyk (co-chair), Dorothy Schlesselman, Mandi Stebbins

ABSENT: Dabitna Chung, Echo Maki, Christopher O'Brien, Greg Sawyer, Janet Thomas

GUESTS: Dean Henning Schroeder, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education; Patricia Jones-Whyte, Director of the Office of Diversity in Graduate Education

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

Committee on Committee's Report

Prior to the meeting Equity Access and Diversity (EAD) members received the Committee on Committee's (ConC) Report regarding its review of EAD. Professor Graff stated the ConC would like EAD to review this report and provide a response.

Professor Graff noted that some of the statements in the review did not accurately reflect the EAD's feelings. Regarding the role the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) plays in the process of moving resolutions from the University Senate committees to the University Senate; several committee members indicated the term "gate keeper" was too strong a description. However, both Professor Michael Goh and Professor Dominique Tobbell stated they believe there is a lack of clarity about the process for moving resolutions forward, and there should be some clear formal policies regarding the process and the SCC's role. Professor Graff stated he does not necessarily believe that the SCC acts as an obstacle to moving the EAD concerns to the Senate, but he believes there is a lack of flexibility in cross-committee conversations and this results in inefficiencies.

Katie Ballering noted that Professor Irene Duranczyk had previously raised the idea of having each of the University Senate committee chairs sit on the SCC in order to increase communication between the committees, and facilitate consideration of the EAD's recommendations and concerns.

Professor Graff indicated that he would consult Professor Duranczyk about the ConC report and draft a response on behalf of the EAD.

Update on the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Service Pledge Drive

Professor Graff provided the EAD with a draft resolution supporting the MLK Jr. Day Community Service Pledge Drive.

MOTION:

The University Senate supports the Equity Access and Diversity Committee's (EAD) proposal to establish a Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Community Service Pledge Drive to honor the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

COMMENT:

Earlier this academic year, the EAD proposed establishing the MLK Holiday as a "day on" rather than a "day off" whereby the University would encourage more members of the University community to engage in various community service activities. This proposal was submitted to the University's Public Engagement Council (PEC) for its review. While the PEC strongly supported the idea of encouraging more members of the University community to engage in community service, it identified a number of personnel, human resources, and financial issues that would make it difficult to operationalize a day of service during an official University holiday. In response, it was determined that the legacy of Dr. King would be better honored with a *community service pledge drive* that would not limit community service to the holiday but rather would extend it throughout the spring semester.

The MLK holiday would serve as a launching date for a University-wide community service drive where members of the University community (faculty, staff, and students) would be invited and encouraged to pledge hours for service at community-based agencies. The pledge drive would be conducted in partnership with the United Negro College Fund/General Mills MLK Day Collaboration, and is endorsed by the University of Minnesota Public Engagement Council.

He then asked committee members for comments on the resolution and to consider whether the resolution should be brought to the University Senate in May or whether it should wait until the fall. He explained that putting forward a brief resolution supporting the concept of the community service pledge drive would provide an opportunity to promote it and demonstrate support from the University community for the proposal.

Professor Goh asked whether this resolution would preclude working toward creating a day of service. Professor Graff responded that it does not preclude future actions. It only supports putting in place a community service pledge drive and EAD's initial objective to increase and centralize communication about MLK Day events.

Professor Goh suggested changing the language in the third paragraph of the resolution to "would be honored" rather than "would be better honored." Those present agreed.

Associate Vice President Lockhart commented that the Office for Equity and Diversity (OED) had no objection to the resolution, and that EAD's work with Professor Furco and the Public Engagement Council had produced a good result.

The consensus of the committee members was that the resolution with Professor Goh's suggested change should move forward to the SCC and the University Senate in May. The committee lacked a quorum, so Dawn Zugay, Senate Staff indicated she would facilitate on e-mail vote on the resolution.

Update on Search for Vice President of OED

Professor Graff next asked Associate Vice President Lockhart to update the committee on the search for a new Vice President for OED. Associate Vice President Lockhart stated that interviews were held last week with semi-finalist candidates and the selection committee passed names to Senior Vice President Jones. Campus visits with key constituency groups would be taking place in early May, she stated.

Associate Vice President Lockhart also encouraged attendance by committee members at the candidate interviews and asked them to identify themselves as EAD committee members when they provide feedback about the candidates.

Equity and Diversity Issues in the Restructured Graduate School

Professor Graff introduced Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Henning Schroeder, and indicated that the committee was following up with him on its discussion of diversity and equity issues in graduate education. He asked Dean Schroeder to discuss issues of diversity in recruitment, campus policies, and communication about diversity on the graduate education website.

Dean Schroeder introduced Patricia Jones-Whyte, Director of the Office of Diversity in Graduate Education (ODGE), and indicated she would assist him in responding to EAD's questions. He then discussed several activities in the restructured graduate program that relate to diversity.

- The Graduate School is partnering with the International Student Scholars on the Connect Program, which is currently being piloted in the Academic Health Center (AHC). This program allows potential students who contact the University to be immediately put in touch with resources for underrepresented groups, and is intended to increase successful admission from underrepresented groups.
- The Graduate School website had been revised to include diversity on the website's main menu.
- ODGE is still located in Johnson Hall, which allows Ms. Whyte to easily attend meetings with the graduate school staff, and ensures that diversity is always at the table during discussions of graduate initiatives.
- The recent Graduate and Professional Education Assembly (GPEA) included the topic of how to create a diverse student body. Dean Schroeder explained that the GPEA is a forum that has helped define issues in graduate education.

Dean Schroeder also discussed the PhD completion Project, a longitudinal study that has gone on for eight years and is designed to help determine what helps students

successfully complete their programs. He noted this survey could be useful in considering diversity issues as students of color could be identified in the surveys.

Professor Graff asked what data has recently emerged from the study. Ms. Whyte responded that there are 14 programs being studied and the responses vary from program to program. However, she stated the PhD completion project has created an increased understanding of the variables that extend the time to degree such as funding and advising, and the advising workshop grew out of the PhD completion project data. She stated that Vickie Field could provide more information on the PhD completion project if the committee would like it.

Next, Dean Schroder noted another initiative that is relevant to diversity – the graduate program evaluation. He stated the previous process administered by the Graduate School of externally reviewing the graduate programs every seven to ten years is no longer in place and a replacement process is being sought. In the interim, an internal review program, the Graduate Review and Improvement Process (GRIP), is being tested. It is a collaboration of the College of Education and Human Development, the Graduate School, and the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development. Dean Schroeder stated its goal is to put evaluation and program improvement in the hands of students, faculty and staff, rather than to solely rely on the traditional external review process based at a higher institutional level.

Nine graduate programs are involved in this pilot project and each of them has a student-faculty focus group working to determine if the programs are “doing all that can be done to make the programs successful.” Dean Schroeder stated that one of the prominent issues that arose from these focus groups was the need for a stimulating environment with a diverse student body. The programs are defining the outcomes that they want to be measured by and this allows diversity to arise in ways it might not otherwise do so, he stated.

Dean Schroeder next discussed the quality metrics and the questions, 1) to what extent the metrics would be used in the future and 2) what other metrics should be included if any. He stated that the quality metrics looked at program characteristics such as time to degree, completion rate, job placement, and attrition rate. He stated the programs were evaluated against themselves over a ten-year period to determine if there were any troubling trends.

Dean Schroeder noted that qualitative data was also collected. The programs being measured were asked to provide a narrative. However, he stated that no diversity metrics were included at this stage, partly due to the limited funding.

Dean Schroeder also noted this was the first year that quality metrics were used, and a group of representatives from the colleges would be convened to discuss if metrics would be used going forward and if diversity would be included in the quality metrics pool or be handled differently.

Dean Schroeder went on to state that research indicates programs that are diverse have better student attainment and productivity because the environment is more intellectually stimulating. He noted that this was corroborated by results of the quality metrics study. The graduate programs that scored high in the quality metrics assessment also had DOVE scholarships (the measure for diversity).

Dean Schroeder then invited suggestions on how best to incorporate and reward diversity in the metrics discussion.

Professor Graff asked if there were any developments of note in DOVE funding since the restructuring of the Graduate School, and whether the DOVE funding could be “used to build up the data set.” Ms. Whyte stated there is enough Dove data to address the metrics.

Professor Graff asked further, if the graduate program ensconces diversity in the metrics, would the DOVE fellowships be a consistent reliable input. Dean Schroeder responded that there is no plan to decrease DOVE funding, and that beginning in 2013 the Graduate School would be providing more global support to ODGE in addition to the programmatic support it already supplies.

Professor Graff stated that subsequent to the decentralization of the Graduate School, it was left to the colleges to set benchmarks for diversity, and asked if any progress had been made in this area.

Ms. Whyte responded that her office had not yet worked with the colleges to set diversity benchmarks. ODGE had assisted faculty applying for NSF and NIH grants to meet the diversity benchmarks written into their proposals.

Dean Schroeder noted that he was meeting with Associate Vice Provost Mendoza regarding the extended metrics and to get input on how best to address the issue with the Deans.

Associate Vice Provost Lockhart added that OED recently created a position for a Director of Evaluation. This is part of OED’s effort to bring greater formality and expertise to the area of evaluation, she stated. The new Director of Evaluation, Dr. White Shield, would be working with Ms. Whyte to consider how to incorporate more formal evaluation planning in ODGE. Associate Vice Provost Lockhart stated that she expects that by this fall Dr. White Shield would have completed her work with several units, and she suggested that EAD invite Dr. White Shield to speak with EAD about her evaluation work, particularly in the area of non-linear evaluation.

Dean Schroeder agreed that quantitative measures only go so far. He stated if you want students to take risks and look for answers that are not in textbooks, it is also important to look at qualitative measures.

Katie Ballering asked if alumni were involved in the GRIP focus groups and suggested that their input would be helpful. Dean Schroder stated alumni are not currently included, and he would bring this up at his next meeting regarding GRIP.

Update from the Women's Faculty Cabinet

Professor Charmaine Stewart reported that no further changes were made to the Salary Equity Study Recommendations following the April FCC meeting. She then reviewed the principles of the recommendations:

- Providing an opportunity to have transparency in the decision making process
- Involving all units of the University
- An ongoing review process done through the creation of salary equity adjustment committees
- Involving clinical as well as tenured faculty

Professor Stewart stated the WFC reviewed the recommendations with Provost Hanson. The Provost responded favorably, and indicated she would like her office to champion the recommendations with the OED. The WFC recommended that the recommendations be implemented next fall.

Professor Stewart stated the next step is for the recommendations to be discussed at the Faculty Senate Meeting on May 3. A meeting would then be held with the Deans and the recommendations would be implemented through the Provost's Office.

Professor Stewart noted that the WFC incorporated Lauren Beach's recommendations regarding gender as much as possible into the recommendations. She also indicated that some units like the AHC would need to customize the recommendations.

Next, Professor Stewart reported that the WFC had conducted a culture and climate survey and that she would be analyzing the preliminary results. She stated she would bring this information to EAD in the fall.

Professor Stewart also reported that the retreat for women faculty of color would be held on April 26, 2012 from 3:00 to 6:00. Professor Stewart stated the agenda would include a presentation of the initial results of the survey, and focus groups would be held on mentoring, hiring, leadership, and morale.

Old Business

Lauren Beach shared a copy of the Michigan State University *State News* with the committee. It had several pages of advertisements for MLK Jr. Day events occurring before and after the MLK Jr. weekend. She noted that it demonstrated the service and activism around the MLK Jr. celebration, and stated she hoped for similar demonstrations of commitment to diversity and the legacy of MLK Jr. at the University of Minnesota.

New Business

Professor Graff indicated that he had reached the end of his six-year term on EAD and would not be a committee member next year. He also thanked all of the committee members for their service.

Hearing no further business, Professor Graff adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office