

EQUITY, ACCESS & DIVERSITY  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
MARCH 12, 2003

[In these minutes: Welcome, Assess EAD's Impact at a Policy Level, Faculty Salary Survey, 13 Credit Minimum, EAD Review, New Members]

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

PRESENT: Mary Lay, Chair, Don Cavalier, Julie Sweitzer, Eric Burgess, Carol Chomsky, Jeffrey Roberts, Nena Fox

REGRETS: Beverly Balos, Shezwee Fleming, Rose Blixt, Benjamin Clarke, Margaret Moss, Vanessa Bailey, Cameron Brauer

ABSENT: Sallye McKee, Stacey Aronson, Srilata Zaheer, Nena Fox

OTHER(S): H. Jeanie Taylor, Joas Petithomme

I). Professor Lay called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present.

II). The first item of business addressed a document drafted by Professor Lay and Julie Sweitzer that focused on the need to assess the potential impact of equity, access and diversity within the University at a policy level. It is likely that there are discussions occurring in other committees that involve equity, access and diversity issues that this Committee is unaware of. This document represents an attempt to:

- Publicize the mission of EAD
- Establish a rubric of questions that can be asked when people devise policy to help them think about issues of diversity.
- Create a more formal monitoring system.

Members read over the draft and discussed it. Discussion highlights included:

- A mechanism for reviewing equity, access and diversity policy matters must be put in place before policy reviews can be conducted.
- A member asked if the Committee is recommending that policy reviews be conducted within the Senate structure exclusively or whether administrative policies should be included in this process. Julie Sweitzer ideally would like to have this review conducted on every policy and/or practice that is being proposed. A practical and reasonable starting point needs to be determined.
- In an attempt to determine a reasonable starting point, a member suggested thinking about how much policy comes through the Senate that EAD would need

- to review. Rather than creating an expectation that the Committee cannot fulfill, the Committee needs to assess the potential workload.
- A member suggested changing the language in the document to include committees that “write and review policy” rather than stating committees that “write and implement policy”.
  - A recommendation was made to remove the language about groups other than Senate committees. At least initially, the Committee should focus its efforts on Senate committees.
  - Besides reviewing Senate committee minutes, members will also need to receive and monitor committee agendas, etc. It is important EAD be proactive and know what each committee plans to discuss rather react to what is already done and past.
  - Ask the administration to conduct a review and present it to a Senate committee and ask other Senate committees to do the job of EAD. Maybe the ultimate measure of success is for this Committee to put itself out of business.
  - Once policies are reviewed, it should be noted on the document that the review was conducted under the guidelines set forth by the Senate Committee on Equity, Access and Diversity.

Professor Lay volunteered to edit this document and re-circulate it requesting the Committee’s approval. Then, once the Committee’s approval is received, members will be asked to volunteer to monitor a Senate committee or two. The immediate goal is to accomplish:

- a) “Write a general memo to all Senate committees and subcommittees requesting that, as they discuss and decide on policies, they invite a reaction from the EAD committee. The committee could raise questions and issues these other groups might not have thought of in their own discussions.”
- b) “Assign each EAD committee member to monitor one Senate committee and subcommittee’s minutes for the year and bring to the EAD committee information on policies being discussed elsewhere. Then invite those Senate committees and subcommittees to get feedback from the EAD committee before they take the new policy for full Senate approval.”

As parts a and b are completed, the committee will learn what questions will be important to ask as part of a policy review process.

III). Members reviewed the EAD statement pertaining to a recent assessment of faculty pay and salary increases. The EAD statement requests the assessment include a breakdown and analysis of salaries based on gender and race/ethnicity as well as information on salary differentials and salary supplements. The statement generated by EAD was sent to Faculty Affairs and Finance and Planning for comment. One response was received from a SFCP member who asked good, fair questions related to the complexities of conducting salary studies. Julie Sweitzer provided some context for the salary discussion that followed.

- The charge from EAD is a request that a meaningful survey be conducted. EAD is not in a position to dictate how it be done but noted that careful compilation of the numbers are critical to the validity of the results.
- EAD will request that whoever conducted the first assessment be contacted to produce another report with information related to gender and race as well as salary supplements. This information is needed to make the report meaningful. Whoever writes a report needs to be able to defend that report.

Professor Lay will append the questions to reflect the input that was received and forward it to SCFA and SCFP.

IV). Professor Lay on behalf of EAD contacted Provost Craig Swan requesting either information or his presence at a future EAD meeting to discuss the impact of the 13 credit minimum on students, and particularly special needs students.

Provost Swan said he would be able to attend a future EAD meeting but wanted to know in more detail the specific concerns of the Committee. He added that there are mechanisms in place to deal with special situations. Provost Swan also referenced the 13 credit website that includes a set of frequently asked questions. The URL for that website is: <http://onestop.umn.edu/13credits/>

Professor Lay asked members for specific information they would like to receive from Provost Swan so he could come prepared to answer the committee's questions. Ideas mentioned:

- What fraction of students in the student body as a whole has been unable to comply with the 13-credit minimum requirement? Additionally, ask that this information be broken down by gender, ethnicity, etc. and ask for an explanation of significant deviations if they exist?
- How does a student get a special exemption? What percentages of students that apply for an exemption actually receive it?
- How many students are taking 13 credits, 14 credits, 15 credits etc.? With this information it could be determined if credit banding has made a difference.
- A member is concerned that there may be student discussion around this issue that is not being captured in the data being collected by the administration. Is it possible to tap into the student body through the Student Senate structure and get their input?

Professor Lay will follow-up with Provost Swan and provide him with these questions as well as contact the Student Senate to see if they are discussing this matter.

V). The Senate Committee on Equity, Access and Diversity will be reviewed this spring. The reason the Committee is being reviewed is because it is a relatively new committee and the Committee on Committees is interested in making sure the structure makes sense and is working. The Committee on Committees will conduct the review and has

provided the Committee with 4 questions it would like answered prior to the review. Professor Lay asked for member input in attempting to answer these questions.

1. Did the charge to the SCEAD effectively establish a foundation for the Committee's work? Should the charge be modified in any way to assist you in your work?
2. Have you been able to establish an effective agenda for the committee's work? What would help you be more effective? What obstacles have you found to being effective?
3. Please list the issues that the committee has addressed since it began meeting as a committee. Have you been able to focus effectively on the issues of women and also on the issues of communities of color and other underrepresented groups on campus? Has the combination of these two agendas been helpful? Problematic? Please be as specific as possible.
4. Has the ex-officio membership of the committee provided the expertise and connection with the administration needed for you to perform effectively?

Committee discussion highlights included:

- The charge was broad and it made it difficult to get started. With time, however, EAD has managed to develop a working agenda. Initially there were so many competing issues to address, many members felt overwhelmed. The Committee, however, worked effectively and efficiently to prioritize these issues.
- What is the purpose of the ex-officio membership? The answer to this question will help to determine the ex-officio membership of EAD. Current ex-officio members are Julie Sweitzer, Director, Equal Opportunity & Affirmative Action, and Sallye McKee, Associate Vice Provost, Multi-Cultural and Academic Affairs. It was noted that although H. Jeanie Taylor, Director, Office for University Women, is not an official member, the Committee has benefited from her presence. Because of the particularity of the women's issues addressed by this Committee, it was recommended that another ex-officio seat be created for Ms. Taylor.
- It might be worthwhile to have more administrative presence at EAD meetings so that the Committee is fulfilling its charge to advise the president. It will be important to have representatives that hold fairly high-level positions that are distributed across the University. Based on the current ex-officio membership, EAD is limited in its ability to perform its advisory role.
- Ex-officio members need to be provided with information on their role and responsibilities to the Committee. Additionally, ex-officio members need to realize there is a benefit to attending meetings because there is a natural connection to the ex-officio's work and mission of his/her department.
- The Committee continues to struggle with how to get groups to come to EAD with issues.
- Recommend the formation of a subcommittee to deal with women's concerns. Can EAD constitute such a subcommittee on its own as a way of developing more expertise and focus? Or, does such action require bylaw changes, etc.?

- Express concern to the Committee on Committees that more student members are needed on EAD in order to capture the student voice.
- Should EAD have a more system-wide approach or a more narrow focus? Should a subcommittee be established to concentrate on system-wide issues? Or, should the Committee at each of its meetings make a concerted effort to try and uncover system-wide issues where EAD could have an impact?
- Clarify the charge of the Committee so EAD can be more effective in terms of its ability to impact policy issues and development.

VI). Other Business: Professor Lay announced the Committee has two new members, Professor Benjamin Clarke from the Medical School and Professor Amy Kaminsky of Women's Studies. Professor Kaminsky's appointment does not officially begin until fall 2003 but she will try to attend meetings before that as her schedule permits.

VII). Hearing no further business, Professor Lay adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate