

EQUITY, ACCESS & DIVERSITY
MINUTES OF MEETING
OCTOBER 17, 2011
Morrill Hall Room 300

[In these minutes: committee orientation; resolution on ex officio membership, sexual harassment and nepotism policies; presentation on OED vision]

[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: Irene Duranczyk (Chair), Rickey Hall, Janet Thomas, Lauren Beach, Richard Graff, Michael Goh, Charmaine Stewart, Katie Ballering, Susan Cable Morrison, Dominique Tobbell, Greg Sawyer, Dorothy Schlesselman

REGRETS: Kimberly Hewitt, Michelle Page, Neil Anderson,

ABSENT: Yu Fu, Raul Marrero Fente

GUESTS: Professor Michelle Goodwin, Jon Steadland

Professor Irene Duranczyk called the meeting to order and welcomed those present.

Update on Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) Salary Equity Study

Professor Duranczyk stated the committee received a presentation on the WFC Salary Equity Study last fall, and has been following the issue. She briefly updated the committee on events subsequent to the WFC presentation. Provost E. Thomas Sullivan directed the hiring of an outside consultant and a steering committee was formed to assist in the process and to work with the consultant. Professor Murray Clayton, from the University of Wisconsin was selected. Professor Janet Thomas attended the August 2011 Faculty Consultative Committee meeting at which Provost Sullivan presented the results of Professor Clayton's report, and Professor Duranczyk attended the October 6 University Senate meeting at which the WFC Study and Professor Clayton's research were discussed.

Professor Thomas reported that Professor Clayton replicated the WFC study but controlled for significantly more variables. His report showed only a 2.2% difference in male and female faculty salaries overall as opposed to the approximately 7% difference in the WFC study. However, the difference increased with faculty rank and varied across the schools and colleges. For example, he reported very little difference in male and female salaries at the assistant professor level but found a 4.1% difference at the full-professor level. Professor Thomas stated the FCC also discussed identifying a source of funds to deal with any salary equity problems, and the cumulative impact on retirement benefits of even a 2.2% salary difference. She stated that overall the FCC and Provost

Sullivan were concerned that any level of salary discrepancy existed, and wanted to focus on the root cause of the inequity.

Professor Duranczyk reported that when Provost Sullivan presented the results of Professor Clayton's report at the University Senate meeting he only mentioned the 2.2% overall difference in male and female salaries and did not discuss that some colleges have gaps as high as 7.3%. She expressed concern that this caused some University Senate members to question whether the salary gap was statistically significant, and might have minimized the problem.

Professor Duranczyk asked Professor Michelle Goodwin (a member of the WFC and the steering committee working with Professor Clayton) for the WFC's viewpoint on Provost Sullivan's response to the WFC study. Professor Goodwin provided the EAD with background on the *Rajender* sex discrimination lawsuit and the process that was put in place in the late 1980s to reconcile the gender pay gap. She also reviewed the timeline of Provost Sullivan's response to receipt of the WFC study. She stated the Provost had taken the study seriously, the process has been transparent, and members of the WFC took part in hiring Professor Clayton and met with him several times. She stated Provost Sullivan is suggesting a wider study of the cause of the pay equity gap and a process for monitoring pay equity should be put in place so that backsliding does not occur.

Professor Duranczyk expressed some concern that the pay equity gap would be looked at on an individual basis rather than being addressed at the department or college level. She thought it was important not just to review cases when a person files a concern or complaint, but that a position-by-position review be done at the department and college level looking for inequities. Professor Goodwin stated the WFC is continuing to work with Professor Clayton and one of the issues being considered is what the salary gaps mean at different levels and in different departments.

Professor Dominique Tobbell asked when the Academic Health Center (AHC) would be included in the pay equity review. Professor Charmaine Stewart responded that the WFC is seeking to have the AHC included in future reviews of salary inequities.

Professor Goodwin then listed some of Professor Clayton's recommendations to address the salary gap.

- Develop a system to identify and correct outlying faculty salaries
- Work to identify the causes of salary inequities, and develop policies to prevent their recurrence
- Annually review faculty salaries by rank within each college
- Institutionalize faculty salary analysis
- Monitor faculty retention packages and impacts on units to understand how gaps begin to develop and what happens at the ground level within departments
- Develop a database on faculty performance in relation to faculty salary

Professor Goodwin noted one question that arose from Professor Clayton's work was the issue of merit and what type of work is rewarded. She stated the WFC data committee is

still working and will likely meet with Professor Clayton when he returns for further consultation this fall.

The committee next discussed the problems of short institutional memory and the high turnover over of department heads. It was noted that these issues impact how pay is adjusted and how family leaves are handled within departments. Professor Goodwin stated the WFC is looking at work life issues, and in particular how to create a healthier environment for faculty and staff.

Professor Thomas asked what system is currently in place for faculty with concerns about pay discrepancies. Professor Goodwin noted the following resources: a faculty ombudsperson, Professor Arlene Carne, and the Office for Equity and Diversity (OED).

Professor Duranczyk suggested drafting an informational statement on the WFC study and Professor Clayton's report. Professor Goodwin agreed it would be important to provide the information to a wider audience. Professor Stewart suggested the WFC could partner with EAD on drafting a statement and it could include recommended action. Professor Richard Graff suggested the statement should include a more detailed statement about the data and should highlight positive actions being taken by some units.

Professor Goodwin emphasized the importance of creating institutional memory, consistency in policies, and providing salary information to faculty in advance. Professor Tobbell remarked that information is needed for both the faculty and the deans. She stated women should be encouraged to negotiate for their salaries and deans should recognize that this is appropriate. Professor Goodwin noted that the University is very decentralized and this results in a lack of uniform standards and values. She noted some universities have a committee that weighs in on all faculty salaries rather than the individual deans making salary decisions.

Professor Duranczyk asked who are the members of the steering committee meeting with Professor Clayton later in the fall, and inquired if the EAD should request a seat on the committee. Professor Goodwin responded that she would send Professor Duranczyk the list of committee members. She stated there would likely be broader community involvement and the need for committee work as the as the salary equity process moves forward.

Professor Stewart and Lauren Beach indicated they would draft the informational statement regarding Professor Clayton's study.

Letter to President Kaler

Professor Duranczyk reminded the committee of its September discussion about assisting equity and diversity work at the University by drafting a letter to President Kaler regarding the significance of having the head of OED as a member of his cabinet. Professor Duranczyk noted that the Vice President position had not been filled since Rusty Barcelo left the University in June 2010. Committee members agreed that the letter should be drafted, and should include the following points.

- The importance of keeping the head of OED as a member of the President's cabinet
- The position should be filled in a timely manner
- EAD would like to take part in the process of filling the position

Professor Duranczyk stated she would draft the letter and bring it to the November 21 meeting.

Hiring and Retention of Faculty of Color

Professor Duranczyk reminded the committee of Associate Vice Provost Mendoza's presentation about the Institute for Diversity Equity and Access (IDEA) and its initiatives to hire and retain a diverse faculty. She suggested the committee draft a statement for information at the University Senate to inform the broader University community about IDEA and in particular the IDEA post doctoral fellowship program.

The committee considered additional methods of informing the University community about the program. Assistant Vice President Hall noted that the deans and department heads are given the information. But several committee members expressed concern that the information was not currently reaching those who could benefit from it particularly in the AHC. Assistant Vice President Hall noted he previously worked with the pediatric and public health groups, but recognized that the information may not be reaching other areas of the AHC. Professor Stewart suggested a representative from OED could speak at one of the weekly AHC academic forums. Other suggestions for disseminating information about the IDEA programs initiatives included:

- OED provide an annual reminder to the deans, department heads, and program chairs
- Providing information at the post doctoral orientation
- Placing IDEA links in the post doctoral orientation materials
- Placing an OED link on all department websites
- Sending the information to the post doc association

Professor Duranczyk commented that the University's decentralized structure seemed to negatively impact the dissemination of information about available postdoctoral opportunities. She asked the committee to consider what should be included in a committee resolution, and to bring their ideas to the November meeting.

MLK Day Resolution

Professor Richard Graff updated the committee on the history and status of the Martin Luther King Jr. Day Resolution (MLK Resolution). In February 2009 EAD created the MLK Subcommittee and charged it with investigating the timing, event type and sponsorship of all Big Ten University MLK Celebrations in 2009. The subcommittee recommend that the University develop a centralized MLK Day website where all known campus-sponsored or affiliated MLK Day events are posted, promote better advertising of all MLK Day events, and establish University-community partnerships to create and sustain a University-wide MLK Day of Service. EAD drafted a resolution incorporating these recommendations and consulted with Associate Vice President Lockhart and Associate Vice Provost Mendoza. Professor Graff brought the resolution to the Social

Concerns Committee. That committee was supportive of the idea, but questioned which unit would implement the proposals.

Last August Professor Duranczyk met again with Associate Vice President Lockhart. Associate Vice President Lockhart stated that many of the proposals in the resolution were addressed by OED's restructuring. In particular, creating a website, enhanced advertising of MLK events, and seeking community partnerships. But OED does not have the resources to create a day of service. Associate Vice President Lockhart suggested contacting Professor Andy Furco, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement. Professor Furco suggested submitting the MLK Day proposals to the Public Engagement Council (PEC). Professor Duranczyk provided the committee with information on the PEC and asked it to consider whether to submit the proposals to the PEC or bring the MLK Resolution to the University Senate. Professor Graff indicated he favored submitting the resolution to the PEC. He thought it might provide a broader audience for the resolution's proposals, and potentially broader support. The committee agreed, and Professor Graff volunteered to complete the PEC Issue Review Submission process.

The committee also agreed that the MLK EAD Subcommittee Report should be placed on the EAD website.

Professor Duranczyk informed EAD that representatives from the Committee on Committees would be attending the November EAD meeting as part of its regular committee review process, and she asked committee members to consider the charge and functioning of the EAD.

Hearing no further business, Professor Duranczyk adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office