

Senate Equity, Inclusion, and Anti-Discriminatory Advocacy Committee Meeting Minutes

December 13, 2013

Present: Ellen Ansell, Chair, Marilyn Hravnak, Secretary, Claude Mauk, Co-Chair;
Carey D. Balaban, Linda Frank, Irene Frieze, Randy Juhl, Cindy Popovich, Luis Vallejo,
Bruce Venarde.

Not Present: David Beck, Erkan Bayir, Brandon Benjamin, Charles Bonge, Deborah Brake, Paula K. Davis, Kathy W. Humphrey, Jahmaiah Lewis, Gordan Louderback, Brady McCormick, Meg Mayer-Costa, Carol W. Mohammed, Sharon Nelson-Le Gall, Burcu Savun, Katherine Seelman, Michael Spring, Kelly Williams.

Moment of Silence. Before the meeting commenced, Venarde requested that we spend a moment of silence to reflect on two individuals who have recently passed, but whose work was directly related to the mission and goals of our Committee: Barbara Shore (Social Work), and Nelson Mandela.

I. Meeting Minutes approval

The meeting minutes of November 11-15-13 were unanimously approved as written.

II. Report from Chair (Ellen)

A. Chair Ansell suggested that the following be added to the EIADAC Operating Principles document:

“A working group chair is responsible for maintaining and conveying to a new chair the history of the working group.”

Discussion ensued regarding how this would take place. There was a suggestion that there be co-chairs, so that if the chair is incapacitated temporarily or permanently, there be another individual responsible for carrying on.

Also discussed, in the context of conveying the history of the WG and past and planned activities, was record keeping internal to the WG. It was reiterated, as per the last meeting discussion, that each WG will keep minutes which the WG Chair will submit to the EIADAC Chair, and which are then included in the external EIADAC minutes as supplementary to the WG Chair’s verbal report. However, they are free to retain any additional internal working notes that are relative to their history and activities.

There was consensus that the above bolded statement will be added to the EIADAC Operating Principles (Addendum A)

B. Working Group Next Steps

Determine the types of information and data to collect, store, archive, and report upon.

Each WG is asked to discuss the above, and to report back to EIADAC on their decisions.

III. Report from Working Groups

A. Gender Equity, Inclusion & Discrimination (formerly the Gender Discrimination Initiatives Subcommittee) (Ansell Chair)

This group met, and determined to name themselves as above to reflect their scope and interests.

Members of this WG are: Ellen Ansell (Chair), Erkan Bayir, Irene Frieze, Cindy Popovich, Meg Mayer-Costa, Burcu Savun.

Attendees at their first meeting on 12/4/13 were: Ellen Ansell, Erkan Bayir, Irene Frieze, Cindy Popovich

They also announced that they are inviting Kasey Marra who was chair of the former Gender Discrimination Initiatives Subcommittee to capture her prior experience, facilitate continuity, and link to her present membership in PACWAC.

The WG reviewed the goals of the Women's AdHoc Subcommittee, both broad and specific, and determined that, in general, the broad goals were appropriate to this WG, and would be adopted.

Goals included:

1. Equitable promotion (academic, staff) for women, as well as fostering leadership skills of women
Balaban suggested that Laurie Kirsch VP of faculty development be contacted as a resource for the WG on faculty development issues.
2. Safety on campus for women.
3. Childcare issues--waiting list for childcare, lactation rooms, and sick childcare.
The lactation rooms are in place, so at this point it is an issue of monitoring their maintenance and use.
4. Sexual harassment policies--monitor compliance with sexual harassment policies, and compliance with sexual harassment training. Balaban reported that there is a current revision underway in the approach to the required sexual harassment training that is now more comprehensive and interactive than the former online-only modality. The EIADAC is in favor of supporting that, when this new approach is deployed, all current employees undergo re-training (similar to how research integrity re-training is mandatory when new information is addressed), as well as newly hired employees.
5. The WG discussed their plan to draw upon existing local expertise and resources—Elsa Stratmeyer (lactation rooms), Joan Lakoski (leadership training) and Kasey Marra (PACWAC).
6. The WG will explore the practices of other universities and local major employers to inform the WG. Specifically they will explore policies and practices relative to lactation rooms and safety to inform their benchmarks.
7. The WG also discussed how issues relative to women (services available, and grievances) are publicized outside their inclusion in the provost's website, and, when first identified, in the University Times, and in the form of Senate

Resolutions. The question arose as to what is disseminated regarding the lactation rooms to new faculty, staff and students. Frieze indicated that faculty generally has private space, so it is more of an issue for staff and students. The WG will contact Lori Kirsch (VP for Faculty Development) to inquire if this information is included in orientation for these groups.

8. Sick child care—perhaps benchmark other local educational institutions, business concerns in the Pgh area, as well as other universities, to see what they are doing.

B. Academic Experience Beyond Mid-Life (Vallejo, Chair, Linda Frank)

The WG has not met since the prior meeting reported in the November minutes, but Vallejo addressed the WG responses to the two questions proposed to them by EIADAC at the prior meeting.

1. Will students be included as well, in addition to faculty and staff? The response was that yes, students would be included. The Committee also asked the WG if they were interested in getting input only from students who are beyond midlife and their experience, or is the intent to get input from students at various age groups to inform the approaches to faculty, staff and other students beyond midlife? Vallejo responded that the WG would seek and include the perspective of all age groups when exploring marginalization based on age.

2. Are the WG goals as stated in their initial meeting minutes meant to be overarching and broad, or as focused and achievable within a specific timeframe? The WG responded that they intended the former, and will discuss further at their next meeting and report back.

IV. Follow-up on old business (Erkan; distribution of funds to student groups)

- A. Erkan was not in attendance so this item was tabled.

V. EIADAC 2013-2014 goals (Mauk; Co-Chair)

Mauk circulated a list of six proposed goals developed by he and Ansell for EIADAC to consider as proposed goals (or strategic plan) for 2013-2014. Two of these (A&B below) have been accomplished; two are in process (C&D); and two are new (E & F).

- A. Name & Mission Statement change

EIADAC Decision: Accomplished

- B. Establish a Strategic Vision and Organizational Principles

EIADAC Decision: Accomplished

- C. Identify and address issues in focus areas as determined by personal interest.

This work has begun with the formation of the 3 initial WG: Academic Experience Beyond Mid-Life; Gender Minority Concerns; Gender Equity, Inclusion and Discrimination.

EIADAC Decision: The EIADAC was in favor of continuing to move this forward as a goal.

- D. Explore and codify the operation of WGs as a vehicle of action for the EIADAC

EIADAC Decision: The EIADAC was in favor of continuing to move this forward as a goal.

E. Identify areas of potential concern for the community (that may be outside areas of personal interest):

1. Demographic change analysis

EIADAC Decision: The EIADAC was in favor of continuing to move this forward as a goal. Such a demographic analysis of the University would help to direct the EIADAC and its WG.

Juhl suggested that EIADAC contact Mark Harding, University of Pittsburgh's Chief Enrollment Officer, Office of Admissions and Financial Aid, and ask him to share with the EIADAC any new strategies to target diversity for student body (national and international scope; targeted strategies—where demographic trends may be heading, not just the present). Based upon this, the EIADAC may request the change analysis for the student population as indicated above.

An approach to the demographic analyses for faculty and staff will be strategized.

2. Monitoring formal public communications (e.g. university and broader community media)

EIADAC Decision: The EIADAC was in favor of continuing to move this forward as a goal.

3. Keep abreast of initiatives at peer institutions

EIADAC Decision: The EIADAC was in favor of continuing to move this forward as a goal.

The EIADAC suggested that we look at not only academic institutions locally, but our peer academic institutions nationally. It suggested looking additionally, at major local employers--not only for what they have in place to address issues of equity, inclusion and anti-discrimination, but also to identify their emerging issues which might portend issues of our own that we could proactively address.

F. Propose analysis by outside organization of Pitt policies for potential discriminatory practices.

There was considerable discussion regarding the need for such an analysis, and its possible outcomes (intended or unintended).

Frank stated firm opposition to this reactive approach as it conflicts with last year's decision to take a pro-active approach. Further, Frank stated, she does not agree with the need for review by an outside organization. Balaban agreed—this can be accomplished internally--both as a product of the proposed EIADAC benchmarking practices, as well as within the present context of shared governance. As an example, Balaban cited the recent update that the University is undertaking in proactively examining Family Medical Leave Act practices and policies based on legislative changes, and benchmarks for update.

Hravnak suggested that perhaps the EIADAC first needs to self-educate on policies, and further, on which policies would be relevant for our own review (advice would be needed), and how or if we could go about determining a mechanism for a systematic review to occur. Hravnak suggested that we develop

a concrete list of policies that are likely to have components that are germane to the mission and goals of the committee and the WGs.

Discussion continued that perhaps the first step in EIADAC self-education would be inviting a series of individuals to speak at EIADAC meetings regarding policies and practices. There was a suggestion to invite Alan M. Pittler from the Office of General Counsel and Carol Mohamed from the office of Affirmative Action, Diversity and Inclusion to provide an overview of Law and Practice. It was also suggested that Carol Mohamed, with regard to staff and faculty, and Mark Harding, Director of the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aide, with regard to students, provide an overview of current demographics and future trends, and how they address these trends as well as concerns of equity and inclusion in recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students.

Nevertheless, some EIADAC members reiterated that there is a need for or benefit from having an external entity provide an audit of policies and practices pertinent to equity, inclusion, and anti-discrimination, in order to identify our current state of “health” in this regard, even if such a report would be confidential and reviewed only by the Chancellor and Provost. Mauk drew the analogy to the use of external evaluation of academic programs in which scholars from other institutions with expertise in the area under review are asked to evaluate programs. He suggested that external evaluation is a valued university practice that could be applied beyond the university’s academic concerns.

The EIADAC determined that they would continue this discussion at the next meeting to address:

- a. What is the purpose of external review; Does this situation warrant external review?

- b. Further discussion on strategies for EIADAC self-education regarding policies that have a bearing on equity, inclusion and anti-discrimination, and if and how any systematic process of policy reviews by EIADAC should, would, or could be operationalized.

VI. New business?

None

VII. Next meeting

Given changes in schedule that happen by academic term, a doodle will be sent out to identify the best day/time for meetings during the Spring Term.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Hravnak
EIADAC Secretary