

**Minutes of the Senate Anti-Discriminatory Policies Committee**  
**14 January 2010**  
**826 Cathedral of Learning**

In Attendance: Mark Lynn Anderson, Patricia Beeson, Anthony Bauer (Chair), Paula Davis, Susan Hansen, Rebecca Harmon, Emilia Lombardi, Sharon Nelson-Le Gall, Carol Mohamed, Paolo Palmieri, Cindy Popovich, and Vijai Singh.

Absent Elected Members: Deborah Brake (on leave through January), Dorothy Hawthorne-Burdine, and Bruce Venarde.

Anthony Bauer called the meeting to order at 3:02 PM.

Review of the Minutes

Patricia Beeson moved to approve the revised ADPC minutes for 10 December 2009. Bauer second the motion and the motion was carried.

Announcements

Chair Bauer reported Bruce Venarde will not be able to make the regularly scheduled meetings given his new term assignments. Mark Lynn Anderson moved to reschedule the remaining meetings since the Thursday afternoon time slot had been determined in September when the teaching faculty who are elected members of the committee were under different obligations on leave. The motion was seconded, and Anderson volunteered to coordinate the rescheduling.

Report on 2007-08 PACWC Survey of Faculty, Staff, and Students

Depending on the interests of the committee, Beeson offered to report on either mentoring efforts or the recent survey of University women by the Provost's Advisory Committee on Women's Concerns (PACWC). Bauer suggested that since the committee has been considering the possibility of data collection, the survey might be a more useful topic. Beeson reported to the committee the findings of a non-scientific survey conducted by PACWC to gain an understanding the perceptions of women at the University on a host of issues. The findings were not made public, and Beeson stressed that, given the informal nature of the survey, the findings were useful but not publishable. The survey was sent to six-hundred faculty, eight-hundred graduate students, eight-hundred undergraduates, and eight-hundred members of the staff. The survey's agenda was divided into two parts: the first series of questions asked respondents to reflect back upon their experiences at the University, while the second series asked respondents what they looked forward to in the future. The goal of the survey was to assess perceived progress in a number of areas in order to prioritize issues for action. Agenda issues included hiring, economic equity, career development, institutional support for life/work balance, safety, advocacy, access, and visibility. Well over half the faculty and staff, and somewhat less than half of the graduate and undergraduate students responded.

The overall perception of all women faculty was that there was progressive change on these issues, with those faculty members at the University for twenty years or more

seeing the greatest changes. All women faculty felt that each agenda issue was a priority, with economic equity, work/life balance, and hiring/advancement being the greatest priorities overall. Hiring and advancement was a greater priority for advanced professors, while work/life balance issues were more of a concern for assistant professors.

Beeson reported that PACWC had surveyed the women staff of the University in conjunction with Human Resources. Again, the staff responding to the survey perceived overall improvement, though not as much as was perceived by the faculty. Staff members felt that family benefits was the most improved area, while staff working at the University for twenty years or more perceived significant changes in most areas, including paid family leave, childcare, supervisory development, and staff recognition. Beeson mentioned, with respect to the latter, the problem of a “culture of silence” among the staff with respect to expressing career ambitions for fear that such expressions might be read as lack of commitment to their current positions. Similarly, many supervisors do not discuss highly competent staff members out of fear of losing them to other departments. The staff who responded to the survey felt that all issues were priorities, with professional development and mentoring being the most important. For younger women staff members, flexible work scheduling was the most important priority. Interestingly, childcare was not typically a high priority for members of the staff.

Beeson also reported that the survey of undergraduate women did not, understandably, include retrospective questions. The issues with the highest priority for undergraduate women were safety, career development, visibility, and advocacy/access. Susan Hansen mentioned that in her class most of the women students had not heard about resources such as the safe Rider Program. Carol Mohamed mentioned that the program’s flier is distributed at undergraduate orientation, but she noted that students are bombarded with so much information during those sessions. Committee members suggested that student awareness about safety issues and resources might be more effectively achieved in other ways.

Vijai Singh asked Beeson if she thought concern over equity was related to the trend of hiring more non-tenure stream faculty. Beeson thought that perhaps it was, but pointed out the equity remains an issue for tenured and tenure-stream faculty, as well. Beeson also mention the complicating factor of the lack of knowledge faculty have about salaries since salary information is not public. Beeson mentioned that when deans were approached with anonymous data from a pay study, they were able to identify specific cases of apparent inequities at the assistant professor levels because they were already aware of the particular circumstances. Beeson saw this as evidence that the administrators were keenly involved with the specific terms of hiring and could identify when disparities were issues of perception and when they were genuine inequities. Beeson also mentioned an equity study at the Medical School that had factored in information such as relative square feet of lab space. Beeson said that studies are done every five years under the Senate Budget Agreement Policy, and she said that similar studies have been done for African American and Hispanic employees. Rebecca Harmon

asked if these pay studies accounted for nine-month versus twelve-month salary options. Beeson replied that all salaries are converted to a single standard.

Beeson reported that the PACWC survey of women graduate students found that issue of work/life balance and career development were deemed the most important, with Arts and Sciences graduate students most concerned with the former, while students in the professional schools tended to prioritize the latter. Because average time to degree is six or more years, there is a parental accommodation program policy proposal to keep new parents connected to their programs of study. Bauer asked how can there be no “double-standard” given that women are culturally perceived and expected to be the chief parental caregiver. Beeson replied that it is important to make it possible for men and women alike to be counted as parents. Beeson said that family issues come to the fore doing hiring, and that the University recognizes the need to accommodate all “health issues with bearing” by granting a one-year extensions to the tenure clock. She also mentioned that she had recently become aware that one could use NIH grant money to support a graduate student on parental leave. Sharon Nelson-Le Gall pointed out that women’s issues are not the same as minority issues, and that the latter have not become a broad concern for the University community. Hansen asked Beeson if women getting tenure remains an issue since they do not necessarily show up in the statistics. Beeson said that this is an area that is similar for women and minorities, though with important differences. Recruitment of both women and minorities is relative good, but successful the completion of tenure remains a crucial area for improvement. While there is satisfactory recruitment, we are not getting them through to tenure.

Nelson-Le Gall asked the committee to consider the distinction between accommodation and assimilation. Given that institutional forms, expectations, and criteria of evaluations have been historically developed through white cultural norms, there is a certain pressure to professionalize that asks all members of the University to “become white.” This is essentially an implicit policy of assimilation. Nelson-Le Gall asked what is wrong with so-called double standards, since people are different and those differences matter. Beeson commented that sometimes a “rule of thumb” is used to enforce standards that are either not known or not visible. Harmon mentioned that Dean Levine of the Medical School recently gave voice to the value in teaching as an activity that brings in tuition revenues, which are discretionary. Nelson-Le Gall said that one’s experiences outside the institution determines your scholarship and your professional identity, but that such differences are not appreciated in institutional evaluations. Singh pointed at the this is not simply an issue of the University as a whole, since it is a significantly de-centralized system. Evaluation is different at different departmental sites, and it is at these were accommodation can and has taken place.

Nelson-Le Gall said that the PACWC information reported Beeson is important data, in part because it spurs attention to areas that need improvement. [Note: Beeson had left the meeting by this point to attend to another appointment.] Nelson-Le Gall added, however, that such studies do not lead to continual change. Harmon agreed that there was no mechanism in place for producing continual progress. She mentioned that women faculty and staff sometimes simply resign themselves to accepting less pay, and they then

do not put in the necessary twelve-hour days. Bauer asked if such resignation was not ultimately a life choice of the individual. Harmon replied that pay inequity helps determine career outcomes, such as failure to get tenure. Anderson said that because pay is secret, it has a deep psychological force on the employee. Your paycheck is a form of “private” communication from the institution to you, telling you how much you are worth. Inequitable pay can affect self-perceptions of worth, and fighting for fair pay can quickly drain whatever professional energy you might have. Hansen mentioned studies that showed women faculty are less likely to complain about pay inequities. Singh pointed out that starting pay is a local decision not an administrative one. Mohamed asked if there was not some mechanism for guaranteeing equity in job offers. Singh maintained that there are important issues and concerns about losing candidates. Harmon and others mentioned that women who ask for more during the negotiation process are often seen differently than men who do the same, and that hiring committees are sometimes more likely to “move on to the next candidate” when women make salary demands during contract negotiations. Harmon and others discussed the possibility of establishing a negotiation workshop for junior faculty and, Harmon added, a workshop for chairs and more senior faculty on how to properly and fairly received a woman’s job negotiation.

The meeting was adjured at 4:55 PM

Submitted by Mark Lynn Anderson, 16 February 2010.

Revised and resubmitted by Mark Lynn Anderson, 28 April 2010.