

**Commission for Women  
Minutes  
Thursday, December 6, 2007**

**Attendance:**

Pam Hindle (Chair), Kathryn Ellis, Mary Papke, Alan Chesney, George Hoemann, Fadia Alvic, Kasey Baker, Jenny Richter, David Patterson, Kerry Howce Green Mary Evans, Kerri Lovegrove, Joy DeSensi, Margaret Crawford, Tammi Brown, Denise Harvey, Nancy Goslee, Wendy Syer, Deb Haines, Cheryl Travis, Nancy McGlasson, Donald Cunningham, Mark Craig

*Pam Hindle called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. The agenda was as follows:*

- I. Approval of November 2007 Minutes**
- II. Faculty Senate Report**
- III. UT Applicant Flow, Workforce & Promotions Analysis (Mark Craig)**
- IV. Planning for Women's History Month 2008 Continued**
- V. Old Business/New Business**

**I. Approval of November 2007 Minutes** – The November 2007 minutes were presented for approval. George Hoemann moved to accept as written. All attendees were in favor and the minutes were approved.

**II. Faculty Senate Report** – David Patterson had nothing to report.

**III. UT Applicant Flow, Workforce & Promotions Analysis (Mark Craig)** – Pam Hindle introduced Mark Craig from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Craig came to the meeting to discuss statistics related to applicant flow and promotions analysis. Craig distributed copies of his Powerpoint slides for the attendees to review as he spoke.

Hoemann asked for clarification of how Craig's analysis defined "n." Hoemann wanted to know if the "n" represented the full number of applicants. Craig responded that it only represented the number of applicants who self-identified.

Patterson asked if Slide 14 correctly indicated that the Administration # had remained fairly flat. Craig confirmed this. Alan Chesney added that this may change soon, however, because there have been some budget changes. Craig added that he could do an actual detailed analysis for the Commission.

Hindle referred to Slide 17 and asked whether it was showing that it takes 4.4 men to equal the value of one woman. Nancy Goslee followed-up asking whether the ratio for full professors has been shifting over time. Craig stated that his study has only covered data for four years, so he cannot make that analysis. Chesney asked whether Craig could provide the Commission with the data for those four years and Craig responded that that is possible. Cheryl Travis

commented that this proportion has existed for about twenty-five years and that we can hope women will move through the pipeline and reach equity eventually, but it appears that we have a leaky pipe. She believes that tracking this ratio would be worthwhile. Craig agreed.

Regarding Slide 25, Goslee asked whether the people represented were already in the professorial rank. Craig said they were. Goslee then asked whether it is possible to consider the number of people being promoted from associate professor to full professor. Craig stated that this is possible to do after the fact. Wendy Syer asked for clarification that the figure represents people promoted into that position, not promoted out of that position. Craig said that that is correct.

Referring to Slide 26, Hoemann asked if, since the curve lines are almost identical, does that mean that there is almost no progress? Craig reiterated that this is a snapshot, an aggregate of the four years, so it does not show whether there is progress or not. Hoemann stated that he found the slide very discouraging because it appeared as though there has been no change. Craig responded that some of that is system driven, but he agreed that if we do nothing this is what will happen. Chesney added that we need to look at this as a process – if you look at it independently, you will reach some conclusions. Deb Haines said that the question still comes back to, if these numbers are generated somewhat by the system structure, what we need to look at is whether as HR128 is put into process how supervisors are using HR128 to help workers move up the ladder. She would like to see in five years how we are making progress in that way and, if not, whether we need to do a reeducation again as to roles. Chesney thought that this was an excellent idea. He believes what we need to do is look at whether men and women are equally likely to move from one job family to another. Ideas like this are one reason they want people to become familiar with the data – so they will start asking this type of question. Haines added that we could do a baseline of how many people are actually using HR128 as of now. Also, we could look at if HR128 was beneficial to the people included in the promotions data. Chesney said that even before we get to that analysis, we have to figure out how we define promotion. The human resources people generally define promotion as moving to a position that offers you greater financial potential – that constitutes both a concrete and theoretically relevant definition of promotion. Mary Evans asked if that means that, according to this data, a promotion includes [????]. Chesney affirmed this.

Following Craig's presentation, Alan Chesney and Donald Cunningham discussed gender and race in regard to salary. Chesney said that they are trying to come up with a model for looking at this information. Cunningham agreed with Chesney that the model is in progress. Their focus is on the Knoxville area, and they want to explain the variations in salary. About 75% of the variation was explained by the midpoint of salary range. Chesney clarified that this information was just about staff, not faculty. Cunningham says they realized there have been big changes since that data set was pulled (merit pay, etc.). They are really in the process of pulling a new data set now. They want to one day use performance evaluations to see if those have any influence on pay range. Finally, Chesney and Cunningham said that they want to have some real analysis to present in the near future.

Fadia Alvic asked how they can use the performance evaluation when there isn't a consistent system across the board. Chesney responded that there are actually some consistent standards

across the board. Alvic said that if they keep the samples stratified by campus, okay, but if they take an aggregate, they could end up skewing the results.

Hindle asked what Chesney had meant by midpoint salary. Chesney clarified that every pay grade has a midpoint. These midpoints have changed recently which is why they are in the process of pulling new data – they don't see the point in presenting an analysis based on out-of-date data. These midpoints are set by HR.

Once they develop a way of analyzing/predicting how a person's salary is determined, they will identify cases where people are too far away from each other. They will identify people who don't fit the model and figure out ways to fix it. Chesney stated that this is the campus's responsibility, not the responsibility of individual departments.

#### **IV. Planning for Women's History Month 2008 continued**

Hindle reiterated DeSensi's idea of her student she has who works with women and sporting in Iran. The student works with the Muslim women's games.

#### **V. Old Business/New Business**

Crawford reminded everyone that the deadline for Notable Women nominations is tomorrow. So far they have received eight nominations, which is a little behind schedule. If a nomination is in tomorrow, the committee will accept the vita, etc., later

Hindle asked Goslee if they should send out the Angie Perkins information in January. The two agreed to this.

Hindle mentioned that the Bryn Mawr notice has been sent out, and she has already received 4-5 responses from people interested in more information.

*Pam Hindle adjourned the meeting at 1:05 p.m..*

*Submitted by Kathryn Ellis*