

**Commission for Women  
Minutes  
Thursday, February 5, 2009**

**Attendance:**

Pam Hindle (chair), Kathryn Ellis, George Hoemann, Maxine Thompson Davis, Alan Chesney, Denise Harvey, John Nolt, Maxine Thompson Davic, Sally Gates, Margaret Sallee, Joy DeSensi, Rosa Thomas, Tammi Brown, Margaret Crawford, Brandice Green, Wendy Syer, Deb Haines, Melanie Wolfenbarger, Kerri Lovegrove, Amanda Blakewood, James Devita, Terrell Strayhorn, Janet Johnson, Jenny Richter

*Pam Hindle called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m. The agenda was as follows:*

- I. November Minutes**
- II. Report from the Faculty Senate – John Nolt**
- III. Student Retention and Success Issues – Terrell Strayhorn and colleagues**
- IV. Women’s Leadership Programs – Sally Dean Gates**
- V. Chancellor’s Honors Banquet**
- VI. Meeting with Chancellor Cheek**
- VII. Old Business/New Business**

The attendees briefly introduced themselves because there were a few new members.

- I. November Minutes** – The November minutes were presented for approval. Joy DeSensi moved to approve the minutes. George Hoemann seconded the motion. All voted in favor of approving the minutes.

**II. Report from the Faculty Senate (John Nolt) –**

John Nolt did not have anything written to present. He said that the big issue right now is the budget and how that is going to impact the faculty and their ability to provide for the students. In his opinion, things look very bleak. The projections for losses of jobs and positions are at a 13.9% loss scenario, which is 324 positions (204 of those positions are already filled positions – that many people will lose their jobs). Full-time employees (FTE) lost within those positions are 145. He says that is really bad. A lot, the majority actually, of these lost positions are teachers. Well over a hundred teachers will be lost. That will seriously impact our ability to offer classes and the ability of students to get classes that they need, particularly those that are sequences, is going to be lost. Nolt thinks the situation is very dire. He believes that it is important for the faculty to make sure that all of the money available is directed towards the classrooms, not extraneous places, so that as much as possible is going to the classes. So far, none of the positions that are projected to be lost are tenure-track positions – they are all lecturer and instructor positions. He thinks that raises the question of what the gender ratio of loss will be. He believes that is something that will need to be closely watched. He does not think that we will really know the extent of the situation until June.

Alan Chesney said that we will know a little more at the end of February after the Board meets and discusses the budget. Nolt, however, does not think we will know completely until June because we will not know the impact of the stimulus package until then. There also will not be a decision on tuition increases until later.

Nolt encourages everyone to write their legislators. He says the single most important thing is to keep the teachers in the classroom. He says that we cannot afford to lose these people. He said that a lot of these instructors are Ph.D.s and that some are the best teachers on the campus.

He mentioned the program review reduction task force – it has created a process for fast tracking program closures (???). This process would essentially mean that if the administration wants to close a program, it would go directly to the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils and then go to the Faculty Senate. This would mean that the faculty will have at least some amount of say in these closure decisions.

One more thing Nolt mentioned was that the Budget and Planning Committee of the Senate has been looking very, very closely at system budgets. The current budget is \$51 million, of which state appropriations are \$4 million; \$47 million is coming from the campuses. This is more than double what it was in 2004. It is even worse for the campus budget.

George Hoemann asked for actual dollar figure for campus administration costs. Nolt responded that it was \$423 million in the most recent fiscal year (2008). He added that in 2004 instruction was 49% of the campus budget and that it is now less than 40%.

Jenny Richter asked for examples of things that have been sent from Systems, but that are now provided from the Campus budget. Nolt said that HR (the entire operation) was part of that, as well as IT. Terrell Strayhorn added that Institutional Research was part of the shift as well.

Nolt said that the details will all be in the Budget and Planning Committee report, which will be available in a few weeks.

### **III. Student Retention and Success Issues (Terrell Strayhorn) –**

**Please see the linked powerpoint presentation for additional information.**

Terrell Strayhorn began by saying that he hopes we would have a conversation about a couple of issues that will be of interest to this Commission. He indicated that the information he and his two assistants were going to present may help to inform what Hindle would talk with the new Chancellor about when she meets with him at the beginning of March.

One of the things that Hindle and Strayhorn talked about in planning his visit to this month's CFW meeting was the kind of data that his office has available – he believes that this talk has been long coming. Two doctoral students from his office, Amanda Blakewood and James

DeVita, were also present to contribute to his presentation. Strayhorn said that they were going to about a bit more than just student success, but also the condition of women here at UT.

Strayhorn began by placing UT in the national context. He said that the representation of women at UT is not alarmingly high and that women are underrepresented in a lot of areas. This is, he explained, part and parcel to what things are like in the country. Women represent a very small proportion of the faculty in the nation (38%) and a large majority of those are in Psychology and Education. A very small number of female faculty are in the sciences, mathematics, etc. He also noted that they represent 50% of the faculty at community colleges, 41% at liberal arts and comprehensive colleges, and less than 30% at doctoral-granting institutions.

Strayhorn added that not only are women in the nation disproportionately represented across areas of study, but also across rank. There are more women at instructor level and assistant professor level, but there is not much movement to associate level and full level. An important question to consider is why this happens.

Another important point, according to Strayhorn, is that across the nation women are earning only a fraction of the salary that male professors are earning. Even when you control for all factors including rank, publications, etc., women still only earn a fraction of what men earn. He thinks that we need to sell why women should be paid equal amounts, why they deserve the same number of full professor positions as men, etc.

Strayhorn continued to the issue of family friendly policies, which he explained are fairly new to higher education. This is one reason he thinks they don't exist at a lot of campuses yet. He noted that family friendly policies are difficult to enact at a place like UT because the campus is so largely decentralized. Denise Harvey added to this by pointing out that the family friendly policies that do exist at UT are only for "traditional" families.

Amanda Blakewood, one of the doctoral students with Strayhorn, wanted to look specifically at the numbers for UT (system, not just UTK). She showed that full-time female faculty, tenured and tenure-track, at UT make up 36.2% of the total faculty. She noted that in the College of Engineering there are 112 faculty members, of whom only 8 are women (based on 2006-07 data). She also noted that in most fields of study/instruction women earn less than their male counterparts.

James DeVita, the other doctoral student with Strayhorn, looked at a sex comparison in positions in 2000 and 2007. Based on information in one of the tables DeVita showed (see attached presentation), Chesney asked who the "supervisory clerical" people are – he does not think there is such a category on campus [this was something that may be a problem with reporting – DeVita and Strayhorn will likely have to look at that].

Strayhorn then talked about student enrollment as of 2007 – women are 50% of all full-time undergrads and 51% of full-time first-time freshmen. He also noted that retention and graduation rates are higher for women. Nevertheless, women report UT being "chilly, unwelcoming" and report a lower "sense of belonging" than men. Women also score lower on their relationships with faculty; men score higher on relationships with peers. Strayhorn noted

that this may be because there are so few women faculty members on campus. He also pointed out that issues of safety continue to disproportionately affect women at UT. Finally, he mentioned that women still report being “encouraged” to choose a “more traditional” or “suitable” major by professors and advisors.

#### **IV. Women’s Leadership Program (Sally Dean Gates) –**

Pam Hindle introduced Sally Dean Gates who is with the office of Student Orientation & Leadership Development. Gates said that she is thrilled about a new program in their office that is provided for by a new grant. The Women’s Leadership Program was kicked off with a mentoring program. She said there was such a large response that they had to cap the number of mentees. She also mentioned that they are always looking for mentors. They are hoping to continue this program even after the grant ends.

She said that they are also offering a women’s leadership program. She will send a pdf version to Deb Haines to be posted on Blackboard about this program.

Her office is also hoping to get women together on campus to complete a service project that will help women in Knoxville.

Denise Harvey said she noticed at the mentoring meeting the other day that most of the girls there were first year, undecided girls from Tennessee. Gates said that she noticed that as well. Gates said they tried to reach out to as diverse a group as possible but that it is clear they may need to get out to other parts of campus to diversify the group even more.

Hindle said that she and Gates have talked about reaching out to students who fall out of certain areas of study. Hindle would like for the CFW to help focus on students in math and the sciences. Hindle asked Gates if there were any efforts to mentor staff – Gates said that right now it is only students.

Gates also mentioned the Clifton Jones Leadership Conference. For the first time ever, they have offered a women in leadership track – it reached capacity about 4 days after being open.

Hindle and Gates said that they look forward to collaborating with each other.

#### **V. Chancellor’s Honors Banquet –**

Hindle announced that despite the current budget problems, there will be a banquet this year. One change, however, is that each of the Commissions will be presenting no more than two awards each – CFW usually presents three. Hindle thinks the CFW should definitely present the Notable UT Woman Award. She said that we need to think about whether we want to present the Angie Warren Perkins award or Women of Achievement award as the second one. She will ask later for feedback on that.

## **VI. Meeting with Chancellor Cheek –**

Hindle is going to have a chance to meet with the Chancellor in a few weeks. She is not allowed to bring others with her because Chancellor Cheek wanted to meet with the chairpersons alone. She would like CFW members to let her know some of the questions/concerns she should bring up at her meeting.

## **VII. Old Business/New Business –**

There was no other old or new business.

*Pam Hindle adjourned the meeting at 1:15 p.m.*

*Submitted by Kathryn Ellis*