

**Commission for Women
Minutes
May 3, 2007**

Attendance:

Tabbatha Cavendish, Pam Hindle, Jocelyn Milton, Jennifer Richter, Thura Mack, Cheryl Travis, Wendy Syer, Lou Gross, Deb Glenn, Deb Haines, Lori Epperson, Rhonda Green, Jane Moser, Margaret Crawford, Jane Redmond, George Hoemann, Nancy Howell, Carolyn Hodges, Mary Papke, Brandice Green

Pam Hindle called the meeting to order at 12:09 p.m. The agenda was as follows:

- I. Introduction of Dr. Janice Musfeldt**
- II. Approval of April minutes - these will be distributed at the meeting.**
- III. Dr. Janice Musfeldt - Women, Science, and the Academy**
- IV. Jenny Richter - a look at the numbers behind diversifying a faculty.**
- V. Lou Gross - New faculty salary study**
- VI. Committee Reports**
- VII. Old business/new business.**

I. Introduction of Dr. Janice Musfeldt

- Hindle introduced Jan Musfeldt, in attendance at our meeting, who is an associate professor in Chemistry. Musfeldt is the topic for the 3rd item on the agenda.

II. Approval of April minutes

- Spirit of the minutes approved at 12:11 p.m. with many corrections to be made.

III. Dr. Janice Musfeldt - Women, Science, and the Academy

- Musfeldt is organizing a workshop which derives from the few number of women in the science field
- The UT Chemistry Department provides a good example where the number of women in the field is near parity: 2 women out of 33 faculty members.
- This workshop will include both UT men and women on the round table panel
 - o Also will include external speakers such as Bunny Hart and Deborah Alison.
- Musfeldt distributed the proposal that she wrote for the Chancellor.
- The Chancellor, Chemistry Department, and Physics department have all agreed to help fund and support this symposium.
- Papke offered some names from Best Practices who would be interested.
- Gross encouraged her to include Sue Lenhart from Mathematics who is also involved in AWIS.
- Papke also suggested Stacy Hutchins who works with minority engineers.
- The tentative dates are October 15th and 16th. They wanted to have the event early in the semester to get people involved before the semester gets going.
 - o It is not confirmed at this time whether this date will work for all the speakers, stay tuned.

- The Chancellor is the one who brought this proposed idea to the CFW
 - It will be in line with our Professional Development and Mentoring Committees

IV. Jenny Richter - a look at the numbers behind diversifying a faculty

- Discussion from the Brown Bag Mentoring Table that Richter attended
- Discussion today – faculty searches
- Passed out reports from 1999 and 2005
- Took a look at summary reports granted in US for each year.
- Richter took us through some charts just to give us an idea of how things have changed.
- P.40 shows institutions around the U.S. that grants the most PhDs.
- P. 48 shows minority stats
- Syer asked if international students are included? Richter explained that sometimes they are and sometimes not.
- Richter pointed out that the best institutes in the country also often coordinate to those producing the most PhDs and the most minority PhDs.
- Travis referenced p.48 saying that she was struck by Howard University and its stats for Hispanics and the school is not even listed under blacks. Is there an error? Richter can think of a lot of reasons why it may not be listed.
- Richter mentioned NOVA as one that has always puzzled her. Gross has given talks there for faculty recruitment. Jenny noted that they turn out a lot of PhDs.
- Howell referenced the 05' data on p.89 stating that this data was included in a resolution that the faculty senate passed. Pipeline building: science.
- Richter referenced p. 45, pointed out the change in women 13% in 1969 to 42% in 1999.
- Richter referenced p.52 on parental education and p.74 for more specific areas of study.
- They look at this data to make an expectation of what will be in the faculty pool.
- Richter explained that if there are no minorities in the pool, they will contact that group because there must be a reason for the pool not reflecting the statistical data.
- The EOD asks many questions about what YOU did to encourage people to apply to that position.
- Gross said, “one would expect that the number of females in the statistics should match the pool. Looking at ALL applicants for every faculty position over the last 10yrs, of that faculty, 50% women. One would expect to see 50% women on the invited to interview list. Is this what we see?” Richter says, “Depends.”
- Travis: “If we take a 10yr span – do we have that info?” Richter says “yes.”
- Richter explained, “EOD does look at it. If you don’t have women in the pool or considered for interview, then EOD calls.”
- Reverse in some instances where pools have been all females. EOD has come in and asked where are the males?
- Over the last 3 or 4 years, there has been almost equal number of males and females; the university has changed dramatically.
- Gross asked if these figures include the veterinary school and agricultural campus? Richter says that it does now but did not in the past.
- How do you handle the Governor Chair searches?
 - Richter was unable to precisely answer because that area is Rudolph’s job

- o Richter does know that a rolling pool is used; also frequently done with the veterinary school because they had to get what they needed so they opened up a search and keep it going until they fill the need.
- Gross stated that the provost has started finally meet with the committees.
- Richter asked, “Who’s finding the men? It is possible that we are not attracting them? What are we doing?”
- The CFW is doing a good job of identifying good women for administration.
- Papke suggests that this topic as well as Gross’ data should be presented at the 1st CFW meeting next year to this topic out on the table.
- Richter invites anyone to come by and see data and discuss.
- Richter added one more thing: The April issue of Chronicle of higher education
 - o Talks about the pros and cons of spousal hiring

Papke needed to leave for a meeting so the order was changed for the next few topics.

V. Papke New business

- Sent out email about the CFW by-laws. (She explained what she had written).
 - o Richter said that Hindle should be appointed for life.
 - o Purpose that we vote on this
 - o Voting on 2 new vice chairs
 - o One of the vice chairs in 2nd year becomes chair elect.
 - o Papke makes motion to exception to by-laws to allow Hindle to serve another term. Moser 2nds. All say “I”, none oppose or abstain.
 - o Hindle thanks and appreciates everyone’s commitment to the CFW.
- Hindle notes Crawford’s display in Hodges Library of the UT Notable Women, Dr. Goslee. Crawford thanks all involved for their help.
- Hindle makes sure that everyone knows that Maxine Thompson has been accepted to Bryn Mawr.

VI. Lou Gross - New faculty salary study

- Before discussing the new faculty salary study, Gross mentioned that the Faculty Senate passed the proposed plan to create a child care facility on the Cherokee Campus at their meeting on Monday
- Gross then distributed the Faculty Senate’s “Analysis of Faculty Salary Data based upon Gender”
 - o Approved in senate meeting
 - o Chancellor and Provost will respond
 - o They will look at female salary
 - o Gross explains his report
 1. Statistics show the AVG and median of females faculty salary
 2. Arguments about if the reports adequately take into account the current market.
 - o Goals:
 1. Gross wants to see if the different salaries are explainable based on type of field.
 2. Also wants to consider departmental differences

- o They developed methods without ever looking at the data
- o The data was given without name but they had to know units
 - 1. However, they just assigned the units without knowing the names
- o Gross then went through the handout he passed out
- Travis asked whether Merit based on Productivity is the reason for pay inequality
 - o She commented that the people who are doing in the reviewing of merit/productivity are most likely the same people who assign the low salaries for female faculty.
 - o If the issue is merit, then the pay difference has been systematic for 30 years because it would mean that departments have been constantly hiring women who aren't as good as the men being hired. Or, after the women get here something is making them less meritorious or productive.

Submitted by Tabbatha Cavendish