

**Commission for Women  
Minutes  
October 12, 2006**

**Attendance:**

Jane Moser, Lori Epperson, Carolyn Hodges, Tammi Brown, Lyndsey Hulen, Jane S. Redmond, Thura Mack, Jenny Richter, Chuck Maland, Barbara Klinkhammer, Cheryl Travis, Nancy Goslee, Kerry Howland, George Hoemann, Margaret Crawford, Wendy Syer, Deborah Glenn, Nancy Howell, Rosa Thomas, Louis Gross, Deb Haines

Pam Hindle called the meeting to order at 1200. The agenda was as follows:

- I. Approval of September minutes
- II. Dr. Sarah Gardial
  - (A) Attaining personal and professional goals
  - (B) The Bryn Mawr Summer Institute experience
- III. Report from the Faculty Senate
- IV. Committee Reports:
  - Communications Committee
  - Mentoring Committee
  - Professional Development Committee
- V. Announcements
- VI. Old Business/New Business

The meeting opened with Pam reading a Newsweek article about groups all over the US that fast to show support to Muslims, to bring attention to world hunger, and as a way to raise money for local food banks. The article cited that “the event began after 9/11 at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville and has spread around the nation.”

**I. Approval of September minutes**

The minutes were approved as written.

**II. Dr. Sarah Gardial**

*The Bryn Mawr Summer Institute experience*

Dr. Gardial started by thanking CFW for their support for her to attend this program. This was a fabulous experience, and she can talk about the subject all day but will do her best to keep it at 15 min. Dr. Gardial attended the 31<sup>st</sup> class of HERS (Higher Education Resources Services). The 4-week program started 31yrs ago at Bryn Mawr. Its headquarters is now housed in Denver. In addition to the main program, there are also two weekend programs offered at Wellesley College and the University of Denver and a program in South Africa that has been around for ~3yrs. Objectives of this program are to bring women in from all levels and backgrounds to help broaden their view of higher education, to motivate these women, and have them leave the institute with specific coaching.

The program is intense. The women (~70 this particular year) live in dorms and are in classes, lectures, networking, field trips or projects from 8am and go to about 830p or 9pm with only a couple of short breaks and a lunch break. During the 1<sup>st</sup> 2 weeks, everyone is all charged up. Week 3, however, is termed “grumpy week,” and week 4, “brain dead week.” This intensity, however, keeps everyone focused.

The networking alone is a tremendous opportunity. Dr. Gardial formed a relationship with 70+ women, women who she feels she can call at anytime for advice or encouragement. These women represent a diverse group. All but 10 of the women were from the US; 6 from South Africa, 3 from Canada, and a couple from the Far East. There was also diversity represented in age, which ranged from 30yrs to 60yrs and from a variety of careers, including both faculty and staff.

The program focused on two main facets in leadership: higher education and what makes it run and then the more personal side. On the higher education side, they focused on environment, challenges, how different parts of a campus work together. Considering issues at the campus level was a very broadening experience for Dr. Gardial. On the personal side, they focused on self-development, leadership skills, presentation, true learning, and career planning, which included a project in which everyone mapped out the rest of their career goals. It was through this career map that Dr. Gardial realized what little time she had left in her career. Women who had previously attended the program flew back from all over to critique and mentor the women based on their individual maps, giving advice and encouragement.

One more comment that Dr. Gardial emphasized was what an “impressive parade of women” and some men were there as presenters.

### *Continue the opportunity*

Jan Lee attended one of the weekend programs. This makes just a few from UT who have attended this institute. Dr. Gardial is very passionate about this and would like to make sure we keep sending at LEAST one every year but maybe push for more. She has spoken to Chancellor Crabtree about possibly creating an in-house program that would allow ~15 people, annually, from all around campus to attend a leadership type program. Although it would not replicate the program at Bryn Mawr, it would allow more to attend, thereby spreading the wealth and would also provide the opportunity to those who would not be able to be away for the 4 week program. This idea would be in addition to sending a few to the Bryn Mawr program. Leadership Development is one of the most important things we can do for ourselves on this campus. She is putting a proposal together for this idea.

*Questions (Q)/Comments (C) for Dr. Gardial and her answers (A)*

C: (Jenny R) Are you familiar with the Systems Leadership Development event that is held in Gatlinburg every year? This provides the opportunity for leadership development through this campus. It is system wide, and a number of faculty have attended. Sara Philips (now retired) use to head the event but is now retired. Linda Francisco may be the new person.

Q: (Barbara Klinkhammer) What happens to people who have families with small children?

A: Story- There was a woman who attended who had a 4month old. Either she went home on weekends, or her husband would come up. After 4 weeks, her husband said, “we need a house keeper”. In general, most women are older. There really is no easy answer to this issue.

C: (Nancy Howell) I attended the program at Wellesley. There are only 6 people in the UT system that have attended. This was brought up in the Professional Development Committee. Other schools send more – we need to push for more to be sent.

Q: (Pam) What was the Chancellor’s reaction to your suggestion to send more than one per year?

A: Dr. Crabtree is very supportive of the program but that it was going to take some consistent prodding.

Q: (Jane Redmond) Relative to career path, you mentioned some obstacles that you identified. Did you find these obstacles to be shared by others who attended?

A: There are 2 kinds of obstacles:

1) Institutional Obstacles (environmental/cultural)

We had a discussion about these obstacles, but it was hard to generalize because of the differences found between institutions. This will be different for everyone.

What we did recognize is that, overall, it is a slow climb for women to get to the top.

2) Self-inflicted Obstacles

As women, we approach things differently, which may be a part of what slows us down. We had very eye-opening conversations about negative moves we make that are self-inflicted.

Q: (Louis Gross) I know little about the Executive Education Program – Is there a market that focuses on women in leadership positions?

A: There are talks to open up a leadership center.

Q: (Wendy Syer) What could UT do differently besides providing more leadership opportunities?

A: Visibility and discussion on the topic of professional development on an administrative level. We have to always push for more opportunities.

Q: (Pam Hindle) Have we become too quiet?

A: I think that it's assumed inside the college that we hammer this subject all the time. The problem is not just women; it's diversity in general.

C: (Dr. Gardial) My career path was narrow going in but wide coming out.

Q: (Chuck Maland) Suggestions on public universities versus legislation. Public universities can make strong cases. An institution needs more money to free up options.

A: They did discuss this, but it was difficult to come to conclusions.

Q: (Nancy Goslee) Was the topic of Institutional Child Care discussed? We need support from the university for women in leadership roles and women in science.

A: We did not discuss that topic specifically. We did talk about the problem with tenure and child bearing, however – a big problem for faculty.

C: (Jane Moser) I would suggest that we have Dr. Gardial do a panel discussion for the Mentoring Committee. (Dr. Gardial agreed).

### **III. Report from the Faculty Senate**

Spousal Accommodations Issues: Provost has announced an opportunity hire.

Nancy Howell passed out the proposal (see attached)

- it passed Faculty Senate

- they are looking at other programs

- they felt it important to have a central contact person in Chancellor's office and written policies in place

- schools engaged in this have a very proactive program, some website based

- the proposal includes opportunity hires and strategic hires

- not a program that guarantees positions

- no progress to date

- the proposal addresses more than just faculty-faculty couples but also faculty-staff and staff-staff and assistants.

- benefits university overall

Wisconsin has had a program for the past 2yrs: 62 waivers; assist 18 couples (waive search process); and 14 new hires

*\*This topic evoked many question and comments. Here are some of them:*

C/Q: (Pam) Faculty Senate passed it; the Chancellor supports it; but it has not gone to the General Council's office yet. Are other groups on campus working on this?

A: (Nancy Howell) AWIS is interested. We ALL need to be promoting this.

Q: (Wendy Syer) Can we make a statement of support on behalf of the CFW?

C: (Jane Moser) Glad they added the word "retention."

C: (Louis Gross) I have hit on this subject at EVERY meeting with the Provost and Chancellor but with no progress. The Provost doesn't have data supporting that this is an issue. I have challenged the Provost to find out why people leave our university.

C: (Carolyn Hodges) There is no exit interview (for faculty).

C: (Louis Gross) Maybe we can get in touch with Heads to get some info. We should also find out why potential employees turn us down.

Louis Gross and Jenny Richter questioned if there is a policy in place or not and its details.

C: (Pam) Need to define "partner."

C: (Carolyn Hodges) Diversity contacts at each college. We could include brochures in recruiting packets.

Chuck Maland encouraged the CFW to vote to support this idea to get someone hired on campus to coordinate the spousal (partner) hire issue.

Louis Gross suggested that since he has to present at the next Board meeting that he will bring this before them.

C: (Louis Gross) There are institutions that take other paths. For example, Arizona State Univ. decided if the spouse was qualified to short-list. Then, they push it through (interview but no position announcement). This is only for faculty. We do not have a policy except for this new "opportunity hire" policy.

C: (Pam Hindle) I suggest a CFW letter to Provost and Chancellor in support. I will send out the info to the members of CFW, and I will bring a draft of the letter to the November meeting to vote on (many CFW members were not present due to fall break).

#### **IV. Committee Reports:**

##### *Communications Committee:*

There is to be a panel roundtable discussion with Dr. Sarah Gardial – 1<sup>st</sup> week of November.

##### *Mentoring Committee:*

- Nancy Goslee reported that there is now a link with the Association of Women Faculty. -
- They discussed wellness, finance, and childcare.
- There were plans made to conduct panels and one-on-one mentoring for undergraduates.

Comment (Pam Hindle): Chancellor is very supportive of us expanding our mentoring committee.

*Professional Development Committee: (2 meetings)*

- Talked about direction we wanted to go in.
- Discussed the reformation of the AWIS
- Discussed opportunities for advancement grants
- WHET: events; can't get there/ need higher presence
- Grant proposal for faculty and staff shadowing program also discussed, including possible problems with the program

*Safety Committee:*

The Safety Committee will report at the next CFW meeting.

V. Announcements

- Location change for the Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup> CFW meeting: 4<sup>th</sup> floor Conference room in Andy Holt Tower.
- Take Back the Night: Oct. 19<sup>th</sup> at 5:30pm

VI. Old Business/New Business

None

Meeting was closed at 1:30pm

*Minutes submitted by Tabbatha Cavendish on October 30, 2006*