

Tue, 09 Oct 2007 Meeting of the Commission for Women

Attendance: Pam Hindle, Kathryn Ellis, Brandice Green, Kasey Baker, Mary Papke, Alan Chesney, Mary Evans, Denise Harvey, Nancy Howell, Wendy Syer, David Patterson, Deb Haines, Margaret Crawford, Joy DeSensi, Cheryl Travis, Jocelyn Milton, Kerri Lovegrove, Deb Glenn, Rosa Thomas

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

- I. September Minutes**
- II. Salary Study – Alan Chesney**
- III. Upcoming Economic Summit for Women - Mary Evans**
- IV. Women in Science Symposium - Deb Haines**
- V. UT Notable Woman - Margaret Crawford**
- VI. Report from the Faculty Senate**
- VII. Report from the Mentoring Committee - Kathryn Ellis**
- VIII. Old Business/New Business/Announcements**

**I. September Minutes** – The meeting began with the opportunity for attendees to offer suggestions and corrections for the September 2007 minutes. Pam Hindle noted that Kathryn Ellis had received an e-mail message from Wendy Syer clarify some of her comments on the childcare issue on campus and that Ellis would clarify those points in the minutes. There were no other suggestions or corrections, so Margaret Crawford moved to accept the minutes and Wendy Syer seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

**II. Staff Salary Study (Alan Chesney)** – Hindle introduced Alan Chesney, Executive Director of Human Resources, who had prepared a report on a new Staff Salary Study being developed to mirror the Faculty Salary Study that already exists. Chesney explained that Human Resources and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) have been getting together for several months to figure out how to best develop this study. They have been trying to figure out the outliers and the regression equation. They have a limited number of variables and in their first results gender did not come out as a significant factor in predicting salary. Chesney stated that this was not particularly surprising. Among the factors they are including in the study are reference salary (midpoint of the pay grade) and years of service. They have noted that there are some job families that seem to contribute to salary. A job family is a group of jobs that vary in their relative value at UT and are in a similar field – for example, police. These are jobs that can be grouped together in a specific category, but there is still a hierarchy within that grouping. Looking at these helps you to develop a market within a job family.

David Patterson asked whether in job families you would expect to have varying levels of women. Chesney responded that you would in certain content areas. You would have different numbers of men and women in each pay grade. Patterson said that this might be a factor that

could be used as a proxy representation of gender in the staff study. Chesney will work to develop a regression equation that addresses this to see if there are any patterns within the outliers.

Hindle asked Chesney if there would be a clearer picture of the effects of gender on staff salaries at that point. He responded that there would be and that he and Donald Cunningham from OIRA are working on this together. They would like to come to the Commission's December meeting with tables and charts to show some of their results.

Cheryl Travis asked Chesney how comprehensive the study is and what is included in "the entire population of staff employees." Chesney clarified that the study includes all regular employees and, in response to Crawford's ask for clarification on this, he explained that the study includes about 6,500 employees. It does not include student workers, term employees, and faculty members. In response to a question from Hindle, Chesney stated that the population of staff employees also includes people who are administrators and teach.

Travis referred back to Chesney's earlier statement that so far gender has not appeared to be a significant factor in determining salary. She expressed her belief that if Chesney and Cunningham have been studying the whole population, any gender difference found is THE gender difference. She wanted to know more about exactly what gender does account for thus far in the study. To this, Nancy Howell added her belief that some job families must historically be heavily female. She asked Chesney whether this might influence why he has not yet seen a gender factor in the study. She also asked whether there has been any attempt to find job families that have parallels. For example, she noted that facilities planning may have job families with parallels to people who come into other positions with no skills.

Mary Papke added that Mark Craig from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment has done something where he shows differences between the genders. Hindle responded that she has asked him to come discuss his work with the Commission and that perhaps he will be able to attend in December with Chesney and Cunningham.

Chesney commented that the work Papke was referring to looks at the applicant pool, the hiring pool, and the promotion pool. It attempts to answer the question of whether the people UT hires reflect the applicants. About half of the people we hire of the applicants are women. When you break things down further, however, you find that there are areas where that is not true. For example, there are good proportions of Asian Americans applying to UT for employment, but when you look closer you see that they are only applying for faculty positions. Papke noted also that while this work shows the pool of applicants, it does not show how UT got that pool of applicants.

Returning to the issue of staff salaries, Howell mentioned that, in general, when there is a search there is a range of salaries for the posted position. She asked Chesney whether there is any analysis to see if gender is a factor in where in that range people are hired. Chesney said there has been no such analysis done here at UT. Papke added that there is a faculty salary review done for Chancellor Crabtree to see which who is on the low end of salary ranges and who is on the high end. Howell expressed the fact that a critical factor in this type of analysis would be when each individual came to the institution. Papke responded that that information would show

up on the Crabtree graph. Chesney reiterated that he and Cunningham will come in December for another report and for additional discussion.

Before moving to the next topic on the agenda, Hindle mentioned that Travis had said before that there should be a follow-up to Lou Gross's faculty salary study from last year. Patterson agreed. Travis said that she thinks the Provost had said he wants to follow up on that as well, but she has noticed that the link to the study on the UT webpage is not active yet.

**III. Upcoming Economic Summit for Women (Mary Evans)** – After a brief introduction from Hindle, Mary Evans presented information about the upcoming Economic Summit for Women in Nashville. The summit was scheduled for Monday, October 22. Last year both Evans and Hindle attended and found it very interesting and stimulating. Evans said that it really makes you think about what is going on in the state and how the legislature is looking at things. She noted that the summit is a bipartisan event. This year, the main speaker will be former congresswoman Pat Schroeder. Another speaker will be Marie Wilson who is the founder and president of the White House Project. She offered to pass around an information form with the summit's web link and a copy of the agenda for other Commission members to see what topics were offered and how the summit would be broken up. She concluded her presentation by mentioning that although the summit covers women's issues it is not an event full of "how to dress for work" and "what makeup to wear" seminars.

Travis took a moment to mention the Women in Science Symposium being held next week, then allowed Deb Haines to proceed with a report on this event.

**IV. Women in Science Symposium (Deb Haines)** – Deb Haines presented a brief summary of the upcoming Women in Science Symposium. She showed the brochure and poster (both of which are available online). She read some of the key programs scheduled and noted that she is excited about the opportunity for postgraduate and graduate students to experience the information/feedback offered by the symposium. There will be participants from UT, ORNL, Battelle, and other institutions. Haines announced that a link to the symposium would be active on the UT homepage starting tomorrow. She encouraged everyone to stop by, even if just for one talk. There are no registration fees and it is a two-day event.

Howell asked whether the symposium should be promoted to mentees; Hindle answered that we are promoting the program to everyone. She added that the participants are "awesome individuals" and that this is an "awesome opportunity for exposure."

Haines added that the program organizers are encouraging men to attend as well. They are hoping that this symposium will serve as a way to start helping other groups on campus to put together these types of symposiums. She mentioned that she believes the Commission has some other goals for future events that we may be able to support without having to do all of the work – these can be discussed at another meeting.

Hindle took the opportunity to mention that Chancellor Crabtree has been very supportive of the Women in Science Symposium and that we hope this is simply the "inaugural" symposium.

Returning the symposium poster, Haines pointed out that all of the women depicted are significant historical women in the sciences.

Wendy Syer asked whether the primary focus of the symposium is undergraduate students? Haines said no, that the primary focus is graduate students. In order to be successful in their profession, they need to be aware of what is required, how to bring themselves up, and how to negotiate for that position. She recounted a great story she heard on the morning news about men and women promised to be paid between \$5 and \$12 for doing a specific job. Upon completion of the job, more women readily accepted \$5 than men who were more likely to say they had been promised \$12. This is a difference she thinks people need to be made aware of.

Both Margaret Crawford and Hindle told Haines that she had done a wonderful job on the poster design. Hindle thanked her for all of her hard work.

Not on agenda – Hindle passed out Newsweek article called “Killing the Consumer.” She admitted that she is not aware of the status on campus (Do we allow smoking in buildings? Do we sell tobacco?). Multiple attendees answer “no” to the former and “yes” to the latter. Howell mentioned that the Faculty Senate tried to address the issue of selling tobacco on campus, but that the resolution had been voted down. Hindle closed with a comment that although she is not a smoker, she thinks that the issue of specific targeting mentioned in the article put an interesting new twist on the subject.

**V. UT Notable Woman (Margaret Crawford)** – Crawford gave a brief report on the Commission’s UT Notable Woman Committee. She explained that this is one of the special committees and that it has selected a notable woman since 1995. There are currently three categories: administrator, faculty/staff, student/alum. The award is given on a rotating basis to one person per year. Within the faculty/staff category, there is some difficulty in selecting a recipient because the two groups are considered using very different criteria. The committee, therefore, is thinking about splitting them into two separate categories. Howell mentioned that she was on the committee last year and there was a very worthy staff member who was not chosen because she was being considered alongside faculty members and only one could be chosen. The attendees offered their general agreement with this idea. This year’s category is Administrator.

Papke asked who supplies the funds for the award. Crawford responded that there is a display in Hodges Library and that the actual award, a certificate, is presented at the Chancellor’s Honors Programs. The Chancellor funds the award.

Papke then asked whether it would be possible to get funding for two awards each year so that, with the split of faculty and staff, there isn’t a four-year rotation. Crawford noted that in 2001 and 2004 the Chancellor did fund two awards in the same category, so the suggestion is not too far-fetched. Papke suggested we take the idea forward to the Chancellor. She also said that it would be better to give two awards each year so that it doesn’t look like we couldn’t find more than one notable woman on campus in any given year. Hindle agreed and said that we will run the idea past the Chancellor.

Crawford said that anyone interested could go to the CFW website to see who has won the award in the past. There are many bios and pictures available on the site.

Mary Evans asked whether we could actually create five total categories by also splitting the student/alumnae category. She wondered whether it would be “shooting for the moon” to asking the Chancellor to fund five awards (one in each category) every year. Papke thinks that perhaps that would be asking too much, in part because we don’t want the Commission for LGBT People and the Commission for Blacks to think that we are too greedy. On the other hand, she suggested that it may not be unreasonable to ask for two one year and three the next on an alternating basis to accommodate five categories.

Again, Hindle said we should put together ideas and run them past the Chancellor.

Crawford added a thank you to Deb Haines for sending out a notice on the women’s listserv about the recent passing of Shirley Underwood, a previous recipient of the award.

**VI. Report from the Faculty Senate (David Patterson)** – Patterson reported that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met yesterday and discussed several resolutions to take to the full senate. First, they are planning to send forth recognition of Rita Geier. Second, they have noted that, while they worked for a long time for the inclusion of sexual orientation language in hiring announcements, it is not included in the faculty handbook. They plan to work to get this changed. Third, they are going to present a safe place resolution. Chesney interjected that this is a program to provide safe places or zones for students, faculty, and staff to go to on campus to feel safe. The idea originally started with regard to sexual orientation, but has expanded. Patterson added that the resolution will allow for tra            regarding safe places.

Denise Harvey asked what happens if you go to a “safe place.” Chesney responded that there is someone there to help you with the issue you are having problems with.

Papke added that the resolution was in part a reaction to the “preacher” and abortion activists who are sometimes on campus.

Patterson said that the senate committee still needs to work on the language of the resolution before it goes forward to the full senate, but that his will send it to us with the understanding that it has not yet been approved. Chesney added that anyo            ing on a task force related to this should let him know.

On another topic, Patterson reported that the Faculty Senate is in the process of reconsidering and revising the ombudsperson office. They are seeking a faculty member or emeritus faculty member to serve as a temporary ombudsperson. There is compensation for the position and anyone with a background in mediation and counseling should contact him about it.

Travis asked when they need someone and Patterson responded as soon as possible. They currently have three ombudspersons finishing out cases and are in the process of making a transformations to having a full-time, paid ombudsperson. They currently need a temporary

person to finish out, possibly, the rest of the year. The primary role is to help those who need to file a grievance to do so.

Haines asked where this temporary person will be housed if it is a faculty member they will use their current faculty office. If it is an emeritus faculty member who does not have an office, space will be found.

Hindle asked whether there are ombudspersons for staff. Patterson said that the issue hasn't been discussed, but that if a person is hired full-time they may be able to work with both faculty and staff.

Syer mentioned that there used to be an ombudsperson for students, and that no longer having one was a huge loss. She no longer knows where to send students. This is a real hole at UT that needs to be filled and maybe this is the time to bring it up again.

Patterson moved on to the next item in his report: the debate between the UT system and campus regarding Cherokee Farms. The Executive Committee is in the process of drafting a resolution about who runs it. They want to include recognition of the need to include childcare facilities at Cherokee. He said that if you look at information the UT system has put out, two things are noteworthy: the word student only appears once (next to the name of a student) and the system creating the task force is rather remarkable.

Howell mentioned that her perception is that the workforce on the new campus will be predominantly female. Syer asked why the discussion of childcare is being limited just to that campus. Howell clarified that the proposed facility would be a potential location for everybody, not just for people working on that campus. She believes it is a great location and that there is an advantage of building a new structure as opposed to retrofitting one on the main campus. Syer expressed the need for there to be a subsidy to help make the childcare affordable.

Not on the agenda – Rosa Thomas took a few moments to give a report from the Safety Committee. She distributed a handout which covered all the items on the agenda. [See handout]

**VII. Report from the Mentoring Committee (Kathryn Ellis)** – Kathryn Ellis presented a brief report of the Mentoring Committee's first meeting. The committee met to discuss the committee's goals for the upcoming year. The primary purpose of this meeting was to identify the ways in which the committee could increase participation in the mentoring program. At the meeting, Nancy Goslee began by mentioning some of the problems faced by the committee in the past. The primary problem has been a lack of mentees signing up for the program. This became the main focus of the meeting. The committee members discussed the need to include faculty, staff, and students in the program. We also discussed the fact that having mentoring solely within departments or individual colleges may not be adequate because of the large number of students who have future goals not directly related to the activities of their department/college. Among the ideas we discussed for attracting additional mentees were to

approach incoming freshmen through their summer orientation programs (perhaps have the academic advisors mention the program), approach freshmen through their FYS courses, and to increase notification through advising offices. The committee hopes to get Ruth Darling and Todd Diacon to come speak with the committee about successes they have had with their offices (Student Success Center and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs). Other committee members will research programs at other schools and at local organizations for models that we may be able to use. We agreed that we would like to see the mentoring program running in some format (either one-on-one or small groups) by this coming spring (2008). We plan to meet again in October to discuss our findings and to further develop a gameplan.

Jocelyn Milton mentioned that in addition to Ruth Darling and Todd Diacon, the committee might want to speak with Tierney Bates and Alicia Cottrell about their work with the Minority Advisors Program.

Haines asked whether we need to encourage each of the individual colleges to do more or whether we want a comprehensive program for the entire university. Milton suggested that we tap into what already exists that we know works. We could work to expand networks. She noted that students need to do this anyway to go to the next level once they graduate. We should try to get more people involved without trying to recreate the wheel. Haines added that we should try to connect people across “borders” in an effort to allow people to make choices.

Hindle said that the committee is absolutely wide open for ideas and suggestions.

**VIII. Old Business/New Business/Announcements** – Very quickly, Papke handed out “Ready for the World” passports that have major events listed for the entire semester.

Harvey mentioned the upcoming Undoing Racism conference on November 2. [See brochure]

Hindle reminded everyone that the CFW’s next meeting will be on November 1.

*Pam Hindle adjourned the meeting at 1:06 p.m..*

*Submitted by Kathryn Ellis*