Commission for Women
Meeting Minutes
May 2, 2019

Attendance: Rachel Chen, Jamie Coble, Hillary Fouts, Melissa Grant, Amanda Hand, Megan Haselschwerdt, Joan Heminway, Catherine Luther, Bonnie Ownley, Marla Roberts, Abby Sherman, Melissa Smith, Jenny Ward, Lisa Yamagata-Lynch, Misty Anderson, Ashley Blamey, Nancy Thacker, Jennifer Richter, Shea Kidd Houze, Thura Mack, Jill Malolepszy

I. Welcome from Chair Rachel Chen

II. Approval of Minutes

III. Report from Chair Rachel Chen
   a. Budget. Historically the Commission has been given a $1500 budget, which was increased to $2500 for this academic year. Rachel has requested a $5000 budget for the 2019-2020 academic year. Tyvi Small will evaluate resources and needs of all Commissions and approve budget in the coming months. Rachel Chen noted secured funding support for 2 HERS candidates and graduate assistant. In terms of our Chancellor’s Awards, supplemental funding has yet to be secured. Rachel Chen suggested we consider moving some of our annual budget to those awards if our request for increasing the financial compensation is denied. We also may use funds from the CFW excellence fund. Rachel Chen noted individuals can electronically donate to the CFW Excellence fund at https://cfw.utk.edu/commission-for-women-excellence-fund/.
   b. Rachel Chen has connected with the incoming Chancellor, who will meet with the Commission in the fall. The 2018-2019 annual report will be shared with her this summer.
   c. Based on outcomes from panel event surveys, there is clear interest from our campus community to host further workshops and/or panels. Rachel Chen will look to standing committee chairs to begin brainstorming for events next year.
      i. Nancy Thacker will distribute a survey to commissioners to gather input on event topics of interests and how to improve based on prior events.
   d. Rachel Chen discussed forming a special committee around bullying prevention, reducing microaggressions, and evaluating policy to improve campus climate. Rachel Chen asked commissioners for input on the name of the committee.
      i. Lisa Yamagata-Lynch noted Mitsunori Misawa conducts research around workplace bullying in academia. He may be a useful partner.
      ii. Megan Haselschwerdt asked if this agenda item could fit under the standing safety committee? Commissioners noted the committee can collaborate with if a special group forms.
      iii. Joan Heminway noted bullying is an uncertain state in the law. It is an ongoing issue, and interest around the topic seems to have accelerated; more people are raising concerns. She discussed bullying is often a power relation issue; discerning when misbehavior is a one-time event or part of
a norm is challenging. She welcomes thoughts to collaborate with law colleagues.

1. Jenny Richter noted bullying is challenging to address when it is not explicitly outlined in policy. When it is the result of race, sex, gender, etc., then it is easier to address because there clearer guidelines in the code of conduct. She noted, if you cannot define bullying, it is difficult to address.

2. Misty Anderson noted the faculty senate is currently revising the faculty handbook. They are working on a section on bullying, particularly with regard to academic harassment. She noted the Commission can contribute to how definitions are crafted as they are drafting specific language into that policy. Misty Anderson also discussed renewed interest in “Play it Out Project,” a theatrical scene base of interactions, displaying microaggressions, and providing examples of clear abuses of power. She noted the project was faculty focused, but it can serve as a model for the community. The project was designed based on interviews with faculty at UT; so, it seemed to apply more closely to faculty and staff rather than students. In future iterations, they will target content for students.
   a. Ashley Blamey noted the project was very valuable and impactful.

IV. Report from Shea Kidd Houze, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Life and Dean of Students: Bias Education Response Team (BERT)
   a. Kelly Rubin, Associate Dean of Students, is a primary contact for BERT. The Office of the Dean of Students’ guiding principles are centered on compassionate care, mattering and belonging, and leadership and service. BERT falls primarily in compassionate care, though it is influenced by all three.
   b. BERT is designed to: (1) be a real time climate survey, (2) support students who are victims of bias incidents, (3) determine how to handle bias incidents, (4) review incidents and refer out as needed, and (5) develop an appropriate plan to initiate communication with the broader community.
   c. BERT includes the offices of: the Dean of Students, Equity and Diversity, Vice Chancellor for Communications, Human Resources, Multicultural Student Life, Provost, UTPD, Student Disability Services, Housing, and undergraduate and graduate students.
   d. Shea Kidd Houze noted certain legal challenges related to how BERT can respond to bias incidents. The state of Tennessee and code of conduct do not speak to hate
speech; they only speak to freedom of speech. Unless the incident is criminal in nature or breaks the code of conduct, it is challenging to move forward. The code of conduct serves as the basis for sanctioning.

i. The code of conduct is currently under review, a taskforce has been assembled. The review is ongoing and will include at least a year of conversations. The taskforce is examining peer institutions’ policies, including if and how they have been able to change codes. The goal is to insure some internal accountability while honoring the 1st amendment.

ii. Joan Heminway noted the FBI does investigate federal hate crimes, and asked if UTPD is able to refer out to investigate certain incidents.
   1. Shea Kidd Houze responded yes, if there is a pattern of behavior, then UTPD can refer to the FBI.

iii. Shea Kidd Houze noted incidents with faculty, particularly in classroom disputes, John Zomchick has stepped in as an intermediary to address department heads.

e. The process to respond to student bias incident reports involve: (1) collect verifiable info, (2) provide support services to student victim, (3) engage UTPD and/or office of student conduct and community standards in the investigation of the incident (if applicable), (4) initiate bias incident communication with the campus community (if applicable), and (5) document and conduct follow-up to bias incident.
   i. If the incident involves staff or faculty, then the office of equity and diversity comes into play at step 3.

f. Shea Kidd Houze shared information about reported incidents during 2018-2019. 38 incidents in the fall semester, 29 in spring semester. Of those incidents, race is the pervasive challenge (30 total incidents were a result of race-related bias). Second, 8 total incidents were a result of sexual orientation-related bias. Shea Kidd Houze noted religion and gender are at play, but race and sexual orientation appear to be the two most challenging areas of dispute. The location of of incidents are largely in residence halls, and classrooms are second. 14 cases were reported from classroom disputes, primarily between undergraduate students and faculty interactions.
   i. Hillary Fouts noted considering the proportion of students to number of incidents within a given demographic category may give us a better sense of risk for that particular group.
   ii. Lisa Yamagata-Lynch asked what happens to faculty in classroom incidents?
      1. Jenny Richter noted it depends on the situation and information gathered. John Zomchick has been instrumental in stepping in to address these incidents. He communicates quickly with department heads. Jenny Richter discussed disagreement between intentions.
and impact; in instances of these disputes, faculty often have intent that is not malicious, but students perceive it differently and can be negatively impacted.

2. Misty Anderson discussed instances where students perceive something as too political in the classroom. She asked what does it mean to file a bias report related to those instances? Does that not get into a challenging academic freedom area?
   a. Shea Kidd Houze responded issues around academic freedom are not primary issues with BERT. Some instances of politically charged discussions could be viewed as cultural appropriation, but as a team, that is not the primary issue with bias report incidents.
   b. Jenny Richter noted the Office of Equity and Diversity, however, handles more disputes around academic freedom. She noted discussions of religion in the classroom are sources of complaints at times, particularly in courses that are not inherently about religion.
   c. Commissioners noted general consensus that academic freedom related issues, such as discomfort around discussions of religion in the classroom, are not eligible for bias reporting.

G. Shea Kidd Houze outlined areas of growth for BERT include: (1) marketing and communication, (2) campus-wide presentations, and (3) future and continued collaboration with Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Engagement, faculty and academic affairs, and student organizations.
   i. Contact Shea Kidd Houze (dos@utk.edu or shouze@utk.edu) to schedule a presentation for your individual unit.

H. The Mattering and Belonging campaign, which has been titled—Vol is a Verb: Be you. Bear the Torch—is rolling out in fall 2019.
   i. There will be memorabilia to display the campaign messages.

V. Melissa Smith discussed UT Foundation women’s programming.
   a. Alumni women group within the Women’s Council includes a 60 member board. The group gathers twice a year to plan regional events targeting UT women.
   b. Alliance of Women Philanthropists. This group focuses on expressing gratitude to women who have engaged philanthropically. There are 4,300 current members, who have collective donated $1.4 billion (this figure includes donations given by members’ spouses). The group also hosts events that target women to engage them philanthropically and encourage giving. They also have a grants program for faculty and students. They have awarded 67 grants this year, with a total of $6,200; they host an annual symposium for this group of grant awardees. For
more information, contact Melissa Smith at msmith@utfi.org or visit their website at https://www.utfi.org/alliance/

VI. Jamie Coble discussed recent articles shared with the Commission related to pressures of service and special treatment requests for women; navigating gender bias in academia, specifically for women in STEM; and women in academic leadership.
   a. A PowerPoint including links to each article and a summary of findings provided by Jamie Coble can be found here: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1iNNoX-Lf33Es11POTJvk6dV2TJ4mcyN_LBa9vxsKwnY/edit?usp=sharing

VII. Bonnie Ownley reported on the gender pay equity analysis, conducted by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA).
   a. OIRA creates an annual faculty salary analysis in the form of a graphical report, where faculty salaries are plotted against years since highest degree. The Provost’s Office receives the report and distributes the faculty salary charts for departments to the appropriate college dean, who forwards them to department heads. These charts illustrate how pay varies within a discipline, and its expected changes over time. However, some department heads have indicated that they do not consistently receive the report. In addition, only faculty with instructional positions were included in the analysis, and some colleges were omitted. Bonnie Ownley noted that the UT system also creates a different report for affirmative action that looks for signs of systemic discrimination at each campus.
   b. The data set used for the current report included all regular, active faculty members. The initial group started at around 1800 faculty across 14 colleges, including governors chairs. However, some groups were removed from the dataset in order to compare salaries of those with similar titles and responsibilities. The final dataset included full-time, tenure-line faculty. Associate and Assistant Deans were omitted. In total, around 1200 faculty were included in the data set.
   c. OIRA specified a model of faculty salary where the key independent variable was gender, and included controls for college, department, year of receipt of degree, years since highest degree, professorial rank, and functional area (Instruction, Research, and Public Service; IRP). Base salary was converted to a 9-month salary for all 12-month faculty. All salary figures included longevity. The model was estimated with ordinary least squares regression.
      i. Jamie Coble asked if Oak Ridge joint appointment faculty were included?
         1. Bonnie Ownley responded she was uncertain but would ask.
   d. Results: After controlling for years of experience, department, rank, and appointment type (IRP), there was some difference between the pay of men and women among full-time, tenure-track faculty. Overall, women faculty make 1.7%
less than men faculty ($2800 per year); however, this difference was not statistical significant ($P = 0.07$). Because the probability was only slightly higher than 0.05, additional analysis was warranted.

ii. Professorial Rank: There were no measureable differences between the salaries of men and women faculty at the Assistant and Associate levels. However, the magnitude of the gender difference doubled (> $5600) at the Full Professor rank, where women made 3.6\% less than men. Again, this difference did not meet conventional levels of statistical significance, but the analysis does provide guidance on where subsequent investigations should focus.

iii. Other significant ($P<0.05$) factors: More years of experience are associated with higher salaries, up to a point, then the effect begins to diminish; higher rank is associated with larger salaries; Differences (large and small) in pay exist between various departments; there were no differences in pay based on appointment type (IRP).

iv. Comparison with 2009 data. OIRA conducted a similar analysis with the 2009 data set. Ten years ago, men faculty were making 2.8\% more than women faculty. The 2009 salary difference was larger and significant ($P<0.05$).

v. Commissioners discussed differences between the two reports decades apart. Commissioners noted there has been more intentionality in attending to diversity during the hiring process, including increasing diversity in hiring committees. The tenure and promotion of women faculty have been helpful as well. Misty Anderson noted this report can serve as motive for the institution to take on this issue, by showing progress over time, and may serve as a model for future analyses.

vi. Commissioner asked if analyzing staff discrepancies is in the works.

1. Jenny Richter noted there is a staff compensation review, but it is different than this type of analysis. For staff, the concern is for systemic discrimination in gender pay.

Bonnie Ownley and Deb Welsh will continue work through the summer on these issues.

VIII. Thank you from Rachel Chen for a wonderful year. Adjourn.