Committee on Diversity and Equity

August 13, 2020


Guests: Provost Kimo Ah Yun, Assistant Provost Cindy Petrites, Alex Riley (Director of Institutional Research)

The meeting began at 2:05 p.m. via Microsoft Teams.

1) Faculty Salary Gender Equity Report

The CDE was joined by Provost Ah Yun, Assistant Provost Petrites, and Alex Riley for the annual discussion of the Faculty Salary Gender Equity Report. The purpose of this year’s discussion was to share the history of the Faculty Salary Gender Equity Report, and to generate a plan for ways to improve the current report so that it is both more informative and consistent. The CDE received the annual memo addressing the Faculty Salary Gender Equity Report at the end of the Spring 2020 semester, and initiated a conversation with Provost Ah Yun and OIRA on ways to improve the data so that the report could present a fuller picture of salary equity across campus.

Provost Ah Yun opened the meeting by expressing a commitment to a simplified process with greater shared understanding between the CDE, provost’s office, and OIRA as to what data are available and how to conduct the analysis. In the Spring 2020 semester, he used the report to initiate conversations with the deans about salary equity and gender.
From the perspective of the CDE, there has been year-to-year great inconsistency in the Gender Equity Report, which has been implemented as of the 2000 Gender Equity Climate Study that both created the CDE and established the annual reporting mechanism as a form of oversight for a then-documented gender salary gap. With many leadership changes since 2000, different provosts have approached the report in different ways, likely leading to some of the inconsistencies. CDE has made recommendations about the form the report should take yearly, and these recommendations frequently get lost in the personnel shuffles.

This year, CDE provided feedback about the 2020 report that mirrored feedback from previous years. In particular, the current report is neither broken out by college or department, the regression tables are not shared, and the CDE members had questions about the way data was used and the approach that was taken to sensitize the model. These issues were transmitted to Assistant Provost Petrites and Provost Ah Yun by CDE Chair Kali Murray after the committee received the 2020 report.

From OIRA’s perspective, Riley shared that the process has changed a lot over the years. Initially, the office was primarily charged with providing descriptive data. In the last few years, the provost’s office asked OIRA for more involvement. Specifically, they asked OIRA to build a regression model. OIRA is very open to having the analyst who developed the model and ran the analysis present the model to the CDE. OIRA relies on data drawn from the Human Resources system, and the model includes variables such as department, rank, years in service, gender, and other metrics. The data and model have not been shared with CDE because OIRA has not been asked to share the model. OIRA can see a benefit in collaborating on the model and discussing the data with CDE. Riley would suggest collaborating to improve the 2021 report rather than seeking to amend the 2020 report. There was consensus on this approach as COVID 19 has disrupted the 2020 cycle, and as a result of budget shortfalls, gender equity salary raises were withheld at the salary evaluation cycle.

Riley shared OIRA’s calendar for conducting the research and generating the report. CDE needs to be attuned to the annual cycle for the report in order to support the process of generating the report. The process typically begins for OIRA in January and February. The report is completed by the March salary evaluations,
and the provost engages deans before contract letters are distributed for the upcoming year.

Assistant Provost Petrites requested information on the role of the CDE in the gender equity salary report. Vice-President for Inclusive Excellence William Welburn explained the history of the report as it emerged from the work of the Gender Equity Taskforce in 2000, and that the original recommendation to constitute the Committee on Diversity and Equity and to require the report be compiled and submitted to the committee annually emerged from the original report, which highlighted a gender pay gap problem in 2000. The purpose of the recommendation was accountability, and CDE was intended to provide oversight for the process. Working with the provost’s office over the years, the gender equity pay gap seems to be improving. The continued role of the CDE is to make sure that the salary equity issues are being systematically addressed, and to keep the university moving in the right direction.

Riley also expressed interest in what CDE has done with other data analysis that she and the OIRA staff have provided in the past few years.

CDE Chair Murray repeated the committee’s concerns that the data might be more useful if it is consistent and also includes unit-level analysis. Because of the way the analysis is conducted and the data is reported, it is difficult to tell which units are leaders in salary equity, and which may have issues that need to be addressed. The CDE also needs the university to have a conversation on issues of equity. One justification often given for existing differences in pay is that there are more men in higher paying fields, while there are more women in lower paying fields. As a hypothetical example, say a unit by unit analysis showed that nursing faculty were paid less than faculty in other colleges, and that this difference is due to the gender demographics of the nursing field, in that it has traditionally included more women than men. What are the implications for this from an equity perspective? In order to have such challenging conversations, we need a strong report that allows the provost’s office to take a leadership role on this issue.
Provost Ah Yun raised the issue of the difficulty of benchmarking salaries, the importance of doing so, and of mapping many pathways to equity.

Dr. Welburn adds that CDE Chair Murray’s observation that there is no college-level analysis of gender salary issues impedes our ability to get a clear picture of what gender equity issues exist at Marquette.

The CDE members explained that their understanding of the CDE’s relationship to the report is to provide a faculty perspective that draws on the committee’s collective disciplinary expertise to inform the process of data collection and analysis so that the resulting report will be adequately rigorous and persuasive.

Provost Ah Yun shared that he had not had experiences with any university leaders who needed to be convinced of the importance of addressing the gender equity pay gap, and that mechanisms exist for the provost to make independent analysis of a salary or raise where concerns about resistance or bias may arise.

In moving ahead, CDE Chair Murray added that the CDE sees the salary equity evaluation remaining between the provost’s office and the deans. However, working more closely with OIRA, the CDE could reevaluate and update its own guidances and policy recommendations.

In reevaluating the process, Provost Ah Yun suggested that the letter containing the salary gender equity analysis could be shared with the CDE, giving the CDE the chance to offer feedback before the letter is shared with the deans. Provost Ah Yun said he believed this would improve the process. CDE members concurred.

Riley also requested a type of guidance letter from OIRA capturing what the committee was looking for in the salary gender equity report. She requested that
the CDE provide a guidance document outlining what data and analysis we would like to see, both at an individual and systematic perspective.

CDE members asked to learn more about the past models, and to consult with the OIRA analyst(s) who had worked on the previous reports as working closely with the data often leads to good intuitions for modeling approaches.

CDE agreed on a timelines with OIRA to provide a guidance document in October. Before issuing a guidance letter, the committee or representatives from the committee will also follow up by meeting with Riley and the OIRA analyst who prepared the last report to better understand the current model. The CDE will also look into best practices at peer institutions around salary gender equity analysis, and contract varying approaches.

2) CDE Projects, Past and Present

Assistant Provost Petrites requested information about what the CDE does. She described herself as still new to Marquette after 4 years, and wanted some examples of guidance that CDE has provided in the past. She was especially interested to see what types of guidance have been provided that are based on requests for data and analysis from OIRA. Understanding that part of the CDE's role was as an accountability mechanism, she also requested more insight into how CDE has shaped policy in the past.

CDE Chair Murray explained that some policy achievements have been hampered because of the inconsistency of access to data, referencing the salary gender equity report in particular.

Other CDE members explained a range of projects undertaken in the last five years that were done after consulting OIRA, or relying on independent research by committee members. Some examples of these are 1) the implementation of a more
racially-sensitive crime reporting system; 2) the implementation of a Faculty Excellence in Diversity Advocacy Award; 3) the recommendation and implementation of equitable faculty hiring practices, now overseen by Vice-President Wellburn; 4) a guidance letter advising the Committee on Promotion and Tenure on race and gender bias in faculty promotion cases, particularly in the interpretation of student teaching evaluations; and 5) the recommendation to conduct exit interviews and surveys to track why faculty depart from Marquette, now overseen by Vice-Provost Gary Meyer. Many other projects are in process, including research on best practices for supporting Title VI and VII civil rights protections on college campuses; and research on the use of diversity statements in recruitment and hiring. In the summer, the CDE appointed an ex-officio CDE member to serve on the committee overseeing the review of the university’s Title IX policies. The CDE also meets annually with Marquette Police to hear from MUPD on issues relating to diversity and equity.

CDE Chair Murray emphasized that the committee has a full agenda.

3) Exit Interviews

Provost Ah Yun raised concerns about the utility of the exit interview, and, because of staffing reductions in the provost’s office, the time-intensive nature of the project. This function is currently located within the office of the Vice-Provost of Faculty Affairs, Gary Meyer. As Vice-Provost Meyers offers an exit survey, did the committee still feel there was an added value in continuing the exit interviews. Vice-Provost Meyer’s has recommended suspending the exit interviews.

CDE members emphasized that the exit interviews were still critical, and that it was a needed feature in order to understand the likely causes driving faculty to depart. They also noted that some departing faculty were not opting into the exit survey or the exit interview because they did not know what the data was being used for, and were unaware that they could be interviewed by anyone other than Gary Meyer. It was not the committee’s intention to require Vice-Provost Meyer to carry out all of the exit interviews, and Dr. Wellburn was supposed to be listed on the form as an option for exit interviews.
Provost Ah-Yun asked for clarification on the value of the interview and what was intended to be done with the data collected from the interviews. The process takes 60 to 70 hours per semester.

CDE Chair Murray spoke to why CDE wanted an exit interview. There had to be a location outside of the academic department, as the department could be the driver of the faculty departure. Faculty were leaving and we didn't know why. For younger women or people of color, it is important to give faculty options as to who they could speak to. The survey does not necessarily capture why people leave, and a skilled interviewer can elicit this information. We also wanted to capture with some sensitivity, even upon departure, that Marquette cares about this person as an individual. In the past, faculty of color just disappeared--- however, the departure should reflect care.

Provost Ah Yun was concerned that both Vice-Provost Meyers and Dr. Wellburn were overextended. He suggested having CDE members conduct the exit interviews. CDE members also suggested HR, which Provost Ah Yun thought might not be the right location for faculty exit interviews.

CDE Members will take this into consideration. The CDE also suggested focusing exit interviews on women and people of color.

4) Office of Marketing and Communication

CDE will be meeting with representatives from the Office of Marketing and Communication. Over the summer, members noticed that representation of Black, Latinx, and Brown faculty and students is lop-sided and uneven in many OMC publications, and reached out to OMC to initiate a discussion. Many examples of problematic and lop-sided representation were cited by committee members. OMC will be invited to meet with CDE. Both representation and equity will frame the discussion, as CDE members were concerned that non-white people were often depicted as subjects of research or recipients of the university’s largesse, as opposed to campus and global leaders. CDE members would like to hear more about how diverse the OMC staff is, and educate both OMC and college staff who participate in the creation of OMC publications on cultural and racial equity and sensitivity.

5) Other Issues for the Greater Good

CDE members raised several issues. On the issue of salary gender inequities, committee members were concerned about inequities among staff salaries, as well as salary gaps related to race. Sustainable equivalent on the staff side should be recommended.
CDE members asked about the relationship to the President’s Commission on Racial Equality.

CDE Chair Murray introduced Heather Hlavka, ex-officio member, and her role in participating in the Title IX rule revision processes. Hlavka reported that the Title IX revision process was nearing completion, and that the new rules would be published by August 14th per federal requirements. There will be opportunities to supply feedback in the coming weeks. Hlavka highlighted some major changes in the Title IX processes: 1) for both parties, the respondent and complainant, to have access to a support person or legal counsel; 2) cross-examination of all witnesses in conduct hearings; and 3) the reclassification of campus sexual assault advocates as confidential support person. Advocates will abide by Clery Act reporting guidelines, but will otherwise be private. The standard of proof has been raised by federal authorities from “preponderance of evidence,” to “clear and convincing.” Hlavka will report on the final revision process at the September CDE meeting.

Dr. Wellburn reported that two campus climate study reports will be released in the Fall. One is a campus-wide study, and the second focuses on the NSF Advance Program with an emphasis on the experiences of women faculty in science and social science fields. Dr. Wellburn suggested that the CDE follow up with Jeanne Hossenlopp on the NSF Advance Study. The reports will be available in early to mid-October and there will be a process to release, debrief and set an agenda related to the findings of both reports. The study results will be shared with all students, faculty and staff. A Tableau website will be available so Marquette’s community can see the data that was collected during the Campus Climate Survey.

CDE Members also noted different efforts across campus to provide more support to Black and Latinx students, as well as students from other underrepresented minorities. In Social and Cultural Sciences, the Dean of Arts and Sciences has approved the appointment of a designated faculty Diversity Advocate, Dr. Marcia Williams. In the Law School, Professor Vada Lindsey’s role as Associate Dean for Enrollment has been expanded to Associate Dean for Enrollment and Inclusion. CDE will revisit these positions in the future to seek feedback from faculty, staff and students as to whether these positions might be implemented across the university.

CDE members asked for the establishing of a Teams Site for archiving of CDE research, reports, recommendations, and meeting minutes.

The September meeting will serve to set the agenda for the year, and to debrief on the updates to the university’s Title IX policies.

Sameena Mulla moved to adjourn. Seconded by Heather Hlavka.
Meeting Adjourned at 3:43 pm

Minutes as recorded by Sameena Mulla