

Minutes of the Senate Anti-Discriminatory Policies Committee
27 April 2010
826 Cathedral of Learning

In Attendance: Mark Lynn Anderson, Anthony Bauer (Chair), Deborah Brake, Paula Davis, Susan Hansen, Rebecca Harmon, Emilia Lombardi, Sharon Nelson-Le Gall, Carol Mohamed, Michelle Page, Paolo Palmieri, Cindy Popovich, Vijai Singh, and Steve Zupcic.

Absent Elected Members: Dorothy Hawthorne-Burdine and Bruce Venarde.

Anthony Bauer called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM.

Review of the Minutes

Emilia Lombardi moved to approve the revised ADPC minutes for 14 January 2010. Vijai Singh seconded the motion and the motion was carried. [NB. The February meeting of the ADPC was canceled when the University closed for three days because of extreme weather. A hastily rescheduled meeting did not produce a quorum of voting members. The March meeting was eventually postponed as several key members, including chair Bauer, were away from town on professional matters. No meeting was successfully scheduled for May.]

Old Business: Healthcare Exclusions

Lombardi inquired of Chair Bauer whether he had had an opportunity to check back with John Kozar, Director of Benefits, about the exclusion of transsexual procedures from medical coverage, as he had proposed at the November meeting. Bauer said that he had not, but he supposed that Kozar was making a comparative study of other institutions' coverage. He also counseled the committee that changing health benefits was a significant process. Steven Zupcic pointed out that the current exclusion could easily be used to deny payment for already long-established medical procedures, for example, treatments for intersexed children. A short conversation took place about the possible provenance of the exclusion and its possible rationales, information that the Benefits office was unable to provide the committee last fall. Mark Lynn Anderson reminded the committee that we were not so much interested in any particular interpretation of the exclusion or how it might relate to particular diagnoses. The language of the policy, he pointed out, was specifically exclusionary and therefore discriminatory, and it is this explicitly exclusionary policy in the University's health plan that we are seeking to have eliminated. Lombardi reported that the University of Pennsylvania had just moved to extend medical costs connected with gender-confirmation procedures to its students, including counseling, hormone therapies, and surgeries. Penn's insurance provider is Aetna. A decision was made to invite Director Kozar to an ADPC meeting in the very near future.

Continuing Business: Faculty Hiring & Pay Equity

Bauer returned to the committee's ongoing consideration of pay equity issues. Looking at the data available on-line in the University *Fact Books*, Bauer pointed out how, from

1995 through 2008, the University has made steady advances in hiring more women in to faculty positions, from 29% of all full-time faculty hiring in 1995 to 38% in 2008. [*Fact Books* are available on-line at the webpage for the Office of Institutional Research at <http://www.ir.pitt.edu/factbook/index.htm>.] The information available in the annual *Fact Books* is given as aggregate numbers that include all tenured, tenure-stream, and non-tenure full-time faculty positions across the University including the Medical School and the regional campuses. Bauer noted that there were similar advancements in faculty hiring for the racial categories of Native American and Asian/Pacific Islander, as well as for the ethnic category of Hispanic. However, Bauer noted, there was no improvement at all in the category of Black Non-Hispanic and, in fact, the *Fact Books* document a slight decrease in the hiring of Black Non-Hispanic faculty over a thirteen-year period. Sharon Nelson-Le Gall pointed out that there had been efforts to bring more African American to campus as full-time faculty, but that these efforts have not been successful.

Rebecca Harmon observed that the *Fact Book* information does not breakdown the proportion of hires into tenure stream and non-tenure stream positions within the rubrics of gender race and ethnicity, information that's critical for fairness in hiring. Deborah Brake mentioned the Paycheck Fairness Act currently pending on Capitol Hill (H.R.12 and S.182) as a possible impetus for re-examining the University's record on pay equity with respect to gender. Harmon and others agreed that the current environment might be conducive to asking for more detailed information, since the committee might conceivably assist the University in responding to new federal law.

Vijai Singh said that the proportions of tenured, tenure-stream, and non-tenured full-time faculty (and part-time faculty) varies widely from department to department. He suggested that Vice Provost Andrew Blair might be able to give the committee a better sense of these differences. Anderson recounted his e-mail communications with Blair in March, but Anderson said that the Vice Provost was reluctant to come to a ADPC meeting until he was provided more specific questions to which he or others in his office might adequately respond.

Nelson-Le Gall mentioned the recent publication of a handbook by American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) as reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. The handbook is a resource manual for implementing and maintaining diversity programs on campuses for faculty and students. Nelson-Le Gall said that while the handbook was designed for schools heavily devoted to science, engineering, and technology, the handbook would prove useful for other sorts of colleges and universities. [Information about the AAAS handbook can be found at: http://www.eurekaalert.org/pub_releases/2010-04/aaft-idi042310.php.] With respect to the *Fact Book* findings, Nelson-Le Gall observed that an institution cannot promote the advancement of one group on the basis of discriminating against another. She maintained that part of the solution was the development of a will to keep minority faculty members at the University. She said a particular strength of the AAAS handbook was its emphasis on providing and maintaining a place for minority scholars to be involved. Bauer mentioned that, in his area of research, there simply were not sufficient African American candidates on the market. Nelson Le-Gall responded by describing how minorities are often "counseled out" of particular disciplines.

Harmon said that another component of the issue is related to questions of perception. In any given instance, how do we know no minority candidates are out there? Is it because they do not apply, or because they do not exist? If they do exist, are there reasons why minority candidates might not be applying to positions at the University? Harmon used these questions to reiterate the necessity of our having as many facts as possible. Carol Mohamed offered that her office can help with the writing of job advertisements with an eye to minority recruitment. Singh observed that it is not simply a question of faculty hiring, and he suggested that if one walks into any graduate classroom today, she or he would see the very same diversity problems. He proposed that we should work on areas where we can make a difference. Paula Davis stressed the importance of mentoring at all levels, and she pointed out that your mentor doesn't have to look like you, only care about you. Nelson Le-Gall added that what is most needed is for people to have a real connection to diversity, for them to care about it.

Carol Mohamed proposed that it might be helpful to know how equity and diversity are achieved at the University by those you are charged with maintaining a diverse campus and workforce. This could be the basis for one of the committee's questions. Susan Hansen asked if exit interviews are regularly given to individuals leaving faculty positions. Paula Davis offered that some things get recorded for some individuals, and for others they do not. Singh said that it was part of his job to retain people when they had other offers, and that his office worked to retain as many faculty members as possible since once you lose a lot of people you can develop a reputation for instability. He suggested that we should focus on the task of developing a set of questions that could be answered by Dean John Cooper or, perhaps, Andrew Blair. Nelson Le-Gall said it would be useful to have a bird's eye view of the entire equity review and hiring processes. Singh said it might be worthwhile asking to meet with the Provost himself, and to meet with Blair one-on-one.

[The remainder of the meeting was devoted to establishing those questions the committee would like answered, as well as to determining the specific information about hiring and pay the committee would like to obtain. This endeavor resulted in six questions that were written down by the secretary and circulated amongst those members of the committee who had attended the meeting. The revised questions were then sent to all committee members before the next meeting of the ADPC.]

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Submitted by Mark Lynn Anderson, 17 June 2010.