University Committee on Women Faculty and Students

Meeting Minutes for October 30, 2014/Room 500 Main Building, 11 a.m.

Members present: Laura Carlson (chair), Kevin Barry, Kathy Brickley, Todd Dvorak, Amy Geist, Karen Hooge, Sharon Keane, Melissa Lindley, Jennifer Mason McAward, Nicole McNeil, Karrah Miller, Catherine Perry, Catherine Pieronek, Ava Preacher, Mirella Riley, Ann Tenbrunsel, Sarah Wake, McKenzie Warren, Rebecca Wingert, Pamela Wojcik, Grace Xing

Members excused or absent: Aedin Clements, Paulette Curtis, Christine Caron Gebhardt, Alison Leddy, Kristen Loehle, Mary Ann McDowell, Heather Rakoczy Rusell, Samantha Salden

Reporter: Mary Hendriksen, Provost’s Office

Prof. Carlson called the meeting to order at 11 a.m.

1. **Announcements:** Ms. Hendriksen asked members to e-mail her with nominations for faculty members to attend the remaining three Mapother lunches with the Provost. Profs. McAward and Xing, both UCWFS members, will attend the first luncheon.

2. **The minutes of the meeting of October 13, 2014 were approved without amendment.**

3. **Report from the UCWFS working group formed to assess whether/how staff leadership initiatives can be adapted for faculty by chairs and deans:** Sarah Wake and Kathy Brickley

   Ms. Wake outlined a pilot program that will take place in January with faculty members who are in leadership roles in University centers and institutes. An initiative of the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR), the six-hour program covers such topics as Human Resources issues (the University’s performance management system, conflict resolution, etc.), legal concerns, finances and budgeting, strategic planning, and communications. The pilot program will include the heads of all centers and institutes reporting to the OVPR, with the hope of eventually expanding the program to all faculty who become administrators.

   Ms. Brickley presented a summary of NDLEAD, the Provost’s Office year-long faculty leadership development program that has graduated two classes (2012 and 2014) of about 18 faculty members each. The college deans nominate faculty members for the program. There is not a formal set of criteria for inclusion or a list of leadership qualities to be demonstrated. There has been fairly equal representation by gender in nominations.

Members discussed:

- Are certain leadership styles, particularly nontraditional leadership styles, equally apparent to deans?
• Do fewer women than men seek out leadership positions? For some women, the decision to participate in such programs becomes a calculus of service versus promotion.
• What rewards are offered to those who participate in leadership development programs or assume leadership positions?
• Should the Provost consider initiating mentoring/classes for leadership positions in the University’s research enterprise, as distinct from positions in departmental or University administration?
• Should participation in leadership development programs be voluntary rather than initiated by a college dean?

Prof. Carlson asked members interested in forming a new working group on faculty leadership initiatives to e-mail her. Topics the group will consider: criteria for identification of faculty leaders, incentives for participation in both leadership development programs and actual leadership positions, and how faculty leaders can best be developed.


At the meeting of October 13, 2014, UCWFS members received an overview of the report and its findings from Prof. Katherine Spiess, chair of the Blue Ribbon Committee on the Faculty Experience Survey, and Prof. Dan Myers, Vice President and Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs. Interviews with women faculty members and members from underrepresented groups have been conducted to enhance the University community’s understanding of the survey results.

At today’s meeting, members brainstormed about possible Committee actions in regard to the survey results. Members noted that there are a wide variety of cultures and climates for women in the University’s several colleges and many departments. Information about initiatives led by the President’s and Provost’s Offices do not always filter down to departments. Members agreed that it is important to look at colleges and departments that reported high levels of satisfaction among women faculty members. It was also noted that a general disconnect seems to exist between expectations of service for women faculty members and tangible rewards for that service. One question was whether women staff members are more or less satisfied than their male counterparts.

For the next meeting, Prof. Carlson asked members to come prepared with one or two issues from the report they found most troubling. The Committee will come to a consensus and develop a list of issues that are possible to address. The goal will be to achieve a series of “small victories” that will make a difference in the overall level of satisfaction among women faculty members.

Prof. Carlson adjourned the meeting at 12 noon.