University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Women in Academia
12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m., March 11, 2013
116 Cunningham Hall

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes from December 10th, January 14th and February 11th meetings
3. Childcare Update
4. HR Database Restructure
5. Adjourn

1) Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Chair Olmstead at 12:35 p.m.

2) Approval of minutes from December 10th, January 14th and February 11th
Motion to approve minutes from December 10th, January 14th and February 11th (previous meetings did not approve the minutes due to lack of quorum). Motion received unanimous approval.

3) Childcare Update
Evans reported that when researching three peer institutions she found that each institution accommodates around 330-400 students for on-campus child care services. This is a much higher number than the approximately 150 – 175 people at the University of Washington that receive such services. It was recommended that we get more precise data on the University of Washington in order to make the appropriate comparisons. The most common model shows high tuition/high subsidies for childcare services, with childcare services subsidized up to 50%. Additionally, there are more spaces to allow for childcare services at these other institutions compared to the University of Washington. It was also noted that childcare services are available for both faculty and students.

It was recommended that each council member review three peer institutions for additional data on childcare and to share feedback at next month’s meeting.

4) Non-ladder faculty Update
The UW-Tacoma campus has a book group that recently read a book that addresses issues for non-ladder faculty. FCWA will reach out to this group and invite the leader to discuss the book at an upcoming meeting.

5) HR Database Restructure
Human Resources (HR) is going into the next phase of developing a new HR database. It was recommended that FCWA, in coordination with FCMA, should directly ask to be brought in to provide recommendations. The initial question is what data will be useful to analyze faculty hiring, promotion, and advancement and how to design the new database so this data is accessible. Guest Helen Remick (retired Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity) gave a historical perspective on the HR database and relevant data. The current database was originally created in 1970-1974 and is outdated, using old programming and coding.
There are three models which large institutions use for HR databases:

- Buying standard software from an established vendor and changing practices to match the software
- Buying a customizable system from a commercial vendor
- Internal development of both the database and the coding

According to Remick’s sister, who works in the computer consulting and application business, large vendors do not like working with government agencies due to difficulties attributable to the differences in work culture. Private sector jobs include extra padding in the bids in order to accommodate change orders; government contracts are usually low-balled because of low-bidder preferences, and each change requires negotiations over the cost of the change orders. Equally important, vendors lie about their products in order to get contracts. This is not a problem in the private sector, where everyone knows sales representatives overstate what they can do because they do it themselves. But public agencies expect 100% of what has been promised---which not infrequently is not possible.

UW and WSU implemented related systems in the early 1970s. The other public four-years use a variety of software packages (e.g., Peoplesoft) for their payroll/personnel systems and student data systems. The community colleges have recently installed a new system. The State Department of Personnel contracted with SAP to implement a major redo of its payroll/personnel system in the late 1990s, and the implementation was declared a failure about 10 years later; it would be interesting to know what went wrong.

The most important role of a payroll/personnel system is making sure that employees are paid correctly and on time. Much information is therefore captured as a snapshot of each payroll. Data required to analyze faculty advancement and promotion are not stored in a way that can easily be extracted for longitudinal studies. Because of Remick’s interest in these kind of questions, she began collecting annual snapshot data electronically on faculty in 1975 to use as a basis for studying change over time. However, it is unlikely that these files have been maintained since her retirement in 2005. Another historical data base was created in 1999 in the Planning and Budgeting Office, but the individuals maintaining these data have also retired. Remick does not know what is currently available.

Mention was made in the meeting that the Faculty Senate does receive information about the faculty from the Academic Human Resources (AHR) office. It was suggested that FCWA follow up with the Senate office to find out what information is currently shared and if there is further information kept electronically by AHR that could be used as a basis for studying the questions of interest to FCWA. It was recommended to research other institutions that have developed their own modified systems to use as an example to support FCWA’s position.

One sensitive issue that was addressed is obtaining private information of employees such as race, sex, specific disability and sexual orientation. If this information is available for analysis, this will also be available to the public and can be disclosed through public records requests. Race and sex are already coded in the data and have been subjects of public disclosure requests for lists by name. Were sexual orientation or specific disability added to the data system, the information would also be subject to disclosure to anyone asking for it. Also to add these variables, the almost 30,000 employees would have to be surveyed. It is, however, relevant to have information on sex and race locally for longitudinal studies. For example, when only snapshot data of minorities within the faculty indicate a loss of
minority faculty between the assistant and full professor level, the data do not show why minority faculty members leave the UW. This creates difficulties in determining if it is due to faculty who are not receiving timely promotions or who are recruited away by other institutions.

A suggestion was made to put together a group composed of both faculty and the administration to create a solution because longitudinal tracking is not embedded in the main payroll/personnel system. One strategy to encourage the administration to adopt a new model that considers the payroll system as a useful dataset is to use the research angle of the analysis to target new money for potential grants. If that can be done, the dataset would need to strip the names of faculty per RSB requirements in order for the data to be studied. An interesting note: ten years ago a faculty member at the University of Oklahoma completed a survey of faculty rank, gender and ethnicity at multiple institutions by contacting individual faculty members and departments, and found that faculty members were actually very supportive in providing their personal information regarding race/ethnicity when asked for it. This changes the idea of who is actually being protected when disclosing private information of faculty members: the faculty members or the institution itself.

With respect to action items: One recommendation was to draft a joint memo with FCMA to submit to the administration that includes additional lines to add to the coding in order to move the payroll system from a 2D database to a 3D database. In order to request changes, the RFP needs to be reviewed to determine what changes need to be made. The joint memo needs to identify the items that FCWA wants to include while also explaining why it is important for the administration to adopt the proposals. The UW has four goals for its new payroll system:

- Streamline data gathering and processing
- Increase business efficiency
- Enable better data management and decision making
- Strengthen regulatory compliance

From reviewing these priorities, FCWA can argue that regulatory compliance is met by leveraging the analysis of the data, and that improved decision making and policy development will result from knowledge and analysis of disaggregated data.

One question raised was whether information that FCWA might request could actually be pulled out for analysis due to limited time and resources. While given information might not be used at the moment for analytical purposes, it still should be collected in order to be pulled in the future. This will be especially useful for affirmative action reports. It is important to stress that the administration can benefit from being able to demonstrate that their policies to advance faculty diversity are working.

**Action Items**

- Follow up with AHR to determine how they maintain the faculty database and track this information. Alex Bolton has faculty senate access to parts of the AHR database, and we should coordinate with him.
- Come up with a resolution to submit to the SEC in order to push this forward.

4) Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned by Chair Olmstead at 1:54 p.m.
**Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst. gcourt@u.washington.edu**

**Present:**  
**Faculty:** Olmstead (Chair), Cooke (via Skype), L. Evans, Mescher  
**President’s Designee:** Neff  
**Ex-Officio Reps:** D. Evans (via phone), Jennerich  
**Guests:** Angela Ginorio, Sutapa Basu, Helen Remick

**Absent:**  
**Faculty:** Iarocci, Fialkow, Anzai, Fisher, Lazzari  
**Ex-Officio Reps:**