The Special Committee on Faculty Women met Thursday, November 9, 2000 at 2:00 p.m. in 36 Gerberding. Chair Barbara Krieger-Brockett presided.

PRESENT: Faculty DeWitt, Frenkel, Muecke and Waaland. Ex officio *Redalje, Remick. (*with vote). Special guest Mary Coney.

ABSENT: Faculty Fligner, Liu, Miller, Powell. Ex officio Basu and *Sengupta. (*with vote).

Minutes from October 19, 2000 will not be approved until all council members have a chance to review them.

Welcome to 2000-2001 Members by Chair Mary Coney
Faculty Senate Chair Mary Coney welcomed SCFW members and thanked them for serving on this important committee. Coney has been a member of SCFW in years past and believes that the real work of shared governance gets done in the faculty committees like SCFW. She offered to assist the committee in any way she could and invited the committee to contact her or the Faculty Senate staff with any questions or comments.

Discussion of Meeting Times - Importance of Quorum
The Chair asked if meetings might be held at a better time to accommodate more members. It is important to raise a quorum in order to approve minutes and conduct business. DeWitt said clinicians have required productivity levels and that she cannot afford to miss a whole afternoon of clinical duties. Muecke suggested that perhaps Medical School faculty can meet on their own and send their recommendations to SCFW. DeWitt agreed that this would make meeting times easier though it would not solve the problem of having representatives from Bothell and Tacoma attend meetings; she also said her issues might be more Medical School related and might not pertain to women faculty on upper campus.

The Chair asked Coney about Muecke's suggestion to coordinate SCFW meetings with a group of women Medical School faculty and about DeWitt's comments that there might be qualitative differences between women faculty issues in the Medical School and elsewhere. Coney replied that Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn had helped settle several issues last year involving women Medical School faculty through the University's adjudication process. The adjudications seemed to touch on many of the same concerns that women across campus have. Coney added that she would like to see SCFW serve as the kernel for advocating change for women faculty across campus. Perhaps the adjudication process is one means to effect this change. However, Coney hoped that by speaking with the Deans of the Medical School some of the issues could be resolved without getting to the point of adjudications.

Regarding salary disparities between men and women faculty in the Medical School, one council member remarked that one of the only ways to get a raise from the University is to get an outside job offer. She said she spoke with the Dean from another school who told her that many male faculty get outside job offers about once a year compared to a substantially smaller number of women. She noted that this may be because women are discouraged from being too aggressive; this extends to other equity issues relating to lab space and secretarial support as well.

Remick commented on an idea that was raised at an earlier meeting that SCFW has lost some of its viability because of the proliferation of women's committees on campus, such as the
President's Action Committee on Women (PACW). All these committees have different responsibilities: PACW reports to the President, the Dean's Committee on Women Medical School Faculty reports to the Dean of the Medical School, and SCFW reports to the Faculty Senate via the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs. Remick feels all these committees serve an important purpose. She also agreed that, while the Medical School does have issues that are unique to its culture, there are many issues that are the same across campus.

One committee member reported that she is an Assistant Professor in her seventh year at the University of Washington and that she has polled her colleagues on a number of occasions and found that women faculty are asked to do a disproportionate amount of extra work that their male colleagues do not want to do. There are still problems with discrimination when male faculty get promoted to full professor more quickly than women faculty; most women faculty feel disenchanted and simply want to retire and get out. Coney suggested that faculty members with complaints should consider using the Faculty Senate governmental structure to bring their voices, and the voice of the Faculty Senate, to the President. The President surely does not want faculty in rebellion against him and would be apt to respond to Class C legislation.

The Chair proposed that SCFW make specific recommendations to the President and take those recommendations through FCFA and on to the Faculty Senate. Perhaps the Medical School Women Faculty, PACW and SCFW could compose something like a "Letter of Climate" that represents the stance of faculty women at the UW. Coney urged the committee to consider this option and advised that, when she was a member of FCFA, WOT faculty (Without Tenure for Reasons of Funding) came and "testified" before FCFA regarding their working conditions on campus--legislation was passed last year that mandates departments to seek bridge funding for WOT faculty if they lose funding. Coney emphasized that the Senate changes the Faculty Code, not the President.

The Chair asked if someone might be retaliated against if he/she were to bring something up in a testimony such as the one Coney described. One committee member postulated that women faculty might be more likely to answer honestly in a survey situation because the survey could be made confidential. Coney said that if enough noise is made about discriminatory practices relating to women faculty to reach the Deans' ears then the Deans will go to the Regents--this is when changes are made. Another member said she would like to see a study of UW women faculty's salaries compared to their male colleagues that also showed a breakdown of how long it takes women faculty to be promoted to Associate and Full Professor compared to their male colleagues. This should be done on a yearly basis and disseminated to all faculty.

Remick advised that such a study was done but it was very controversial--even members of SCFW were critical of it. She also noted that many professional areas are rapidly feminizing of their own accord--Pediatrics and ObGyn are two such areas--though she agrees that the power structure is still the same. One member raised the "global salary" issue and wondered if there is a 7% cap on raises when a faculty member is promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate, even though new hires are brought in at higher salaries than current Associate Professors. Issues like this need to be addressed. Remick asked if she might comment on a few issues relating to the above points: first, the idea that the competitive salary "benefit" is used by all men and no women is not borne out by the data--the data show that roughly 6% of female and 4% of male faculty have received raises based on outside offers; second, Remick submitted that the issue of new hires coming in at salaries higher than current Assistant and Associate Professors is one that affects all faculty, irrespective of gender.
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One committee member said she has seen a graph depicting mean faculty salaries and that her salary as a full professor was exactly on the mean. She commented that none of her salary stream comes from state funds, though she is held to the state employee salary scale. However, she emphasized that more of her female colleagues are bothered by their work milieu--by how they are treated and by how much less quickly they are promoted than their male colleagues. The Chair advised that she would type up a list of issues relating to the committee's discussion and bring it to the next SCFW meeting for the group to sign off on; if the committee agrees, the list can be submitted to FCFA and may be turned into a Class C resolution that would go before the Faculty Senate. One member asked, if the issue is one of climate, how will the Faculty Senate improve this? Coney replied that a Class C resolution would represent the official voice of the faculty and would raise the level of debate about the issue; the resolution would also make it harder for the Administration to allow these issues to continue without taking immediate steps to mollify them.

Remick asked if Christine Surawicz (head of the Dean's Committee on Medical School Women Faculty) is doing a salary study. One member replied that she is, and the study is showing that new hires are coming in at good salaries and have few complaints about their promotion schedules.

Several committee members said they would like to explore the issue of childcare on campus. This is an issue for faculty in general, not just women faculty. Remick suggested issuing a statement to Coney to have childcare on campus taken up by FCFA. Remick also noted that undergraduate students have set aside $600,000 from their budget for childcare. There are somewhere between 6,000 and 10,000 children of faculty and students under the age of 6-7. Remick revealed that the UW runs four childcare centers and there are actually openings at the Harborview Childcare center, though there have been responses from parents that the UW subsidy for this center is not sufficient.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. Minutes by Todd Reid, Recorder.