Report Card Project Discussion with Dr. KerryAnn O’Meara:

Donna Wiseman began the meeting by introducing Dr. KerryAnn O’Meara and asking KerryAnn to explain her vision for organizing the Report Card project. KerryAnn explained that the class would be structured around approximately 15 students whose work would explore background information and current research in order to create a product that is meaningful. She also noted that she has the option to extend the timeframe for delivering the student’s grades from about 2 to 3 weeks to 4 to 5 weeks. KerryAnn would like to focus the class’ research on areas where the PCWI doesn’t have people to collect data. This research will use data from think tanks and literature reviews to create theoretical frameworks of peer activity. The data obtained from other institutions will be compared to the information from UMCP. KerryAnn would like access to the PCWI’s old reports.

General discussion created consensus that the group supports the idea of comparing UMCP’s current status to that of its peers and including benchmarks. KerryAnn also noted that it would be good for the students to have 15 minutes to present their results to the Commission. Donna suggested that President Mote or Provost Farvardin could be invited to attend the presentation in order to encourage the conversation at the university level.

KerryAnn then shifted the conversation to request known information sources from Commission members. Ellin Scholnick said that some gender and access information should be readily available, but noted that salary information would not be as easy to acquire. She also noted that pay information would require modeling with access to the “plexiglass ceiling.”

Donna presented the revised topics of “Women in Leadership” and the “Gender and Tenure/Pay Gaps for Women Academics” as the group’s primary concerns. Ellin suggested adding information regarding: the postponement of tenure, evaluations, personal leave and modification of duties as subtopics to the larger issues. Joanne suggested noting information on which universities allow graduate students to “stop the clock.”

For the “Women in Leadership” topic, KerryAnn added that the students will also examine the existence of intentional programs and Ellin asked where the group was planning to look. According to Laura, this information is relatively unknown here even though President Mote often says that mentoring is key. Donna suggested Assistant President Ann Wylie as a subject of interest for the students. Multiple Commission
members suggested returning to the areas of comparison even though the ACE representation is not completely representative.

KerryAnn noted that the class will visit “1 Dupont Circle.” She then asked who was active in the various leave conversations that students could speak with and Laura Nichols suggested contacting Joel Cohen. KerryAnn then solicited related information from the Commission and Jess Jacobson mentioned the group’s archives. Marla added a reference to the Greer Report, (http://www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Reports/Greer/), which all members supported using.

KerryAnn steered the conversation back to the leave options and the group followed with a discussion of the facts regarding the issue. Marla mentioned that many individuals may feel reluctant to ask for leave because of the stigma attached to it and Ellin agreed. Julie Choe Kim advised that it was important for the group to include staff information in the report. Donna asked about the impact of culture and diversity, specifically relating to women and women of color. Kerry Ann noted that this was a good idea.

In order to provide the student’s with Commission guidance, Donna asked which PCWI members would be available during the summer and a sign-up sheet was circulated. Since multiple members will remain on campus, Donna suggested staggering their times since the individuals have examined the ideas and the students could come in and examine the issues. Commission members who may be available include:

- Donna Wiseman
- Sally Kobinsky
- Marla McIntosh
- Laura Nichols
- Carol Parham
- Ellin Scholnick
- Linda Steiner

KerryAnn asked what type of report card the commission wanted to create. Donna explained that the group is looking for a 1 page report of progress that could be posted online where viewers could double-click and view the student’s information, (with their permission). However, with student involvement, she explained that the group’s options have increased. Linda Steiner advised that she saw this as an opportunity for Commission members to see options far beyond UMCP and these benchmarks are what the report card should show. Various members also discuss using this as an opportunity to position the Commission as a “watchdog,” that notes issued for concern. Linda also noted that while she agrees with this position, she feels that the report card shouldn’t contain letters. Donna suggested that the group see the data and then decide how to use it. KerryAnn agreed and said that she will edit the results and then allow the Commission to use the information as it sees fit. She explained that her vision was to examine the history and look at peer institutions to see where the University should focus its efforts. Donna anticipated that this would provide the Commission with a “meaty” fall and provide the group with activities. Linda suggested that those members staying on campus evaluate the student’s reports and then offer suggestions.

Marla noted that the group should include longitudinal data in the report to add information to the “leaky pipeline,” such as data regarding a cohort of female PhDs. In response, Ellin noted that longitudinal data has been kept since the mid 1990s and that UMCP has cohort promotion data, including the data contained in the Middle States
Report. Sally Koblinsky noted that many methodologies exist for reviewing data such as an examination of a cohort of full professors. She also noted that such data often speaks for itself. Overall Donna stated that the group will be happy with whatever data KerryAnn’s students are able to provide since it will provide the Commission with a new agenda for the fall.

Before the discussion ended, Sally asked for clarification regarding the Family Friendly topic and KerryAnn noted that the students will examine the issue in its entirety. One Commission member noted that Ellin has good data for the topic. Laura Nichols also stated that OHRP could help with specifics, including the time and presence of various data. Laura referred the students to Roberta Coates for staff information and Donna noted that information could be posted on the website for the class.

2008 Celebration of Women, (reactions):

Discussion began regarding the 2008 Celebration of Women. Donna stated that “thank you” notes should be sent to both Sharon Fries-Britt and Debbie Yow for their assistance with the program. Laura Nichols noted that while the event was described as wonderful and uplifting, there were some who missed the individuality and uniqueness of the individual ceremonies. Overall, all agreed that reactions to the consolidated event were overwhelmingly positive. However, a few concerns were noted, including the absence of natural light and the high ceilings. A suggestion was made to discontinue use of the Comcast Center for future Celebrations. Donna noted that the group might also want to consider moving the next Celebration back to late March and set the date at the next meeting.

Returning to the event evaluation, Marla noted that from the faculty point of view, the event was a powerful combination that it kept individuals from missing out on either ceremony. Many members agreed that the event was powerful since the speakers seemed to build off of each other.

A discussion regarding the award names ensued and the suggestion was made that Commission members work to clarify the names of the presented awards. Donna stated that the group may want to complete this conversation, although it is a tough issue. Ellin reported that many people are not aware that the awards are given for contributions to the women’s community and not a reflection of the recipient/nominees. Sally explained that the Woman of Color Awards is for contributions to the community of diversity and the group should clarify the required qualities. A suggestion was made to create a website item with definitions of the requirements and meaning of each award. Jess pointed out that work has been done on the website and that suggestions for the site should be submitted. All in attendance agreed that it is important to illuminate the criteria and available information. Minimal discussion regarding renaming the event also took place. However, Donna warned that the group should take care not to lose the historical perception of the event, even while attempting to clarify its various components. Laura suggested that each award subcommittee suggest revisions for its area. Marla asked what other organizations call their awards. Simultaneous mini-discussions then began regarding the various topics.

Overall, Donna noted that President Mote loved the combined event. Carol Parham again reminded those assembled that in light of the report card project, everyone must keep the historical aspects of the program in mind. Donna then suggested that all
Commission members examine the names and criteria, while noting that although there is normally concern about the event; it always works out. The suggestion was then made that as Commission members review the PCWI award information they also research the awards presented by the other campus Commissions.

**Budget:**
Donna noted that hosting the Celebration did not exhaust the Commission’s budget and a discussion began regarding how committee members would like to allot the remaining funds. Suggestions included funding a one-time scholarship, creating a brochure or purchasing membership buttons. Members voiced their ideas regarding each suggestion and some included combining the options. The idea of hosting an activity featuring the student presentations with handouts was also made. Someone again asked what the other Commissions. *(Discussion regarding the budget will continue during the April 23rd meeting.)*

**Office of Victim Advocate, (staffing update):**

**New Commission Chair:**
Donna announced that Carol Parham will takeover as the PCWI’s new Chair.

**Other Business and Announcements:**
- **Upcoming PCWI meeting:**
  - The next PCWI meeting will occur on April 23, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. in 3237 Benjamin Building.
- The E-mail Inquiry Discussion slated for this meeting will take place during the April meeting.

The meeting concluded at 4:15 p.m. The next meeting will be Wednesday, April 23, at 3 p.m. in room 3237 Benjamin Building.