Diversity in Leadership

Submitted by: Xavery Hopkins, Chair
Subcommittee members: Erin Connolly, Karen Edwards, Reenea Harrison, Xavery Hopkins, Brooke Stillwell, and Margee Ziegler

2013–2014 Summary

The PACWI Subcommittee on Diversity in Leadership was charged with promoting USC Workplace Bullying Policy and to create a plan of action for programming and increase engagement. USC Workplace Bullying was passed and the Diversity in Leadership electronically distributed copies/links to the University Policy as well as post the actual policy on PACWI’s website. The goal is to make the policy accessible and increase awareness about the policy.

In November 2013, members of Diversity in Leadership met with John Dozier who is USC Diversity Officer. During the meeting we discussed ways to partner and build a USC Community that embrace and support diversity of types and genres. The action plan was completed to include activities and ongoing seminars that would cultivate a campus community that fosters diversity.

Recommendations

- Provide funding to support the work of PACWI and its subcommittee. Allocating funding to each subcommittee to support outreach and programming would assist in the accomplishments of the goals and objectives.
- Include an overview of PACWI in its onboarding of new employees.
- Consider opening PACWI activities to spouses of faculty, staff and graduate students. They should have first priority over guests. This will support PACWI position of inclusion.
- Create an awards ceremony to recognize USC Women that have made a difference in improving or advocating for women. This can be a self-nominating award application and/or receive nominations.

Plan of Action: Future Programming

- Provide best practices or white papers addressing diversity in the workplace (University)
- Host a mini-conference titled: Awareness – Action – Impact: Diversity at Its Best
  - The mini-conference will address faculty, staff and student topics such as:
    - How USC is Creating Cultural Competence
- Closings Confidence Gap: how women can boost their careers by exuding an executive presence; how a woman’s career drive is not any different from men but social norms sabotages women’s confidence to achieve
- Diversity Recruitment Strategy: Discuss the state (overall) HR recruiting practices and employee retention strategies for a diverse workforce
- How do we increase diversity in the Tech Industry: Ways to influence or impact the tech industry with increasing diversity (women and minorities)
- Understanding New Workplace Diversity Guidelines: Steps employers can take to ensure they are meeting all of their legal responsibilities; how to make your leaders culturally competent; hiring workers with disabilities, funding diversity and inclusion
- Diversity in Leadership: ways for faculty, staff and students to improve diversity in a University Community.

---

**Mentoring & Professional Development**

Submitted by: Marguerite O’Brien, Chair  
Subcommittee Members: Christine Christle, Kathy Evans, Christina Friend, Xavery Hopkins, Marguerite O’Brien, and Linda Shimizu

**FALL 2013 SUMMARY**

The PACWI Subcommittee on Mentoring & Professional development hosted a workshop on Monday, December 18th on *Mentoring & Career Advancement*. Approximately 37 faculty and staff participated in the event. The format of the event is included the program below.

**PROGRAM DETAILS:** The event included a moderated panel discussion followed by breakout discussion groups. Panelists were:

- Dr. Claudia Benitez-Nelson (Earth & Ocean Sciences)  
- Stephanie Duncan (State Budget & Control Board)  
- Dr. Dianne Johnson (English Department)  
- Dr. Kirsten Kennedy (University Housing)  
- Dr. Melissa Moss (Chemical Engineering)

**Mentoring & Career Advancement Workshop Agenda**

*Welcome & Introduction of Panel*

Panelist Remarks: Linda Shimizu, Facilitator
Questions from Moderator

Questions from Audience

Breakout discussions by area: PACWI member at each table

- Navigating the tenure process
- Promotion to full Professor
- Advancement for administrators and staff

Closing PACWI member

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: (N=25)

80% strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the panel presentation.
80% Strongly agreed that the panelists were appropriate for the presentation.
72% Strongly agreed that the question and answer period with panelists was adequate.
84% Strongly agreed that the panel presentation met its intended goals.
92% Strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the breakout session attended.
84% Strongly agreed that the presentations met expectations.

A sample of qualitative data based on the following questions:

Please let us know what you thought was most effective in today’s presentation:
The Q&A was very beneficial b/c we could hear from both sides of the house
The panelists were dynamic and successful women whom I enjoyed learning from &
listening to
Small group sessions
The ability to ask specific questions
Variety of experiences of panelists
Approachability of panelists
Breakout sessions
Breakout panel
Open discussion and honest answers
Hearing panelists’ different perspectives
I enjoyed the targeted breakout session which allowed me to ask more direct questions
It was a great experience in knowing how to find a right mentor and some career paths
Networking
Panel

What was least effective in today’s presentation?
N/A
Nothing
I wish there could have been a representative from the social science faculty
It was all good
I would have liked more staff/administrators on the panel
Panel seemed to be very faculty oriented
Small group

What kinds of programs would you like to see us offer in the future?
Continuing these conversations; how to navigate campus culture – how to get unstuck=changing careers across “the lines” = going from staff to faculty. Staff = transferring across departments within Student Affairs or into academic management
Advancement opportunities for staff, mentoring for staff and a focus on staff
Continued opportunities such as panels or programs focused on enhancing/development of competencies (budget, policy, governance)
Bystander Accountability (SAVIP office)
Advancement tips, leadership skills
Women – balancing home and work life
More panel sessions
A focus on faculty who are women of color
How to mentor “millennials”
Resume writing for professionals that have been employed for several years
Perhaps a session on how to be a good mentor, how to deal with difficult students
More of same
More in-depth discussions of particular topics
Mentoring workshop – including mentoring language and how to be an effective mentor
How to break ties with difficult students
When to mentor and when not to
Perhaps a session specifically aimed at different disciplines (separate liberal arts from hard science?)
Education on change management, position description/classification/salary negotiation, advocating for yourself, career goals clarification
More about leadership!
Gaining more responsibilities
360 degree competency from Nathan (Strong, I believe)
Skill building
Salary negotiation and sponsorship

New & Existing Policies

Submitted by: Robin DiPietro, Chair
Subcommittee members: Jan Breuer, Sara Corwin, Lauren Dattilo, Robin DiPietro, Karen Edwards, Alison Hogue, Susan Kuo, Courtney Littlejohn, Kathryn Luchok, Deanne Messias, Donna Richter, and Brooke Stillwell

Review of Family Friendly Policies

This year, the Subcommittee was asked to review the family-friendly policies and make recommendations from a perspective of recruitment and retention for improvements in University policies and practices relating to family-friendly policies and creating an atmosphere that supports dual career households. After an extensive review of
the family friendly policies the following questions and recommendations are put forth.

Questions:

The use of the terms “Option A, Option B, Option C” in the Tenure clock extension, post-tenure review extension, or Modified Duties for Faculty is misleading. It suggests that a faculty member pick only one of them, when clearly that is not what the provost’s office has in mind. For example, a faculty member could get an automatic one-year extension for the birth of a child and sometime later in their career get an extension because of serious illness. So, it would be more accurate to drop the term “Option”. The list could be numbered, instead. Or, given that the headings are underlined and bolded, they may not even need to be numbered.

It seems that some formatting would help in the clarity of the document, for example tabbing over to the left for “Review and Approval Process” and “Extension of the Tenure Clock and Third Year Review”.

Also, the “Basic Principles”, which appears below Option C seems to apply only to Option C but assume it applies to all 3 options. Perhaps this should say “Basic Principles for Request and Approval of an Extension” and it should be tabbed to the left similar to the above headings.

The statement regarding Eligibility for “Faculty Dual Career Accommodations” doesn’t read quite right. It states that “Eligibility applies to the spouse or partner of any potential faculty …” but it doesn’t say what the eligibility is for. But, the sentence after that says what a spouse who is not in an academic field is eligible for. Some of the bulleted items under “Process” suggest what the eligibility may be for. In any case, I think there needs to be some editing and clarity added to this section. It needs to be clearly stated what the University can and will do for spouses or partners if they are not academic- this is unclear. Don’t promise and then not deliver, if the University can only help with websites for job hunts, then say that specifically. Make sure that consistency is used throughout the University with the use of this policy.

For the latter section on modified duties, it is not as explicit as the tenure clock provisions as to deaths or serious illness of spouse/partner, child or parent--would those be allowable grounds and if so, could it be stated?

Could there also be a requirement that HR or Chairs and Institute Directors make faculty aware of these programs available to them--particularly when the faculty member comes to their chair or director when experiencing a negative life event, they be told of these options. We believe that these policies need to be reviewed in detailed during the faculty orientation process and then again during their first annual review to ensure comprehension and consistent application of the policies. It is important for all faculty members to know about the provisions and policies designed to protect our jobs when we experience negative life events.
Recommendations:

Our recommendation for the first point is to delete the letters and list them with the specific titles (e.g. Automatic one-year extension of maximum probationary period; Requested one-year extension of maximum probationary period; Provost approved one-to three-year extension of maximum probationary period).

Our recommendation for the section regarding Dual Career is that the process is obviously different for spouse/partner who is eligible/looking for an academic/faculty position (which falls under the Provost’s domain) or other employment (which falls under HR). The differences need to be more clearly stated in the policy.

One issue that should be raised is regarding extension of the tenure clock and how to address it in writing letters to external reviewers. We suggest that there be a more formalized statement that all units adhere to when writing letters to external reviewers regarding extensions of the tenure clock.

Recommendation Regarding Partner Benefits

This year, the Subcommittee was asked to make recommendations for improvements in University policies and practices relating to domestic partners. Currently The University of South Carolina does not use the term ‘domestic partner’ as it relates to any substantive benefits. The University does provide insurance and benefits to common law marriage partners, but not to same sex or opposite sex domestic partners. Domestic partners are not eligible for medical benefits or any form of insurance coverage. However, information provided by the Provost’s Office indicates that the University does refer to domestic partners in its family-friendly policies, and policies pertaining to extension of the tenure clock, third-year and post-tenure review, modified duties for faculty, and faculty dual career accommodation. Most recently, the University’s Plus One program extends benefits under the new EAP plan, access to University Libraries and recreational facilities to an individual, 18 years or older, who resides with an employee of USC. Though the program does not explicitly use the term ‘domestic partner,’ domestic partners would fall under the provision.

After an extensive study of partner benefits provided by universities regionally and across the nation as conducted in early 2013 (attached as Exhibit A to this report), the Subcommittee concludes that the University should consider providing domestic partners of faculty and staff with benefits equivalent or identical to those available to married partners as a recruitment and retention incentive. While our survey was limited to flagship state universities and does not capture historical information about when domestic partner benefits were adopted, the evidence seems to support the conclusion that there is a strong national trend toward full domestic partner benefits. For instance, of the 57 universities surveyed, 36 already offer medical benefits. This number includes 4 other SEC schools and 6 peer/peer-aspirant institutions (1 of these peer/peer-aspirant schools is also in the SEC). Life insurance is available for domestic partners at 25 of the universities surveyed, including 3 SEC schools and 4 peer/peer-aspirant institutions (1 of
Another extensive search was done of the top businesses in the state of South Carolina as well as a review of newspaper and magazine articles about the Fortune 500 businesses throughout the country. This search is summarized in Appendix B. Overall, it was reported that some of the largest companies in South Carolina offer domestic partner benefits while some of them offer benefits to legally married same sex spouses. More than 62% of Fortune 500 companies offer domestic partner benefits, as well.

Furthermore, there are currently 17 states and Washington DC that offer same sex marriage, and the trend is likely to continue. This trend will make it more likely that universities and businesses nationwide will implement domestic partner benefits. Without changes to current HR policies, the University of South Carolina may become further out of sync with the national trend. The University competes with other colleges and universities for talent, but they also compete with private industry and not being proactive in adopting partner benefits is a threat to the ability to recruit and retain good people. Accordingly, expanding the existing benefits available for domestic partners would likely improve the University’s ability to attract and retain highly qualified candidates for faculty and staff positions. Extending fair and equal benefits to all individuals and their domestic partners will increase worker productivity by reducing job turnover and enhancing employee job satisfaction. The university and the state of South Carolina gain.

In the University’s Policy on Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, it is stated that “the University of South Carolina is committed to a policy of equal opportunity and non-discrimination on the basis of the following protected classes [i.e.]: race, sex, gender, age, color, religion, national origin, disability, genetics, sexual orientation and veteran status.” Since the University does not offer partner benefits, it can be misinterpreted that sexual orientation is not protected as benefits are not extended to people with different sexual orientation than other couples.

For these reasons, we recommend that the University adopt a policy to define and cover domestic partners with benefits equal to married people that work at the University. We also recommend that the policy contain stipulations for what constitutes a domestic partner in order to avoid misuse of the policies created for domestic partners. The attached documents (Appendix A and B) provide samples of criteria used by universities and businesses in determining to domestic partner status.

_________________________

**Technology**

Submitted by: Aisha Haynes, Chair
Subcommittee members: Kathy Evans, Christy Friend, Karen Edwards, Aisha Haynes, and Xavery Hopkins
The technology subcommittee, in conjunction with the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) and the Division of Information Technology (DoIT), conducted thirteen (13) very successful technology workshops during the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 semesters. In total, two hundred and nineteen (219) faculty, staff and students from the University attended the workshops.

During the Fall 2013 semester, eight (8) technology sessions were conducted. Michele Branch-Frappier from the Division of Information Technology and Aisha Haynes from the Center for Teaching Excellence conducted a workshop on “PowerPoint Basics” in September. Evaluations were completed by attendees and the responses were very positive. One-hundred (100) percent of the twenty-five (25) attendees found the workshop “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”. Additionally in September, Aisha Haynes, Sherry Grosso and Leonora Bularzik – all from the Center for Teaching Excellence - conducted a “PowerPoint Intermediate” workshop. All twenty-two (22) attendees noted that the workshop “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”.

In October, Aisha Haynes and Sherry Grosso conducted a “PowerPoint Advanced” workshop. Sixteen (16) individuals attended the workshop. One-hundred (100) percent of the attendees found the workshop “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”. Michele Branch-Frappier also conducted a workshop in October entitled “Information Technology Security Basics”. Fifteen (15) individuals from the Carolina Community attended the workshop and all attendees found the workshop “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”.

During the month of November, two workshops were conducted. Michele Branch-Frappier conducted a workshop on “Microsoft Word Basics” and Sherry Grosso and Aisha Haynes presented on “Microsoft Excel Basics”. The “Microsoft Word Basics” workshop had ten (10) people in attendance. Seventy-one (71) percent of the attendees expressed that the workshop was “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”. Eighteen (18) individuals attended the “Microsoft Excel Basics” workshop and everyone found the workshop “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”.

In December, Sherry Grosso and Aisha Haynes presented on “Microsoft Excel Intermediate”. Eighteen (18) people attended the workshop and all individuals found the workshop “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”. The last workshop of the Fall 2013 semester was conducted by Michel Branch-Frappier on “Prezi Basics”. There were nineteen (19) USC Community members to attend the workshop and everyone thought that the workshop was “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”.

During the Spring 2014 semester, five (5) technology workshops were held. In January 2014, Sherry Grosso and Aisha Haynes from the Center for Teaching Excellence conducted a “Microsoft Excel Intermediate” workshop. Twenty-three (23) faculty, staff and students attended the workshop. In terms of the overall event rating, one-hundred percent of the attendees found the workshop “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”.

In February, Andrew Grimball from the Division of Information Technology conducted a workshop on “Managing your Digital Information”. Fourteen (14) individuals
attended the workshop. Ninety (90) percent of the attendees found the workshop “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”.

During the month of March, Kyle Brown from the Division of Information Technology presented on “Information Technology Security Basics”. There were four (4) people from the University to attend the workshop. All four (4) attendees thought that the workshop “Very Helpful”.

In April, Susan Quinn from University Technology Services (UTS) conducted a workshop on “Creating Websites with Google Sites”. Eighteen (18) individuals attended the workshop and all attendees noted that the workshop was “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”.

The final technology workshop, “Microsoft Word Developer”, was conducted by Leonora Bularzik from the Center for Teaching Excellence. A total of seventeen (17) members of the Carolina Community attended the workshop. Seventy-four (74) percent of the attendees found the workshop “Very Helpful” or “Helpful”.

**Ideas for Technology Workshops Participants would like to see in the Future**

- Microsoft Access
- More in-depth Microsoft Excel
- Excel PivotTables or GANT Charts
- Creating fill-able forms in Adobe
- Adobe Acrobat Intermediate
- Microsoft Outlook – using it for improved efficiency
- Microsoft Publisher
- Analytical software: SAS, STATA, SPSS
- Mobile Security for phones and tablets
- Microsoft PowerPoint
- How to Blog
- Using Social Media
- Excel Data Formulas
- More in-depth “What-if”, Count Functions and other functions in Excel
- Excel – More advanced data manipulation
- Advanced Excel
- Web-based instructional design workshops
- Building or designing instructional material utilizing web-based programs
- Intermediate and Advanced Google Sites courses
- Additional teaching technologies
- Emphasis on social media and guidelines for using social media in the workplace
- Advanced Prezi
- Google Presentations
- Photoshop
- Keeping kids safe when using Internet/social media
• Entire Microsoft Suite
• Filemaker
• Advanced Microsoft Word
• Specific Software to install to increase information technology security
• Sharepoint
• Writing workshop
• Using videos in adobe connect
• Blackboard

In conclusion, the technology subcommittee had a very successful year. Within the evaluations, attendees expressed interest in additional technology workshops. The subcommittee will attempt to conduct workshops that were requested and will continue to include additional individuals from the University to become presenters. The USC community has expressed their thanks to the PACWI Technology Subcommittee for hosting these workshops and is looking forward to learning additional technology skills during the Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 semesters.

Women Graduate Students

Submitted by: Danielle Schoffman, Chair
Subcommittee members: Caroline Bergeron, Lauren Dattilo, Kallie Metzger, Elizabeth Peeler, Tiffany Rogers, Danielle Schoffman, and Brittany Walter

This year, the Women Graduate Students Subcommittee (WGS) built off of the progress of the previous year by planning two sessions for the Women’s Leadership Institute (WLI) and beginning plans for an event to be held next year.

One of the sessions hosted by the WGS at the WLI was a panel discussion about “Promoting Gender Equality in the Workplace”. Responding to feedback we received on our hosted panel at the WLI last year, we included a staff member as a speaker and structured the questions to be applicable to a more general audience. We had three speakers on the panel: Dr. Helen Doerpinghaus, Dr. Xuhong Su, and Ms. Leslie Brunelli.

Questions were directed to each panelist to allow them to discuss an area of their expertise or personal experience.

Dr. Doerpinghaus: Discussed the benefits of gender equality for all people, including other marginalized groups (racial/ethnic minorities, LGBTQ individuals) and men.
Dr. Su: Discussed the translation of gender-based research about workplaces into policy, including challenges and successes she has seen in this area.
Ms. Brunelli: Discussed her experiences navigating a career in a male-dominated field, and where she has found support throughout her professional life.
Each panelist also responded to a general question about what we as women can do to support each other and help foster a better community of professionals. After mediator questions concluded, several audience questions were accepted.

The second session hosted by the WGS was focused on networking. At last year’s WLI the WGS attempted to hold a networking/mentoring session but it was not well attended. After brainstorming this year, we decided to focus one of our WLI panels on networking skills, as well as develop a plan for a networking “speed-dating” event to be held next fall (an event that will match women graduate students with female faculty for small group mentoring).

We hosted two speakers for the networking session at the WLI, Ms. Stuart Hunter and Ms. Georgia Doran.

- Ms. Hunter discussed the keys to finding a mentor and fostering a strong mentoring relationship.
- Ms. Doran discussed the keys to becoming a master networker and maximizing networking opportunities at conferences, etc.

The networking session was very interactive and participants left with concrete suggestions for developing their mentoring relationships and networking skills.

This year’s subcommittee worked well as a team, and communicated frequently through email and meetings between the general PACWI meetings. We look forward to another great year of programming and community building next year.

---

**Women’s Leadership Institute**

Submitted by: Mary Alexander, Chair  
Subcommittee members: Elizabeth Belle, Ashley Byrd-White, Jenna Eckel, Angela L. Foulks, Lydia Frass, Kaci W. Greene, Omega Honeywood, Annie Kelly, Bridget Leslie, Tessa McLain, Kim Rose, Catherine Sale, Maria Sophocleous, Deborah Staley, Amy Teixeira, Alissa Thebarge, Erin Wilson, Patsy Yarborough, and Summer Yarborough.

The Women’s Leadership Institute is designed for faculty, staff, and graduate students from SC institutions of higher education who are interested in the advancement and success of women in leadership roles. The Institute featured workshops, interactive presentations, and a networking luncheon centered on promoting greater awareness of the challenges and opportunities women face as they seek to achieve a work/life balance.

We had over 330 women from eleven institutions across the state of South Carolina attend this year. We also offered free skin cancer screenings and Earthfare set up a table during registration to display healthy choices.

This year, the institute opened with the keynote speaker, Katherine Swartz director of the Center for Leadership at Columbia College. She discussed the pillars needed to become a leader. In addition, 20 workshops were offered based on specific topics: Well-Being,
Meeting Your Needs, Career Advancement and the graduate school has their own track. The lunchtime speaker was Patrice Roberts from SisterCare. She discussed the mission of this great organization.

Featured Topics included:

**Well Being**
- Sexual Harrassment
- Women’s Fertility
- The Whirlwind: Life Inside of an Abusive Relationship
- Prioritizing Healthy Eating When You’re a Woman on the Move
- Verbal Judo
- SharePoint - Mapping your Course to Collaboration

**Trade: Meeting Your Needs**
- Start $mart Salary Negotiation
- What’s in Your Pocketbook?
- Navigating Workplace Drama
- Social Media for Professional Development
  *Maegan Gudridge*
- Network Security
- Boss or B#tch – Misperceptions about Women’s Leadership

**Trade: Career Advancement**
- Women in Public Speaking – How to Become an Excellent Public Speaker
- Leadership Strategies in Development of
  *Multi-Disciplinary Research Centers*
- The Complex Process of Human Communication
- Leadership through Strategic Planning
- Assessment . . . And Why It Should Matter To You

**Trade: Graduate Students**
Graduate Students, we also have a networking workshop in the morning and a panel discussion in the afternoon to help you navigate the new chapter in your life!

- Networking
- Panel: Promoting Gender Equality in the Workplace

The survey results we received to date from the participants were all very positive with some great suggestions on topics for next year.