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The Commission for Women presents this 1976-77 Annual Report to you as a member of the total academic community in the belief that you will care about and act upon the issues, problems, recommendations and progress of the Commission.
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INTRODUCTION

Original conceptions of our country's educational system, policies and practices reflected the prevailing belief that men and women were destined to assume different life roles. The power and limiting effect of these sex-role stereotypes breaks down slowly. It was not until 1972, when Title IX of the Educational Amendments passed that Congress recognized that many discriminatory policies and practices were based upon these long standing traditions and unexamined assumptions about the appropriate roles of men and women in society. Therefore Congress asked educators to participate in a self-evaluation process to examine their current policies and practices for sex bias, to modify policies and practices that discriminate on the basis of sex, and to design solutions which ameliorate the effects of past discrimination.

It is a significant positive fact that the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, appointed its Task Force on Women in December of 1971. In a comprehensive report, the Task Force presented data that indicated the obvious as well as the subtle effects of sex role assumptions upon advising and personal life choices, career decisions, curriculum content, and upon hiring and employment practices. A series of recommendations were offered and this report reflects the continuing effort to implement those recommendations.

The format of this Annual Report is similar to last year's in that the complete minutes of meetings are not provided; rather, the primary focuses of Commission concerns are discussed in a chronological developmental format enabling the reader to examine each issue and priority as an integrated whole. If the full minutes are needed for reference, they are on file with the CFW materials in the Women's Center.

We present the progress on seven priority areas of commission concern in the year 1976-77. They are:

Affirmative Action
Clerical Issues
Salary
Title IX and Women's Athletics
Women's Center
Publicity
Women in Academia

The report concludes with a discussion of priorities for the future.
It is important to review the charge to the CFW. The UTK Commission for Women is appointed by the Chancellor to advise on planning, implementation, and evaluation of University programs, policies, and services designed to improve the status of women. The Commission relates administratively to the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration.

The Commission:

1. recommends changes in policy or procedure relative to the concerns of women;
2. facilitates coordination of new and existing academic and extracurricular programs;
3. recommends and encourages research to assess the status of women at UTK and compares their status with that of women at other institutions and agencies;
4. assists in the evaluation and revision of the Affirmative Action plan.
5. advises and consults with all University officials on the needs and status of women; and,
6. aids in ensuring campus and community access to information on Commission and University activities related to women.

As we look back over the past year it is clear that a real momentum for change in attitudes and practices toward women has been established. It is critical that we do not backtrack in our efforts to create a more equitable university community. Recent studies reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education indicate that for the first time, university enrollment of female students exceeds that of male students 52% to 48%. Hence, the urgency for erasing any discriminatory beliefs or practices that would discount the majority of students at our universities.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The Commission had 3 priorities in reference to affirmative action this year.

Priorities
1. Publication of hiring policies and procedures.
2. Clearly defined grievance procedures.
3. Emphasis upon recruitment of female faculty and administrators.

After the successful beginning of Affirmative Action programs in 1976-77, the CFW has continued to work closely in 1976-77 with Chancellor Reese and Dr. Ebersole to further implement this important plan. The plan was restructured and put into effect on January 1, 1977.
With the leadership of the subcommittee members, Sarah Blanshei, Sammie Wynn, and Mary Richards, the Affirmative Action plan was reviewed by the CFW and eight areas of concern were identified. A memo was drafted and sent to Dr. Ebersole voicing these concerns and recommending possible changes. Five of these changes were adopted (Ebersole memo dated December 30). The Commission was pleased with overall high level specificity of the plan. It is a helpful vehicle for equity on this campus if administrators, faculty and students will read it and conform to procedures.

The Commission suggested that Central Administration take several steps to insure implementation of the plan:
1. The chancellor was requested to release a special newsletter on Affirmative Action.
2. Hiring procedures be summarized in some way that administrators could refer to and implement them easily.
3. Provide sources for location of qualified women.
4. Commission for Women representation on search committees particularly at administrative levels.

Action

An excellent Chancellor's Newsletter was released August 16, 1977, incorporating the philosophy of Affirmative Action, the EEO report, the complaint procedure, salary equalization, MBO, recruiting procedures, Title IX and the role of the Affirmative Action Co-ordinator. It would be helpful if administrators and faculty would keep their copy available for ready reference and as a reminder of our commitment to Affirmative Action.

Dr. Ebersole and staff developed a permission-to-recruit form to encourage compliance with Affirmative Action guidelines.

Dr. Herndon, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, released a helpful summary of principles and procedures to Deans, Directors, and Department Heads which leaves no doubt about the exact steps that are to be taken in hiring personnel at UTK. (Memo, May 5, 1977.)

These are important examples of the effects of a University Central Administration working in cooperation with, rather than opposition to, a Commission for Women. Commitment to and implementation of Affirmative Action processes increase the probability that greater numbers of women and minorities will be hired, hence lending strength through diversity to the total institution.
TO:        Dr. Judith Kuipers  
FROM: Luke Ebersole  
SUBJECT: Recommendations from the Commission for Women with Regard to the Revised UTK Affirmative Action Plan  

We appreciate the careful consideration given by the Commission for Women to the draft of the revised Affirmative Action Plan and the opportunity to talk through and clarify the suggestions with you. As you requested, now that the Plan has been finalized and sent to Graphic Arts for duplicating, we are responding to each of the points listed in your memorandum.  

1. Page 13: As we agreed, Item B-2 under "Implementation" has been modified to include communication. In the Plan which is distributed, the last sentence will read: "It is the responsibility of Deans and Directors to ensure that criteria for promotion and tenure established within their respective colleges and schools are appropriate, not inadvertently discriminatory, described as precisely as possible, and communicated to faculty." The first sentence of this item is unchanged.  

2. Page 15: As we agreed, we checked with Mr. Edward Bennett about the design of the Carpenter-Apprenticeship Program, since it is externally funded. The program is designed for both male and female minorities. We have, therefore, modified the description to: "This program is designed to train minority males and females in the carpentry trade."  

3. We continue to feel strongly that the section on "Faculty and Other Instructional Staff" (Page 32) is necessary to indicate suggestions for possible special efforts which could be taken by units in which underutilization has been identified. The section on "Terminations" on Page 39 is a part of the monitoring effort, not the affirmative action effort per se.  

In order to incorporate the Commission's point about inclusion of men in the section on "Terminations" (Page 39), the first sentence in Item A has been modified to read: "The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Graduate Studies and Research will send a questionnaire to all full-time, permanent faculty who choose to leave UTK to assess the reasons for employment termination, and will prepare a monthly summary of the reasons cited for responses." The second and third sentences of Item A remain unchanged.
Item B on Page 39 has also been modified. The first sentence of Item B now reads: "The UTK Personnel Office will send a questionnaire to all full-time, permanent administrative and professional personnel who choose to leave UTK to assess the reasons for employment termination, and will prepare a monthly summary of the reasons cited in responses. The second and third sentences of Item B and all of Item C remain unchanged.

4. Page 40: Salary Review. This section has been retitled "Salary Studies and Salary Equalization" for clarification. The section has also been expanded in order to clarify its points. Currently, we are required to have goals, timetables, and other specific affirmative action programs for minorities which constitute a significant percent of our population. If minorities other than Blacks become a significant percent, then we would move to implement the same kinds of studies and programs. At present, however, we believe that we should concentrate on Blacks, women, the handicapped, and Veterans covered under the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1974.

The revised Section IV (Page 40) is:

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration is responsible for ensuring that the annual study of the salaries of UTK male and female faculty members is made by the Office of Institutional Research. The Affirmative Action Coordinator will oversee the preparation of the report.

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration will also initiate, in 1977, an annual study of comparative salaries of Black and white UTK faculty members. The study will be made by the Office of Institutional Research, and the Affirmative Action Coordinator will oversee its preparation.

The annual salary study of male and female faculty salaries is utilized as one means of identifying salaries of individual women which may be inequitable. In the annual process of examining women's salaries and correcting inequities, the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration meets with each Vice Chancellor to discuss the salary of each faculty, administrative, or professional staff member in units reporting to the respective Vice Chancellor. The study and an ancillary document listing average salaries for each faculty rank by department and salaries for administrative and professional employees are examined, and the salary of each female is reviewed.

The results of the central review are provided to Deans and Directors, who, together with department and unit heads, make recommendations for equity adjustments as part of the budgeting process.

The process of salary equalization is designed to take into account not only the quantitative factors assessed in the annual salary study and ancillary report, but also professional judgment of the individual's performance in the department or unit.

If the comparative study of Black and white faculty salaries indicates possible inequities in salaries of Blacks, the process described above will be utilized for equalization.
The annual report to the UTK community on Affirmative Action efforts will describe the year's process.

5. We do not believe it would be possible to reduce all the affirmative action steps to a brief statement of policy and have the policy properly reviewed and approved for inclusion in the revised Affirmative Action Plan, if it is to take effect on schedule. We shall reconsider the possibility of doing this at the time of the 1977 annual report to the UTK community on Affirmative Action efforts.

6. As we agreed, we have modified Item F on Page 48 to indicate the availability of guidelines. The Affirmative Action Coordinator is in the process of preparing the summary guidelines. Item F, under "Item" now reads: "Copies of the Affirmative Action Plan and summary guidelines will be available for use by all search committees, groups, and individuals responsible for identifying qualified applicants for UTK positions."

7. Form: "Affirmative Action Report" (Page 41). The following question has been added to the form, as No. 4, with the succeeding questions being renumbered 5, 6, 7, and 8: "If Blacks, women, handicapped individuals, Vietnam Era or disabled veterans were not hired, explain the reasons." In addition, the definition of "Affirmative Action" given on Page 4 has been added to the bottom of both this form and the "Request to Search" form (Page 17).

We certainly promote equal employment opportunity for all applicants and employees, but, as was discussed in Item 4 above, we believe our current affirmative action efforts must be directed toward Blacks, women, handicapped individuals and veterans covered under the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Act.

The form does accompany appointment papers, as indicated in the instructions for completion of it.

We hope you will express our thanks to the Commission for their assistance in reviewing the draft of the revised Plan. If, after the Plan is distributed, there are additional recommendations from the Commission, I would be glad to receive them and discuss them with the Commission.

rh
December 1, 1976

Dr. Luke Ebersole
Vice Chancellor for Administration and Planning
506 Andy Holt Tower
CAMPUS

Dear Dr. Ebersole:

At the last meeting of Committee W of the Knoxville chapter of the AAUP, your letter to us of July 6, 1976, was reread and discussed. In that letter you responded to our proposals regarding various salary issues which we set forth in letters to you and to Dr. Herndon, dated June 30, 1976.

Of our five proposals, we were pleased to note that four had been taken into early consideration. We are wondering, however, about the status of the first one:

that complete information on individual salaries, which is public information and available in Nashville, also be available at some neutral location on the UT-Knoxville campus, such as the Payroll Office or the office of an affirmative action officer, and that anyone who wishes to examine it be permitted to do so.

Have the Vice Chancellors and Chancellor had an opportunity to discuss this proposal now that the summer vacation period is behind us, as you suggested in your letter that they might?

Since we are aware of the ambiguity with which faculty members assess their salaries and their hesitancy to initiate a salary review without knowing how their salaries compare to those of their colleagues, we would like to encourage a favorable response to our proposal.

In the event that it is decided that such action should
not be taken at this time, perhaps it would be in the best interests of the UTK-AAUP to secure its own copy of the information to have available for those who wish to examine it.

We are concerned that the salary review procedure be as effective as possible in its operation, and it is in this spirit that we make our request.

Sincerely,

Paula J. Nassen, chairperson
UTK-AAUP Committee W
713 McClung Tower

cc: Dr. Walter Herndon
Dr. Paula J. Nassen, Chairperson
UTK-AAUP Committee W
713 McClung Tower
CAMPUS

Dear Dr. Nassen:

The Chancellor and the Vice Chancellors have again discussed alternative ways of making salary information available to persons to whom it would be useful in assessing their own situation. We are unanimous in believing that it is essential for each individual to have an appropriate means of learning his or her salary standing both in relation to the University as a whole and within the immediate group of colleagues.

The ultimate deterrent to a decision to make individual salary information widely available continues to be strong concern regarding the personal right to privacy in this matter. We believe that the wish for privacy with regard to salary is preponderant among faculty and staff. We are eager, therefore, to achieve the objective which we all share without violating the privacy principle to which we attach considerable importance.

Under usual circumstances the most appropriate source of salary information is the department head, inasmuch as it is the department head who has primary responsibility for the evaluation process and for correlative salary recommendations. The department head, better than anyone else, can communicate the relative salary position of an individual along with reasons for it. Moreover, in this context salary position can be conveyed without intruding upon the privacy of any other person. The Vice Chancellors will again reinforce with department heads the importance of defining as precisely as possible the salary position of any individual who may wish this information.

When an individual feels that salary should be reviewed with someone other than the department head, the Dean or the appropriate Vice Chancellor will welcome the opportunity to discuss salary position with any member of the faculty or staff. Although the department head will usually be able to give the most complete interpretation of salary position, the Dean and the Vice Chancellor can provide full information regarding relative salary status.

We want to assure you and members of your committee of the availability of the Vice Chancellors to discuss salary position with any individual and
further that every effort will be made to stress again the importance of providing the fullest salary information possible by all persons having evaluative and salary recommending responsibilities.

Sincerely,

Luke Ebersole
Vice Chancellor

cc: Chancellor Jack Reese
Susan Whitney, Affirmative Action Coordinator, worked closely with the Commission this year beginning with an explanation of her role. It involves working with different departments to insure their attention to Affirmative Action procedures. She developed a flow chart on how to recruit and a higher education resources list to aid in searching for new staff personnel (November 17, 1976.) The Commission asked Dr. Ebersole to make these items available to every department who was filling vacancies. CFW members discussed better methods for locating qualified women for positions which occur at UTK and each member assumed responsibility for locating qualified women in their particular area.

Members also expressed real concern about myths that still prevail in reference to the academic working woman. If the reader is unaware of such myths we have included a copy of those listed in the 1971 report for your information. Take time to read them, they are most interesting. (Appendix I)

Central administration would not agree to a specific CFW slot on every major search committee stating that such committees would be cumbersome if every interested group on campus requested representation. However, other steps were taken to insure representation of the women's perspective.

a. Dr. Ebersole discussed the composition of search committees with CFW members before committees were selected.

b. Four CFW members were asked to serve on search committees.

c. Dr. Reese did ask a CFW member to serve on the Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance search committee.

d. Search committees for the Deanship positions in Education and Liberal Arts provided special opportunities for CFW members to participate in the interview process of candidates brought to campus. It is a significant negative fact that there were no women interviewees for Deanships on this campus.

Results

While there was distinct progress made in developing procedures and processes for more equitable recruiting, the true test of their effectiveness is the number of women hired. The university did not hire females in any major administrative position during the 1976-77 academic year.

We requested a brief report from the Affirmative Action Coordinator, to be submitted in Fall, 1977, that presents a gain-loss record in women faculty.

CLERICAL ISSUES

The CFW has continued to be concerned about the status of
clerical and supporting staff at UTK. Barbara Baldwin, Evelyn Bales, and Nan Scott formed the subcommittee who worked with this issue. They met with the Employee Relations Committee and other interested persons to ascertain their current concerns. The subcommittee also assisted them in locating channels for solving problems which had previously been identified.

Perhaps the greatest step forward in this area was the acceptance by Chancellor Reese of the Commission's recommendation that a member of the Employee Relations Committee be placed on the CFW. Chancellor Reese stated that this would occur when new Commission members are appointed for 1977-78. This action will increase opportunity for the Commission to be helpful to a majority sector of UTK female employees.

Priorities

1. Increasing availability of job descriptions.
2. Change in employer notification policy.
3. Reasons need to be given for denial of re-classification.
4. Notification through channels that there is no quota system at the various levels of supporting staff.

Action

1. E.K. Bennett responded with the following memo.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Stan Bohne
FROM: E. K. Bennett
SUBJECT: Commission for Women Report

Listed below are my comments on the four items pertaining to Personnel outlined on page 4 of the annual report submitted by the Commission for Women:

1. Every employee has been furnished a copy of his/her job description and a complete set of job descriptions are available in the Personnel Office. Employees are welcome to review this manual at any time. It would be entirely too expensive to reproduce.

2. Employees seeking a transfer must indicate that they have notified their supervisor of their intent to transfer before they go on an interview. Some supervisors take this as a personal affront and do attempt to penalize the employee for seeking a transfer; however, it seems to me that we should correct this shortcoming with individual supervisors rather than changing good personnel procedure.

3. When a job is audited it is done to determine whether it is properly classified or not. If it is not properly classified, we recommend the appropriate classification. To state specific reasons why a reclassification is denied would require a comparison between the audited job and all other classifications. If a department head requests that a job be reaudited for the purpose of upgrade (which is not proper) to a specific classification, we attempt to explain to the department head why the job is not upgraded.
4. There are no quotas placed on classifications and we explained this to the Commission for Women and to all other groups on campus that we have met with. We could outline this in a future article in Staff Stuff.

Should you wish additional information, please let me know.
2. However, there are clear discrepancies in these procedures as evidenced by the following letter.
MEMO

TO: All faculty and Staff, College of Education
FROM: E. Dale Doak
SUBJECT: Executive Committee Activity Concerning Classified Personnel
DATE: February 7, 1977

Attached is a report of a subgroup of the Executive Committee. It is circulated to you for information and so that you will be aware of our concern and activities in this area. We are involved in a continuing effort to implement the recommendations of this report.

su
In the fall of 1976 we began to investigate various policies relating to clerical and supporting personnel on this campus with specific focus on the College of Education support personnel. The study was implemented because of growing concern about lack of communication, about seeming arbitrary practices followed by the Personnel Office in matters of classification and salary adjustment, and numerous other miscellaneous concerns. After some preliminary probing of all of the issues, it was decided that the study should focus upon three basic questions. These included:

1. Who develops policy for supporting personnel, especially regarding the classification system and salary matters?
2. What is the function of the Personnel Office on this campus and to whom does the Director of Personnel report?
3. What is the classification system and how is it to be implemented?

Extensive sessions were held with Ed Bennett, Director of Personnel, and Stanley Bohne, Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance. The following basic generalizations resulted from these meetings:

1. The basic function of the Personnel Office is administration of the clerical and support personnel system within
University policy. It is not a policy-formulating operation, although Ed Bennett sits in on some groups which do have influence on policy. Basic functions include personnel recruitment, classification of positions, and development of employee training program.

2. The Director of Personnel, Ed Bennett, reports to the Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance, Stanley Bohne.

3. Policy is formulated at two levels: University (by the President's staff) and campus (by the Chancellor's staff). Communication is supposedly accomplished with each of the President's and the Chancellor's staff interacting with his constituency. Operationally there appears to have been little interaction with academic units on this campus. Policy formulation for support personnel and communication regarding these policies once formulated has been limited, and in some cases policy appears to be a rather closely guarded secret. No policy manual exists which addresses the issues of classification, salary flexibility, long-range plans for adjusting our relatively unsatisfactory competitive position with other area agencies, etc.

4. It is impossible to obtain comparative data regarding the position of our supportive staff with supportive staff in other academic units.
5. There is a strong push from the Personnel Office to study the classification of each position in this college.

6. The two persons interviewed demonstrated seeming surprise at our dissatisfaction with the system; and by inference, it was suggested that we were alone in our dissatisfaction (excluding general concern regarding our non-competitive salary position).

7. Mr. Bohne promised to take our concerns to the Chancellor's staff. On 12/30/76 Mr. Bohne reported that he had visited with Chancellor Reese briefly about this, but that it had not been a topic for discussion in a staff meeting. He again promised that he would get it on the agenda.

8. No satisfactory answers were forthcoming on the classification process. Questions such as the following were not satisfactorily answered: - Is the position or the role incumbent classified? - Are principal secretary positions usually reserved for Vice Chancellor and above level administrative offices? - Why are there such obvious discrepancies between soft and hard money positions?

With these generalizations in mind, and with our general level of dissatisfaction concerning the system, the following actions are recommended:

1. We should refuse a restudy of classification of positions within our College until questions regarding the process are satisfactorily resolved.
2. We should request that this report be circulated to all campus deans and the topic be made an agenda item for one of the Dean's Council meetings in the near future.

3. We should move to:
   a. internally recognize those support staff who are making exceptional contributions to the University both in quality and length of service;
   b. develop an internal procedure for coordination of our personnel efforts; i.e., consistency in classification, salary, and communication.
The Commission believes that these discrepancies need careful examination by Dr. Herndon and the Employee Relations Committee and real efforts exerted to solve promotion and reclassification problems. High quality supportive staff often "make the difference" in high quality production in a department and it is imperative that this university provide work settings and opportunities that are as fair and equitable as possible.

Joe Robustelli, Commission member and a Personnel officer, studied current job titles with male and female root words in an attempt to provide non-sexist titles. A list has been completed and Robustelli is to be complimented for his excellent work.

**SALARY**

Within the past few years we have heard about the difficulty women have had in receiving any equity from their institutions and the slowness of enforcement by Federal agencies. The following list indicates more positive moves nationally within the past few years in our struggle for equity.

1. Minnesota State University has recently agreed to pay $63,000 in back pay for inequitable pay policies.
2. The U.S. District judge has ruled in favor of four faculty members at Montana State University who sued on the grounds that MSU discriminated. Seventeen women will share $38,600 in back pay.
3. Brown University has agreed to pay $29,495 to a psychiatric social worker who had charged the university with sex discrimination.
4. Temple University has agreed to pay $150,000 to 90 female service workers for discriminatory pay practices.
5. The U.S. Department of Justice has filed a civil suit against Pima County Community College on behalf of six women there.
6. HEW has begun proceedings to cut off an estimated $5-7 million in federal contracts from Southern Illinois University because of discriminatory practices at SIU.
7. The Department of Justice is seeking to join in a private suit against Texas A & M University system.
8. The Department of Labor has found USC in violation of the Equal Pay Act and has recommended approximately $70,000 in back wages be paid to 27 women professors.
9. The University of Pennsylvania has offered $70,000 in partial settlement of a suit brought against the University by one faculty member.
10. Tufts University has agreed to pay $6,000 to a woman who had filed a sex discrimination charge against the institution.
11. In fiscal year 1974, $6.8 million in back pay was awarded under the Equal Pay Act to nearly 17,000 workers.

12. The University of Montana has paid $88,000 in back pay to 39 women.

13. Rutgers paid a psychology professor $6,400 as a result of her discrimination suit.

Inequities in salaries for women have been a continuing concern of the Commission here at UTK. A Salary Study is conducted annually by the Office of Institutional Research at UTK. The Commission was particularly interested in assessing inequities between the salaries of male and female faculty. The major focus of this concern last year was basically twofold: to familiarize members with the strengths and weaknesses of the existing surveys and secondly, to recommend changes to improve the quality of future surveys.

**Priorities 1976**

1. Clarification of the equalization process.
2. Notification to employees of assignment of equity monies.

**Action**

Central administration has made a definite, concrete commitment over the past three years to salary equalization by assigning equity increments to colleges and departments.

At the October 19 meeting, the Commission commended the administration for the process of identifying inequities, especially the step that includes careful examination of every salary by at least two Vice Chancellors. However, the Commission pointed out that there was a communication and process breakdown in some departments. Women receiving inequity monies were not notified ahead of time, the money was given without explanation, and in at least two cases the Department Head deducted the equity money from the overall merit raise. Dr. Ebersole and staff have agreed to examine Department Head and Dean accountability in future assignments of equity monies.

Dr. Reese's August 19 Newsletter informed every employee of their right to question their salaries through channels at any time.

The University Salary Study was released in April. The Commission felt that the narrative description of the study was much stronger this year and the study did indicate a decrease in the differential of male and female salaries within rank. However,
the picture will not be complete until data on tenure and promotion are examined.

Dr. Ebersole and Betsey Creekmore attended the May 11 meeting to respond to questions which members had regarding the study. Data validity and analysis were discussed with no concrete answers found for some obvious discrepancies. The Commission felt that this study far surpassed the previous one, but hopes that errors in the data will be eliminated and some obvious discrepancies be clarified. This issue will continue to be foremost for the Commission for Women.

In summary, there has been definite progress over the past few years in eliminating salary inequities between men and women on this campus. A procedure has been developed to identify inequities, monies have been assigned to colleges where inequities occurred, and employees have the right to question their salaries at any time. We express our appreciation to University administration for real progress made; but at the same time, caution that this is an area that must be monitored very carefully due to the extremely wide variability in beliefs, policies and procedures within and between departments and colleges.

TITLE IX AND WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

Priorities

1. Incorporate specific Title IX guidelines to support women's athletics here at UTK.
2. Provide supportive role to new Director of Women's Athletics.
3. Pursue financial resources for women's athletics
4. Attendance at women's athletic events.

Action

The Commission, through the use of Title IX has been especially significant in promoting women's athletics on the UTK campus. Pat Ball, Mary Ellen McLoughlin, and Sharon Soldano served on this subcommittee while Gloria Ray evaluated compliance with Title IX in women's athletics. Dr. Ebersole stated in a memo that the report on UTK Title IX self-evaluation was on file in his office and might be reviewed by members of the Commission. Also, copies are on file in the Main Library. Deans, Directors, and members of the E.E.O. committee were also sent copies on November 14, 1976.

Pat Ball recommended comparing UTK's model with that of the University of Utah which is considered exemplary. A copy of that
At the January 26, 1977 meeting, Chancellor Reese stated that cases and decisions by Congress would determine the direction of UTK's compliance with Title IX. At this time, Mary Ellen McLoughlin reported on the meeting between members of the subcommittee and Dr. Mike Brookshire, who had reported on steps taken by the Systems Personnel Office to insure compliance with Title IX. The CFW members informed him of concerns about lack of visible Affirmative Action procedures in UT System's search approach. Chancellor Reese expressed his appreciation for the progress that Dr. Brookshire has made in organizing Systems Personnel hiring procedures. However, the Chancellor was disappointed to learn that vacancies will not be listed for job openings within the system.

At the April 27 meeting, Joanna Allman, a doctoral student, presented copies of the measuring instrument she will use to study Title IX (sexism) on the UTK campus. She met with the Title IX subcommittee to determine if the Commission could use the instrument in some manner as an aid for determining campus compliance. The Commission agreed that the instrument UT used was not constructed to ferret out lack of compliance.

The Commission was extremely proud of Gloria Ray's outstanding job this year with women's athletics. There was concern that more attention was not given to them by city papers, especially in view of the women's basketball team honors. They did, however, hold their own awards banquet and the Chairperson of the CFW participated.

Next year, the Commission would like to see greater attention given to outstanding women athletes, both by the administration and the press.

On November 13, a reception was held for women athletes encouraging university-wide support and to encourage attendance at events. The commission suggests that there be a 2 ticket system developed in order that spectators who want to see female competition, but don't have tickets to the male competition, may attend basketball games.

Judy Kuipers, Chairperson of the Commission for Women, was asked to serve on the Women in Athletics Advisory Committee as per request for Commission representation in last year's report.

PROMOTION AND TENURE

Priorities

1. Investigation of promotion and tenure issues.
2. Identifying methods and a vehicle for study of tenure and promotion procedures.

**Action**

Promotion and tenure for women is a primary focus of the Commission. On October 19, Dr. Ebersole stated that this area needed further study suggesting that the Commission raise significant questions and then Institutional Research would conduct data collection and analysis.

Members serving on the subcommittee were Sandra Bell, Roger Nooe, and Mary Ellen McLoughlin. These members assumed the responsibility of defining these questions and determining areas of CFW input into the study. Variables suggested follow with each item subdivided by rank, tenure, status, and sex.

a. MBO ratings for last year.

b. Number of publications.
   (1) total (if possible. Would the Graduate School have this information for the professorial ranks?)
   (2) last 3 years.

c. Length of full-time service.
   (1) UTK
   (2) total for college or university teaching

d. Number of years in current rank.

e. Highest degree obtained.

Difficulties were encountered when criteria used by different department heads and the inconsistency of the MBO data were examined. The Commission agreed that access to other universities' promotion and tenure studies might be helpful and letters were sent for such information to the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Michigan. Pittsburgh had no data but the University of Michigan shared information late in May that will assist the Commission next year in its attempt to obtain a rigorous study.

On February 9, Sandra Bell reported that the Faculty Senate had met and discussed promotion and tenure. A statement of recommended policies and procedures for each department to follow regarding tenure review was passed "in spirit". The Commission was disappointed that more definitive action was not taken.

On May 3, Dr. Ebersole asked the status of the Commission's work on questions for Institutional Research. Sandra Bell explained that there were several variables which might skew the data, thus distorting the picture of campus efforts in this matter. However, the Commission plans to continue a diligent effort to isolate meaningful variables and design questions for
research which will accurately indicate the amount of discrepancy in promotion and tenure for women across the campus.

WOMEN'S CENTER

The 1971 Task Force report recommended that a women's center be established on campus with a full-time director. On October 19, 1976, Cindy Straub, the new Director, reported that the center was open.

The Women's Center is the coordinating unit for women's programs on the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, campus. As a result of the Student Activities Office, the Center functions as a resource for all University departments and organizations in the areas of women's programs and activities. The Center is located in Room 301, The University Center, 974-4160.

Three areas have been identified as the priority objectives for the Women's Center:

1. The development of a base for the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs for women. Programs initiated by the Women's Center focus on the educational development of the campus community with regard to women's needs and issues. Leadership skills, national and regional trends, appreciation of the arts and artists, social concerns, and historical perspectives are some of the broad categories in which programs are implemented. The broad program responsibility is accomplished by the Women's Center staff in two ways. Major programs are planned and implemented by the Women's Coordinating Council, and a student committee under the auspices of the Center and the staff advisor. Also many programs and services are undertaken within the existing structure of the Student Activities Office where a major responsibility of the Women's Center advisor is to stimulate a more pronounced consciousness for women's concerns and women as resources throughout the SAE staff. To these ends, the staff advisor is developing and maintaining an on-going file of program ideas, including artists, performers, and speakers from all fields.

2. The expansion and circulation of the collection of media resources about women. Current literature newsletters, magazines, video tapes and films are being collected and organized for the Center. Many of these media resources are currently available for use in the Center. Other types of resources are offered in the Center, such as lists of campus, community, and regional resource persons and their speciality areas, and information from Women's Centers and Women's Studies programs from other schools and communities. The emphasis is on the collection of popular resources for wide circulation and the compilation
of files and listings for program development.

3. The creation of a comprehensive information exchange service on all types of women's activities occurring throughout the campus. The publication and distribution of a campus newsletter and the availability of a bulletin board and a women's calendar in the center are our primary means of communicating these activities. The newsletter contains information on UTK course offerings of particular interest to women, services available for women on campus and in the community, news on women's organizations and programs, etc. Through an up-to-date compilation of the programs and services for women offered by other University departments and organizations, the Center maintains a campus and community referral service as well.

An integral part of the Women's Center is the volunteer support advanced by the Women's Coordinating Council. The WCC is the campus organization charged with primary responsibility for the development and coordination of women's programs. Students are trained in leadership development, program design and production promotional methods, budget development as well as expanding their awarenesses of the national trends and issues concerning women.

Priorities

1. To meet in the Center, thereby lending visibility to both the Center and the Commission.
2. Feed to the Center ideas for activities that meet needs of UTK women.
3. Support Women Center's activities and programs through committee work and co-sponsorship.

Action

The Center was very active this year. Women's Health Week was held in February and included guest speakers such as Marlene Sanders, Vice-President of ABC News; Chris Smithers, and Anita Johnson. A Women's Colloquium was held every third Wednesday of the month and was well attended.

To aid in promoting awareness of women's activities on campus, a newsletter was distributed. An additional service of the Women's Center was to maintain a file on job opportunities for women.

On May 2, the Women's Center and CFW co-sponsored an afternoon reception for female UTK athletes in the Student Center.
On May 25, two members of the Women's Coordinating Council, Nancy-Ann Minn and Lisa Atchin, spoke to the CFW. They explained future programs for 1977-78, which will include major themes of relationships, lifestyles, and transition, and requested support from the Commission for next year's programs.

Fliers which explain the services of the Women's Center are being distributed by Engineering and other colleges to various guidance counselors across the state. The Commission hopes young women considering college and UTK will become aware of the purposes of the Center.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS FOR WOMEN'S STUDIES

At the meeting of February 23, the Commission was informed that the National Women's Studies Association was seeking a location for a national headquarters. The members delayed a decision on whether they would suggest that UTK be considered as the site until several areas had been explored, such as cost, time involved, and facilities needed. Upon receiving this information, the Commission decided to express their desire to have the headquarters located at UTK. Cindy Straub and Cathy Farmer drew up a statement which outlined the feasibility of housing a national headquarters and the Chairperson sent this to Dr. Ebersole. A letter was sent asking that UTK be seriously considered as the home for this organization. However, the University of Maryland was later designated as the site of the national headquarters.

WOMEN IN SCIENCE WORKSHOP

Priorities

The CFW puts priority on the encouragement of women to pursue careers in science.

Action

Dr. Suzanne Kurth, Dr. Margaret Perry, Dr. Jo Lynn Cunningham, Dr. Linda Painter, and Dr. Judith Kuipers conceived a Women in Science workshop proposal and submitted it for funding to N.S.F. Funding was obtained and under the leadership of Suzanne Kurth, Project Director, a Women in Science Workshop was held at the University Center January 14 and 15, 1977. The goal of the workshop was to encourage women to pursue careers in all areas of
science by providing them information on the following content:

"The Funding Game: Research, Grants and Post-Doctorates.  
Joyce Lazar, National Institute of Mental Health  
Carl Thomas, Dean for Graduate Research, UTK

"A Scientific Career: A Women's Perspective"  
Marion Webster, President, Association for Women in Science  
President, Graduate Women in Science

Workshops: Employment Opportunities, Lifestyles, Scientists at Work.  
1. Employment Opportunities in Biological Sciences and Medicine.  
4. Employment Opportunities in Social Sciences, History and Philosophy of Science.  
5. A Woman Scientist in a Research Setting.  
7. Recruiting Women in Science (for faculty and administrators).  
10. Women as Professionals.  

One hundred twenty-five potential graduate students attended. Evaluations were very positive.

PUBLICITY

Priority

Increase visibility of the CFW and its activities.

Action

Throughout the year, the Commission has felt the need to inform the campus and community of their work. Publicity has been somewhat difficult to obtain, even in the campus newspaper.

James Crook and Cathy Farmer outlined suggestions for concentrated efforts regarding CFW publicity which would begin in the fall of 1977. They are in the process of composing a guidebook to inform Commission members of various procedures to follow when obtaining publicity.
Judith Kuipers suggested that an article which summarized the Commission's activities of the past year be reported in the Beacon. An article by Nan Scott on the history and function of the Commission was published in the Beacon on March 10, 1977.

James Crook sent a letter to the News-Sentinel offering suggestions for coverage of women's issues and activities.

WOMEN IN ACADEMIA

All of the information in this report really revolves around a basic assumption of the CFW. It is that the University is beginning to implement a systematic approach to remove the basic barriers to equal opportunity for women -- the attitude that women are females first and persons incidently. Women are individuals with wide ranging intellectual capacity, unique talents, and capacities for leadership that need development for their own sake. Where else but in the conceptualization, administration, and implementation of our academic program do the actions reported in this paper have more importance? Think about it.

These issues have been an ongoing concern to the Commission for Women. Subcommittee members were Suzanne Kurth, Judy Kuipers, Pat Ball, Cindy Straub, and Joseph Robustelli.

Priorities

At the February 9 meeting, Dr. Kurth presented four areas of focus regarding sexism in the classroom. These were: 1) advising, 2) behavior in the classroom, 3) behavior outside the classroom, and 4) direction of theses and dissertations. Problems she discussed were: 1) defining different types of sexism and establishing their negative consequences, and 2) assuring freedom of speech for both students and faculty.

Action

Student member, Cynthia Butler, composed two questions to be used on the class evaluation forms to give students an opportunity to express their feelings regarding both the sexism displayed by the professor and the sexism found in the class reading materials.

Drs. Karen Swander, Margaret Perry, and Charles McCleland spoke to the CFW on February 23 concerning complaints they receive from students regarding this issue. Dr. Swander stated that the most frequent complaints she heard involved career counseling.
Dr. Cleland, Ombudsperson, discussed the strategies of his office for cases brought to his attention there. The variety of complaints has eliminated the desirability of a uniform policy, so he handles each case separately and directly.

Dr. Perry cited examples of sexism regarding rewarding of assistantships and fellowships. She also emphatically stated that more female department heads are needed to assure women faculty of less sexism in all areas.

Judy Kuipers asked that a memo regarding sexist language be circulated again to administrators and faculty. (A copy is included in Appendix I.) She also suggested the guidelines be incorporated into the new faculty handbook.

Various means of raising the awareness across campus of the problem of sexism have been explored by the Commission and will be given high priority next year. Some of these means include: 1) Incorporating sexism as a topic in the Teaching and Learning Seminars, 2) sponsoring a workshop on sexism, 3) developing programs to be presented at faculty departmental meetings across campus, and 4) conducting a survey of students' awareness of sexism by means of a Beacon questionnaire. In the coming year, these strategies will be developed and implemented.

Plans were made to offer assistance in increasing knowledge and awareness levels of advisors for the new advising system. However, that system was delayed university-wide.

**PRIORITIES 1977-78**

The Commission will continue next year with the leadership of Dr. Suzanne Kurth, Assistant Professor of Sociology, who has been the Assistant Chairperson this year. The 1977-78 Commission, which will include some new members, will set their priorities firmly at their first fall meeting. However, based on our problems and progress over the past 2 years, the following priority areas emerge:

1. **Students** - Vigorous efforts need to be continued to recruit qualified women students at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels, especially where current enrollment is below 50%.

2. **Faculty and Administrators** - Vigorous efforts need to be applied to recruit well-qualified female faculty members and particularly, female administrators.

3. **Sexism** - Every effort must be made to educate our academic community to both the subtle and obvious modes of sexism within the college classroom, with university advising practices, and in the designation of graduate student candidates and assistantships.
4. **Tenure and Promotion** - A university-wide study of tenure and promotion needs to be accomplished. The CFW will continue its work in structuring questions that will result in a study that is accurate, informative, and meaningful for all faculty members.

5. **Athletics** - Efforts to promote and support the increase of opportunities for Women in Athletics must be continued.

6. **Supporting Staff** - While some progress has been made, there is much that needs to be done to develop and maintain equitable policies and practices for supporting staff. It is not by chance that the clerical staff is primarily female.

7. **Publicity** - The CFW needs to do a more effective job of publicizing their efforts and activities, both in order to act as a vehicle for change, and education of those who lack knowledge and awareness of the special problems women experience in higher education.

8. **Women's Center** - Continued University and CFW support of this Center and its activities is critical. Through programs it offers, courses in Women's Studies, and informal discourse between faculty and students at the center, there are meaningful mediums for change in belief systems and practices toward women.

It is important to conclude this report with statements of fact about, and appreciation to, Dr. Reese, Dr. Ebersole, Betsey Creekmore, and the other members of Central Administration. Over the past two years, certain amounts of mutual distrust and frustration were experienced by all of us. It is an outstanding tribute to our Central Administration and to our Commission members, as individuals, that these frustrations and conflicts, so necessary for change to occur, could be confronted openly and honestly. Dr. Reese, Dr. Ebersole, and Betsey Creekmore met with the Commission regularly. Dr. Aldmon worked diligently on the Women's Center. Dr. Herndon constructed, both in spirit and in letter, more equitable hiring procedures. Without the commitment and cooperation of these individuals, our Commission for Women would have little to report under the Action sections of this paper.

The Commission believes that this cooperation can and must result in even greater efforts to extinguish any kind of sexism on this campus that discounts women and their contributions.

**SPECIAL EVENTS**

In order for the reader to gain some comprehension of the numerous activities of the CFW, the following list of events is provided. These were in addition to the twice monthly meetings that were the work sessions of the Commission and Women's Center activities.

*WOMEN ARE AN ACTIVE GROUP AT UTK!*
October 19
Chancellor Reese hosted the CFW for a luncheon meeting.

November 13
A benefit for the women's basketball team was held.

December 8
CFW members shared in a Christmas social event designed to reward themselves for all their hard work with fun! fun! fun!

January 12
Judy Dorton was introduced as the Graduate Assistant for the CFW replacing Nan Scott, who is Assistant Director of the Women's Appalachian Center.

January 14-15
Women in Science Workshop.

January 26
Chancellor Reese again met with the CFW at a luncheon at the Faculty Club.

February 16-17
Women and Health: Question of Survival.

March 17
The Chancellor invited the CFW to breakfast at the Hyatt with Elizabeth Dole of the Federal Trade Commission.

March
The UTK Women's Basketball team finished 3rd in the nation.

April 20-May 10
Suzanne Kurth presided in Dr. Kuiper's absence.

May 3
Chancellor Reese met with the CFW in a special session to discuss affirmative action.

May 11
Sharon Lord addressed the CFW concerning her work with the Women's Equity grant.

May 20
Co-hosted a reception for women athletes.

May 27
A brown bag luncheon was held for the UTK Faculty Women in the Crest Room to facilitate both personal and professional interaction.

July 22
Tennessee Commission on Higher Education held a conference on Women in Tennessee Higher Education. The UTK Chairperson and 6 members attended.
APPENDIX I
Appendix I.

BREAKING THE MYTH BARRIER

Perspectives

Women are invisible. In the United States almost every social role except motherhood is structured to keep women invisible. The subtle structuring of thought and behavior by patterns of language, law, work, and worship seem to establish and maintain the idea of man's world and woman's place.

Why are women under-represented in those positions where their skill and motivation equal or exceed that of men? The answer seems to be hidden in the nuances of inequality, inability, and negativism which govern women's access to, and therefore their participation in, the labor force. We now turn to a brief study of two factors in transmitting and maintaining the nuances of inequality -- mythology and language.

In the academic market place

The first problem for all of us, men and women, is not to learn, but to unlearn. We are filled with the popular wisdom of several centuries just past, and we are terrified to give it up.

Gloria Steinem (1970)

Myths about the nature of women abound amid the science and truth of the modern university. Some of the myths are derived from the Genesis' account of the creation or the Pauline epistles: Women was made from Adam's rib, created for the man, should learn in silence with all subjection, and not usurp authority. Males and females apparently were equal only in Noah's ark (Fisher, 1970). Other myths have arisen because "alternative beliefs and attitudes about women go unimagined" by women as well as men (Bem, 1970). Biased images of women in advertising (Komisar, 1971), textbooks (U'Ren, 1971), fiction (Martin, 1971), language (Strainchamps, 1971), and children's stories (Fisher, 1970), serve as constant reinforcers.

As Steinem suggests, our first task is to unlearn, to give up our myths about women, and then reevaluate in light of this newly gained perspective. Within a university, this task, broadly defined, encompasses women as students as well as employees and as administrators.

The myths are numerous (Dahlstrom, 1967; Holm, 1970; Youth Activities Office, n.d.): Women are worse risks than men. Women don't need to work. They can't be objective. Women aren't career oriented. They aren't interested in promotion. They don't identify with their job. They produce less, are sick more. They take jobs away from men. Women belong in women jobs. A careful examination of the facts is the most positive approach to a clear picture and a dispelling of myth and misunderstanding.
Profile of the women worker

Myth: Women don't need to work. -- In 1970, over 31.5 million women, age 16 and over, were in the labor force. Fifty-nine per cent of these were married; 22 per cent single; and 19 per cent widowed, divorced or separated (Steinem, 1970). Women work to support themselves and supplement their husbands' earnings to meet basic family needs. About 15 per cent (4.5 million women) of the married women workers had husbands whose income was below $5,000 annually. About 40 per cent of working wives account for over a third of their family's annual income.

Myth: It doesn't pay to train or promote a woman because she will quit, and the investment will be wasted (Osofsky, 1969). -- Women's participation in the labor force varies by the presence or absence of children, the women's ages, and their need for self-support. Women are most likely to work between the ages of 20-24 and 45-54. Of working women age 35, the single women on the average will work another 31 years. Widowed, divorced, or separated women will work another 28 years, and married women with husbands will work another 24 years. More than 80 per cent of women college graduates enter the labor force after graduation. During the period of early parenthood, they drop out of work or work part-time. By age 35, when their children are in school, over half of them go back to work (Youth Activities Office, n.d.) or change from part-time to full-time.

Myth: Women are absent too much from work because of illness. -- Time away from work differs little between men and women. In 1967 employed women of all ages lost 5.4 days per year; men lost 5.3. In the age group 45-64 years, women lost 5.8 days per year while men lost 7.0 (Ferriss, 1971).

Myth: Women take jobs away from men. -- In March, 1971, there were 18.5 million married women in the labor force. At the same time there were three million unemployed women. There would have been over 15 million unfilled jobs if all the married women had left the labor force. Also, most unemployed men do not have the job skills required for the jobs most often held by women: secretaries, teachers, and nurses.

Women seeking university academic positions experience discrimination even when they possess equal or superior qualifications. Instead of taking jobs away from men, they have been relegated to lesser positions, given temporary appointments, and by-passed for promotion and tenure (Rossi, 1970a; Scott, 1970).

"Probably the ultimate myth," according to Steinem, "is that children must have full-time mothers and that liberated women made bad one." (Steinem, 1970). Why should the role of working wife and mother be any more harmful to children than that of working husband and father? What is taught children and how it is taught appear to be more significant than the presence or absence of the biological mother.
It is difficult to assess changes in the role of women without reechoing the biases of our own personal and social histories. Rossi (1970b) concludes that the "theories of society and of human motivation" of men now in power in academia "mirror their own personalities and life experiences." She further asserts (Rossi, 1970a) that department chairmen sometimes evaluate academic women on the basis of their own personal resentment of the higher life style a working wife and husband may enjoy rather than on the women's job performance. They find it difficult to deal with working women because they cannot distinguish between them and their own homemaker wives. Just as men are redefining their traditional work and family roles, isn't it reasonable that women reevaluate the "women's place is in the home" definition of their roles?

Myths of work and home encapsulate both women and men. "Isn't it time," asks Rossi, "the university, as the most far-seeing of our social institutions, prepared itself for life in the post-industrial world? ... a compassionate world with the time, the room, and the flexibility to create a style of living of living that permits men and women to live deeply and meaningfully at play and at home as well as at work?" (1970a).

Socialization Through Language

In a statement appearing over fifteen years ago, the president of Mills College:

The grammar of English dictates that when a referent is either of indeterminate sex or both sexes, it shall be considered masculine. The penetration of this habit of language into the minds of little girls as they grow up to be women is more profound than most people, including most women, have recognized: for it implies that personality is really a male attribute, and that women are human sub-species. It would be a miracle if a girl-baby, learning to use the symbols of our tongue, could escape some wound to her self-respect: whereas a boy-baby's ego is bolstered by the pattern of our language.

Numerous articles and statements focusing on the sexist nature of the English language have appeared in publications in recent years. Some articles trace the history of our male-female language system: others point to the breakdown in the use of the "generic man" when references are made to predominantly female fields such as teaching and many illustrate the lack of identification of young females with language statements referring to man, brother, him, mankind, etc.

In an effort to insure maximum opportunity for the development, education, and employment of females in the University community, the Chancellor's Task Force on Women would like to make some rather specific recommendations in regard to language usage:
IV-1. Every effort should be made to utilize language terms and statements which obviously include both sexes of our community. For example, one could utilize human, humans, person, persons, individual, individuals, human beings, homosapiens, people, peoples, man/woman, woman/man or humanity instead of the term, man. A course labeled "Man and Culture" might be more appropriately labeled, "Humanity and Culture," "People and Culture," or "Humans and Culture."

Terms such as chairman or ombudsman should be replaced by chairperson, chairone, ombudsperson, or ombudsone. Instead of utilizing the generic he, him, and his, one might substitute one, he/she, him/her, her/him, his/hers, hers/his, or one's. An increase in the use of they, or them to include both males and females (even though the referent is singular) has been observed recently. For example, "every individual should be encouraged to do their own thing," is, even though "grammatically incorrect," more acceptable to individuals concerned with female identity than is emphasis on formal grammar.

IV-2. The title, Ms., rather than Mrs. or Miss, should be used within our University community. The rationale behind this title is that the marital status of females is as irrelevant in addressing them as is marital status of males. Just as we use the title Mr. to address men, whether married or unmarried, we propose using the title Ms. to address females, whether married or unmarried. Ms. is currently being adopted across the nation as a standard form of address by women who want to be recognized as individuals, rather than being identified by their relationship with a man. In the same sense, it seems inappropriate to refer to a female, whether secretary, student, or faculty, as Mrs. John Doe when her name is Mary. Therefore, we suggest the use of Ms. Mary Doe in University communication, thereby recognizing her individual identity. It is also inappropriate to compose lists of persons in which men are identified as John Doe, Joe Blow, etc., and women are identified as Mrs. Mary Doe, Miss Mary Blow, etc. Marital status is irrelevant; individuals, male or female, should be given comparable treatment.

IV-3. Personal language patterns, course titles, and descriptions, job descriptions, application forms, student handbooks, and other University literature should be examined to insure that the sexist bias is removed from our language. Language constantly evolves in response to need. It is grasping today for ways to accommodate the new recognition of women as full members of the human race.

Breaking the Myth Barrier is an excerpt from the Final Task Force Report, 1972, pp. 110-114.