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MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Jack E. Reese, Chancellor
FROM: Martha E. Begalla, for the Commission for Women
DATE: August 11, 1975
RE: Annual Report III, Concerning Period: December 5, 1974 - August 11, 1975

Attached is the third Annual Report of the Commission for Women. The report is submitted both to document the activities of the Commission and to keep the University community informed of the work of the Commission.

An overview of the Commission activities and major concerns is included in Section I. The subsequent sections report specific Commission projects and recommendations.

cc: Dr. Luke Ebersole, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration
Mrs. Marty Begalla, Chairperson  
UTK Commission for Women  
812 Volunteer Boulevard  
CAMPUS

June 27, 1975

Dear Marty:

We hope you will convey to members of the Commission for Women our appreciation for the opportunity to discuss possible means of making more visible and efficient the UTK commitment to affirmative action implementation and monitoring. We believe that we have made progress in the last few years, but recognize that we need to continue to press for increased gains.

As I indicated I would, I have discussed your suggestions and concerns with Chancellor Reese and others. We are all anxious to provide supportive services which will enhance the shared-responsibility mechanisms currently in effect, and we shall consider the Commission's suggestions and those of other groups and people fully as we move toward this end.

We shall be revising the UTK Affirmative Action Plan this fall, and we hope that this major revision and recasting of our Plan will alleviate several of the problem areas we discussed. We expect more precisely to define grievance and complaint procedures, the responsibilities of various offices and individuals, and to provide for effective implementation and monitoring of the provisions of the Plan. We shall involve as many people and groups as possible in the revision process, and we hope that the Commission will provide its usual sound advice and assistance. As soon as plans are definite for the revision process, we shall be in touch to ask for Commission participation.

Again, Marty, we express gratitude to you and the other Commission members for your interest and suggestions. We believe that such meetings are extremely beneficial and hope the CFW will continue to make its thinking known to us.

Sincerely,

Luke Ebersole  
Vice Chancellor
SECTION I: OVERVIEW OF CFW ACTIVITY

Commission Projects

Following the analysis of 1973-74 Commission for Women, the 1974-75 Commission decided that follow-up of specific recommendations of the original Task Force on Women should not be the sole focus for the year. The Commission established projects having varying levels of priority - 1974-75 projects, continuing or long-range concerns, projects requiring data collection, and topics necessitating research to define the problem. The priorities of the projects were based on recommendations of the Commission members.

Women's studies, governance, salary equilization, preparation of a handbook for women, and placement procedures were targeted as the priority projects for 1974-75. The implementation of Title IX regulations was categorized as a continuing concern. Projects requiring data collection included the admission and financial aid of graduate students, and child care. Finally, the Commission assigned discrimination in the classroom, employee benefits and MBO evaluations to the category of topics necessitating research. The Commission established sub-committees for all of these projects. Each sub-committee reported periodically to the entire group. As the year progressed, the Commission undertook other projects (Section III) which required their attention and/or support.

Commission and Affirmative Action Restructuring

As the Commission worked during the year, it began to question the effectiveness of a committee-type structure in meeting affirmative action goals. The Commission agreed that the University community would be better served by the appointment of a full-time staff person in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration who would have responsibility for the whole range of affirmative action activities. The Commission saw itself and other groups as a source of advice and counsel to the proposed staff person.

The creation of a staff position and the restructuring of the Commission was proposed in a letter to the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration on July 11, 1975, and discussed in a meeting of June 24, 1975 (copies of correspondence follow). A response to the proposal and the June 24 meeting was received June 27, 1975. The Commission reaffirmed its proposal in a letter to the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration on July 17, 1975. This letter outlined specific reasons for the creation of a full-time staff position. The Commission did not receive a response to its proposal, and perceived that the lack of response indicated that no change in structure or function of the Commission was needed at this time. On August 11, 1975, the majority of those involved in the summer Commission resigned their appointments indicating that they felt unable to retain membership on the group as it was presently structured. After the resignations were received, the Chancellor invited the former Commission members to a meeting to discuss proposed changes in the affirmative action area.
No consensus was reached during the meeting on the proposals presented by central administration. At the request of the Chancellor, individual members submitted reactions to the proposals.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Luke Ebersole

FROM: Commission for Women

DATE: June 11, 1975

RE: Staff Position for Affirmative Action

Thank you for agreeing to meet with members of the Commission for Women (CFW) to discuss a new staff position for Affirmative Action. The rationale and general responsibilities for the position are summarized below to provide some background information for our June 24 discussion.

While the Commission members are agreed that they have been an effective committee during 1974-75, they question the advisability of concentrating sizeable resources in a committee rather than staff structure. The CFW has viewed its role as that of problem identification and recommendation, leaving program implementation to appropriate University staff and departments. Since the creation of the Task Force for Women in 1971 to the present, we have arrived at a situation where there is little disagreement between the CFW and central administration on the problem areas in Affirmative Action. It is our contention that fiscal and staff resources presently being used by the Commission and E.E.O.C. could be better utilized centrally in a staff position in your office. Additionally, the ex-officio members of the Commission have developed a history of cooperation which would certainly continue with or without our present CFW structure. Specific job responsibilities of the proposed position are listed in the June 5, CFW minutes.

Thank you for your continued support of the CFW and its activities.

m

cc: Commission Members
Dear Dr. Ebersole:

STAFF POSITION FOR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The members of the Commission for Women (CFW) reaffirm our proposal (copy attached) for a new staff position for affirmative action. We have considered this proposal in light of the meeting with you on June 24 and your written response of June 27, and we think that this written outline of our recommendation and the reasons that support it would be helpful to you.

The CFW members agree that the CFW has outlived its usefulness and that the future effectiveness of the University in identifying problems and recommending policy to meet affirmative action goals depends on the full-time commitment of a professional administrator. If this person were to have staff responsibility for the whole range of EEOC and other affirmative action activities, including some that have not been CFW activities such as programming and responding to individual problems, we think that the University community would be better served.

We feel the value of the commission structure lies in its representative nature. As a body composed of many people with varied backgrounds and positions in the University, the CFW has been an effective representative of and communications link to University faculty, staff and students. This attribute of the current structure will not be sacrificed by our proposal, but is in fact made more viable by it. Part of the job description for the staff position involves soliciting the advice of many University members and having both the staff person and these advisors report formally and informally to the University community on the progress made in affirmative action areas. We believe that this reorganization will ensure the continuing input of ideas from the University community while also creating and maintaining the professional guidance, high level of commitment, and continuity of effort that a full-time administrator can provide. Despite the dedication of time and resources from current and past CFW members, the CFW is not able to overcome some serious limitations on our effectiveness that are caused by our structure.

SUMMARY EVALUATION OF CFW

As is stated in the charge to the CFW, its function is "to advise on planning, implementation, and evaluation of University programs and services designed to improve the status of women." As presently structured and staffed, it is impossible
for the group to function in any role except that of evaluation since it lacks the authority, access to information, or staff support to effectively advise on planning or implementation. Examples of CFW's limited role follow:

Salary Equalization - The CFW is one source of input in the process which provides feedback on the overall salary figures available in the survey conducted by the Office of Institutional Research. Because the group does not and should not have access to specific departmental or individual information the value of its input into the salary equalization process is limited. For numerous reasons, salary equalization must be a staff responsibility.

Individual Complaints - Numerous individuals with sex discrimination complaints are unaware of available complaint procedures. Many complaints could be resolved through consultation with a neutral advisor rather than through formal procedures. The publicity of existing procedures and conciliation are staff responsibilities.

Referrals to the CFW - An overview of the Commission activities also indicates clearly that referrals to the group come from only one source -- individuals dissatisfied with the current status of women on campus. The CFW received no referrals from the University administration, EEOC, or other University committees which points to a lack of use of the group as an advisory body.

Further evaluation of the 1974-75 projects point to two additional conclusions: a) many projects of the CFW fall under the jurisdiction of the EEOC, and b) many of the CFW projects were administrative in nature rather than characteristic of an advisory body. For example, preparation of a handbook for women is certainly a staff responsibility. In addition, the CFW engaged in several activities to increase its own visibility or be of service to women employees. While such programs as the faculty receptions and the open hearing were successful, they are not substantive enough to justify the maintance of a commission.

The fact that the Task Force on Women and subsequent Commissions for Women have all recommended some additional form of administrative responsibility for commission activities indicates continuous support for the concept since 1971. Since a large number of people have served as task force or commission members during the years from 1971-75, input on the problem of effective management of women's concerns is extensive. Many people viewing the problem have arrived at a similar conclusion -- programs for women and implementation of affirmative action goals are administrative functions. In 1972, the Task
Force on Women recommended the appointment of a full-time female administrator. Subsequently, the 1972-73 Commission for Women revised the recommendation, indicating that the position could be filled by a male or a female but retained the concept that fuller administrative responsibility for women was essential. The 1973-74 Commission for Women through its sub-committee on reorganization also proposed additional staff and a modification of the charge to the Commission.

The idea of appointment of an administrative person to coordinate the activities of the Commission and affirmative action programs has a long history of support by the Commission. The current proposal to consolidate the staff assistance presently available to the Commission and EEOC is fiscally possible given the current funding levels of the CFW and EEOC. The lack of new fiscal resources available for a position for the 1975-76 academic year need not inhibit the adoption of this plan. The advantage of the current proposal is that present resources would be redirected toward implementation of programs related to women and away from the internal administration of the CFW such as preparing minutes and internal reports.

This proposal is motivated in large part by the feelings of CFW members that, although we have been as effective as possible, we have not met many of the affirmative action goals that we and the University community have set. If this gap between expectations and performance continues, the dissatisfaction that results will ultimately be focused on the University administration. We strongly feel that reorganization and the increased effectiveness that will be gained will overcome and abort the formation of negative attitudes.

We would appreciate your reconsideration of our proposal. The CFW intends to complete its annual report by August 1 and, we would like to have your response by that date.

Sincerely,

Martha E. Begalla, Chairperson
Commission for Women

Mary Ellen Mitchell

cc: Jack E. Reese
August 11, 1975

Dr. Jack E. Reese
Chancellor
506 Andy Holt Tower
Campus

Dear Dr. Reese:

The Commission for Women sent you a copy of its July 17 memorandum to Dr. Luke Ebersole outlining our concerns about the ineffectiveness of the Commission. To date, we have not received a response from Dr. Ebersole.

As a result of the evaluation of the 1973-74 Commission, some changes were made in the structure of this year's group such as the inclusion of ex-officio members. After having worked with the revised structure, we still find the inadequacies noted in our memorandum to Dr. Ebersole.

An additional frustration of the Commission is that it has been a visible group and viewed by many as having a central role in affirmative action efforts. Unfortunately, the Commission as a committee has not nor should have functioned in this manner. It is not feasible to assign a committee such demanding staff responsibilities. Having the University community place responsibility for the effectiveness of our affirmative action efforts with a committee rather than with the appropriate administrators is dysfunctional.

The Commission members feel, therefore, that we must resign our appointments to serve and feel unable to continue our membership as it is presently structured. Through the ex-officio members, we have been communicating on CFW activities of this past year to many concerned women and men who are aware of our frustration with the present structure. We will be informing them of this latest development also. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our resignations with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Mitchell

Dorothy E. Lyon

Cathy G. Farmer

Elizabeth Ihle

cc: Dr. Luke Ebersole
SECTION II
The 1974-75 CFW was divided into various sub-committees, each charged with investigating specific problems or concerns and referring their findings and recommendations to the full Commission. A report from each sub-committee follows.
Sub-Committee on Graduate Admission Procedures and Stipends

The sub-committee investigated the current status of males and females with regard to graduate admissions and financial assistance. Information was obtained from the Admissions and Records Office, the Graduate Office, and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration.

At the time of the sub-committee's inquiry a form (follows) was being developed by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration to be distributed to all departments asking for data on graduate admissions and financial assistance. Data obtained from the departments can be used to assess the status of male and female graduate admissions and financial aid by race. (Winter 1975 enrollment figures for graduate students by sex follows this report.)

During 1974-75 there were 40 non-service fellowships awarded - 19 men and 21 women. One woman and three men served on the selection committee.

Areas of follow-up for the Commission include being provided with graduate admission and financial aid data annually and requesting information on efforts by the various colleges and schools to recruit women.

Robert Netherland

Sub-Committee on Child Care

As a result of its charge to investigate major concerns of UT women, the CFW decided to survey child care needs of UTK faculty, staff, and students and appointed Elizabeth Ihle to be the chairperson of the child care sub-committee.

The availability of day care in Knoxville, at other southeastern state universities, and especially at other universities in the UT system was examined. It was learned that:

1. There were over 70 child care homes or centers of varying quality in the Knoxville area. Almost none were open to children under two or who were not toilet trained.

2. Approximately one-third of all Southeastern universities had child care facilities for their university communities. The average cost per child at these centers in 1974 was $27 weekly. Most of these centers were restricted to children of students, staff, and faculty and were created by interested parents, not by university administrations.

3. UT at Martin has child care facilities for its university community. UT at Nashville has child care for its evening school.

The availability of child care at UTK was considered next. The Department of Child and Family Studies of the College of Home Economics operates three child care centers. Although they are among the best in Knoxville, they are primarily teaching and research centers for students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intercollegiate</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,565 (61%)</td>
<td>1,650 (39%)</td>
<td>4,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans and Directors of Academic Units

FROM: Luke Ebersole

SUBJECT: Affirmative Action Reporting on Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate Professional School Applicants, Acceptances, and Financial Aid Granted

The UTK Affirmative Action Plan (page 33) calls for reporting each September by Deans and Directors of Academic Units on Graduate and Professional School applicants, acceptances, and financial aid granted. Last fall, many departments and units sent information on these processes in response to Dean Perry’s reminder, and it is evident from the responses that a substantial affirmative action effort is being made.

In order to collect data which is consistent throughout the units, the attached form has been prepared. All departments which have graduate programs and the College of Law should prepare the form and a college/school-wide summary should also be prepared.

We shall need to have the college/school summary, together with copies of the departmental responses, by September 15.

We appreciate your assistance in meeting the requirements of our Affirmative Action Plan in this area of reporting.

/bsf
Attachment

cc: Dr. Jack Reese
    Dr. Howard Aldmon
    Mr. Stan Bohne
    Dr. Walter Herndon
    Dr. Hilton Smith
For the period covering September 1, 1974 - September 1, 1975, please provide the following information:

1. Total number of male applicants for admission to all departmental, degree-granting graduate programs or professional schools. (Persons not completing their applications should not be included.)

2. Total number of female applicants for admission to all departmental, degree-granting graduate programs or professional schools.

3. Total (men and women) number of Black applicants for admission to all departmental, degree-granting graduate programs or professional schools.

4. Total number of male applicants who were accepted during this period.

5. Total number of female applicants who were accepted during this period.

6. Total number of Black applicants (male and female) accepted during this period.

7. Total number of male applicants who also requested financial aid.

8. Total number of female applicants who also requested financial aid.

9. Total number of Black applicants (both men and women) who also requested financial aid.

10. Total number of male applicants for admission who were granted financial aid.

11. Total number of female applicants for admission who were granted financial aid.

12. Total number of Black applicants (men and women) for admission who were granted financial aid.

13. Total value of financial aid granted to male applicants for admission by category of aid (include value of fee remission in appropriate categories):
   a. teaching assistantships (number ___) $ __________
   b. assistantships (number ___) $ __________
   c. research assistantships (number ___) $ __________
14. Total value of financial aid granted to female applicants for admission by category of aid (include value of fee remission in appropriate categories):
   a. teaching assistantships (number ______) $ ______
   b. assistantships (number ______) $ ______
   c. research assistantships (number ______) $ ______
   d. UT non-service fellowships (number ______) $ ______
   e. grants, other fellowships and scholarships (number ______) $ ______
   f. other (number ______) $ ______

   TOTAL FEMALES (number awarded) $ ______

15. Total value of financial aid granted to Black applicants (men and women) for admission by category of aid (include value of fee remission in appropriate categories):
   a. teaching assistantships (number ______) $ ______
   b. assistantships (number ______) $ ______
   c. research assistantships (number ______) $ ______
   d. UT non-service fellowships (number ______) $ ______
   e. grants, other fellowships and scholarships (number ______) $ ______
   f. other (number ______) $ ______

   TOTAL FEMALES (number awarded) $ ______

16. Total amount of financial aid granted to males (including amounts granted to applicants) during this period (including fee remission). $ ______

17. Total amount of financial aid granted to females (including amounts granted to applicants) during this period (include fee remission). $ ______

18. Total amount of financial aid granted to Blacks (including amounts granted to applicants) during this period (include fee remission). $ ______
in the department and presently cannot be expanded; they operate on the academic calendar and thus do not meet the needs of University people who have non-academic jobs. In addition, their hours do not coincide with UTK working hours. Even these facilities, however, have very long waiting lists.

The situation described above was reported to the CFW which authorized Elizabeth Ihle to form a group to develop a proposal for establishing a quality day care center for the UTK community. The following people were selected:

- Eleanor Dempster, Staff Development Librarian, UTK Libraries
- Christy Hughes, graduate student, Department of Child and Family Studies
- Judith Stoloff, Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Planning
- Marcia Verzaro, Assistant Professor, Department of Child and Family Studies

The sub-committee was assisted by several consultants.

A major obstacle to child care activities was designation of a suitable facility. Funding was the other major problem. The sub-committee met with Dr. Luke Ebersole, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration, in May to discuss what aid might be available from UT. He said that the sub-committee would have to look elsewhere for support because of University priorities during a tight budget. The sub-committee decided to continue its plans to find a location and funding sources in the community, hoping that at a later time the University would give financial and in-kind support.

Formal University affiliation was dropped by the sub-committee on June 4, 1975. Three members of the UTK faculty on the former sub-committee presented a basic proposal to the Session of the Second Presbyterian Church on Kingston Pike requesting authorization for space in which to house a community-based early child care program. The Session voted affirmatively.

By July 10, 1975, the Board of Directors was essentially formed; its members included church members, and several UT-affiliated personnel. In August, 1975, the Child Care Committee of TVA merged its efforts with the newly incorporated Knoxville Early Child Development Center (KECDC).

Proposals for funding to several sources are currently pending. It is hoped that the KECDC will form the nucleus of the intended program in November by accepting a limited number of full-paying students to get the program established. Until funding is available to subsidize students on a sliding scale basis, the KECDC cannot fulfill its ultimate purpose of serving a heterogeneous group of children from all income ranges.

The KECDC hopes that the University will want to support a model child development service-oriented program which will reach students, staff,
and faculty. It recommends that an appropriate administrative contact person or committee be designated with whom the KECDC can negotiate services and support.

Elizabeth Ihle

Sub-Committee on the Concerns of Clerical and Supporting Personnel

The sub-committee reviewed the supporting personnel group for any problem areas that would relate to the responsibilities of the Commission. Two things stood out as being of the greatest concern: job reclassification and salaries.

The primary problem area relating to supporting personnel was dissatisfaction with new job titles and descriptions and the resulting low morale among many. The problem is particularly acute among the longer employed personnel many of whom had worked their way up the title scale over a period of time only to be reclassified at what seemed to them to be a lesser title and an incorrect job description. After being told that the wage and hour reclassification would eliminate the discrepancies that existed in jobs, many people feel that they were misled when the results did not meet the promises originally made. This has created a low morale problem with some people not having satisfaction or pride in doing their work and letting down in the job performance.

Sub-committee members discussed this problem and what part CFW should play in it. It was agreed that the CFW should not become involved unless constructive, successful measures could be undertaken which related to female employees. The Commission was aware of various UT units that have voiced strong opposition to the wage and salary reclassifications. Since a large number of clerical and supporting employees are female it was decided that the Commission should make an effort to help solve the problem. A questionnaire was designed to send to all supporting personnel to give them a chance for feedback. While there could be some merit to distribution of a questionnaire, it was decided that the questionnaire could generate false hopes. An alternate suggestion was for the Commission to send one or more members to meet with Mr. Ed Bennett, Personnel Director, and convey to him the concern the Commission had about the low morale and dissatisfaction many female employees have, due to the reclassification. We felt that positive suggestions should be presented to him as to what should be done.

Suggestions included:

1. Seeing that the directors, dean, department heads and supervisory staff are aware of their responsibility for everyone under his/her supervision being correctly classified and of their need to take action to reevaluate some jobs if necessary for correction of titles. They could notify the Personnel Office of their findings and insist upon any corrections needed.
2. Determine why systems level personnel can have higher and different titles than campus level employees for the same type of work. The justification for this should be explained to employees.

3. Establishment of a semi-professional category for those employees who are assuming responsibilities beyond the supporting level but not into the academic/administrative/professional level.

4. See that all supporting personnel have a copy of their job description and that all job descriptions are available to supporting personnel, not just administrative personnel.

The average 8.5 percent increase received in July 1974 was badly needed to help UT retain employees and to enable supervisors to hire more highly qualified employees. The majority of supporting personnel seem satisfied with their increase, although knowing that UT is still not able to be competitive with a large number of area employers. The indications were then and are now for FY 75-76, that Central Administration is aware of the relatively low salary rates and is sincerely trying to increase them even though they are having to work with limited state funds. Supporting personnel should be made aware that the need for higher salaries is just as acute in the academic and professional areas as in the supporting personnel. With these facts considered, it is felt the Commission's responsibility is to continue to be observant of male/female salaries; to remain aware of salary trends and statistics; to negotiate for equilization of male/female salaries where discrepancies exist and to act in an advisory capacity in keeping administrative personnel aware of the continuing need for salary increases.

Barbara Baldwin
Cathy Farmer
Evelyn Bales

Sub-Committee on Discrimination in the Classroom

I begin my report by making two assumptions: One, that sex discrimination has been a time honored tradition in institutions of higher education and two, that this situation is detrimental to students, society, and the schools themselves.

We would like to think "That sort of thing doesn't happen here." To date there has been nothing in either Hill Topics or the Faculty Handbook to suggest that sex discrimination is inappropriate classroom behavior, simply because we were not aware that sex discrimination existed or that it was harmful. The Committee on student rights and responsibilities is working on an anti-discrimination statement that will hopefully be included in student and faculty handbooks; this should help open people's eyes to the problem.

Sexism has been allowable in universities because it is a logical extension of a sexist society. Attitudes we learn at home and in
early schooling follow us to the university; we notice where men and women are concentrated in certain fields. Women are not encouraged to go into "male" fields like law and chemistry, men are not drawn by the low prestige and pay accompanying "women's" fields such as elementary education and nursing. Peer and parental pressure help reinforce societal attitudes, resulting in sexually unbalanced participation in academic disciplines.

Inside the classroom three types of sex discrimination are sometimes found. Very often teachers use our sexist language in a way that seems to exclude women from humanity (examples: using "man" when they mean humans; "he" or "him" in referring to non-specified persons.) A second possibility is that of faculty using women, sex-discrimination, or the women's movement as the butts of their humor. This is hopefully less common than the former. A third possibility of preferential treatment by sex may sometimes occur. Complaints have been made recently by a few women students who felt their grades were affected by being female, the teachers involved have denied sex was the reason. Preferential treatment to males (or females) could be demonstrated in grading, not being called on in class, etc.

All of the above behaviors discourage women. Many educators feel that part of women's higher drop-out rate in college is caused by the feeling that they do not "belong" in this male preserve. Many authors feel that even the presence of men discourages women from academic involvement (example: in co-ed classes men almost invariably speak more than women; the women tend sometimes to feel intimidated.)

Further sexist bias is shown by course content and materials. With the exceptions of women's studies, most courses are slanted towards male achievements and history; women are generally ignored. Women's studies rounds out the curriculum as is pointed out in the Women's Studies Sub-Committee report giving an entirely new perspective. Course materials are also male-biased, having been written mostly by, for and about men (sometimes including a token chapter on women). Supplemental texts such as novels, biographies, etc. are often used and reflect the above bias. University publications could also be improved in this area; for example, in the general catalog 1974-75, a typical student in UT's Law College is referred to as "he".

The following recommendations were made but not acted upon before the Commission resigned.

1. The CFW needs more publicity in regard to students and its function as a grievance outlet. Further Beacon articles could help in this; student members might consider doing classroom surveys of sex discrimination.

2. The Office of the Ombudsperson is another student grievance outlet; perhaps one of the Ombudspersons could devote a column to explaining the services of their office in complaints of sex discrimination.
3. UT should devise a policy on recruitment into sexually unbalanced fields, and should utilize mailings to high school seniors as an opportunity to make their policy known. High school guidance counselors should also be made aware of the need for such recruitment.

4. Space should be included on course evaluation forms available from Learning Research Center to designate sex, and whether any sex discrimination was encountered in a class.

5. Textbooks should be evaluated on the basis of their sexism or lack of it.

6. The UT Counseling Center should facilitate the organization of consciousness-raising groups for interested people.

7. The Career Planning and Placement Services should continue its emphasis on early career planning and making wide varieties of options known to both men and women.

8. The administration at UT must adopt a policy discouraging sex discrimination in the classroom.

Mary Peterson

Sub-Committee on Placement

The Placement sub-committee of the Commission for Women reviewed the current affirmative action practices in the Career Planning and Placement Services (CPPS). Over the last year the CPPS has attempted to implement EEO guidelines as they affect students seeking employment in the interviews conducted in Alumni Hall. The overall policies regarding equal employment seemed to be in order, with one exception. The CFW sub-committee discovered that the CPPS staff is still concerned about the appropriate procedure to implement with regard to discriminating employer literature. Some of the employer literature in the CPPS seemingly implies discriminatory hiring practices in that this literature contains only pictures of males and refers only to "he".

The exclusive use of one gender pronouns was ruled as sex discriminatory in Wetzel v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, January 1, 1974. In another decision, Kaplowitz v. the University of Chicago, October 22, 1975 ruled that a law school placement office is not required by Title VII to "deny use of its facilities to employers who are engaging discriminatory employment practices." The CPPS is not required to deny use of its facilities in implementing EEO guidelines. The issue to be resolved currently is to determine the role the University wants to assume in enforcing or reporting a discriminatory policy of employers.

The Commission for Women recommended that a written procedure delineating the implementation of Title VII as it applied to the CPPS literature and other practices by that office be established. Such a statement could also benefit other offices affected by EEO Guidelines.
such as the Counseling Center where testing is occasionally conducted for employment purposes.

The CFW wrote a letter to central administration in an attempt to gain a directive as to the appropriate procedure for implementing this EEO policy. This letter went to Dr. Howard Aldmon, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, on May 15, 1975. He responded that he would share the memorandum with Dr. Jack E. Reese, Chancellor, and members of his staff. (Copies of correspondence follow.) As of August 11, 1975, the subcommittee had not received specific direction from the Chancellor or members of his staff.

Recommendation or needed follow up:

The sub-committee on Placement recommends that a statement from central administration be directed to this concern.

Mary Ellen Mitchell
Mae Jean Go

Sub-Committee on Salary

The sub-committee was charged by the UTK Commission for Women to review practices concerning the employment of women on campus. This sub-committee divided its work into three divisions: 1) investigating the problems of female faculty employed part-time, 2) requesting a salary review to be undertaken by the Office of Institutional Research to provide current data, 3) recommending to the UTK EEOC that it review the affirmative action plan and suggesting inquiries to be made in monitoring the plan. The recommendations of divisions 2 and 3 were made and are reflected in the minutes of the Commission meetings.

Under division 1 the sub-committee investigated the status of women faculty employed part-time and identified existing problems. According to the 1974-75 UTK Salary Survey prepared by the UT Office of Institutional Research, there were 70 women and 124 men employed part-time in academic areas as of November 1, 1974. Tables follow which compare the rank, degrees, and salary of men and women.

The sub-committee found, by analyzing written comments sent to the Commission and interviewing representative female part-time faculty members, that a substantial amount of confusion exists among female part-time faculty about the status, privileges, and benefits available to part-time faculty. There was some feeling that female part-time faculty may be discriminated against in salary or in courses assigned by individual departments. Primarily, however, the problems associated with part-time employment were viewed as resulting from unclear policies about part-time employment, lack of information furnished to part-time employees, and lack of concern for the participation of part-time employees in University processes and services.

The following areas were identified as areas in which information is not provided to the part-time faculty member and/or areas in which
MEMORANDUM

TO: Howard Aldmon, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
FROM: Martha E. Begalla for the Commission for Women
DATE: May 15, 1975
RE: Placement Office E.E.O. Policies

In an effort to implement the E.E.O.C. guidelines, the Placement Office (CPPS) established the policies outlined in the enclosed memorandum to you. The policies were approved in the enclosed October 2, 1974, memorandum to Mike Brookshire with the exception of number five which deals with discriminatory literature. As yet, the question of what is the appropriate procedure to implement with regard to discriminatory employer literature remains in question.

The exclusive use of one gender pronouns was ruled as sex discriminatory in Wetzal v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, January 1, 1974. In another decision, Kaplanitz v. the University of Chicago, October 22, 1975, ruled that a law school placement office is not required by Title VII to "deny use of its facilities to employers who are engaging discriminatory employment practices." The CPPS is not required to deny use of its facilities in implementing E.E.O. guidelines. The issue to be resolved currently is to determine the role the University wants to assume in enforcing or reporting a discriminatory policy of employers.

The Commission for Women recommends that a written procedure delineating the implementation of Title VII as it applies to the CPPS literature and other practices by that office be established. Such a statement could also benefit other offices affected by E.E.O. guidelines such as the Counseling Center where testing is occasionally conducted for employment offices.

cc: Howard Lunsden
Commission Members
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Mike Brookshire
FROM: Howard F. Aldman
RE: Policies of Placement Office Concerning EEO

Mike, I have shared with Chancellor Reese your memorandum of September 25 concerning efforts of the Placement Office to comply with EEO regulations. With the exception of number 5, stamping of literature, we feel that you have established some sound policies.

The Chancellor and I have recommended to Howard that literature not be stamped at this time. Howard has concurred with this recommendation. Hopefully, we can secure before the end of fall quarter a better interpretation of the EEO guideline related to literature.

HFA/bw
MEMORANDUM

TO: Vice Chancellor Howard Aldman

FROM: Mike Brookshire, Associate Director

RE: Placement Office Equal Employment Opportunity Policies

DATE: September 25, 1974

Placement Offices across the country have been required to continually review and update their policies in order to meet the legal requirements of equal employment opportunity. This is especially true since college placement offices would probably be construed as "employment agencies" under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as amended (Section 703). In addition, this office believes that it has a responsibility to exert some degree of leadership vis-a-vis recruiters in this area.

A brief outline of our internal EEO policies is as follows:

1. Notices have been placed in prominent areas stating that the Placement Service is only made available to employers whose employment practices exclude discrimination based on sex, race, creed, color, national origin, and age. The notices further urge students to see a Placement Officer if they feel that discriminatory practices have occurred as they have used our services.

2. If a student feels discriminated against, one of our professional staff members will complete a "Statement of Alleged Discriminatory Practices" with the student. In the least, the employer involved will be notified of this complaint.

3. No employer can conduct a pre-employment test on our facilities unless they first provide us with evidence that the test has been validated according to EEOC guidelines.

4. All Placement Office personnel have been made aware that no referrals of students/alumni will be made from our office on the basis of sex, race, creed, color, national origin, or age.

5. Finally, employer literature that indicates an employment preference on the basis of race or sex, for example, is stamped, "This Literature Does Not Appear to Conform with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act."

Unilateral literature which consistently referred to employees as "he" and/or which showed pictures only of males in professional-level jobs would be labelled in this way.
The last policy requires further comment. Employers were warned not to send questionable material but many firms have sent such material. When recruiting season begins, I expect several employers to indicate their displeasure over our policy. As to the correctness of this policy, the EEOC Regional Office indicates that the policy has a sound basis. I am enclosing some material to document the basis of the policy. I also have received some citations of EEOC rulings which might also be valuable in documenting our position. However, Mr. Ron Leadbetter in the General Counsels Office has not shown any enthusiasm for helping us locate these rulings.

Please keep us informed of any developments in EEO regulations which may have an impact upon our office.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. Martha E. Begalla
FROM: Howard F. Aldmon
RE: Placement Office and E.E.O. Policies

I shall share with Chancellor Reese and members of his staff your memorandum concerning Title VII and literature of the Career Planning and Placement Service. I appreciate the interest of the Commission for Women in this matter, and you may be assured that it is my desire to implement fully the provisions of Title VII.

bw

cc: Mr. Howard Lumsden
policy is unclear:

I. Tenure
A. Is it possible for part-time faculty to be granted tenure?
B. May a part-time faculty member who subsequently moves to a full-time position count equated years of part-time service at UTK as part of total years of service for tenure consideration? If "yes" must these be counted and how does one know whether they are to be counted? Who makes this decision?
C. If a full-time, tenured faculty member moves to part-time status, does he/she retain tenure? Who makes the decision, if there is no uniform policy?

II. Fringe Benefits and Salaries
A. Part-time faculty do not currently automatically receive the "Benefits and Services Available to Faculty and Staff" booklet and some provisions of retirement and insurance are unclear to them.
B. How are salaries for part-time employment set? Is there a uniform policy?
C. Could student insurance be made available to part-time faculty?

In addition, several suggestions for improvement and clarification of the status of part-time faculty were identified:

1. Extend group insurance coverage to all part-time faculty.
2. Provide a means of part-time faculty to participate in the retirement program. Since full-time faculty who become part-time may continue participation in the retirement program, the possibility of full inclusion would seem to be present.
3. Clarify insurance exclusions for continuing, part-time faculty and investigate group insurance in which these people may be included.
4. Revise the Faculty Handbook clearly to state the prerogatives of part-time faculty and insure that all part-time faculty receive copies.
5. Add a representative of part-time faculty members to the Faculty Senate.
6. Invite part-time faculty to attend and participate in departmental and college faculty meetings.
7. Review salaries of female part-time faculty as part of the annual salary review process.

The sub-committee recommended that a letter requesting administrative review and action to alleviate the problem areas enumerated to Luke Ebersole, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration.

Judy Ittig
Betsey Creekmore
Nancy Lay
### COMPARISON OF THE RANK AND DEGREES OF MEN AND WOMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lecturer</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*in cases in which both male and female staff exist in the same category

### COMPARISON OF SALARIES OF WOMEN AND MEN EMPLOYED PART-TIME AND NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Average UTK Experience (yrs.)</th>
<th>Average No. of Years in Present Rank</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor:</strong>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asst. Professor:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lecturer:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-Committee on the Handbook

The sub-committee on Handbook was formed in February, 1975, and at the first meeting the following decisions were made:

- a three-page folded brochure would be the format
- for all women on campus, faculty, staff and students
- understandable by all
- not a duplication of what is already published
- free to anyone, rather than even a slight charge
- explore possibilities for funding - Betsey Creekmore, Publications Council, Martha Begalla
- probably print enough for two years -- 10,000 copies

A rough dummy was presented at the CFW April 17, 1975, meeting and Commission members each wrote out what they thought should be included in the Handbook. A revised dummy was then typed and Dorothy Lyon took it to Sammie Lynn Puett, Chairperson, Publications Committee, on April 30, 1975, for comment in preparation for submitting it to the Publications Committee. With her encouragement and excellent comments to make it something really wanted by women, a promotion piece for the CFW, not a duplication of other published materials, and to include a feedback form, the handbook dummy was reworked.

A "Form A - Prior Approval Data Sheet for New, Recurring Publications" was submitted to the Publications Committee on May 12, 1975, and approval was received following the meeting of the Committee on May 13, 1975. The letter of approval was dated May 15, 1975.

Following the helpful suggestions of the Publication Committee for the content, the Handbook sub-committee again met and discussed how the information would be gathered. Marty Begalla assembled statistics on the status of women on campus, and the following people wrote up a "mini-report" on the indicated topics:

| Jacque Martin | Women Related Groups |
| Susan Gordon  | Women Returning to School |
| Mary Ellen Mitchell | Career Planning |
| Marty Begalla  | Women's Programs |
| Suzanne Kurth  | Women's Studies |
| Bob Netherland | Scholarships, Financial Aid |
| Gary Purcell   | Publications and Women's Resource Center |
| Elizabeth Ihle | Child Care |
| Betsey Creekmore | Grievances |
| Nancy Lay      | Health Care |

The requested reports were turned in on May 29, 1975. During the first term of summer school the Handbook sub-committee edited the material. Prior to the resignation of the Commission, plans were to seek assistance from Graphic Arts or a student in advertising for the art work. Estimates for printing and a source of funding were then to be obtained. Distribution plans were incomplete, but distribution target date was immediately following registration Fall
Quarter, 1975. Plans for funding were incomplete at the time of the resignations of the Commission.

Dorothy Lyon
Cathy Farmer
Robert Netherland

Sub-Committee on Women's Studies

Early in the year the Commission for Women sub-committee on Women's Studies met to determine an appropriate role and course of action for the Commission to take in relation to the development of Women's Studies on campus. It was determined that the chairperson of the sub-committee would meet with Suzanne Kurth, Chairperson of the Women's Studies Committee, to develop proposed areas of Commission activity in relation to Women's Studies on campus. This was done and a proposed course of action was submitted to the Women's Studies Committee. The Women's Studies Committee in turn recommended modifications in the proposal.

The proposal recommended that the Women's Studies Committee reaffirm its rationale statement for development of Women's Studies at UT. It further recommended procedures be developed for systematically disseminating information about the Women's Studies program throughout the campus. In response to this proposal, the Women's Studies Committee reaffirmed the rationale statement which included the following points:

1. growing student and faculty interest in the area (development of courses and programs around the country)
2. academic need for Women's Studies (rectify omissions in present curriculum - provide balance)
3. situation at UT - study by Task Force on Women; recommended development of Women's Studies; subsequent Commissions for Women have affirmed that recommendation

The Colleges of Education and Liberal Arts have for several years offered courses in Women's Studies and have been working on programs. There is now an inter-disciplinary Women's Studies Program in Liberal Arts. It is directed by a committee of faculty and students from the colleges actively supporting Women's Studies through courses and funding. There are potential developments in other colleges through additions of new courses, changes in existing course content, as well as sponsorship of programs.

The following is a revised text of the proposal originally submitted to the Women's Studies Committee:

The University of Tennessee Commission for Women has created a sub-committee which is charged with working with the UT Women's Studies
Committee to further develop Women's Studies on this campus. The Committee consists of Gary Purcell, Chairperson; Mary Peterson; and Mae Jean Go. The sub-committee has met on two occasions and on the second occasion decided that the Chairperson would meet with Suzanne Kurth to identify areas in which the sub-committee might work with the Women's Studies Committee to further these objectives. The results of this meeting are presented below for consideration.

It was determined that there were several major responsibilities with which the Women's Studies Committee was concerned. The direct responsibilities were 1) curriculum of the Women's Studies Program; 2) dissemination of information about the program; 3) the mechanics of student advisement for the program. Indirect responsibilities were 1) increased involvement of other colleges; 2) soliciting adequate financial support for the program which has a broader base than at present. To the end that these responsibilities can better be fulfilled, the Commission for Women expects to propose to the central administration of UT at Knoxville a course of action entailing some of the following elements:

1) The statement of rationale should be examined and reaffirmed by the Women's Studies Committee.

2) A program should be developed by which the curriculum is examined to determine if courses or units exist or can be created which will be appropriate for the Women's Studies Program.

3) Pursuant to number two, the Women's Studies Committee should develop a statement describing the Women's Studies Program. The Committee should also develop criteria and suggestions which could be used by academic departments to consider courses or units of courses for inclusion in the Women's Studies Program.

4) The Committee should explore the possibility of an expansion of Women's Studies courses as a part of the continuing education program of the University.

Information about the Women's Studies Program should be disseminated to the faculty and to students. This would be a primary means of informing the faculty and students of the purposes and objectives of the program to the end that individually and collectively they would be more aware of the program.

The Office of Special Services - Women's Programs has a responsibility for maintaining a general awareness of the needs of women students on campus, to provide educational programs where appropriate, to coordinate these efforts and to assist in publicizing sources of information on campus available to women related to women's needs. The Women's Studies Committee has a responsibility for advising students interested in a Women's Studies minor and for publicizing the availability of this program to actual and potential enrollees. It is responsible for the mechanics of administering the program.

The Women's Studies Committee together with the Commission for Women should have responsibility for encouraging a broader base of financial
support of the Women's Studies Program. There should be clear evidence of positive support for the program coming from various parts of the academic community. There should be released time for the program director, secretarial assistance, and funds for publicizing the program.

Gary Purcell
Mae Jean Go
Mary Peterson

Sub-Committee on Governance

The sub-committee was asked by the Commission to increase awareness among heads of University committees and administrative offices of the necessity for having representation of women and their views; develop a method for keeping the Commission aware of vacancies; and, to prepare lists of candidates qualified to fill positions and distribute them to search committees, administrative officers and committee chairpersons. However, the sub-committee revised its charge after determining that few positions except clerical and supporting ones were listed on the position vacancy list available through the Personnel Office.

The sub-committee focused its efforts on ensuring that all non-faculty positions be listed. A recommendation was made to that effect to the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration. Subsequently, the deans, directors, and department heads were notified by the Chancellor of the new practice recommended by the Commission. All correspondence follows.

Suzanne Kurth

Sub-Committee on Title IX

The sub-committee was instructed to find out what planning the University intended to undertake to implement the Title IX guidelines and how the Commission would be involved in that process. Following an inquiry to the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration a response (attached) was received indicating Commission involvement.

Nancy Lay
Susan Gordon
February 28, 1975

Mrs. Marty Begalla, Chairperson
UTK Commission for Women
812 Volunteer Boulevard
CAMPUS

Dear Marty:

We appreciate the interest of the Commission for Women in the implementation of Title IX at UTK, and intend that the Commission be involved in planning for the implementation.

As you know, the final HEW Guidelines have not yet been published. Until those guidelines are received and interpreted, no plans for implementation at UTK can be devised.

All of us are committed to the goal of Title IX, i.e., equality of access to and participation in educational programs and activities, and we have followed closely the progress of HEW in finalizing its guidelines. When we have the guidelines, we would be pleased to discuss the specific role of the Commission with regard to implementation on our campus, and we will welcome the Commission's aid and counsel.

Sincerely,

Luke Ebersole
Vice Chancellor

rwh

cc Miss Betsey Creekmore
SECTION III
SECTION III: GENERAL CFW ACTIVITIES

In addition to the work of the sub-committees, the CFW undertook several projects and programs as a group. The major projects are summarized in this section and others are recorded in the minutes.
Women's Intercollegiate Athletics

The CFW was approached by the Coordinating Council for Women's Programs (CCWP) about the current status of the UTk intercollegiate athletics program for women. Along with the CCWP, the Commission wrote a letter to the Chancellor suggesting the establishment of a task force to evaluate the athletics program and suggest future direction. The Chancellor established a task force during the Spring Quarter of 1975.

Survey of UTK Female Employees

The Commission requested through the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration that the Office of Institutional Research conduct a survey of female employees to access their attitudes about the status of women on campus. A similar survey had been conducted by the 1971-72 Task Force on Women. The original instrument was updated by the Office of Institutional Research from CFW suggestions and distributed in May, 1975.

The results of the survey were being analyzed at the time that many of the Commission members resigned. It is our present understanding that the final study will be made available to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration for distribution.

If another survey of employees is conducted, the following recommendations should be followed:

1. Males as well as females should be surveyed, particularly if child care data is gathered.
2. An additional question should be included for persons without children asking whether or not they would use child care facilities if they had children.
3. The questionnaire should be administered during the middle rather than at the end of an academic quarter.

Visibility of the Commission

An initial concern of the Commission was the low level of visibility it had both within the University and in the community. A sub-committee prepared the following report outlining several methods for increasing CFW visibility. Implementation of the recommendations are listed in the column to the side.

VISIBILITY OF THE UTK COMMISSION FOR WOMEN

One of the major problems the CFW has encountered in the past in becoming an effective channel for study, recommendation, and the
COMMISSION FOR WOMEN
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WOMEN EMPLOYED IN SUPPORTING, ADMINISTRATIVE/NON-FACULTY, AND ACADEMIC/NON-FACULTY CATEGORIES

Please answer all items

How long have you worked at UT? □ less than a year □ 1-4 yrs. □ 5-10 yrs. □ over 10 yrs.

Are you employed full-time or □ part-time? Previous work experience: ___ yrs.

Educational experience: (check all that apply) □ high school □ business college □ college (___ yrs.) □ other (please specify)__________________________

What is your title on your employment papers?__________________________ □ Don't know

In your department or area do you feel there are significant differences between males and females with similar qualifications on the following:

- Salary
- Title assignment
- Grade level
- Equalization of title with job duties and responsibilities—more accurate
- Promotion opportunities
- MBO evaluation
- Recruitment and hiring
- Other (please specify and comment)__________________________

Do you feel that you have been discriminated against in your work situation because of your sex by (check all that apply): [•] the university [•] department head or supervisor [•] others in your department. In what ways?

Are you regularly made aware of job openings as they occur on campus? □ Yes □ No

Is your husband employed at UT? □ Yes □ No □ Not married

If yes, has your job been affected by your husband's job? □ Yes □ No

If yes, in what way? □ insurance □ football tickets □ salary □ other (please specify)__________________________

If child-care facilities were available near campus, would you use them?

□ Yes, regularly □ Yes, occasionally □ No

If yes, what type? □ Infant Day Care □ Preschool Day Care □ After School Care □ Morning Nursery School Program □ Afternoon Nursery School Program

□ If you need after school care, could you provide transportation from school to the program? □ Yes □ No

If you would use the child-care facilities, check all of the age groups that would apply to your family: □ 0 - 12 mo. □ 3+ to 4+ yrs. □ 6 to 8+ yrs. □ 18+ mo. to 3 yrs. □ 5 yrs. □ 9 to 12 yrs.

Federal aid for child-care facilities require the following information. We need and greatly appreciate your cooperation. This confidential information will be seen only by the researcher, although no attempt will be made or is necessary to identify personnel through this questionnaire.

Total number of children in family:__________

Is your present child care adequate? □ Yes □ No

The combined income of the parents is: □ less than $9,000 □ $9,000 to $15,000 □ over $15,000

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BY CAMPUSS MAIL TO: Office of Institutional Research
111 Student Services Building
Please answer all items

Length of service at UTK: [ ] yrs.) Previous experience: [ ] full-time (yrs.) [ ] part-time (yrs.)

Highest degree attained: ☐ doctorate ☐ master's ☐ baccalaureate ☐ other (please specify)

Type of appointment that you presently hold: ☐ full-time ☐ part-time

☐ academic ☐ administrative with academic rank

☐ professor ☐ associate professor ☐ instructor ☐ lecturer

☐ administrative with ☐ administrative only

☐ professor ☐ associate professor ☐ instructor ☐ lecturer

☐ administrative with ☐ administrative only

(Title of Position)

In your department or area do you feel there are significant differences between males and females with similar qualifications on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and hiring</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job or course assignment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released time for research</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer teaching assignments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening teaching assignments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for consulting</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work load</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee assignments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBO evaluation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify and comment)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you aware of recent salary equalization efforts? ☐ Yes ☐ No

How or from whom did you learn about these efforts? ________

Do you feel that you were given proper consideration? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Have not been employed long enough

In your department or area, are qualified women individually encouraged to pursue additional study? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☐ Don't know

Would you advise a qualified woman to work in your department? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Would you advise a qualified woman to study in your department? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If not, why not? ________

Is your husband employed at UT? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not married

If yes, has your job been affected by your husband's job? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, in what way? ☐ insurance ☐ football tickets ☐ salary ☐ other (please specify)

If child-care facilities were available near campus, would you use them?

☐ Yes, regularly ☐ Yes, occasionally ☐ No

If yes, what type? ☐ Infant Day Care ☐ Morning Nursery School Program
☐ Preschool Day Care ☐ After School Care
☐ Other (please specify) ☐ After School Care

If you need after school care, could you provide transportation from school to the program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If you would use the child care facilities, check all of the age groups that would apply to your family: ☐ 0 - 18 mo. ☐ 3 - 4 yr. ☐ 4 - 6 yr. ☐ 10+ yr. ☐ 18+ mo. to 3 yrs. ☐ 5 yrs. ☐ 9 to 12 yrs.

Federal aid for child-care facilities require the following information. We need and greatly appreciate your cooperation. This confidential information will be seen only by the researcher, although no attempt will be made or is necessary to identify personnel through this questionnaire.

Total number of children in family: ☐ Is your present child care adequate? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Combined income of parents? ☐ less than $9,000 ☐ $9,000 to $15,000 ☐ Over $15,000

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BY CAMPUS MAIL TO: Office of Institutional Research 111 Student Services Building
consideration of problems related to women's status on this campus has been its lack of visibility both within the University and in the community. Its purposes and work have not been widely known or understood, and its very real accomplishments have often gone unnoticed or credited to other groups and people.

The visibility the Commission achieves must be carefully designed and systematically implemented. The kind of visibility necessary for the Commission to function efficiently and effectively as an advising, recommending, and coordinating group is a mandatory objective.

First then, the kind of visibility needed by the CFW must be ascertained. There are at least three areas in which visibility is mandatory:

1. The Commission's function and purpose must be understood by as many segments of the University and the community as possible. This visibility would serve to channel issues which are legitimate CFW concerns toward the Commission. Further, by sharing problems and information of general interest with the rest of the University and community, greater input of non-CFW members would be achieved.

2. The members (real and ex-officio) of the Commission and their various specific interests must be known to as wide a segment of the University and the community as possible. This exposure will serve to allow the CFW to provide information, advice, and help on specific concerns more rapidly. It will also serve to indicate the stability, respectability, and seriousness of the members and the University about the CFW.

3. The CFW should be visible in the planning and conducting of seminars, lectures, and programs whenever possible. This would aid planners of such activities by providing a resource and would allow the CFW better to perform its role of aiding in unifying all efforts for women.

Implementation of the three types of visibility could be undertaken in a variety of ways. The CFW sub-committee recommends that the CFW examine the following and adopt from these and other means a unified plan for each quarter.

CFW ACTION

I. Visibility of Function and Purpose

A. Request of John Clark, UTK Director of Public Relations that a feature article delineating CFW's emphases for Winter and Spring Quarter be prepared by his office for use in the Beacon in early February and amended for use in the next issue of the Orange Peel.

Request discussed with Office of Public Relations on 2/3/75. A press packet on CFW was developed and disseminated. Article published in Orange Peel.
B. Submit articles to at least the following UTK publications during Winter and Spring Quarter:
   1. Staff Stuff
   2. Feminist Findings
   3. Evening School Newsletter
   4. Graduate Cause
   5. College and School Newsletters

C. Have a column in the Beacon once a month, prepared by the CFW chairperson, on CFW happenings, goals, priorities, and problems.
   Articles appeared in Beacon as prepared by the child care, placement, and discrimination in the classroom sub-committees.

D. Send letters to women's organizations in the Greater Knoxville area (partial list available from the Greater Knoxville Chamber of Commerce) delineating the purpose and function of the CFW and possibly offering to send speakers from UTK who are women to speak in their areas of competence. This letter should contain enough information to provide material in the newsletter of any organization that has one. This is recommended for Spring Quarter, in order to describe this year's progress on issues.

E. Ask that Panhellenic and Mortar Follow through requested. Board be kept informed of CFW issues and priorities through ex-officio members of the CFW who are involved with these groups.

F. Arrange for a booth in the Student Center to make known CFW priorities when handbook is ready.

G. Ask to use a display case in the Student Center to represent visually CFW concerns.
H. Through letters from the chairperson, keep the faculty Senate, Student Coordinating Council and Graduate Council informed of CFW plans and projects.

I. Ask John Clark to prepare feature stories or news releases on various CFW projects and send to all local papers, including weeklies.

J. Ask to discuss the CFW and CFW projects on WSJK, WUOT and to appear on the early morning and Sunday "talk shows" on local commercial television and radio stations. Investigate "public service spots" for appropriate CFW issues.

K. On a regular basis, have a "project feedback" type session with appropriate administrative officials, open to University community.

L. Devise a "women's handbook" and either sell it or give it away. This might well be done in cooperation with the women's groups on campus, such as Mortar Board, Panhellenic, and Women's Programs in Continuing Education.

M. It should be pointed out that visibility concerning function and purpose can be achieved through undertaking projects and deriving visibility from the process by which the project is carried on. In other words, one would first solicit approval and support from the chancellor and vice chancellors, work through deans and directors, and publish results widely.

CFW ACTION

Chairperson met with each group listed and provided minutes throughout the year.

Referred on 2/3/75.

Referred on 2/3/75. Chairperson appeared on WUOT.

CFW held one session on 3/6/75.

See sub-committee report.

On-going.
II. Visibility of Commission Members

A. Contact local newspapers (through John Clark) and investigate the possibilities of feature articles on CFW members. Invite newspaper representatives to attend a meeting.

B. Identify, in brochures, quotations etc., anyone on the CFW as a member of the CFW whenever possible.

C. Send a list of CFW members to John Clark and ask that when news releases are sent about these people they be identified as members of the CFW.

III. Visibility through Planning and Participating in Conferences, Programs, Etc.

Ask, through the ex-officio members, that conferences, programs, etc., planned for or about women involve the CFW, either as a co-sponsor, or as a recognized segment of the University. Request that the CFW members appearing on such programs be so identified.

It is finally recommended that, while the chairperson would undoubtedly need to call upon various members to aid in the preparation of information for release to the media, all releases, articles, etc., come from the chairperson. It is likewise recommended that the Commission review articles and releases prior to their submission to the media in all possible cases.

See report on faculty reception and state-wide meeting.

Faculty Receptions

In order to promote social contact among the female faculty and administrative/professional employees, the CFW joined with Women's Studies
Committee, Office of Special Services, and University Center in sponsoring a reception. The reception was held at the Faculty Club, February 27, 1975 and attended by approximately 50 people.

CFW Open Meeting

The Commission held an open meeting on March 6, 1975, to hear suggestions and concerns. The concerns offered to the Commission at that meeting and their disposition are listed below.

1. Faculty Senate - Dr. Arthur Jones, President, Faculty Senate, took items that could be referred to sub-committees of the Faculty Senate and sent those items to the appropriate sub-committee chairperson. Dr. Jones was also sent CFW minutes to keep him informed of on-going projects.

2. Child Care - Ms. Eleanor Dempster's concerns were referred to the CFW sub-committee on child care.

3. Part-time Employees - These concerns were referred to the CFW sub-committee on salary.

4. Nurses Training Act - The information regarding the Nurses Training Act was disseminated to individual CFW members.

5. FLEX Time and EEOC workshops on March 25 - Letter was sent to Mr. Ed Bennett, Personnel Director, informing him of Ms. Eleanor Dempster's concern about investigating the possibility of FLEX time at UT.

6. Meeting space for women students - This concern was referred to the Coordinating Council for Women's Programs.

7. THEC statement on restructuring - No follow-up.

8. Grievance procedure for students - Such procedures will be outlined in the Handbook for Women.

9. Awareness of staff in advising centers - This concern will be brought to the attention of the Career Planning Committee and the Undergraduate Advising Committee.

10. Consideration of the problem of advising returning students - Same as number nine above.

11. Career Council Committee - Same as number nine above.

12. Proposal about Academic Integrity presented to the Board of Trustees - This concern will be mentioned in the Handbook for Women if the handbook handles the problem of sex discrimination.

13. Resources available at UTK are not made available to enough community people - Faculty Women's Club will be conducting tours of UTK in 1975-76.