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MEMORANDUM

TO: Vice Chancellor Ebersole and Assistant Vice Chancellor Creekmore

FROM: Alice Moses, Past Chair, Commission for Women

DATE: October 26, 1979


After an unconscionably long time, the report is finally finished. One reason for the long delay was that I wanted to check with Commission members regarding their agreement with the report and then made some revisions based on their feedback.

You'll notice, I'm sure, that the summary and recommendations section shows some of the frustration that members of the Commission feel with the University Administration. Please notice also that I have attempted to make it clear that the Commission's frustration is not directed at you. I feel, and I know other members of the Commission feel, that both of you have been as helpful as possible in supporting and forwarding the business of the Commission. Your efforts in our behalf are certainly appreciated. Suzanne Kurth, particularly, was adamant that we recognize these efforts, and that we express gratitude for your continued good will.

I hope that this report is satisfactory and apologize for its having been so long overdue. If I can be of any further help in this regard, please let me know. I've forwarded a copy of the final draft to Marty Black for immediate circulation to Commission members so that there won't be any pressure on your office to get it out.

AM: clb

cc: Marty Black
Suzanne Kurth
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of 1978-1979 Commission for Women

FROM: Alice Moses, Past Chair

DATE: October 16, 1979

RE: Attached

Since sending around the draft of the CFW 1978-1979 Final Report and receiving replies from some of you, I've slaved, labored, obsessed, worried, and asked for divine (as well as mortal) guidance in the writing of the summary and recommendations section that you will find attached. I am sending it to you because it is an outgrowth of both my conscience and conviction and I do not want to append it to the official report as coming from you unless it has your support. Furthermore, it is perhaps somewhat strongly worded for some members of the Commission to feel comfortable about endorsing it. Therefore, I'm sending it to you before it becomes formal and final so that you can decide whether or not you want to be considered as supporting or dissenting.

If you are in essential agreement with the statement, you need do nothing. If I don't hear from you by October 24, I'll consider you to be in agreement. If you do not wish to support what I've said, you may either write a dissenting opinion that I'll be glad to include or I will simply indicate how many Commission members supported and how many dissented from the views expressed therein. I just wanted you to have a chance to react one way or another. Thanks again for your time and attention to old news.
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INTRODUCTION

During the 1978-1979 academic year, the Commission for Women departed somewhat from the tradition set by earlier Commissions in that we did not base our activities on the goals set by previous Commissions. Although the areas on which the Commission focused reflect continuity with those of past Commissions, we focused on those areas that were of concern to participating members. The fact that issues of concern this year are similar to issues addressed in previous years is a function of continuity of Commission membership to some degree. However, it also reflects the fact that the same major issues continue to be of concern to women on campus from year to year. These issues are salary/equalization, promotion and tenure, and child care. The Commission for 1978-1979 also identified other issues, some of which have also been addressed by earlier Commissions.

The areas of concern for the Commission for the 1978-1979 year were determined by Commission members. Prior to the first meeting of the entire Commission, the Chairperson and the Student Assistant met with small groups of Commission members to solicit from them their particular areas of interest and concern. On the basis of these meetings, the following areas of interest were identified:

- Affirmative action
- Child care
- Communication among women faculty and staff
- Promotion and tenure
- Publicity
- Support staff
- Women's Center

At the first full meeting of the Commission, these areas were designated as foci for sub-committees and each Commission member was asked to sign up for the sub-committee(s) of her/his choice.
The activities of these sub-committees are reported below. Since not all sub-committees produced clear results, the report will cover only those that were active.

Child Care Sub-Committee

The Child Care Subcommittee of the CFW was designed to identify the child care needs of the university community and to ascertain appropriate and feasible responses thereto. The subcommittee viewed its efforts as auxiliary to those of Judy Kuipers who had already been attempting to arrange for such facilities. Initially the Subcommittee identified three tasks: (1) to survey the needs of the UT community, (2) to survey similar universities to ascertain what child care facilities they provide, and (3) to identify feasible facilities on the UTK campus. During winter quarter Marilyn Kent conducted a survey of UT needs (see Survey Report, p. 3). The survey to other institutions has not been completed. The subcommittee members, as well as Judy Kuipers, have made inquiries regarding facilities at UT, but as yet no specific arrangements have been found.

Child care facilities are needed at UTK; our survey undoubtedly represents a small sample of the community needs. This Subcommittee now needs to proceed with the survey to other universities and should continue to urge the UTK administration to cooperate in setting up appropriate facilities at UTK.

The Child Care Subcommittee of the 1978-79 UTK Commission for Women developed and distributed a child care survey during the months of January and February, 1979, at the beginning of Winter Quarter. The survey itself was advertised through articles in the Beacon and by word-of-mouth throughout the University Community. Thirty-two UT faculty, staff, and students responded to the questionnaire which was distributed through the UT Women's Center.
Results

Some results are:

32 respondents
25 women 78%
7 men 22%
100%

Of the 32 respondents:
20 are students 63%
16 are staff 50%
2 are faculty 9%

5 are single 16%
27 are coupled 84%

23 have primary family responsibility 72%
20 women 87%
3 men 13%

9 do not have primary family responsibility 28%
5 women 56%
4 men 44%

The 32 respondents represent 44 children with an average of 4.9 years, plus 4 unborn. 25 of the respondents, or 78%, would prefer their children to be in an educational day care setting. None of the parents had handicapped children. 25 of the respondents, or 78% have summer child care needs, expressed as "the same as the rest of the year." Most of the parents expect to pay between $20-$40 per week for child care. Many expressed a need for hourly rates.

Special Needs

In an area labeled "further needs", the following concerns were mentioned (in order of frequency mentioned).

Child Care
on city school snow days (12x)
after school (8x)
on city school holidays (7x)
during city school vacations (6x)
occasional sitter - sitting lists (6x)
drop-in basis (2x)
evenings (2x)
parent involvement (1x)
Conclusions

Although the committee has not examined the material in detail it is apparent from the surveys that there is a great need for child care on campus and in the Knoxville area. Each respondent has child care needs when she/he completed the survey, and the range of needs is varied. Further study is needed.

The Commission for Women 1979 Child Care Survey can be viewed in several different ways. The Child Care Subcommittee approached the task as an information gathering project designed to assist in the preparation of a final report dealing with UTK child care needs. The survey can also be viewed as a needs assessment of the UTK community child care needs. Finally, the survey must be approached as a beginning towards the development of solutions to the child care needs at UTK.

Communication Sub-Committee

The purpose of this committee was to attempt to increase communication among women faculty and staff. It was decided that the sub-committee would arrange and the Commission would sponsor several brown-bag lunches. Each Commission member was requested to sign up for one lunch and to bring to the luncheon a faculty or staff person (preferably a woman) who might be interested in the Commission. It was hoped that this would serve to bring women on campus into closer contact with the Commission as well as providing the Commission with input from non-members.

Three lunches were scheduled but only two were held. Because of the late starting time for the Commission, it was not possible to schedule lunches until winter quarter when inclement weather and illness cut into attendance. As with so many efforts made by the Commission, this seemed like an excellent idea and was met with enthusiasm. However, when it came to carrying out the idea of luncheons, it was difficult to harness the enthusiasm that members expressed. The burden of communication within the community of women on campus may be too
heavy for the Commission to meet, given the non-existence of funds and the time constraints under which all members operate.

It appears that if the Commission is going to attempt this kind of service in addition to its function as advisory body to the Chancellor, more energy and time will be required. It may be the case that this is a function more appropriately housed with the Women's Center or with an independently functioning group of campus women.

Support Staff

The Sub-Committee which dealt with the problems of support staff at the University came up with several priorities and areas of concern this year. The following items were brought up for discussion at one of the Commission's meetings with the Chancellor:

1. There seems to be widespread concern within the clerical and supporting ranks that there is a ceiling on clerical positions which is determined by the administrative rank of a person's supervisor. Rather than evaluating positions individually, it seems that clerical employees are unable to move up past a certain point unless their supervisors are promoted accordingly. The Chancellor's answer was that this is true to a certain extent.

2. There also does not appear to be adequate differentiation in grade levels between secretaries and unskilled laborers. It was suggested to the Chancellor that lower clerical levels be shifted upward in order to reflect the training and skills which those positions require. He agreed that this was a definite problem.

3. Non-exempt female employees of the University have many of the same problems that re-entry women do in pursuing degrees or taking classes. We suggested that the Chancellor's task force on re-entry women include this group of women also in their study of various options in order to make advancement more possible.

4. Other problems which had been discussed in past years were also brought up, such as the continuing need to educate faculty and administrators on the topic of sexual harassment, secretaries being called "girls" instead of "women", and clerical staff being used to do menial chores which are not included in their job descriptions.

At a later meeting with Chancellor Reese, this sub-committee proposed some changes in the Policy on Educational Assistance (Fee Waiver). In order to deal with the problem of some non-exempt employees not being able to use their lunch
hour to take classes, it was proposed that the employee must work a forty-hour week and that time taken for class attendance must be made up by a regular arrangement with the supervisor.

It was the opinion of the sub-committee that the lunch hour is unpaid, personal time of the employee and that, as such, its use should not be subject to official University policy. The Chancellor agreed to support this proposal and to pass it along to Ed Bennett and the University committee which deals with changes in the personnel policies and procedures.

Commission Activities

The Commission as a whole addressed a number of major issues during the year. Many of these issues are the same as those addressed by earlier Commissions. These issues were: the use of AAUP Guidelines in yearly salary review; use of the Hay Study; title changes; exit interviews; and the use of a ranking system for part-time employees.

Use of AAUP Guidelines in Salary Review. The Commission continued to strongly advocate the use of the AAUP Guidelines in salary reviews both at the state and University levels. We presented our position to Representative Bill Nolan, Chancellor Reese, Vice-Chancellor Ebersole, and Assistant Vice-Chancellor Creekmore, and to the Executive Committee of the AAUP (personally and in writing). Copies of these documents are in the Commission for Women files.

We received no written response from Representative Nolan. However, he did discuss with the Commission the possibility of including members of the Commission in hearings during the Fall of 1979.

The Chancellor responded to our formal request for inclusion of the AAUP Guidelines as part of the yearly salary study as follows:

"We will ask the Office of Institutional Research to apply AAUP Guidelines to produce an additional document for use in the 1980 salary equalization process and to share with us and with the Commission an analysis of the validity of this approach for ascertaining sex-linked salary differentials."
We will continue to utilize the actual and predicted salaries derived from the regression analysis included in the annual salary study as a means of 'flagging' possible inequities which should be reviewed by the appropriate Dean and Department Head. We will also use the AAUP-based document in this process. Since we annually review centrally the salary of every female faculty and staff-exempt employee, a variety of statistical tools for identifying salaries which may be inequitable may be appropriately used."

The AAUP's Committee made the following recommendations to the Full AAUP for submission to the House Finance Ways and Means Committee:

1. The state legislature conduct a uniform review of salaries at all state institutions of higher education for the purpose of determining inequities based on sex.

2. The predictors of salary should themselves be free from cumulative discriminatory practices which would tend to bias results in such a way as to minimize possible inequities. We specifically propose that rank and tenure status be excluded from analyses for this reason.

3. The level required for statistical significance should reflect the extensive human costs involved in failure to detect subtle yet consistent underpayment of low status groups. The .05 level of significance will detect only the most blatant instances of bias, and is therefore too conservative. We recommend a .10 level of significance to test for sex effects.

4. We further recommend that statistical procedures be adopted which will not only test for significant effects due to sex, but which are supplemented by procedures that identify specific women who apparently receive an underpayment, along with an estimate of the size of underpayment. Such additional information may be obtained by developing a formula for men's salaries and then applying the same formula to women who have the same qualifications, as is recommended in the AAUP Higher Education Salary Evaluation Kit.

Hay Study. The Commission requested of the Chancellor that the updated Hay Study be used to determine the distribution of men and women across categories and compare salaries and responsibilities within categories on the basis of sex. The Chancellor responded in writing that "Vice Chancellor Fisher would be glad to discuss the potential use of the Hay Study with the Commission. When this year's update is complete, we expect to have a more refined measure of job size and complexity and to be able to utilize the results as a 'flagging' mechanism in the annual salary equalization process." During the Commission's meeting with him, the Chancellor also suggested that Commission members go over
Title Changes. On November 29, 1978, the Commission was informed by Homer Fisher that Ed Bennett would have his title changed from Director of Personnel to Assistant Vice Chancellor and Director of Personnel. We were advised that this change in title did not constitute the filling of a new or vacant position.

The Commission was nonetheless concerned that, although this was a legitimate administrative procedure, it resulted in another white male in a position as Vice-Chancellor. The Commission was further concerned that should the combined roles be considered too much responsibility in the future, they would be split and another position would be created that would not, legally, require a search. The Commission was further distressed by the failure of the campus administration to consult with us prior to announcing the title change. These concerns were voiced to the Chancellor in person and to Vice Chancellor Fisher in writing.

Both the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor responded with assurances that there is no plan at present for splitting the positions of Assistant Vice Chancellor and Director of Personnel. We were further assured that, in the event such a split should take place, a search would be made.

Exit Interviews. At the request of the Commission, the Chair met with Walter Herndon on Tuesday, December 5, 1978 to discuss the matter of exit interviews. At this meeting, Dr. Herndon said that he was open to input from the Commission regarding both the form and administration of exit interviews. He also stated that he would be writing a summary report of these interviews at the end of the academic year (1978-1979) and that he would share that report with the Commission. At this time, no report on exit interviews has been received from his office.

Ranking system for part-time employees. During the spring quarter, the Commission for Women became concerned about the status of part-time employees
at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. It was brought to the Commission's attention that there is a lack of any kind of systematic ranking system to be used in giving assignments to part-time employees. The absence of any such system allows for discrimination in such assignments, particularly against women. The Commission communicated our concern about this matter to the Chancellor, the AAUP and the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Following the Commission's expression of concern, the Chair received a copy of a memorandum from Howard Pollio, President AAUP-Knoxville to the Chancellor supporting the development of specific ranking criteria for part-time employees. The Commission also received a memorandum from Chancellor Reese indicating that Dr. Herndon would "discuss the matter of the use of a 'ranking' system for determining the employment of part-time, temporary faculty with the Deans." He further stated that Dr. Herndon was concerned that "the Deans take an active role in ensuring that distribution of such appointments is made on objective bases."
Summary and Recommendations

In many respects, the Commission for Women experienced a frustrating year. The issues addressed by the Commission were in many instances the same as those addressed by earlier Commissions. Affirmative action in hiring, the achievement of equity in salaries, promotion and tenure, fair and equitable treatment for support staff, and provision of child care, as well as other concerns, are understood by Commission members to be large issues. We expect that it will take time and effort to achieve badly needed changes in these areas. What is frustrating is not simply the relative slowness of progress. Frustration is also felt with what Commission members frequently perceive as Administrative commitment to the letter, rather than the spirit of policies mandating equitable treatment for women.

The Commission for Women, like the Commission for Blacks and the office of Affirmative Action Coordinator, is essentially powerless. As an advisory body, we can function only if our advice is requested, heeded and supported by those who do have power. Since the Commission is seldom consulted, and almost never attended to nor supported, it would seem that our effectiveness as an advisory body in advancing the cause of women at the University of Tennessee is minimal at best.

Because of this, it is our recommendation that the Commission for Women change its focus. Until the present, we have been largely a reactive body and have spent most of our energy attempting to fulfill our designated function as "watchdogs" and advisors. The result of this has been a very limited usefulness. While it will continue to be necessary for the Commission for Women to be aware of and react to University policies and procedures that may be sexist in either intent or effect, it is suggested that the Commission begin to take a more active stance vis-a-vis the campus women's community. To this end it is further recommended that the Commission for Women identify our own goals and
objectives and that we explore ways to implement these.

In the interest of taking positive steps, it is suggested that the Commission for Women attempt to increase our visibility, support base, and number of positive achievements. This means establishing long-range pro-active (as opposed to crisis-oriented reactive) objectives, focusing on a few achievable objectives rather than dissipating our energy on a wide range of goals, and striving to develop greater year-to-year continuity.

If these things can be done, it seems conceivable that the Commission for Women could become what it is not now: a source of strong, positive leadership in the struggle for a non-sexist University.