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Dear President Enarson:

After completing our study of educational and employment opportunities for women and minorities at The Ohio State University, and the University's affirmative action programs, the Commission on Women and Minorities herewith transmit our report.

The report is in three volumes. Volume I contains a summary of the Commission's findings and all of the Commission's recommendations. Volume II is the complete report. Volume III contains the appendices, including minutes from all meetings of the Commission and its six task forces, as well as selected working papers and reference documents.

The Commission recognize the complexity of the issues it was charged to review, and the passions, opinions, and conflicting interests involved. We do not expect full agreement with our report. However, substantial consensus has developed within this Commission, although individual members reserve their separate views on particular points and on forms of expression.

The Commission thank you for the opportunity to serve you. We hope that we can meet with you soon to hear your reactions to our report and to discuss further the future of affirmative action at OSU.

Respectfully submitted,
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CHARGE TO THE COMMISSION

TO REVIEW THE STATUS OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN

AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

1. To study and evaluate current programs for broadening educational and employment opportunities for minority groups and women in all functions and activities of The Ohio State University, including programs specifically designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged students.

2. To inquire into and report on existing conditions, practices, and policies that result in any form of discrimination against or disadvantage for minority groups and women.

3. To delineate clearly and specifically the achievements as well as the weaknesses of the University's Affirmative Action Programs, and to suggest appropriate ways in which the University's efforts may be enhanced.

4. To communicate to the University and its various constituencies the significance and importance of the University's affirmative action efforts, and the need for increased sensitivity in this regard in employment as well as educational opportunities. In addition, to encourage the development and recruiting programs that will enhance educational and employment opportunities.

5. And, in view of the above, to make such recommendations as in the Commission's view would sustain, strengthen, and improve the whole concept and program of affirmative action at The Ohio State University.
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SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OPENING REMARKS

The Commission on Women and Minorities were assigned a broad charge (see page vi) under the Board of Trustee's resolution of July 11, 1975. The resolution encompassed the entirety of the University and penetrated vertically throughout the structure of the University. The Commission have responded as fully to this charge as time, energy, and resources have permitted, recognizing that ultimately they will have fallen short of the goal set by the Trustees.

This realization, however, ought not to diminish the acknowledgement of what the Commission have accomplished. In this portion of their report, the Commission have summarized what they have done and their recommendations. The Commission believe that some of their work has been unprecedented at this University and that the remainder of it has pulled together matters that have traditionally been treated in a discrete, ununified way.

The Commission believe, therefore, that what they have done will be of use to the University community in forming plans for future affirmative actions at this University.

CHAPTERS 1-3

THE MEANING OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AT THE UNIVERSITY

In addressing the subjects assigned them, the Commission first sought to reach agreement upon the meaning of affirmative action and equal opportunity within the context of higher education and, specifically, at this University. As a result of those deliberations, which were based upon an examination of the pertinent statutes, judicial decisions, administrative regulations, and commentaries upon these juridical acts, the Commission have concluded that equal opportunity is more than treating all people affected by affirmative action decisions the same way at a given time. Equal opportunity does include equality under the law and under the concepts of what constitutes fairness in an open, democratic society.
But equality is not synonymous with sameness. It does not rest upon an assumption that affirmative action has been legitimately served by treating everybody exactly alike. Most particularly, this is true when patterns of discrimination long established in social institutions have prevented persons from being able to bring similar qualifications to the purportedly equal occasion.

The Commission recognize that in American society, as presently constituted, there are many reasons considered socially legitimate to justify disequal status for individuals. The University by itself cannot change such disequality. But this society in the past generation has sought to eliminate many sources of disequality, previously tolerated or even praised.

The chance for an individual to improve a present status can no longer be lawfully barred because of that person's race, sex, religion, national origin, or ethnic identity. The University would be remiss if its processes did not reflect an enthusiastic acceptance of that change. University leadership is needed in order to extend the opportunities for individuals to change a personal status which they wish to alter.

The purpose of affirmative action is to permit and encourage freedom for participation by any individuals in any group on the basis of fairly determined standards controlling the entry of all participants. Views that would bar entry into the process of individually elected status change, however supported by tradition or private conviction, cannot be permitted in the operation of the University. Society and its legal institutions have made this determination, not this Commission. But the Commission believe it incumbent upon them to point this out to all persons involved presently or potentially in decision-making processes at the University relative to affirmative action.

Members of deprived categories of American citizens, as defined under the Federal and state laws concerned with affirmative action, have often suffered damaging educational treatment as the result of open or invidious discrimination. The fact that discrimination has been delegitimated does not mean it does not continue to exist on one level or another in the experiences which persons bring with them into the University community. No University affirmative action program which fails to take this into account can be adequate for the fulfillment of affirmative action goals.

Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that members of some affirmative action groups have frequently had experiences
that provide them with especially valuable insights into the institutional processes with which this University is concerned. Perhaps these stem from learning reactions stimulated by the very acts of discrimination. Perhaps these come from the richness of cultural backgrounds previously disregarded by the mainstream of social action in American life. Perhaps these are the product of the strength of a sex denied or minimized by traditional views of appropriate sex roles. Whatever the explanation, members of the affirmative action groups have much to offer this University, not only in affirmative action decisions but also in academic and administrative actions. Here too the Commission must point out that failure to take these special insights into account with respect to equal treatment for admissions to schools, for hiring, and for determinations relative to promotion and tenure would be a failure to act on behalf of affirmative action.

On the basis of their investigation, the Commission have come to the conclusion that affirmative action is part of a healthy management technology. It serves to open institutional actions to new ideas and to introduce the vigor and intelligence of people previously excluded. By providing hope where hope previously was lacking or denied, affirmative action enables individuals to mobilize their talents and energies in ways that socially strengthen all institutions that are the recipients of these personal efforts. Affirmative action permits a healthy action-interaction-reaction pattern of an open sort to take place between individuals in the affirmative action groups, individuals who are not, and institutions. Affirmative action, therefore, is not something to be grudgingly accepted by this University. It should be wholeheartedly welcomed and acted upon.

Some allege that affirmative action is dead or dying. We believe affirmative action is not even languishing. The Commission must conclude, on the evidence of our own investigations, that affirmative action has not been as vigorously pursued at this University as ought to have been the case. The Commission must conclude that much needs to be done at this University to intensify affirmative action movement. This University has a legal and moral duty, so intertwined as to constitute a single institutional obligation, to implement both existing and to-be-improved standards for recognizing human dignity and respect.

**THE ROLES OF THE UNIVERSITY RELATIVE TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION**

The University ought not to play off against each other its dual roles of educator and employer.
is not one or the other. It is inevitably both and, hence, must act accordingly, however difficult it is to simultaneously perform both roles under the affirmative action requirements.

Furthermore, the University's role of educator embraces more than what goes on in the classroom or laboratory. Education is an acculturative process as well as a degree-preparing program. In the acculturation process, all of the University is involved, not just the academic-training components. The cognitive skills with which the University is principally involved are an important element since acculturation is essentially a cognitive process. But learning at the University includes the whole of a student's experience and affirmative action programs at the University must accept this as a reality in student life.

As a result, the University cannot act as if affirmative action was a compartmentalized problem to be handled vis-à-vis students out of any particular office at the University, whether that office be the Office of Academic Affairs or the Office of Student Services. Affirmative action for students, as for others, is a University-wide responsibility.

COMPARATIVE UNIVERSITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOR MINORITY STUDENTS

Relative to minority students, the Commission strongly support the thrust of programs already undertaken for black students. The funding for these must be maintained and strengthened if the black community in the State of Ohio is to receive the assistance needed to enable their youth to make the positive contribution of which they are inherently capable. Effective interest at the University's vice-presidential level in the operation of programs for black students, and minority students generally, is required.

Most of the effort on behalf of minority students has gone into support for black students. Given the relative size of minority populations encompassed within the affirmative action groups resident within the geographical area wherein the University has primary commitments, it is to be expected that the heavier support would continue to be directed toward black students. However, the Commission is concerned that support for black students' needs is inadequate, whatever the relative weight in support black students have received comparative to other students.

But the question of support for nonblack target groups is a matter of great concern to the Commission. The Commission
have been particularly dismayed with the University's failure to deal with hispanic persons for recruitment as students in any way that would be equivalent to the relative portion their ethnic group bears to the total population of the geographical area primarily served by this University. This is a group which may have particularly severe bi-lingual and bi-cultural educational difficulties because of the continued contact with the home sources. The Commission can see little, if anything, that the University has done or plans to do to ease access of persons from this group into the University as students. Here, as also in the case of black students, it is important for the University to establish contact with secondary schools in order to assure a pool of candidates for admission to the University.

As for students with an Asian, Pacific Islander, or American Indian background, the University has been particularly indifferent. Their numbers are small in the geographical area served by the University. Where resources are small, one would anticipate that the University would allocate those resources where the number needing assistance is greatest. Very little has been done at the University toward the identification of these persons or toward the determination of the precise numbers in these affirmative action groups. The Commission believe that here, as in the case of hispanic students, the University has much work to do in reforming its affirmative action approach to both present and future students in these groups.

The Commission, having noted that the University has a primary obligation to the residents of a geographic area, point out that the University is part of a national enterprise which compels a broader approach to affirmative action than might otherwise be the case. With a substantial part of the University funding coming from the Federal government, hence from taxpayers all over the United States, the University has an obligation to be open to--and to seek out--students from groups previously granted little or no recognition here. These include especially hispanics, Asians, and native Americans.

The Commission stress that nothing should be done for one affirmative action group that would be at the expense of another. Each of these groups is composed of individuals who in the past (and, unfortunately, continuing into the present and likely to continue on into at least the near future) have suffered severe disadvantages from discrimination. Federal law requires that these groups all be brought equally within the scope of affirmative action. Recognizing that the support for black students has been insufficient to the need--
however large relative to the other affirmative action groups - the Commission strongly recommend against transferring funds from the support of one group to another. The Commission recommend that funds not be divided further, but rather that new funds be allocated.

To force one of these affirmative action groups to compete with others for funding would be, initially, harmful to the individuals within these groups and, eventually, disastrous to the peaceful operation of this University. Minority students have a sufficiently developed intergroup identify that any University attempts at dividu et impera will not only fail, but such attempts in their failure, would generate consequences the Commission refuse to contemplate. Rather than apocalyptic speculation, the Commission recommend that the University urgently pursue policies of maximizing University identification and support of all the affirmative action groups presently at the University. This must include vigorous efforts to increase the representation of these groups among the student body.

REACTIVE ACTIONS AS THE COMMON UNIVERSITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION STANCE

On the basis of their review of what has happened at the University over the past decade, the Commission believe that reaction has been the dominant cause for affirmative action. There is little evidence that at any time has affirmative action been self-generated within the regular processes at the University. This has been as true for academic parts of the University structure as it has been for the administrative and nonacademic portions.

Part of this has been the failure of the University to develop informational and management systems coordinate with the obligations of affirmative action placed upon this University by Federal and state laws. In 1971, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women pointed out many deficiencies in the data accumulation, interchange, preservation, and availability processes at this University. In the intervening years since the writing of that report, much has been done to compensate for the long-established deficiencies which were therein pointed out. However, the University's response to the important recommendation for coordinating management systems has been inadequate.

Perhaps the most important recommendation that former committee made was for the creation of what is called
"coordinating management systems". The Commission must conclude that for purposes of affirmative action such coordinating management systems are not in effective operation or even existence. Too much still depends upon information cooperation among decision makers as and when their responsibilities and, perhaps more significantly, their personalities will allow.

The Commission recognize the merit of the administrative reforms undertaken at the behest of the 1971 committee. But too many of those changes do not seem to have been more than officially concurred with by those having the duty to make them maximally effective. Obtaining information has been the bane of this Commission's operation, and the Commission would be remiss in their duties to the University if they did not say so.

Furthermore, the reactive character of the University's affirmative actions has produced an unfortunate, unnecessary, and perilous atmosphere of impermanency relative to affirmative action on the part of many at the University. There is an air of "ad-hoccery" about so much of what has transpired. The administrative structures seem to have a transient quality, as if another turn of a political wheel would sweep them all away. Because the University created them as a reaction to demands, rather than out of a sense of need, they have been added on to existing structures in a manner that makes their character as an afterthought painfully clear.

The Commission acknowledge that the University is a person only by legal convention. It is a composite of many persons, with markedly different levels of participation and responsibility. Nevertheless, there is such a thing as University action of a self-generated kind. The Commission cannot help but know in our personal capacities that large elements of change have been routinely suggested and carried through at this University without the necessity of groups substantially outside the University decision-making structure having to make demands, or Congress having to pass a new law, or the full weight of the Federal or state governments having to be thrown into the balance. The Commission know that affirmative action has not been among these self-generated changes to any significant degree at this University.

As a result, the University has followed rather than led in the fair treatment of women and minorities. Educational democratization has not reached fulfillment. The opinion has gained ground that the University reacts only to demands and that anything less can effectuate no change on behalf of women and minorities. The evidence heavily is on behalf of this view. Progress of the sort that is reactive to demand has
taken place at this University. Change of the sort that is self-generated has been in slight evidence.

The Commission believe that we must say in no uncertain terms that the time is gone when women and minorities are to be "tolerated" at this University by those illicitly asserting a self-defined right to extend or to withhold that "toleration". There can be no place within the institutional decision-making structure for people with those views.

However honest, generous, and vigorous the University's affirmative action might ultimately become, if even one woman or member of an affirmative action group is discriminated against by persons holding such attitudes, the University will be liable at law and in equity for the harm done. For purely corporate reasons of protection from fiscal liability, the University must move promptly to remove persons holding discriminatory views concerning women and minorities from positions where those views can impact upon individuals. The Commission believe the law requires this and the University must move to close the gap between women and minorities on the one side and their bigoted, entrenched adversaries on the other.

The Commission would deprive no individual at the University of the right to express any opinion. Academic freedom means at least this much. However, Federal and state law no longer will permit views to dominate decision-making to the detriment of the educational and occupational careers of women and minorities. The Commission recommend that the University vigorously act to inform all persons to this effect within the University, including faculty, who are in a recommendatory or action position relative to decisions concerning women and minorities.

The time has long gone by when the University could sit back passively and wait for some "intransigent" group to make another demand to which the University could then react. The sooner the University starts generating its own self-actions along these lines the better the situation will be--managerial as well as legal, academic as well as administrative.

In a nutshell, the University should adopt the role of an active innovator rather than a passive reactor.
CHAPTER 4

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND STUDENTS

Women Students and Affirmative Action at the University

There has been an overall increase in the numbers of women students in graduate school since 1965 at the University and in its professional schools since 1970. Increases have also taken place in the undergraduate programs. The presence of the woman student has been an increasing and intensifying phenomenon.

The Commission believe that the University must encourage the open reception of women students in what have been traditionally male-dominated disciplines. The University must set up liaisons with secondary schools so as to encourage girls to consider courses not previously regarded as suitable for them. Young women of University age should have a wide selection from which to choose careers. Accompanying this, the University should be prepared to see a drop in enrollments of women in traditionally female subjects and perhaps an increase of male enrollments in them.

The University must always keep in mind that it trains women, as it does members of minority groups, not only for the larger job market but for itself and its sister institutions of higher learning as well. The University has an obligation to increase the pools of qualified persons eligible for employment and for the furtherance of graduate instruction. There will never be enough women or minorities available for graduate school if the numbers in the concomitant undergraduate majors are not increased. And the University will never find competent people from among the affirmative action groups for faculty appointment unless the University assumes responsibility for the production of holders of graduate degrees.

The Commission conclude that these missions impose certain responsibilities upon the University, especially the central academic administration. Whenever there is a drop in the number of persons in the affirmative action group in any discipline at the graduate level, the University must find out why. Where there has been an increase in the number of women and other affirmative action groups holding graduate degrees and they are not represented (or only slightly represented) in the faculty of that discipline, the University must find out why.
The University cannot limit its inquiry to the faculty presently holding positions in the disciplines being investigated. It must include input from the members of the affirmative action groups who may be the victims of intended or objective discrimination. "Asking around among the guys" is a technique of inquiry the Commission specifically reject as being solely sufficient. It must be only one co-equal source of information in the development of a full University inquiry.

Women students demand more than an end to past discrimination against them. They will not accept any institutional sex-based barriers at face value and will hold suspect any assertion that they cannot compete, or ought not to be allowed for their own good to compete, or would make a greater contribution to social well-being if they would not compete.

Women today believe that as individuals and as members of society they can make their greatest contribution and reach their greatest individual fulfillment in equal educational, professional, economic, and social competition with men. The Commission urge the University to work wholeheartedly with that as the emerging view of the role of women held by women students in the late 20th century. Nor is there any evidence that this will cease to be the dominant view among women in on-coming generations.

Affirmative Action and Social Expectations at the University

All societies tend to demand homogeneity. The Federal and State laws in this society, however, have set limitations upon how far the demand for homogeneity can be carried. Within the limits as established by these laws, society is free to continue pushing in the direction of social homogeneity. What is important is that society not be allowed to put barriers in the way of individuals which would bar them from accommodating themselves to these demands for social homogeneity or would reject sincere individuals seeking to accommodate to that demand because they were of the wrong sex, race, or other affirmative action group. Nor, as noted above, does the law tolerate such actions by the larger society.

Although the Commission accept the tendency toward homogenization as a valid social demand related to acculturation, the Commission reject the right of society to compel individuals or groups into an homogenization unwanted by them. Persons and groups have a right to maintain their own identify and to contribute to a cultural heterogeneity, whatever the attitude of the social majority.
Furthermore, such heterogeneity eventually enriches the society seeking homogeneity, makes the ultimate social admixture a more complex and, probably, tougher composite, and often does this despite the misplaced wishes of the majority. It is one of the purposes of the University to sustain the richness of social heterogeneity available in American society, while at the same time assisting those individuals who wish to accommodate to the social demands for homogeneity. The University ought to be a heterogeneous and pluralistic society and actions taken ought to support that society.

Education is a means for changing one's status and for acquiring the skills necessary to obtain the chance at exercising choice for social change. As a society, the United States is still in the early stages of realizing these opportunities. The conditions at the University are reflective of this fact, although the Commission wish the University were in a more advanced position than the line taken by society generally.

Women and minorities tend to be clustered in certain majors although less so than in the past. Some majors are effectively without either women or minorities. Such absence may indicate a bias against their participation in those disciplines. Although the bias may be of the paternal sort that has concluded that certain majors are not "suitable" for certain minorities or women, the University has the legal responsibility to make sure that this is not the case. If a University inquiry indicates that such bias exists, such practices must be promptly stopped, whatever their motivation. It is for individuals within the affirmative action groups to make their own determination as to what are suitable majors for them, after they have been advised and counseled in a fair manner.

There has been an increase in the enrollment of minorities in the undergraduate programs and, as has been true for women, an increase in graduate programs. But in the case of minorities almost 50 percent of their numbers in graduate programs are concentrated in the College of Education. This is an unfortunate clustering, if for no other reason than the present fiscal state of the educational establishment to which these students must, in the normal course of events, look for their employment.

**Minority Student Recruitment**

The heart of any successful program relative to minority students lies in their recruitment and, then, in the successful completion of the students' college work. When minority students are conspicuous by their absence, or
when those who have been recruited drop out before successful completion of their required work, there can be no effective program for minority students. Steps can be taken leading to recruitment of more minority students and to more minority students successfully completing their college programs.

Prior to 1968, there was no particular effort on the part of the University to attract minority students. The University, from its founding, had been an open institution; a high school diploma from an Ohio high school had been the only prerequisite for undergraduate admission; and it was believed that the student admissions and financial programs then in existence were as applicable to minority students as to those in majority status. However commendable the egalitarian theory presumptively working behind this point of view, it did not succeed in attracting many minority students to this University.

What must be understood is that the University never exists in isolation from the larger community. When the larger community poses barriers to education for members of affirmative action groups, the University must take on the burden of counteracting those barriers and not merely ignoring them. Majority students have long had encouragement to seek higher education. They have had long-established alumni and professional organizations designed to establish interaction among high school students thinking about some particular field of higher education, college students engaged in higher education, alumni from the college working in the fields for which these programs trained them, and persons from other institutions in comprehensive professional societies. All of this has either not been available to the minority students, or has existed on a scale meager in comparison to the size of the programs for majority students.

Efforts have been made at the University since 1968 to recruit minority students, particularly black students. But these programs have not succeeded as well as they might have. Even those which have been successful need strengthening. Furthermore, in the case of hispanic students, particularly, more effort needs to be made by the University to increase their numbers in the recruitment process. As for Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and American Indians/Alaskan natives, the Commission have noted the University's national obligation to these groups even though, within the geographic area to be primarily served by the University, they are present in numbers that are very small in comparison to potential black and hispanic students.

The Commission, of course, deplore any overt or covert racism that may exist at the University. But more importantly, institutional changes need to be made so that any
unintentioned racist consequences flowing from institutional organization will not result or be continued.

First of all, the Commission recommend that there be increased numbers of minority persons brought into the recruitment process for minority students. This should be coordinated through the Office of Minority Affairs. If a College is sufficiently large in enrollment, there should be an assistant or associate dean or a director of minority recruitment on the staff of the College. There is no substitute for giving a student considering a particular field of study an opportunity to talk with someone in that field. This kind of recruitment effort is badly needed for minority students.

In this coordination effort, the Commission recommend that the Alumni Association work with the particular College alumni associations to identify the persons of minority status who would be willing to work with students. This work could consist of advising students who expressed an interest in their particular field of study or students who have already enrolled. It could also include conducting seminars for discussion of professional difficulties and rewards and of job opportunities of which only persons actively at work in the profession might have knowledge.

In the coordination effort, the Commission recommend that the adviser system in the University College (UVC) be used as extensively as possible. These advisers, in the first 2 years at a University as complex as this, are particularly important in establishing a student's identification of interests with particular fields of study. The Colleges have an obligation to work as closely as possible with these advisers. This means appointing a specific person, preferably an assistant dean or a faculty member with release time for engaging in such work with the UVC advisers and interested students.

The Commission recommend that the University increase the efforts of the Office of Minority Affairs to work with minority students in the high schools. This includes working with parents even after the young person has become a student at the University. The encouragement of interest in higher education on the part of parents of minority students is important. Among many such parents, it is already very high. But many legitimately question the worth of higher education for family members under conditions of family hardship.

These circumstances require encouragement from the University and persons should be made available to assist the Office of Minority Affairs in this important work. This could be done by deputing faculty or administrators to attend seminars in local communities in order to deal with any questions
In this regard the Commission does not recommend that these tutoring programs be for minority students only. Tutoring programs for use by all students will prevent the development of invidious attitudes relative to minority students, and will indicate to minority students a College commitment to helping students who need educational assistance rather than an indifference to their plight.

The Commission cannot overlook how important the successful recruitment of minority faculty and administrators is to the successful work of minority students. The presence of role models is important. Their success encourages the student and offers the student a realistic goal. The student acquires the knowledge that there is a place in the University for members of all groups and that professional success is a matter of individual merit rather than membership in a majority.

The Commission, however, caution that minority faculty and administrators ought not to be over-committed to working with minority students to the extent that the professional and/or academic success of these faculty and administrators is imperiled. Not only does that harm the faculty and administrators, but it ultimately is detrimental to the whole minority educational effort. The University, through the Colleges, is urged by the Commission to set guidelines of what is objectively expected of minority faculty and administrators, in consultation with them. It is, in the opinion of the Commission, dangerous to leave such decisions to highly personal, individual situations where no such objective guidelines exist.

The Commission recommend that advisory groups of minority persons be established, at least for every College. These would be composed of minority students, alumni, professionals, and community leaders, drawn from the minorities, who would consult with the dean on how best to utilize programs within the College for increasing minority enrollment, successful completion of courses of study, and ultimate placement. These advisory groups will greatly enrich the stock of ideas available for the improvement of College programs.

The Commission recommend that, in order to provide additional assistance of hispanic students, the Office of Minority Affairs add at least one full-time professional hispanic person to work specifically for the recruitment of hispanic students and the development of retention programs. Efforts must be made by the University to fairly coordinate the recruitment of students in all minority groups. However, given the fact that state rules in many colleges require not over 15 percent of student enrollment be from out of state,
or that preferences be given to in-state residents (not to speak of the distinctions imposed by the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition), the Commission must recommend that in this State the minority student groups upon which this University would be expected to concentrate its primary efforts would be black and hispanic students.

Opportunities must not be denied students in other minority groups, but their numbers within the State would indicate this statement is a reasonable basis for action by the University. However, the Commission recommend in this regard that the Office of Minority Affairs continuously monitor applications, the experiences of enrolled students, and the perceptions existent among the various minority groups under the Federal affirmative action program to make certain that no unfairness appears in the University treatment of any student in any minority or majority group.

The Commission commend the University on its effort since 1968 to recruit minority students. Much good work has been done by the Office of Minority Affairs and by the recruitment efforts of individual Colleges. But all Colleges are not to be equally commended. For that reason, the Commission has sought to point out actions which could be taken to produce a more even, University-wide policy and course of action for the recruitment of minority students.

The Commission, in Chapter 4, have delineated those areas in which various degrees of activity must be taken in order to achieve a successful University-wide minority recruitment program. The recommendations are now summarized:

(1) That an annually increasing number of capable minority students be recruited for each academic year. The academic backgrounds of these students should reflect such a potential that their curricular choices across the academic spectrum of the campus(es) is accompanied by their and the University's expectations of success in their chosen field of endeavor.

(2) That the student recruitment processes employed be conducted by the individual Colleges under well-defined guidelines from the top of the administration. It is in the Colleges that the requisite expertise for successful recruitment resides, or is expected to reside.

(3) That the implementation of the individual College recruitment programs adhere as closely as possible to the characteristics of the model program defined in Chapter 4.
(4) That the Colleges coordinate their recruitment efforts with both the Office of Affirmative Action and the Office of Minority Affairs.

(5) That the recruitment program supervisors have an administrative position within the College of at least assistant dean. Also, that these supervisors possess the sensitivity, dedication, and commitment requisite to program success, and that their primary functional efforts be directed to their recruitment and enhancement programs described in Chapter 4.

(6) That the University and its Colleges extend their community involvement to wider geographic area of the minority community. This extension should be implemented through the Office of Minority Affairs and the Black Studies Division.

(7) That the OSU Alumni Association work closely with the colleges and schools to identify minority alumni and to solicit their aid in the recruitment process.

(8) That the expertise within the counseling and advisement functions of the UVC be strengthened in order to provide sound, accurate upper-class-level information to incoming freshmen.

(9) That the University recognize the value of minority student organizations to the recruitment process.

(10) That the University maintain a constant awareness of the total value to a successful recruitment program of the role presented by minority faculty and staff. It is crucial to program success that this awareness manifest itself in the University's hiring, tenure, and promotion considerations.

(11) That each College establish a Minority Program Advisory Group. The group is to be responsible for short- and long-range planning and overall monitoring of the program's progress.
That the University clearly define and articulate operational objectives for the special services offices which serve minority students in order to eliminate duplication of effort.

Affirmative Action and Student Services at the University

Student services provided by the University cannot be all things to all students. The official responsibilities of persons working with women and minorities within student services should have their official duties carefully delineated. Part of the job description must include review and accountability. Competition among them for the scarce resources available for assisting women and minority students is conducive to the well-being of neither the administrators, the students, nor the University.

Several kinds of services are currently being provided all students at the University. Affective services, such as counseling, deal with the student's socialization and personal growth. Cognitive services, such as academic advisement, support the student in the educational process. The Commission have used the terms in this manner throughout the report whenever referring to counseling or advising of students.

In the case of both affective and cognitive services, the University provides a nearly total environment. This means that affirmative action requires maximum improvement in the delivery of all services to students in the affirmative action groups. Only in this way can the University assure itself that women and minorities among the student body have come into fair contact with activities previously regarded by traditional views as "unsuitable" for them. Only by pursuing such an approach can the University be sure such illicit views are no longer being implemented or allowed to block the aspirations of women and minority students.

Because of the expectations commonly established for students at American institutions of higher education, the University has an obligation to help students to relate to each other through organizations helpful at establishing healthy identities for them. This applies to students in majority and affirmative action groups alike. It means that programs for both women and minorities at the University must be coordinated so that their strength can be maximized and brought into positive interaction with majority student organizations in which women and minority students can also be expected to play important roles. The University cannot institutionally encourage systems of mutual exclusivities among the students or other members of the University community.
The Commission recommend that for both women's programs and black programs (as well as for hispanic programs when established) coordination be established at the vice-presidential level and not left to the responsibility of the middle strata within the University. This University is too hierarchically organized for middle strata to be able to effectively negotiate across the vertically constituted organizational lines in order to establish uniform programs for women and minorities. The character of University governance raises issues of problem control at all levels of the institution. This requires a Coordinating Committee at the vice-presidential level on Women's Services and another Coordinating Committee at the same level on Minority Students' Services. Only in this way can the University overcome the not-unfair perception on the part of women and minorities that "no one is listening".

The Commission know people are listening. But when they are middle strata in a table of organization where all decision-making has an upward-thrusting character there is not much they can do except screen information and pass it along "upstairs". The Commission want to get this information on affirmative action "upstairs" right away so that such decisions as funding increase, administrative reorganization, and inquiry can begin promptly. Otherwise, the practice will continue of accumulating grievances while the middle strata listens, of fomenting demands in the absence of apparent University interest, and of further strengthening the reactive decision-making pattern now apparently well established at this University.

Some minority students easily handle the University environment alone, while others have much more difficulty and need assistance. The University should not let its investment in the latter easily lapse. These students are too individually important and have too much potential social value for the University not to make extra efforts to help them manage their lives at the University with the same ease that most students attain.

But the University must be careful not to produce a contact between student services and women and minority students which is thought of as a program exclusively for the deficient or "problem" student. Women were not happy with an office for women being placed in the Counseling Center, and minority students grow increasingly resentful at being thought of as the only students with deficiencies.

Women, black, and hispanic students have all expressed a desire to have the opportunity to talk with personnel from their own affirmative action group. Partly this is a matter of role models, partly a sense of similar attitudes
Black students who have come to this University have accepted the fact that they are not attending a black institution. The same is true for women who have elected not to go to a women's college. But these students still need support for their group identity at this University because, by supporting them through the stress of higher education, the University will have helped them to maximize upon their efforts at improving their learning and occupational/professional situation. This effort should not be postponed until new monies have become available. The Commission recommend that present resources should be re-examined with the eye to maximizing to the fullest extent the scope of their possible success. This is short-term in regard to what appears to be lack of money. In the long-term, more funding will be necessary.

Many minority students are dependent on financial aids. The University is operating under conditions of relative financial stringency and that further infusions of money across the board are not a bright prospect. There will be greater pressure in the future for financial aids for all students and there is likely to be a greater response to that pressure. But the needs of minorities are such that a distribution of financial aids to them in greater proportion than their ratio to the student body is necessary, justified, and perhaps even dictated by the laws relative to affirmative action.

The last may be deduced from the legal pressure to produce more women and minority graduates in order to provide the candidates for jobs in the general economy. The demand to accomplish this is outrunning the ability of financial aids to support such affirmative action groups while their individual members are in institutions of higher education. The industries who are most strongly asserting this pressure have at least a moral obligation to assist in training these candidate pools—and if they refuse to provide such fiscal support in order to keep such pools in a shrunken condition, then they are acting with a covert intention to frustrate the requirements of Federal and state laws.

Here again is an opportunity for both industry and the University to establish an interchange with each other that could be fruitful for many purposes, as well as for providing more graduates in affirmative action groups. The Commission urges the University to vigorously explore these linkages with business and industry in order to expand the chances for support of persons within the affirmative action groups while they are in school and to assist them in seeking employment upon their graduation. As a policy, it will also produce positive results for graduates not included in the affirmative action groups.
The Commission recommend that the University make early commitments to within 50 to 75 percent of the previous year's aid so that the money will be available for aggressive recruitment of the more academically promising minority students. Failure to do this unreasonably allows sister institutions to take advantage of this University in the recruitment process.

Minority students, both before arrival and after coming here, should be given counseling on how to allocate their economic resources. Many minority students need to be directed to people who are able to answer questions about financial matters. The margin of fiscal resources possessed by the same minority students is such that these students cannot withstand the consequences of dealing with a misinformed or incompetent employee at the University. The Commission believe that if this effort is made on behalf of minority students initially, justified by their greater need, the University will find it has developed techniques that can be transferred to the needs of students in nonaffirmative action groups. Certainly, both the University and the general student body would be advantaged if correct information could be routinely channeled to all students and the weight of the administrative mechanism could be lightened for all students arriving at and progressing through this University. The Commission also recommend that the mechanics of form preparation be moderated and that the University offer students assistance through the administrative maze that seems to defeat the purpose of minority recruitment.

The Commission further would not limit access to financial aids to what has been defined under University rules as the full-time student. Students enrolling for fewer than 6 hours per quarter ought to be permitted to make a case for some degree of financial aid from the University, and this is the recommendation of the Commission. Current University rules should be changed to assist such students who frequently are among the most ambitious, self-reliant, and intelligent members of the student body. Flexibility for granting financial aid between the full-time and part-time student is essential in the view of the Commission.

The Commission recommend that more women and minority persons should be deputed to serve on the University Financial Aids and Scholarship Committee. Women and minorities have viewpoints that need full expression in that committee and their proportional weight in the decision-making process needs to be increased.
Affirmative Action and Student University Employment

The Commission was concerned with issues of student employment at the University as these were impacted upon by affirmative action. For this purpose, the Commission examined the figures maintained by the University in accordance with Equal Employment Opportunity job classifications for the academic years 1972-1973 through 1975-1976.

The Commission learned that in each of the years studied women students shared in the work force at a level of representation somewhat higher than the percentage of their representation in the overall student body. The representation of black students in the work force was substantially higher than their representation in the general student body. Other minority students shared in the work force in almost exact representation to their representation in the student body.

On the basis of the above, the Commission conclude that there is no unfair representation of women and minorities in student employment at the University. These affirmative action groups have been favored at the University in the distribution of total jobs. However, what the Commission did not have time to learn is how these jobs are spread among the full range of job opportunities. A review for that purpose at the University is in order. The Commission, therefore, recommend that a review be undertaken of the full range of job categories at the University for which students are eligible so that the University will know how the differing job categories are allocated between affirmative action and non-affirmative action groups of students.

The Commission made a separate analysis of graduate students working in graduate associate work classifications. In some instances, the Commission received lists containing needed information from such sources as the Graduate School and the Office of Affirmative Action. In other cases, the Commission had to hand-pull certain statistics from computer printouts.

The Commission compared the statistics in the academic year 1972-1973 with those for 1975-1976, the latest period for which a full range of statistics was available. The Commission learned that the total number of graduate students had increased, the number of women graduate students had increased, and the number of all graduate students receiving University compensation (including women graduate students) had increased. In both academic years, the representation of women receiving University compensation as graduate students was below the percentage of their representation in the total numbers of graduate students.
What is significant, however, is that in that interval the gap increased in this difference between University-compensated graduate women students and their representation in the total graduate student population. In 1972-1973 it was 30 percent versus 34.6 percent, while in 1975-1976 it was 32.4 percent to 40.9 percent. As women have striven to increase their individual opportunities through graduate education in the 1970's, the University has been unable to, or unwilling, or indifferent in keeping similar pace with University compensation for women graduate students.

The Commission, therefore, recommend that the University determine why there is this gap—and an increasing one at that—between the percentages of University-compensated women graduate students and the total graduate population. The Commission cannot assert that this gap is unjustified in terms of relative grade levels, full- as compared to part-time enrollment status, application levels, and other related matters on a comparative sex-differentiated basis among graduate students. In so doing, the University must also learn if there is overt or covert discrimination against women graduate students in the extension of the University compensation or if women graduate students are in any manner discouraged from seeking such compensation.

The University in the investigation should also determine if compensation programs for part-time graduate students may not be of special value for the returning, more mature, and perhaps more financially vulnerable woman student. The Commission recommend that such a comprehensive investigation be undertaken, preferably through the Graduate School, and that women graduates—both those receiving University compensation and those who have not received it—be involved equally in the process with other persons conducting the investigation.

In the case of black graduate students, two-thirds of them receive financial assistance. The ratio of black graduate students receiving University compensation has been slightly higher than black representation among the total graduate student population. Again, however, the Commission found that between 1972-1973 and 1975-1976 there was a significant drop in the proportion of black graduate students receiving associate appointments. Even so, black graduate students received associate appointments in proportion to their total number. This number, though still small, is steadily growing. The Commission, for this reason, is particularly disturbed in the noted drop over the 4-year period studied.
The Commission, therefore, recommend that the Graduate School make an investigation to determine if this is a temporary phenomenon or a permanent trend and, in either case, what the justification for it may be. If it is a permanent trend and is unjustified, the Graduate School must promptly take action to terminate the practices that have produced such a condition.

Because of the condition of the University's records relative to Asian Americans, it was impossible to make any determination for any of the years studied about the proportion of Asian American graduate students receiving University compensation to the total graduate population. In all years the figures indicate a higher number of Asian American graduate students receiving University compensation than there were reported total numbers of Asian American graduate students. The Commission recommend that the University note this inconsistency and attempts be made to clarify statistics relative to Asian American students in general and graduate students in particular. Such a recommendation confirms Federal and state affirmative action laws.

In the case of hispanic graduate students, for all years examined, practically every hispanic graduate student has also received University compensation as a graduate associate, a situation unmatched by any other affirmative action group of graduate students. However, the number of hispanic graduate students, relative to the percentage Spanish-surnamed persons bear to the total population, even in the states, is very small. The Commission recommend that the University consult with representatives of hispanic students and organizations of Spanish-surnamed persons in order to increase the flow of hispanic graduate students at this University.

The numbers of native American graduate students have been too small for the Commission to draw any conclusions. Currently there seems to be more than fair support for those who are graduate students.

The ability of graduate students to finance their education often depends upon University compensation because of the long time period and intensity of scholarly application often involved. There is a need to increase the numbers of women and minority graduate degree holders. Efforts must be made by the University to increase their numbers in the application pool and to make certain that there is fairness in the manner of distributing University compensation among affirmative action groups and between these and the non-affirmative action groups.

Ultimately the individual worth of each graduate student should be determinative in the process of admission, compensation, and earning of the degree. The Commission strongly
support this view as the only means of upholding the quality of graduate degrees earned at this University. But the Commission recommend that the University make vigorous efforts to make certain that there is no discrimination, intentional or invidious, in these processes that would suppress the legitimate aspirations and potential success of individuals in the affirmative action groups.

Women's Athletics

The Commission, in examining the requirements of affirmative action and student services at the University, looked closely at the support for women's athletics. It is the conviction of the Commission that women must have equal participation in all decisions affecting athletic programs at this University, not excluding athletic programs in which women do not participate. Financial disparities in University support for men's and women's athletic programs must always be justified.

The same requirement for justification is necessary in relation to contracts for coaches in men's and women's sports. This is particularly true where both men and women participate in similar sports that receive about equal public interest. The Commission, however, in making this statement, do not eschew the responsibility of the University athletic program to undertake efforts to change public attitudes relative to men's and women's events in the same sport.

Women coaches at this University are regularly given additional assignments, unlike their male counterparts. This is particularly unfortunate at a time when the efforts of these women coaches are so badly needed in encouraging girls' athletic programs at the secondary school level, so that graduates of these programs arrive at the University with the expectation and skills to undertake a broader range of women's sports than is now the case.

The Commission, therefore, recommend that women coaches be given only coaching assignments plus liaison work in secondary schools to assure the University a steady procession of women athletes capable of participating in a broad range of sporting competition. If this is fiscally impossible for the University, then the Commission recommend that men and women coaches be given equal teaching and administrative assignments. This would free some time for the women coaches to do the sort of work men's coaches have traditionally enjoyed and would equally distribute the burden throughout men's and women's coaching ranks at this University.

Men's and women's athletic facilities are far from equal. Improvement is badly needed and much of the failure
stems from University planning that has been without regard for the woman athlete. The Commission recommend that women coaches, athletes, and students must be brought into the decision-making process in all athletic matters, including the design of facilities.

The Commission recommend that the University provide counseling for women athletes. This includes special training programs for women who have not had the previous opportunity for good athletic training. Some work along this line has already begun for the minority women students and it needs to be expanded for women generally who may have had no or inadequate physical education and athletic experience at the high school level. This must also include counseling for the woman athlete who has been unprepared by her background to deal with competition.

There is far more to the work of the student services at this University than raised herein. Much of that work is to be commended. The Commission have been particularly struck by the positive response of the University to recommendations of previous committees and task forces concerned with women and minorities. This has given the Commission heart and may even go some way to counteract the earlier expressed view of the Commission that puts much emphasis upon the reactive rather than the self-generative capacity of the University. Yet there is much to improve upon. It has been in this spirit that the Commission have reached their conclusions and made their varying recommendations.
CHAPTER 5

THE FACULTY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Faculty Statistics--General Observations

The Commission undertook their investigation of the relationship of affirmative action to University faculty with the foreknowledge that, at least in appearance, there had been nonprogress in the recruitment of women and minorities to faculty positions in the 1970's. Their study confirms that this is not just appearance. It is harsh reality.

There has been much activity, and the Commission commend those who have raised the representation of women and minorities among University faculty. But activity without results is not progress.

Once again, statistics at this University often are impossible to reconcile, which makes cross-verification also impossible. For example, this University, in the years 1971-72 through 1975-76, had either an 8.0 percent or a 0.8 percent increase in faculty, depending on which sources are used. The Commission believe that 8.0 percent is the more accurate figure. If the 8.0 percent increase is correct, then the percentage of women to total faculty increased 5.0 percent in a 5-year period; minorities, 3.3 percent. However, if 0.8 percent is correct, the situation for women and minorities is extremely serious.

If the University had set about to conceal, deliberately, the statistical facts, it could not have done a better job. The Commission do not believe that is the case. However, now--5 years after affirmative action became applicable to higher education through operation of Federal statute, and even more years since the state passed applicable antidiscrimination laws--the current information system is inexcusable. The plans for better data systems by 1978 can only be applauded, and their implementation urged, with haste.

Women Faculty

In a time of announced fiscal stringency, the University faculty increased by 6 percent in the year 1976-77. In that same year, women faculty increased by 8.5 percent, which restores the percentage of women to total faculty to the
percentage existing in 1971-72, i.e., 19.5 percent. Consequently, progress for women in 7 academic years has been zero, and it would be markedly down if there had not been an unaccounted increase in overall faculty employment in 1976-77.

University statistics show a better picture for women on an overall basis than on any breakdowns. For example, if University Libraries and Cooperative Extension Services faculty, which traditionally have been heavily populated by women, are excluded from faculty counts, women comprised 15.3 percent of the total faculty in 1975-76, and comprise 15.4 percent in 1976-77. If, in addition, the almost entirely female faculties of Home Economics and Nursing are excluded, the percentage of women faculty to total dropped to 11.6 percent in 1975-76.

Statistics by rank show that the number of women professors and associate professors dropped in the years from 1971 to 1976. The percentage of women assistant professors increased somewhat in that time. In terms of percentage, women instructors increased substantially, but their number remained essentially the same. The percentage gain was due to an overall decrease of instructors at this University, a phenomenon occurring among lower nonacademic staff ranks, as well.

Activity in the direction of recruiting women faculty has been in areas traditionally deemed suitable for women, e.g., Nursing and Home Economics, or more open to women, e.g., certain areas of the Humanities. In the male-dominated disciplines, there has been no discernible movement in the direction of hiring a higher percentage of women faculty than existed at the beginning of the 1970's.

Minority Faculty

The statistics for minority faculty do not present any encouraging signs. The percentage of minority faculty to total faculty has gone from 5.0 percent in 1972-73 to 4.6 percent in 1976-77, despite the increase in total faculty in the latter year. Of concern is the drop in minority faculty, which began after 1972-73, continued, and intensified in 1976-77. Possible reasons for that drop include the structure of the current tenure system; an overload of teaching assignments at the expense of research; and the "publish or perish" syndrome, which, admittedly, plagues almost all University faculty.

Black Faculty. When the Department of Black Studies faculty is excluded from statistics on total black faculty at the University, black faculty show an overall loss in the years from 1971 through 1977. If the Department of Black Studies is
included, the increase is so small that it is worthless to calculate it in terms of percentage. The situation for black faculty at this University has been one of gradual deterioration.

Black faculty also are not progressing in individual faculty ranks. For example, there has been only a 0.2 percent increase in the number of black full professors in 7 years. Black faculty also have increased slightly at the instructor level, but, in the ranks of associate professor and assistant professor, there has been a decline. The allegation that there has been a national black talent search which has allowed black faculty to bid—or, as some insist, overbid—their market command-price is a pure myth when applied to this University.

The Commission took a head count, as of January, 1976, of all black academic classroom faculty, excluding courtesy appointments, and including University Libraries faculty and all joint faculty appointments. Of those, 61 percent had been appointed since 1970. Nearly 38 percent of that group of appointees were in the Department of Black Studies. On the basis of examination as of October, 1976, taking into account the relative sizes of different Colleges and the different sizes of availability pools of black candidates for each academic area, no College, on the basis of percentages, will get—nor deserve—any commendation from the Commission, with the exception of the College of Social Work, an area which continues its tradition of being accessible to blacks.

Asian/Pacific Islander Faculty. The Asian faculty constitute the second largest minority group within the University, though their number is by no means large. In 1976-77, Asians accounted for 2.3 percent of the total faculty.

Aside from East Asian Studies, Asians have their greatest clusterings in the Colleges of Engineering and Mathematics and Physical Sciences, and in the Department of Sociology, areas that traditionally have been accessible to them. However, the total Asian representation, even counting those with appointments in University Libraries, is small, with only 29 percent joining the faculty after 1970. The arrival of Asians cannot be said to have been the result of any University commitment to affirmative action.

Hispanic Faculty. There is a substantial hispanic population in the geographical area served by the University. In October, 1976, there were only 13.15 full-time-equivalent (F.T.E.) faculty appointments held by hispanics in the University. Although University records do not show it, none of those appointments were held by Chicanos or Puerto Ricans. Over half the hispanic faculty have been appointed since 1970, but the Commission conclude that those appointments are not the result of affirmative action.
American Indian/Alaskan Native Faculty. Only 4.00 F.T.E. American Indians have been identified among the University faculty in 1976-77. The Commission did not reach any conclusions regarding American Indian or Alaskan Native faculty at this University.

Graduate Faculty--Women

Numbers of women graduate faculty are extremely low, as are their percentage to total graduate faculty. In 1975-76, 8.0 percent of the graduate faculty were women. They comprised 13.1 percent of all Category 1 graduate faculty, and 4.2 percent of Category 2 graduate faculty.

In 1975-76, 40.9 percent of all graduate students at this University were women. They have few female role models with which to identify, and the Commission note that this ultimately might lead to a drop in enrollment of women graduate students, although their numbers have increased steadily, and dramatically, in the past 12 years.

Yet, the women graduate students--and women graduate faculty--still tend to cluster in academic programs long considered "acceptable" for women such as Education, Humanities, and the Arts, or dominated by women, such as Nursing and Home Economics. Few role models in nontraditional areas perpetuates low women student representation.

Graduate Faculty--Minorities

The negligible percentage of minority graduate faculty poses another serious problem for the University--lack of role models for minority graduate students. In 1975-76, 1.5 percent of the total graduate faculty were black; 1.5 percent Asian; 0.2 percent hispanic; and 1.1 percent American Indian/Alaskan Native.

There seems to be little hope of recruiting any minority faculty from the ranks of this University's own graduate students. In 1975-76, about 5 percent of the University's graduate students were black, heavily clustered in the College of Education; 0.4 percent Asian; 0.4 percent hispanic; and 0.06 percent American Indians/Alaskan Native. This is isolated, but graphic, evidence that a low level of minority role models produces a low level of minority student representation.
Auxiliary Faculty

The Commission examined the position of women among the salaried auxiliary faculty, since they had been assured that most salaried auxiliary faculty are women. That did not prove to be the case. In October, 1972, the percentage of salaried women auxiliary faculty was 30.7 percent. In October, 1975, it was 31.7 percent.

The numbers of minorities among the salaried auxiliary faculty were negligible.

Faculty Statistics--Conclusions

For both women and minorities among the faculty in the years 1971-72 through 1976-77, according to available statistics, the Commission reviewed percentages by rank, College, tenure and nontenure track appointments, and by salaries (see Chapter 10). The Commission found that faculty data were difficult to interpret. There were only minor increases in women and minority faculty in the years since affirmative action mandates were set forth. Those increases, it seems, have come at the expense of other affirmative action considerations, such as support programs for women and minorities, and have been random, rather than systematic.

The only conclusion possible is that AFFIRMATIVE ACTION HAS MADE NO PERCEPTIBLE CHANGES IN ACADEMIC HIRING PRACTICES AT THIS UNIVERSITY IN THE YEARS SINCE 1971. From the point of view of results, it is as if the Congress had never extended the equal opportunity legislation to higher education.

Academic Administrators

Among academic administrators, the latest figures the Commission could use were for December, 1975. The Commission was supplied with figures in mid-December, 1976, but it has been impossible for the Commission to include them in this report. The Commission urge the Office of Affirmative Action to do so.

As for women in the ranks of academic administration above the level of assistant dean, the years 1971-72 to 1975-76 show two woman-held appointments. The number of women non-academic assistant deans has dropped sharply and two women academic assistant deans have been appointed. Women assistants to deans show an increase. Of 98 chairpersons in October,
1975, only three were women, and one of these was subsequently replaced by a man.

In the same period, four black men have held positions above the level of assistant dean in academic administrative appointments although not all remain. There were four minority assistant deans in the same period and minority chairpersons increased from two to three.

The influence of a single individual may be far greater than the number of that individual's affirmative action group.

The Commission are pleased that the University has a woman Associate Provost and one College is headed by a black dean. But the University need not think it has reached any resting point in pursuing affirmative action goals in relation to appointments to academic administrative position.

Faculty Retention

The Commission were unable to obtain summaries of numbers of faculty leaving the University for any given year. But the Commission did develop a questionnaire to be answered by faculty leaving the University in the period from July, 1973, to June, 1976. One hundred fifty women faculty who had left the University in that period were identified. The results of the questionnaire provide more information than the University has previously had on faculty turnover.

Minority faculty left at a rate in excess of minority appointments. Minority women particularly had a high turnover, with three leaving for every one appointed. Nonminority women, however, showed a net increase in the number of those appointed to those who left. While new appointments of minority faculty are occurring at a higher ratio than their percentage on the faculty in the academic year 1976-77, more are leaving in various disciplines than are being appointed.

Responses to the Commission questionnaire raise real concerns for intensive reviews by the University. Minority women and hispanics, in particular, expressed the greatest dissatisfaction with the University's affirmative action effort. Job offers, opportunities for administration, and the apparent lack of efforts to retain faculty are reasons for their dissatisfaction, not unrelated to the University's affirmative action program.

The Commission do not recommend that the University have an on-going program to inquire among departing faculty as to the reasons of their departure. But these people have
information based upon their experiences at the University which could be of value to the University. For that reason, the Commission recommend the University continue to pursue reasons for faculty turnover and to work the results of that investigation into University planning generally, as well as into affirmative action planning.

Two other questionnaires relating to faculty concerns were administered for the Commission by the Polimetrics Laboratory at the University. The Commission commend the Laboratory for the work done and particularly commend its director, Dr. Stuart Thorson, for contributions beyond those of any contractor. Potentially the most important of the three faculty-related questionnaires is the one for current faculty. It is, unfortunately, the one which the Commission have been unable to consider thoroughly as part of their final report.

This questionnaire was sent to all regular women and minority faculty at the University in Autumn Quarter, 1976, and to selected nonminority men faculty as well. The returns were satisfactory for purposes of statistical analysis. About 57 percent of the men responded, 43 percent of the women, and 35.3 percent of the minorities. This questionnaire could not be distributed until late in the Autumn Quarter, 1976, and the response could not be delivered to the Commission until January 20, 1977. It has been impossible for the Commission to work all of the relevant material into their report, but a summary of new data appears in Appendix V-7.

The Commission recommend that the Office of Academic Affairs undertake a full analysis of the material contained in this questionnaire's responses, by June 30, 1977, since the particular significance of the information lies in its currency as well as the numbers responding, and since the University both needs and lacks information on faculty attitudes regarding affirmative action.

Studies such as those made by this Commission can initiate more studies which either cannot be completed or which have an on-going character. Even a commission allotted much time will likely produce studies which cannot or should not be completed by the time the group terminates. This is particularly true for our Commission's salary equity study (see Chapter 10), the inquiry among departing faculty, and analysis of the questionnaire circulated to present faculty. All three require further attention from the University administration. They will provide some of the information the University needs in pursuing an affirmative action program capable of being regarded as adequate under Federal and state laws.
As were all Commission questionnaires, the ones circulated to chairpersons were sent by a Commission acting under a direct charge from the Board of Trustees. They were accompanied by a special letter from the University President urging full cooperation. The Commission had every reason to believe there would be a prompt and nearly full response. The Commission's assumptions were unfounded.

The Commission made a continued effort to increase the levels of chairpersons' responses. Finally, in order to get results from the questionnaires into this report, efforts to raise the response level were terminated.

There was a 68 percent return. A number of respondents did not complete the entire questionnaire. (For some questions, the response was well below 50 percent.) Those who would not respond at all, or those who would respond only in part, have delivered a stronger message to the Commission and University than they may have been aware.

The behavior of these University bureaucrats supports a recent study which found that governmental bureaucracies have the poorest response to affirmative action; unless it is vigorously enforced as a top-priority item by the President, the bureaucracies tend to ignore affirmative action in the name of their "higher" missions (James Q. Wilson and Patricia Rachal, "Can the Government Regulate Itself?", Public Interest, No. 46, Winter 1977, 3, at 7-9, 12-13).

The Commission cannot say if this hypothesis fully applies at this University, but there is considerable evidence that it does. Persons in decision-making roles at this University have no "higher" mission under Federal and state laws than the implementation of affirmative action, under pain of subjecting this University to drastic penalties that will certainly interfere with their self-determined "higher" missions.

The Commission have sought to summarize the results from the chairpersons' questionnaire as fully as possible in Chapter 5 of this report. The Commission strongly recommend that administrators at this University carefully read and study that analysis.

The Commission also recommend that the President sponsor training sessions with both academic and nonacademic administrators at this University to impress upon them the importance of special charges from the Board of Trustees, of special requests from the President, and of the operation of specially charged University commissions. It is important that
the faculty understand that noncompliance with Federal and state mandates may result in severe penalties against this University.

Faculty Recruitment

The Commission recommend that faculty recruitment practices be consistent with University rules, and that search committees include, at a minimum, tenured and nontenured faculty, students, and, where possible, women and minorities. Women and minority professional organizations particularly must be consulted. At this University, the Commission must conclude that, although there are a few exceptions, there are no affirmative action recruitment efforts for faculty.

Closer University pressure and surveillance are needed on those recruiting women and minority persons to the faculty. Clearer directions are needed. Affirmative action is not something the recruiting or promotion processes are to get around to when they have time. It is something to be done daily as part of the regularly established routine.

The Commission recommend that each College Dean establish an Affirmative Action Coordinating Council (AACC), which must include women and minorities. In consultation with the chairpersons and/or departmental faculty, this Council would establish recruitment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increase guidelines in relation to the pools of women and minorities available in particular disciplines within the College. If no women nonminorities are available among the College's faculty, they must be represented by those among the College's graduates. If a College has no women nonminority graduates, then it must turn to women and minority leaders in professional organizations in the community.

The Commission recommend that the Dean and the Council develop procedures for recruitment and retention of University faculty, consistent with University rules and the University Affirmative Action Plan. The AACC, in conjunction with the Office of Affirmative Action Plan, should develop training programs and information sources to implement the objectives of open, direct recruitment and retention techniques for women and minority faculty members.

Recruitment and retention practices should be reviewed each year, by the Dean and the Council. The Dean and the Provost in their review of chairpersons' appointments should consider the results of affirmative action.
Faculty Promotion and Tenure

The Commission recommend that the University, both for purposes of affirmative action and generally, determine where the priorities lie in hiring, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increase in relation to teaching and university governance on the one hand and publication and productive research on the other. The Commission can only say that, on the basis of their study, the faculty see this as basically a teaching and not a research institution. If the faculty are correct in their perception, it would be helpful if all University procedures were in accord with that priority.

The Commission recommend that these requirements and priorities be clarified and fully communicated in writing to all faculty. Conditions of equality can be articulated, communicated, and applied in an open, responsive manner.

Should the University determine that research and publication have a higher priority than teaching, then the Commission recommend that no person be permitted to serve on any committee passing on promotion and tenure, in which this priority is the basis for decision, who has not in the previous four years had a publication or conducted a significant research project. Women and minorities, as well as other junior faculty, have grown weary of being lectured to by senior faculty (overwhelmingly white males) who neither teach, conduct research, nor engage in current scholarly activities. This is particularly galling for women and minorities when in 1975-76 they received 3.3 percent of monies from the Graduate School allocated to support research (commendably raised to 16 percent in 1976-77), when women received 3.6 percent of the total monies administered for research through the Research Foundation, and when the Commission could not learn what percentage of monies administered by the Research Foundation went to minority faculty.

The Commission recommend that more uniform affirmative action procedures relative to faculty be adopted. These are to include:

1. Publication of promotion and tenure expectations.

2. A process for annual review of faculty with including feedback regarding individual faculty members' strengths and weaknesses.

3. A process of review to determine the relative weight of advisement and counseling compared to other promotion and tenure criteria.
(4) A process whereby faculty, without fear of reprisal, can raise issues of assignment short of resorting to formal University review procedures and a right in the faculty to know negative information which the individual faculty member could have an opportunity to rebut.

(5) Procedures to assist in the establishment of collegial relations between majority and minority faculty, and between men and women faculty on the basis of their professional fellowship.

The future will likely see larger numbers of non-traditional parent-child relationships. These require child care if the parent is to fulfill an optimal career at the University and if the University is to get the best from such a faculty member. Furthermore, the Commission recommend that promotion and tenure rules be amended so that persons with child care responsibilities may be given part-time contracts and part-time compensation that still would leave them on tenure-track, with the time for the earning of tenure being extended. Otherwise, the University risks the foreclosure of useful careers at this University in which the University will have made a substantial investment. In addition, a vigorous fulfillment of affirmative action laws may require such an effort.

The Commission believe that sex and race can be taken into account on their own in reaching a determination of qualification. There are serious, fair-minded persons who deny this and think such considerations a dilution of educational equality. Until carefully accounted evidence indicates the day of full equality is at hand, the Commission believe that sex and race under particular circumstances are valid considerations to be openly taken into account.

Students undergo acculturation as part of their higher education. An education is failing that exposes a student to faculty, researchers, or graduate students of but one sex and race. For this reason, the Commission fully endorse the employment of race and sex as bases for recruitment, promotion, tenure, course assignment, research grants, alumni relations, community liaison, university governance, and any other of the educational missions performed by this University. The Commission believe in equality. But the Commission know that equality does not come of itself. Like liberty, equality too must be earned.
CHAPTER 6

THE STAFF AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

A University the size and complexity of this one requires ample support, provided primarily by the University staff. This staff consists of Civil Service and Administrative and Professional personnel. As a result, the Commission reviewed programs related to staff recruitment, appointment, training, promotion, benefits, job classifications, and salary.

The Commission, working with the Office of Personnel Services, compiled statistical data on the nonacademic employees at the University. In addition, the Commission made inquiries for informational purposes as to how the procedures functioned for the posting and publication of job openings, for the availability, design, evaluation, and selection criteria used in appointments, and for the conditions of work and benefits at the University.

Further information was gathered by using a staff questionnaire for nonacademic administrators to garner attitudinal data as well as ideas to increase the effectiveness of affirmative action. Data were gathered through interviews about current recruitment procedures and training programs. The commission believe that the extensive information gathered during this process will be of great value in further analysis and as a model for future data needs.

Women comprise nearly 50 percent of the total University work force. The problem is not that women are not being hired by the University, but, rather, what they are being hired to do.

Women are being hired primarily in traditional jobs--as clerks and secretaries, nurses and librarians, janitresses and food service workers. There are relatively few women in executive, administrative, and managerial positions. Although there has been some progress in the past 5 years, there still is a dearth of women "at the top".

Of course, one of the reasons that women continue to be hired in traditional jobs is that women continue to pursue traditional career paths. In order to change the existing
patterns, women certainly will have to rethink their roles in society, as well as develop a new sense of self-worth. However, it is the responsibility of the University, as part of its commitment to affirmative action, to seek women, both within and outside its own work force, who have the desire and talent to be executives, administrators, and managers, or to be in non-traditional areas of the work force; to take an active role in developing and training women for those positions; and to offer an encouraging, rewarding atmosphere conducive to growth and retention.

Minorities comprise about 14 percent of the total University work force and little progress has been made in the past 5 years to increase the percentage. In fact, minorities seem to have lost some ground. In addition, minorities, primarily blacks, are clustered in one particular area of the work force--as service and maintenance workers. For minorities, the problems seem to be both getting hired and moving into non-traditional areas of the work force.

As have women, minorities seem to have become locked into traditional job patterns. It is essential that minorities reassess their position in society, pursue nontraditional career paths, and develop a positive attitude toward themselves in order to make new inroads into the work force. However, it is up to the University to identify, recruit, and train minorities with the desire and potential to move into nontraditional areas of the work force. Coupled with maintaining an atmosphere conducive to growth and development, taking the responsibility to develop minority employees can do much toward helping the University fulfill its commitment to affirmative action.

The Commission's analysis of the University workforce, for the years 1972 through 1976, shows that the University has reduced overall numbers of University staff, through dismissals and through the practice of not replacing vacant positions. As a result, percentages of women and minorities increase, not due to an increase in their numbers, but, rather due to an increase in the total staff. This is a "zero-sum" game that affirmative action critics often point to with alarm--jobs for women and minorities mean deprivation of jobs for men and non-minorities.

This is not true at The Ohio State University. Jobs for women and minorities also have been eliminated. However, because women and minorities are clustered in lower pay ranges, and because the fiscally-strapped University eliminated first higher paying positions--traditionally dominated by non-minority males--women and minorities are being eliminated more slowly.
Furthermore, there has been a recession in the larger economy. The Commission believe this has made more non-minority men willing to take jobs traditionally held by women and minorities.

Commission findings conform to the expectations in the proposed regulatory amendments to Revised Order No. 4 of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs in 41 Federal Register 40339, which says:

Concentrations of minorities and women are likely to be found in those organizational units, work processes, lines of progression or promotion sequences and specific jobs which are lower paying, less desirable, and which have less promotion and advancement potential.

Women and minorities have not been advantaged by affirmative action programs at the expense of non-minorities and men. They have suffered stagnation, with small gains offset by larger losses. Furthermore, the vulnerability of non-minority men has not been to affirmative action, but to the University's fiscal stringency responses.

There are affirmative action changes to commend at this University, but there are not enough of them. A review of the statistics shows objective conditions over the years 1972-1976 that requires prompt, full action. These conditions extend into the current academic year and, unless changed, will continue. They adversely affect everyone. Given the likely continuation of the fiscal problems, and given the imperatives of Federal and state laws on affirmative action, the Commission urge that the fullest attention be given their recommendations.

The problems in recruiting women and minority staff are the results of numerous factors. Confusion regarding the University's equal employment/affirmative action policy, an unclear internal/external applicant review policy, lack of sufficient applicant pools, little available assistance to help identify qualified women and minorities—all of those factors undoubtedly stand in the way, to some extent, of the University's fulfilling its affirmative action objectives. However, the University can take positive steps to solve those recruitment problems and to honor its commitment to affirmative action.

The following are specific recommendations addressed to the problem of recruiting women and minorities for the University staff:

(1) That an advisory committee to the Office of Affirmative Action be formed for the purpose of soliciting expertise on staff recruitment methodology.
- The committee would be composed primarily of women and minority business and community leaders from outside the University, the object being to obtain more of a "real world" perspective on methods of recruitment. Members also would be chosen from the University community. The group would meet on a quarterly basis.

(2) That the policy for reviewing internal and external applicants be more clearly outlined, step by step, in the Operating Manual, with further clarification regarding a policy for advertising available positions in non-University publications.

- Currently, there seems to be a misconception regarding the University's policy for reviewing internal applicants for positions prior to reviewing applicants from outside the University. It is not clear whether all internal applicants must be considered and rejected before external applicants can be reviewed and considered for employment, nor if a position can be advertised until all internal applicants have been considered and rejected.

(3) That the terms "equal opportunity" and "affirmative action" be clearly defined in the Operating Manual, and an official University policy regarding both, as related to hiring, be written and disseminated.

- Affirmative action speaks to correcting historical inequities regarding employment of women and minorities, but the concept of equal opportunity, as mandated by law, seems to conflict with affirmative action. At present, the OSU Personnel Policy does not clarify those two concepts, and, seemingly, does not address affirmative action at all.

- The Commission have sought to define both "equal opportunity" and "affirmative action" throughout their report, particularly in Chapter Two, and hope that those definitions will be useful for future affirmative action implementation.
That informal reliance upon personal networks for the generation of candidates for appointment be formalized, that guidelines be established, and that such procedures be opened up to examination and evaluation.

Traditional methods produce traditional selections and, in many areas during periods of general recession in the economy, often work against the consideration of women and minorities for appointment or hiring. The Green Sheet is assumed to require consideration and rejection of all internal applicants before any external applicant may be considered. The Commission believe this too narrowly restricts the available choices concerning persons within the affirmative action groups, given the present make-up of the staff at the University. The Commission recommend that, at least in the case of persons in the affirmative action groups, there be simultaneous consideration of internal and external applicants to University openings.

That a wide range of advertising in suitable media for positions at the University be implemented. Apparently, little advertising is now done, if the questionnaire circulated by the Commission among staff is any indication. Advertising was considered by those using it an effective recruitment tool, and the Commission recommend that it be more widely utilized, especially for the filling of positions at the level of middle management and above. This means making more funds available for advertising. Such an increase in funding for the purpose of increasing the size of the pool of candidates from affirmative action groups is needed.

That the University undertake a training program for University personnel involved in staff recruitment and hiring to assist them in the task of improving their abilities at identifying women and minorities to fill job positions at the University.
An agent should be located in the Office
of Affirmative Action or within the Office
of Personnel Services to undertake this
training program and to follow up on its
effectiveness. Of those responding to the
Commission's staff questionnaire, half said
it was difficult to identify women applicants
for positions and 80 percent said it was hard
to identify minority applicants for positions.
The traditional informal networks do not
seem to work at all well for the affirm-
ative action groups. This was true
for both men and women responding to the
questionnaire, although minority respond-
ants believed they could identify minority
persons for available positions.

The University is somewhat limited in its ability to
change current Civil Service recruitment and hiring procedures. However, the following is a recommendation addressed to the
problem of increasing women and minority applicant pools for
Civil Service jobs:

All applications for Civil Service positions
should be held for not more than 90 days.
Currently, applications are kept on file for one
year. During that time, many eligible applicants,
particularly those seeking lower-classification-
level jobs, undoubtedly find employment elsewhere.
Yet, their names are still kept on an active list
of "eligibles". A 90-day limit on holding ap-
plications would increase the rate of applicant
turnover and might increase pools of women and
minorities.

Hiring and Promotion

An overwhelming majority of respondents to the staff
questionnaire felt that race and sex should not be determining
factors in hiring and promotion. Those answering that the two
factors should be weighted heavily in appointment and promotion
decisions indicated, in open-ended responses, that the primary
reasons were to correct imbalances and to rectify past discrim-
ination. It is necessary, therefore, as previously stated, for
the University to clarify its policies on equal opportunity and
affirmative action. It is clear that, in some cases, race or
sex ought to be a determining factor in hiring and promotion,
in order to correct historical inequities and to fulfill a com-
mitment to affirmative action.
About 39 percent of all questionnaire respondents indicated that there were women in their areas who were overqualified for the jobs they held. Of those respondents, about 70 percent also said that those overqualified women were interested in promotion. Yet, only a handful of respondents indicated that any specific efforts were being made to find more suitable assignments for those women.

Those answering that there were overqualified women in their areas also indicated that both promotion from within the department and within the University were effective methods of recruiting women. However, those not indicating that there were overqualified women in their areas also found those two recruiting methods effective. Once again, the problem is not that women are not available for promotion, but, rather, what jobs are available to them. Promoting an overqualified Secretary 1 to Secretary 2 is not a step upward for a woman with management potential. It is, at best, a band-aid solution to a serious problem of underutilization of women.

About 12 percent of the respondents indicated that there were overqualified minorities in their areas. About 82 percent of those said that the minority employees were interested in promotion.

Promotion from within department and from within the University were found effective methods of recruiting minorities in their areas and those without. As with women, the problem is not the availability of minorities in the workforce, but, rather, where those minorities are located and what opportunities they have for advancement.

The following are recommendations affecting hiring and promotion procedures at The Ohio State University:

1. The Office of Affirmative Action should set up a clearinghouse that actively seeks and disseminates information on names and networks of contacts, available applicants and résumés, media contacts, and organizations to contact for the purpose of recruiting more women and minorities, particularly in upperlevel A&P positions. The clearinghouse should actively seek recruitment and availability pool information and disseminate it at least twice a year.

2. A centralized data bank should be established for internal recruitment of University employees wanting to change jobs. A central office should be established
for the purpose of matching qualified University employees, desiring job changes, to appropriate positions. Applications and résumés would be filed in the office. When a position becomes available, an applicant would be referred to the appropriate area. The office should also employ a career counselor to assist University employees in developing career paths and finding jobs.

Training

On the basis of evidence collected in interviews with 19 administrators from 16 nonacademic areas, the Commission conclude that, while some training activity is taking place at the University, little is geared specifically to women and minorities. The Commission believe that a strong training program is necessary for any institution, including this University, that wants to provide experiences for its staff that will 1) increase the quantity and efficiency of output, and 2) improve the quality of output.

In addition, a strong management training program, with a variety of workshops and activities, is necessary to increase the pool of internal applicants for promotion. In other words, the University should provide all its employees with opportunities for advancement, as do almost all corporate businesses and industries. The latter becomes particularly important in the case of women and minorities.

By strengthening its management training programs and gearing some specifically to women and minorities, the University will increase its pool of persons eligible for promotion. It should follow that the University can then fulfill its affirmative action commitment by placing more women and minorities in executive and management-level positions, since they have been thoroughly prepared, by the University itself, for those decision-making roles.

In light of those conclusions, the Commission make the following specific recommendations regarding training at OSU:

(1) The Training Office should devise and disseminate, on a quarterly or monthly basis, a calendar of in-house training programs.

(2) The Office of Personnel Services should set up its Training Office to operate as a self-supporting, auxiliary enterprise that would
charge departments and/or individuals nominal participation fees for training programs and workshops. Fees would be used to help increase the number, range, and scope of programs and workshops held.

(3) The salary limit for fee reimbursement should be raised, and no salary limit set for persons wanting to take courses that are directly job-related. The possibility of a reimbursement program for taking job-related courses at colleges and universities besides The Ohio State University should be investigated.

(4) The Office of Affirmative Action should develop training guidelines, with each administrative area accountable for implementing its training program in accordance with those guidelines.

(5) Each administrative area should be required to develop a training policy, and designate one person a training coordinator to administer policy, to monitor its success or failure, and to report to the Office of Affirmative Action for additional assessment and consultation. The training coordinator could be an employee with other responsibilities, but the position description would include training duties and percent of time to be spent as training coordinator.

Affirmative Action

The somewhat even distribution of questionnaire respondents' answers to a question regarding affirmative action responsibility showed that the attitude among nonacademic administrators is that everyone at the University has some responsibility for helping achieve affirmative action objectives. The two persons considered primarily responsible, most frequently, were the President and the Affirmative Action Officer. The Office of Personnel Services ranked third. Those considered to have the least responsibility were categorized as subordinate staff.

The results seem to indicate that, while it is acknowledged that everyone has some responsibility for affirmative action, the predominant feeling is that an enforced commitment from the top is necessary before any affirmative action objectives realistically can be achieved. A clear, precise, well-defined policy statement on affirmative action objectives,
Most respondents felt that the Office of Affirmative Action's most important function is to educate the University community about affirmative action. However, all functions named in the questionnaire were deemed important. The Office of Affirmative Action, it seems, is viewed as an organization that ought to be both active and reactive, and in the mainstream of the University at all times.

It is interesting to note, however, that in at least one function it performs, the Affirmative Action Office has been somewhat passive. Over 70 percent of the respondents who said that they had submitted reports to the Office of Affirmative Action also said they had received no feedback from that Office. Of course, this might indicate that the reports were in order and that all reporting requirements had been met. However, does the lack of feedback also indicate that each reporting area had met its affirmative action objectives? Is the role of the Office of Affirmative Action merely to collect reports and offer neither positive nor negative feedback? Responses to the staff questionnaire seem to indicate that the answer to the latter question is, "No". The University should frequently hear from an active, innovative Office of Affirmative Action, regarding whether or not objectives continually are met, and the Commission so recommend.

Most respondents felt that affirmative action efforts in their areas have been effective. Yet, many of them also supported various activities that would presumably aid the University in meeting its affirmative action objectives. Those activities receiving support from 50 percent or more of the respondents were management training (87.8 percent); staff training (85.6 percent); staff personnel/career counselors (72 percent); publication vehicle--general information (72.1 percent); publication vehicle about OSU Affirmative Action programs (70.6 percent); monitoring system for hiring and promotion (60.8 percent); and expanded child care (57.6 percent). Further analysis of those responses can be found in the complete analysis of the staff questionnaire. Responses show that there is a need for more initiative on the part of the University to develop new avenues for personnel development and affirmative action.

Few respondents felt that a reward and penalty system, as incentive for achieving affirmative action goals, would be effective. Only about 11 percent of the respondents perceived that they had ever been rewarded or penalized for affirmative action efforts, or lack thereof. Several persons offered suggestions for rewards, including publicity, letters of commendation,
salary and budget support, and use of the area as a model for other areas. Penalties included publicity, admonition, budget cuts, appointment restrictions, and inquiries. Although there seems to be little support for a reward and penalty system to facilitate meeting affirmative action objectives, it is necessary to have a monitoring system so that the objectives will be met. The question has been, "Who will monitor affirmative action at OSU?"

The following are recommendations regarding the Office of Affirmative Action and the total affirmative action effort at the University:

(1) The Office of Affirmative Action should institute a process of re-educating the University about affirmative action, beginning with a clarification of the terms "equal opportunity" and "affirmative action".

(2) The Affirmative Action Liaison Officers Committee should be strengthened. Duties and percent of time to be spent as liaison officer should be written into each person's position description and become an official function of that position.

See summary and recommendations, in this volume, for Chapter Eleven ("Affirmative Action Implementation") of the Commission report, for more recommendations applicable to staff management.

Salary Equity Analysis

The Commission attempted to study salary patterns for non-Civil Service employees by selecting 5 specific job titles for analysis. The wide variance in their job responsibilities and salaries made a conclusion about salary equity impossible. We are pleased that Personnel Services is in the process of re-classifying Administrative and Professional positions. The reclassification is critical to an understanding of salary equity.
CHAPTER 7

REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The charge delivered to the Commission by the Board of Trustees was not confined to operation of affirmative action at the Columbus campus alone. It extended to the entirety of the University, wherever its facilities were located. However, certain limits have been recognized by the Commission as going beyond any hope of investigation due to limitations as to time, personnel, and resources of the Commission.

The Commission know that the extended operations affect affiliated technical schools, the Agricultural and Research Development Center at Wooster, and the Center for Lake Erie Area Research at Put-in-Bay. These were not included by the Commission in their study. The Commission, instead, limited their inquiry concerning affirmative action to the four officially designated regional campuses at Marion, Mansfield, Newark, and Lima.

Regional campuses are located in environments that are not the same as the Columbus campus environment. The obtaining of information from the regional campuses for a study conducted at Columbus has not been easy. Clearly, a better system of reporting, wherein information is kept centrally available in Columbus about the regional campuses, is necessary and the Commission so recommend. Sufficient information concerning affirmative action at the regional campuses has been accumulated to make certain conclusions and recommendations feasible.

The Commission was interested in securing an accurate picture concerning the composition (and rate of change in that composition) in the proportion of persons in affirmative action groups among faculty, staff, and students at the regional campuses. To assist personnel at the regional campuses in providing information, summaries of suggested information were supplied them. Full returns were not made from the regional campuses, so the Commission's conclusions are by that much deficient.

The faculties at the regional campuses over the past several years have remained stable concerning the relative proportion of faculty within the affirmative action groups. Among minority faculty, the allocation of representation over the years has been different from that at Columbus, with the
greater number being Asian American and Spanish-surnamed, rather than black. Presently, as nearly as the Commission could discover, there are no black faculty members at any of the regional campuses in this academic year 1976-1977.

Women faculty at the regional campuses have been concentrated in the disciplines traditionally associated with women, e.g., English, elementary education, music, and so forth.

Recruitment of regional campus faculty is the joint action of the campus director and the chairperson of the department at Columbus in whose department a new appointment is to be located. While the director may urge the appointment of a person in an affirmative action group, the practice seems to have been for the directors to limit their actions to reacting to candidates recruited by the departmental chairpersons in Columbus. The obligation for the recruitment of persons to faculty positions in the affirmative action groups is upon the chairpersons and departmental faculties (insofar as they participate in the process) at Columbus rather than upon the directors or faculties at the regional campuses.

Since regional campus faculty must look to departmental decisions for promotion and tenure in Columbus (with the regional campus playing a very small role), the burden of any failure in such recruitment lies there rather than upon the regional campuses. The Commission, however, do believe that the Office for Regional Campuses in Columbus must take a stronger stand for affirmative action recruitment at the regional campuses and should initiate this stronger stand by preparing and distributing to the departments suggested guidelines to assist in their recruitment decisions. This is to be coordinated with the College AACC in faculty recruitment efforts.

It may be difficult to recruit single persons or members of minorities willing to live in the communities where the regional campuses are located in the belief (whether sustained in reality or not) that these communities would not be congenial. And persons willing to live there may also be unwilling to undertake commuting for the privilege of working at a regional campus. Nevertheless, the University must make the effort. The students at regional campuses need exposure to the faculty experiences of persons in the affirmative action groups, and the University should do all it can to ease the relocation of such persons in the communities where the regional facilities are located.
The purpose of building the regional campuses was to bring higher education facilities of a major university to other locations so that students might attend classes while living at home. The results, inevitably, are student bodies that fairly well reflect the composition and attitudes of the communities wherein any particular regional campus is located. Given the purpose of the regional campus, it is nearly impossible for the University to adopt any affirmative action that would alter this situation.

Some campuses, e.g., the one at Marion, have few, if any, minority students. At others, the minority student representation is almost entirely composed of black students. There are a few Asian Americans and practically no hispanic or native American students. The statistics indicate that, small as all such enrollments have traditionally been, the enrollments for all minority students at the regional campuses declined in the academic year 1975-1976.

The decline is unfortunate because there are persons in minority groups--particularly blacks and hispanics--within the commuting distances for the geographical areas which the regional campuses are presumed to be serving. Furthermore, it is evident that the regional campuses, despite closer contacts with high schools than personnel at Columbus can regularly match, are not serving as student recruitment channels for minority students who might wish to attend the University at the Columbus campus. A program for black students interested in engineering in 1975 was a success; and the Commission believe more such programs would be equally successful. The Commission recommend that, on a continuing basis, the regional campuses begin to hold programs designed to attract minority students to study at either Columbus or the regional campuses.

Sporadic efforts to attract minority students can only fail. The Commission recommend that on-going programs to attract minority students be undertaken through coordination with the Office for Admissions and the Office of Minority Affairs. It is evident to the Commission that the Office for Regional Campuses, and the regional campuses themselves, need help in this matter of recruiting minority students.

The Office of Minority Affairs, in the recommendation of the Commission, should have its one-person recruitment staff increased so that reasonably adequate help can be forthcoming to the regional campuses. There is among the four regional campuses only one black person working with admissions. Other than that single individual, there are no minority staff admissions personnel at any of the four regional campuses. If
they exist, their numbers were not conveyed to this Commission. The Commission recommend that black and hispanic persons especially be drawn into the admission process as members of the admission staffs at the regional campuses. If they cannot be locally recruited, then they must be deputed from the Columbus campus for temporary duty.

The regional campuses need to assist both students and their parents in learning how to deal with the administrative burden of the University, particularly in relation to financial aids. It has been suggested that the regional campuses create community coordinating committees. It was also suggested that more public sessions for interaction between community and regional campus leadership be instituted. The Commission believe these may be useful but all of them must be carried through with the idea of expanding minority participation and expanding the ideas of suitable educational roles for both women and minorities.

No particular effort has been made to recruit women students into nontraditional courses at the regional campuses. In fact, most women students there enroll in elementary education or nursing. But most of the academic counsellors are women and the number of women faculty are in a greater ratio than on the main campus. The Commission know these women advisers and faculty are very sensitive to expanding the choice horizons of women. It is the obligation of the University to support these women in this endeavor, to make advisement facilities more easily available from the main campus, and to indicate the people at the main campus who would be willing to talk with a woman student from a regional campus who was thinking about a change in her education from a traditionally feminine discipline to one that is traditionally masculine.

The regional campuses have initiated noncredit courses for women within their communities. These should be continued and strengthened. Coordination of these programs should be undertaken with the Office of Women's Programs, Continuing Education, and the Office of Women's Studies, in the recommendation of the Commission. Courses for credit in women's studies should also be instituted at the regional campuses. The Commission believe that courses with a distinct feminist orientation would be particularly valuable at the regional campuses.

The Commission recommend that the same be done on behalf of minority students. Courses in black studies should be offered at the regional campuses, both to strengthen the group identity of black students there and to broaden the horizons of others.
The University also should, for the same reasons, offer both credit and noncredit courses in programs related to the other affirmative action groups. The heritages of hispanic, Asian, and native Americans are too rich not to be made amply available through the facilities of the regional campuses.

The Commission note that there is a problem in the retention of minority students at the regional campuses. The Office of Minority Affairs should provide regular visitations to the regional campuses to counsel with minority students. Because special services are commonly shared by students at the regional campuses, there is less general prejudice against making full use of them by all students. Minority students should be encouraged to make full use of the developmental education facilities at the regional campuses.

The Commission commend University College for its efforts to bring regional campus personnel into a fuller relationship with the whole University. But this cannot be only a matter of regional campus people coming to Columbus. The main campus has a duty to carry personnel, ideas, and resources out to the regional campuses in order to improve the levels of affirmative action. Insofar as there are disappointments in affirmative action performances at the regional campuses, these are as much or more the responsibility of persons (including departmental chairpersons and faculty) located in Columbus at the main campus as they are of persons permanently part of the faculty, administration, or staff of the regional campuses.
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women provided this Commission with certain baseline data concerning the representation of women faculty and students on the University's boards, committees, and other recommendatory or decision-making units. Since the academic year 1970-71 and extending through the academic year 1976-77, the number of women faculty serving on University committees has increased substantially. In the present academic year, it is only slightly below the percentage of women on the University's faculty.

For women students the rise in committee membership has gone from 27 percent in 1970-71 to 32 percent in 1976-77, which compares to a percentage of 43 percent of women in the general student body in 1976-77. Women students, therefore, have continued to be underrepresented relative to their student numbers and to a greater degree than has become the case with women faculty.

Minority faculty are not represented on University committees proportionately to their numbers on campus. Minority faculty are much underrepresented in advisory, policy, and decision-making University committees. Unfortunately, it was impossible to find out what percentage of minority students is serving on University committees, even in the present academic year 1976-77, much less in previous years. The University keeps no record of this information and it is impossible to learn it from most lists of names.

An overall abstract gross percentage arrived at by considering all committees is misleading concerning the representation of women and minorities in University governance. Affirmative action requires participation in governance by women and minorities within the affirmative action groups. This means they are brought effectively into the decision-making process and are not simply made part of a bookkeeping procedure. The Commission do not believe all committees at the University are equally important. No women at all in 1976-77 are serving on such bodies as the University Senate Steering Committee, the Campus Planning Advisory Board, or the Research Foundation Board of Directors. The Commission must recommend, in the strongest terms possible, that, since so few women/minorities are available to serve on committees, the committees be prioritized so that women/minorities, who are
available, serve on those committees having the most impact on University policies. The Commission have not undertaken the invidious task of comparing the relative importance of the varying University committees, but any fair-minded person would agree that the three enumerated would fit in that definition by any standard.

Membership on some University committees is the result of election. The University cannot control the casting of ballots or the exercise of the nominating procedures or of the franchise. The majority of the constituencies at the University are persons in nonaffirmative action groups. This does not terminate the University's obligations under the requirements of Federal law.

The Commission recommend that the University monitor the result of elections to elective committees at the University. If a pattern of exclusion of women and minorities is established, the University has an obligation to provide representation for them in these bodies through provision for the election of representatives from special constituency districts composed of women and minorities or through their appointment to these committees as University representatives-at-large. The alleged rights of self-serving, specially constituted, traditionally limited constituencies with the surface appearance of majority status cannot bar the participation of women and minorities in University governance.

The Commission recommend that the President's Office set up a central information file on the composition of all University committees on the basis of their representation of women and minorities. No comprehensive view is now possible. The Sunshine Law of Ohio requires this University to set up a central information file on the committees which are purely advisory and those which have final decision-making powers. In the central file the University should identify potential candidates in the faculty, since turnover among students may be too high to permit this, in order to provide potential candidates and not continue to rely upon the "old-boy network", which still seems to be the way committees are recruited at the University.

Because of their smaller numbers, women and other members of affirmative action groups should not be over-committed to University committee work to the detriment of their personal professional advancement. If University governance is important, then participation in governance should have equal importance to teaching, scholarship, publication, or any other consideration taken into account for promotion, tenure, or merit salary increase.
Because junior faculty are reluctant to refuse committee assignments, since they do not know how much refusal impacts on their career at the University, the central information file recommended by the Commission should contain all committee assignments currently, or within the previous three years, held by any single faculty member. This would prevent overloading individuals with committee work and would take away the onus from a faculty member of having to decline a committee appointment considered unduly burdensome at the current stage of that person's career.

The presence of women and minorities is absolutely essential in the processes of governance at this University if their needs are to be fairly defined and dealt with. Furthermore, it is a requirement of Federal and state law that women and minorities participate equally in the decision-making procedures with persons in nonaffirmative action groups.

University governance, of course, involves more than just committee memberships. For a complete summary of conclusions and recommendations regarding affirmative action responsibilities of the President, Vice-Presidents, the Affirmative Action Officer, College Deans, and other University administrators, see the section in this volume on Chapter 11, "Affirmative Action Implementation".
CHAPTER 9

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND UNIVERSITY CHILD CARE

The Commission has looked closely at the operation of child care services at the University. The Commission commend the present child care services at the University and recommend that there be a continuation of the present program, including its training and certification capacities. But this does not exhaust the potential University responsibility in the area of child care services.

The Commission, nevertheless, recommend to the University that alternative child care programs be considered. These should be more service connected. Important as the training of graduates committed to child care management is to the University, there exists a present demand among faculty, staff, and students at this University for child care services to which the University is justified in responding. This response should not be principally aimed at preparing students for jobs or certification. It should be intended, instead, for meeting the needs of children whose parents are committed to programs at the University in one capacity or another or who desire to pursue programs for educational advancement at this University, assuming adequate child care services could be made available.

It is necessary for the University to define what "quality" child care means. Having reached that definition, the University should seek funding to support it. Women see child care as a higher need than do most men. However, particularly the more mature women returning to the University for further educational experiences opt for child care in the category best described as "drop-in services". This means they can leave the child for brief periods of time for essentially protective rather than educational purposes. Occasional drop-in services are very important to older women students, especially part-time students. Among this group, drop-in care should extend through evening hours. For this reason, the Commission recommend that child care of a drop-in variety be made available until as late as 9:00 p.m. each week-day evening.

The Commission recommend that the University examine the definition of such terms as "need" and "ability to pay" in relation to any programs of child care to be sponsored or financed by the University. These are indeterminate terms that are hard to give specific meaning to under particular conditions. But the University must address itself to them, difficult as they may be to define.
Women, in the recommendation of the Commission, should be drawn into the planning and decision-making functions relative to any child care program to be set up at this University.

Federal law does not as yet require the employer to furnish child care as part of an affirmative action program. But Federal law does urge this as part of a fully comprehensive affirmative action program. The University in this area ought to move ahead of existing Federal requirements. The requirements seem to be in the formative stage and only a short time away from constituting requirements the University shall have to meet. The University ought not to wait until these actions are thrust upon it as a requirement. Instead, the University should move ahead on a voluntary basis and adopt its own position as to what shall constitute an adequate program for child care services for a university.

Child care is also an area where the University should seek cooperation from industry and the larger community. All parts of the economy, as women of child-rearing years move into money-earning occupations, will have to provide child care facilities. The University should assume a position of leadership in pointing this out. In consequence, the University should offer its expertise in setting up such child care centers, and, in so doing, the University should take care to establish for itself a primacy that would enable these centers to serve as off-campus centers for the training of students and the maintenance of certification programs needed for persons seeking training in this educational area.

The Commission recommend that the University, in the interval before such a full-fledged child care program is founded in the larger community, should work in creating satellite child care centers in the periphery of the University community. These would assist the University in defraying its present need to meet child care responsibilities and would enable the University to acquire experience in managing the kind of network of child care operational and training centers envisaged by the Commission.

The extent of the possible University responsibility for child care has not been defined. The University, however, should explore the precise limits of this potential responsibility. Having made this determination, the Commission recommend that the University then move forthrightly, without waiting for further Federal or state compulsion, in the direction of meeting the child care requirements the University has determined exist.
CHAPTER 10

SALARY EQUITY ANALYSIS

The issue of discrimination based upon race, sex, religion, national origin, or ethnic identity in the determination of salary is a major concern at the University under the Federal and state requirements for affirmative action. Trying to determine if location or nonlocation in an affirmative action group produced salary differentials between individuals having similar educational and experiential backgrounds was early identified by the Commission as an important part of their charge. The Commission undertook to make an empirical analysis of this matter at the University, using the services of Dr. David Shapiro. The Commission consulted with various officers of the University in gathering the data.

This study analyzed salary potential differentials from the standpoint of average male/female salaries within a department. This is an unfortunate limitation. The Commission found there was lacking in the data deck similar information concerning the relation of minority and nonminority faculty so that no such cross-checking was possible for the Commission. Furthermore, the Commission could not, even for the male/female comparison which could be made, identify certain quantitative factors which might have weights attached to them in arriving at a just conclusion concerning salary decisions.

However, despite these inadequacies, the Commission had an obligation to make such salary analysis as they could since this is an integral part of responsible University management under the legal mandates of affirmative action as interpreted by the Federal courts. Therefore, despite the above limitations and the further limitation of an investigation limited to a sampling of departments out of the total at the University, the Commission proceeded with this salary equity analysis.

The sampling technique may have underrepresented departments in which a doctorate is the norm. However, the sample chosen showed that the highest degree for 50 percent of the women was the master's, while this was true for only 17 percent of the men.

Salary differences in which women consistently place below men as a group may be justified by differences in qualification, degrees earned, work experience, publication record, and so forth. However, this does not exclude the simultaneous
presence of discrimination, since women may have been denied the opportunities for education, work experience, and scholarship available to their male counterparts within the same discipline.

On the basis of their sample study, the Commission must conclude that educational differences between males/females within the same departments do not account for all of the salary differentials found in the sample. In the sample chosen, about half of the difference in average salary by sex can be accounted for by difference in attributes reflecting qualifications, while the rest seemingly must be accounted for by some other explanation. The Commission did not examine faculty rank in making its analysis, so the Commission do not know if women are discriminated against in promotions.

On the basis of the sample studied, the gross gap between male/female was just over $4,000. Taking account of educational differences between male/female reduces this gap for the sample chosen to about $2,000. If further variables were taken into account, this gap might shrink to something under $1,000; but since data on actual male/female work experience, as well as other pertinent data, are missing, it is not known if the gap would shrink by this much or by far more on further examination. On the basis of the sample chosen, it is doubtful if the gap would be closed entirely.

Clearly more information is needed, and the University has a legal obligation to generate that information. In this regard, therefore, the Commission recommend that the University study the salary differentials for male/female and minority/nonminority persons receiving compensation at this University.

In the case of academic faculty, this requires learning the degrees earned, the work experience, the number of publications, and all other matters normally regarded as pertinent to salary levels. If academic departments take into account the reputation of the institutions or programs in which degrees have been earned, journals in which publications have appeared, or places where experience has been received, the departments have an obligation to articulate those prejudgments.

Interest has been expressed by officers at the University in pursuing these inquiries further and in inducing departments and offices to articulate their reasons for acting as they have in establishing salaries as they now stand at the University. This line of action hopefully will continue uninterrupted. There is a mandate to do so and the University should proceed promptly. Should ultimate unjustifiable
differences be established, the University will be under the obligation to immediately redress the differences. Pleas of financial stringency will not be a defense under Federal law as it presently stands. Further delay might result in increasing liability for an institution already hardpressed for funds.
CHAPTER 11

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IMPLEMENTATION

Although it is acknowledged that everyone has some responsibility for affirmative action, the predominant feeling is that an enforced commitment from the President is necessary before any affirmative action objectives realistically can be achieved. A clear, precise, well defined policy statement on affirmative action objectives, authored and disseminated from the Office of the President, to be administered by the University's middle management, is critically needed, and recommended by the Commission.

Both the guidelines stated in Revised Order #4 and the Commission's study of the University reveal that, for affirmative action to work, there must be commitment at all levels of the University. The Commission have previously recommended tools for developing that commitment and action in the Colleges and non-academic administrative areas. However, an effective affirmative action program must also have several strong supporting functions to assist each area in the development of its plans. A successful affirmative action program requires at least the following supporting services:

- A strong procedure for the resolution of individual (discrimination) complaints
- Thorough data collection and analysis
- Provision of resources for action programs
- Training and informational programs
- Compliance review.

All of these could be housed in the Office of Affirmative Action, if it were appropriately staffed. However, these functions are currently decentralized in the University and can remain so.

Resolution of Discrimination Complaints

The University has only to gain by developing a strong internal unit to investigate complaints of discrimination. If the unit can resolve problems internally, the University can avoid investigations by state and Federal investigative bodies and, perhaps, eventual litigation.
Much of the work of the Office of Affirmative Action now is handling grievances. Grievances are not currently being handled in a way capable of producing the most effective results for the purposes of affirmative action because of the structure of the procedures themselves.

Currently, a grievant initiates the complaint with her/his immediate superior, who normally insists that no legitimate grievance exists. The grievant then goes to the superior's superior who generally backs his/her subordinate. And so on to the Office of Affirmative Action, by which time the grievance has become barnacled with prior administrative decisions, the grievant has been characterized as a troublemaker, and the chance of either the grievant or the University "winning" has been suffocated by procedures meant to open up channels of communication and fair, corrective decision-making.

The Commission recommend that the University create an Affirmative Action Grievance Panel. The panel should not be permanently appointed but should either be appointed to hear individual cases or to sit for a short period of thirty days for hearing cases. The selection of the entire panel would be managed by the Office of Affirmative Action in consultation with student leaders, the University Senate, staff alumni officers, University officials, and others who could assist in the provision of a steady succession of names for service on the panel. The persons selected to hear cases could be chosen by the grievant and the University or, in the case of persons serving for a fixed period, by a random drawing similar to juror selection. In preparing such a program, the Commission urge that the University consult with such professional organizations as the American Arbitration Association.

Grievances, immediately following the failure of the attempt to negotiate differences between the grievant and the grievant's superior, would go to this panel for settlement. Settlement would include mediation as well as arbitration or more formal adjudicatory decision making. A grievant could be represented by counsel, as could the grievant's superior, and the University could also be represented by counsel before the panel. These procedures should be mostly nontechnical in which the grievant and the grievant's superior would be self-represented, the University would not be represented by counsel, and the panel members would be engaged in a process of dispute resolution rather than in an adversarially conducted fact-finding endeavor to determine fault.

Such a procedure would of course be affected by any collective bargaining process at the University for such a procedure cannot replace grievance procedures provided in a collective bargaining agreement. Perhaps this recommendation is one which could be incorporated within the framework of collective bargaining agreements.
Data Collection and Analysis

There can be no single, central, all-embracing data system at the University. The institution is too complex for that. At best, there must be several systems, maintained for different purposes. However, when the Federal and state laws concur on mandatory requirements for institutional action, the University has to respond with amendments to its various data-collection systems so as to interleave what each contains. Affirmative action is such a requirement to which the University has had to respond. The University has made extensive, good-faith efforts to meet its affirmative action data systems responsibilities. Nevertheless, more needs to be done.

In 1971 the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women made a number of critical observations upon the affirmative action data systems then in operation at the University. The University, in response to this criticism, immediately undertook to extensively revise its data systems so as to remove the bases for such criticism (See Appendix X-1 for a report from Personnel Services on Affirmative Action Data Systems, date 1/26/77).

Various kinds of record keeping differ widely in cost. Often the more expensive kinds of records are the ones needed to know if affirmative action programs in recruitment and advancement are working. However, since it is important to know if the investment in affirmative action is producing positive results, the University will have to allocate scarce resources to data systems which accurately analyze the University's work force. Records that say little of significance as to the success or failure of affirmative action programs at the University are not really an economic investment, however cheap they may be to institute and maintain.

The Commission commend the Office of Personnel Services for the work undertaken by it in the years since 1968 to alter the character of its record keeping from payroll-driven to a personnel-driven model. The alterations that are further projected to go into effect as of July 1, 1978, will greatly improve this model and expand its capacity to deal simply and comprehensively with the Federal and state affirmative action requirements. After that date there will be an "enhancement of inter- and intra-office retrieval of needed personnel data ... throughout the University . . . " (see Report of Personnel Services, supra, p. 8).

However, special problems are inherent in implementing any projected data system, and the University's data system has not been immune to such problems. For example,
although the data system maintained by the Office of Personnel Services has as its primary purpose the processing of compensation owed persons at the University, additional work, such as the recent Civil Service reclassification requirement imposed by state law, is placed upon that office and assigned priorities as to time and energy, greater than those simultaneously assigned to other Federal- and state-imposed requirements such as affirmative action.

Other central University systems, such as budget and accounting, are similarly undergoing a building or rebuilding of data systems. It has been and will be difficult to build all such central systems so that each one conforms to the specifications of the others. The result is a competition among central data system projectors for the allocation of priorities and resources. Many of the new models have no precedent and this introduces great uncertainty in design and in predictability as to the success of designs chosen. As the Office of Personnel Services has said (Report, supra, p. 4):

"Thus, the system issues of the size, complexity and dynamics of the University cannot be treated lightly since a bad systems decision can be extremely costly to remedy."

The Commission concur fully in this statement.

For this reason, the Commission recommend that the University not continue delegating affirmative action data systems to the Office of Personnel Services alone or to such an extensive degree. These are matters that also belong in the Office of Academic Affairs, the Graduate School, the Office of Student Services, and elsewhere. Budgeting and accounting processes will also be involved in this, if certain of the recommendations of the Commission are followed. This means action at the highest levels in the University's hierarchically organized administrative structure.

There does exist in the Office of Personnel Services a major capability for accomplishing these purposes. But they are not the primary reason for the existence of that Office. Perhaps there has been too great a willingness to delegate to that office affirmative action data systems responsibilities that properly should have been located elsewhere. Even though the Office of Personnel Services is willing to undertake such delegations, it ought not to be overallocated with affirmative
action responsibilities, in the opinion of the Commission.

The Commission have already recommended the creation at the vice-presidential level of coordinating committees on the problems of women and minority students. The Commission recommend that these coordinating committees (or committee, if the decision is made to consolidate them into a single committee) undertake to direct the creation of an interacting exchange system for data relative to affirmative action at the University.

Guidelines need to be established for the allocation of administrative responsibilities relative to affirmative action data systems. Standards need to be adopted as to what each University office should keep or contribute in the way of content for interlocking data systems. Rules should be prepared pointing out to University faculty and staff the sanctions to which the University and individual operations within the University may be liable for failure to maintain adequate affirmative action records.

Affirmative action data systems are the responsibility of the entire University. The adoption of guidelines, standards, and rules relative to potential sanctions needs to be done at the highest level. The vice-presidential coordinating committees in this regard might even treat their work-product as recommendatory to the Board of Trustees for adoption by the Board as part of the regulations of the University. The participation of all central administrative offices is essential in affirmative action data maintenance. Several coordinate and interleaved systems are essential. It will not be an easy task. But the Commission believe it to be a necessary undertaking.

A thorough analysis of the current University workforce through the use of these data systems is the first step in preparing an affirmative action program. With the current University data system, that first step is nearly impossible. Once the data systems are developed and in place, the Office of Affirmative Action should have overall responsibility for seeing that appropriate units report the data to the University community on a regular basis, at least yearly.

In addition to the dissemination of workforce data the Office of Affirmative Action should collect information yearly from the Colleges and various administrative units on action programs conducted within the College or unit over the year. The Office of Affirmative Action has done this in the past. However, one step the office has not yet taken is give feedback on these reports. The Commission recommend that at least yearly the Office of Affirmative Action analyze the workforce data and the action program report from each College or
unit report to the appropriate person. Data collection is useless unless the data arrives in the hands of the decision makers.

Resources for Action Programs

The combined recommendations of the Commission really amount to a recommendation that each College and non-academic administrative unit have its own affirmative action plan. Action programs to meet objectives are the meat of any affirmative action program. There are many offices at the University which Colleges and administrative units could approach for assistance, for example, the Office of Minority Affairs (OMA). The Office of Affirmative Action could also provide technical assistance in development of individual College plans and should supply advice on recruitment, training, staff development, or any other affirmative action programs the Colleges are planning.

Training and Informational Programs

One of the most important functions of the Office of Affirmative Action is to educate the University community about affirmative action. The "how" and "why" of affirmative action as well as the "how we are doing" have to be marketed continuously within the University. The Office of Affirmative Action should see that a thorough training program is provided for University decision makers, should insure that current University publications such as On Campus and the Lantern carry affirmative action news and feature stories, should consider the publication of its own affirmative action newsletter. In short the Office of Affirmative Action must be visible within the University community, as must the affirmative action programs themselves. The University should frequently hear from an active, innovative Office of Affirmative Action, regarding the University's progress toward objectives, and the Commission so recommend.

Compliance Review

Another aspect of a successful affirmative action plan is a compliance review mechanism. This function must be separate from the Office of Affirmative Action. Many companies have an affirmative action compliance review team as a part of the operations audit group. This review team prepares the University for a government audit and would allow the University to discover its own vulnerable spots before the Federal
government does. Some compliance review teams in private industry are so expert that the government no longer audits the company. This function is a vital check on how the University is progressing and is also designed to prevent government intervention in campus affairs. The compliance review team must have the authority to recommend sanctions for the enforcement of affirmative action to be imposed by the President.

The Commission recommend the creation of a compliance review team with authority to recommend sanctions to the President.

Sanctions include both rewards and penalties. The Commission believe that to expect people to act out of a sense of abstract duty, with no penalty if they fail to act or if they act obstructively and with no reward if they act wholeheartedly, is really to punish them for undertaking the costs always present in action.

Positive steps for affirmative action mean disturbing traditional patterns. Persons engaged in that process of disturbance particularly risk the imposition of costs upon their careers, responsibilities, and personal working relationships. The University's policy toward these people has been to let "virtue be its own reward".

The Commission recommend that a full range of rewards and penalties for affirmative actions be developed and used by the President and the Office of Affirmative Action. The rewards could include publicity, letters of commendation, salary and budget support and the use of that college or unit as a model for other areas. Penalties could include publicity, admonition, budget cuts, appointment restrictions and inquiries. Whichever of these or others which may be implemented the Commission recommend that a portion of the University budget be made available to reward University operations which fully meet predetermined affirmative action goals. This should be maintained as a separate fund administered by the President. University operations which do not meet predetermined affirmative action goals, and which are unable to justify this failure, shall lose a portion of their previously allocated budget. This loss of theirs shall be transferred to the reward fund to be used to reward those operations which are reaching full goal. In this way, very quickly, the message would be delivered throughout the University that affirmative action matters.

This is not just a matter of faculty recruitment or promotion. It includes student recruitment, placement of graduates, granting of research funds, and all the multiple variations of work done at this University where the traditionally racist and sexist views still hold too important a place in
ultimate decision making. No one wants to be monitored, nor to be penalized for obstruction, nor to see others rewarded at one's expense for doing what one has tried to block. Such a person would rather go on doing all the illegitimate business that has been traditional and call it "academic freedom". The Commission do not believe in that kind of "academic freedom". They have made the recommendations they have in order to effectively alter it to an academic freedom that fully includes women and minorities as well as the "good old boys" at this University.

The Commission believe that good management means good communication with central management, so that central management can act on comparatively complete information, and so that they can continuously monitor the effectiveness of their management decisions. Good management also includes responsive interaction with and reaction to the decisions of the central management by administrative entities responsible for carrying out Federal and state requirements.

The Commission do not want an authoritarian model of University governance, nor do the Commission believe that this is wanted by many at this University. There exist at this University wide-ranging degrees of participation in governance, which the Commission would not diminish. Indeed, the Commission has recommended that faculty recruitment be expanded for greater participation and that each College create a Coordinating Council in which extensive participation is called for from faculty, students, and others in order to carry through on the affirmative action requirements of Federal and state law and to positively fulfill the promise inherent within affirmative action.

But University management is not made up only of participation and "talk-back". There are lines of administrative responsibility which are designed to carry through centrally generated decisions. Furthermore, even in the comparatively autonomous zones of decision making, there cannot be complete independence from the University which supports them and makes their autonomous actions possible. Finally, no one at this University is free of the mandates of Federal and state laws. The University has the duty to implement them, and everyone at this University has an obligation to respond affirmatively.

The Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Board consider at some future date a study that would examine the effectiveness and good management of the present University hierarchical administrative structure. But since the decision to conduct such a study (not to speak of any consequences flowing from the results of such a study)
might legitimately be years hence, the Commission recommend that a central coordinating committee at the vice-presidential level be created for dealing with affirmative action.

The Commission are also aware that the vice-presidents at this University are heavily deputed with substantial work commitments in many areas at the present time. A Committee, therefore, which would meet periodically and bring them together for an exchange of views, would be without operational effect. To counteract that, the Commission recommend that the Office of Affirmative Action be directed to serve as the administrative arm of this committee (or committees), to prepare its agenda, and to monitor the effectiveness of its decisions.

There is already a structure to implement affirmative action within the Office of Affirmative Action. This is composed of the Affirmative Action Liaison Officers. The Commission held several meetings with these officers and the report of those meetings, dated March 4, 1976, is in Appendix X-2.

The Commission recommend that the Affirmative Action Liaison Officers Committee be strengthened. The duties and the percent of time to be spent as liaison officer should be written into each person's position description and become an official function of that position.

The Commission recommend that the differing components these officers serve be separated. Single joint meetings should be discontinued, except for unusual circumstances. Separate sessions should normally be held for officers working with such subjects as student recruitment, faculty recruitment, staff management, and so forth. Otherwise, one topic, usually concerning student or faculty, dominates the joint sessions, to the exclusion of other topics.

The Commission also urge that these officers not double in their duties the work of a general personnel officer. When this occurs, the general responsibilities of personnel serve to overwhelm the obligations for affirmative action implementation.

The Commission, therefore, urge the Office of Affirmative Action to consider carefully the report of March 4, 1976 (which was forwarded to that Office over a year ago), to respond to the recommendations in this report of the Commission, and to increase the effectiveness of the Affirmative Action Liaison Officers.
In conclusion, procedural reform, though absolutely necessary, cannot by itself further the cause of affirmative action. Affirmative action is rich in opportunities for the University in every aspect of its function, from management to academic programs. But if the people in authority refuse to perceive the bases for this opportunity, continue to "stone-wall" the purposes of affirmative action, continue to despise the work accomplished by women and minorities who are striving to make affirmative action a process for attaining a more equal society at this University, then there will be failure.

It will not be affirmative action that has failed or the cause of women and minorities in the University which has failed. Rather, the promise of equal standing on an individual basis which has been implicit in American society since 1775 will have failed. The promise to those who aspire to a different condition through education and training will have failed. Persons within discriminated groups seem no longer willing to passively accept the costs to them of discrimination, so that failure may mean the disruption of this University and of a society which refused to deliver on promises which have been proffered for over two centuries.

The Commission offer their report, their conclusions, and their recommendations with the hope that the Board of Trustees will not simply file them and leave them for University Archives. Whether the entirety of this report is to be accepted may be a moot point. But what this study has indicated to the Commission is too important to be passed over in silence.

Though there are costs, assuredly, in what the Commission recommend, there are infinitely greater costs potentially to be incurred should the present course be insisted upon by those holding the decision-making powers at the various levels of this University. It is the Commission's hope that each one of the conclusions and recommendations should be discussed at the highest levels. They should be used to stimulate reactions throughout the decision-making levels and autonomous zones of decision at the University, so as to test and improve them. This is not a report to "file and forget".

Affirmative action won't go away. It is neither dead nor dying. There is no hunkering down until it all blows over. Those who cannot accept its promise must be prepared to fight its assertions. In so doing, they can distort that promises, but they cannot any longer exercise
the power to abort it. The Commission hope that this University will work to fulfill the promise, because an affirmative action that has been distorted by bitter struggle will not fulfill all that is inherent in a program capable of realizing the potential present in all people, men and women, majority and minorities, who could make up this University in the future--the near future, which ought to have been the present.

The choice of fulfillment or of distortion is at hand. It is the only choice left where affirmative action is concerned.