

PLANNING UNITS FOR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

① School: Agriculture and Life Sciences

Discipline Groupings

I. Agricultural Sciences

Administration  
Adult and Community College Education X  
Agricultural Information  
Agricultural Economics  
Animal Science  
Biological and Agricultural Engineering  
Crop Science  
4-H and Youth Development  
Food Science  
Horticultural Science  
Poultry Science  
Rural Sociology  
Soil Science  
Veterinary Science

II. Biological Sciences

Biochemistry  
Botany  
Entomology  
Genetics  
Microbiology  
Plant Pathology  
Zoology

III. Home Economics Extension

② School: Design

Discipline Groupings

IV. Design

Architecture  
Landscape Architecture  
Product/Visual Design

③ School: Education

Discipline Groupings

V. Education

Curriculum and Instruction  
Occupational Education  
Math and Science Education  
Counselor Education

VI. Psychology

④ School: Engineering

Discipline Grouping

VII. Engineering

Chemical Engineering  
Civil Engineering  
Electrical Engineering  
Engineering Mechanics  
Engineering Research  
Industrial Engineering

SCHOOL : VETERINARY MEDICINE  
ANATOMY, PHYSIOLOGICAL  
DIVERSITY Pathology  
Microbiology  
Genetics  
Plant Pathology  
Soil Science

Mechanical Engineering  
Materials Engineering  
Nuclear Engineering  
Industrial Extension Service  
Freshman Engineering  
Min. Res. Laboratory

③ School: Forest Resources

Discipline Grouping

VIII. Forest Resources

Forestry  
Wood and Paper Science  
Recreation Resources Administration

④ School: Humanities and Social Sciences

Discipline Grouping

IX. Humanities and Social Sciences

Economics and Business  
English  
Foreign Languages and Literatures  
History  
Philosophy and Religion  
Physical Education  
Political Science  
Sociology and Anthropology  
Speech Communication

⑤ School: Physical and Mathematical Sciences

Discipline Grouping

X. Physical and Mathematical Sciences

Chemistry  
Statistics  
Mathematics  
Physics  
Computer Science  
Geosciences

⑥ School: Textiles

Discipline Grouping

XI. Textiles

Textiles Materials and Management  
Textile Chemistry

Other Units

④ Division of Student Affairs

④ Library

④ Office of Business Affairs

④ University Extension

④ Special Units

1. Chancellor's Office
2. Provost's Office
3. International Programs
4. Graduate School
5. Dean for Research
6. Alumni Affairs
7. Information Services

8. Foundations & Univ. Relations
9. Athletics
10. Water Resources Res. Institute
11. Sea Grant
12. University Studies
13. Radiation Protection Officer
14. Computing Center



REQUIRED COMPONENTS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS: ORDER NUMBER 4

The available federal guidelines for the preparation of Affirmative Action Plans consist at present of three basic documents:

1. Revised Order No. 4 (Affirmative Action Programs), prepared by the Secretary of Labor (Title 41 CFR Part 60-2), which has been made available to the campuses previously; an additional copy of this basic set of instructions is attached.
2. Higher Education Guidelines, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, which has been made available to the campuses previously.
3. Revised Order No. 14, prepared by the Secretary of Labor (Title 41 CFR Part 60-60), which is a set of guidelines to be used by compliance agencies in the evaluation of contractor Affirmative Action Plans and which, thus, is a useful guide to the contractor in preparing such plans; a copy of the Revised Order No. 14 and attachments A and B are attached.

The following supplemental explanation of the basic requirements of Order No. 4 is based on meetings with HEW Regional Office Officials. All points here treated must be considered by each campus in the preparation of a revised Affirmative Action Plan. The numbered paragraph and section numbers which follow correspond to the numbered paragraphs of Order No. 4.

- I. Utilization and Availability Analyses and Goals and Timetables (60-2.11 and 60-2.12, Revised Order No. 4)

The core component of an affirmative action program is an analysis of the total employment profile, a determination of whether there is



underrepresentation or underutilization of females or members of minority groups within the various categories of employment and a statement of remedial hiring goals designed to correct any representation or utilization deficiencies found. Pursuant to certain prescribed analytical techniques designed to impart certainty to the process, the contractor is expected to make its own assessment of its work force and to adopt appropriate programs which will address effectively any problems discovered.

A. Basic Data Collection and Analysis: Workforce Profile by Race and Sex

The necessary first step is an evaluation of the incumbent workforce, by race and sex for each major occupational category. Within the University context, there are three general categories of employment which are materially distinguishable: EPA Faculty, EPA Non-Faculty, and SPA. Further subdivision of these three categories is required; for example, EPA Faculty must be subdivided by rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, etc.) and by discipline or department (e.g. English, History, Math, etc.); EPA Non-Faculty must be subdivided by occupational job-title category which is convenient to existing administrative practice and fairly reflects salient distinctions among occupations; and SPA must be subdivided by occupational job-title category.

Certain summary data reflecting the race and sex profile of the workforce by appropriate occupational category must be included in and form the basis for certain goals articulated by the Affirmative Action Plan. Underlying the summary presentations, however, must

be the detailed individual employee printouts of the type which each institution has had occasion to prepare previously; the guidelines concerning the type of information which must be collected and maintained on a current basis for each employee of the institution are found in Tab J of the HEW Higher Education Guidelines (including name, sex, race, salary, job title, date of hire, educational level); this detailed information with respect to individual employees should not be included as a part of the Affirmative Action Plan submitted; however, it should be available for inspection on request by HEW.

The summary materials which must be appended to and discussed in the Affirmative Action Plan should be presented basically in the following manner:

EPA Faculty

*A. W. Campbell*

<u>Department</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>White*</u>		<u>Black (Negro American)</u>		<u>Other Minorities**</u>	
		<u>Male(%)</u>	<u>Female(%)</u>	<u>Male(%)</u>	<u>Female(%)</u>	<u>Male(%)</u>	<u>Female(%)</u>
<del>Administrators</del> Administrators Professors	20	10 (50)	5 (25)	2 (10)	1 (5)	1 (5)	1 (5)
Assoc. Prof.	14	7 (50)	4 (29)	1 (7)	2 (14)	0	0
Asst. Prof.	10	6 (60)	3 (30)	0	1 (10)	0	0
Instructors	8	4 (50)	2 (25)	1 (12.5)	1 (12.5)	0	0
<u>Subtotals</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>27 (52%)</u>	<u>14 (27%)</u>	<u>4 (8%)</u>	<u>5 (10%)</u>	<u>1 (1.5%)</u>	<u>1 (1.5%)</u>

Department  
Math

Professors

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Instructors

Subtotals

\* Includes all foreign nationals.

ETC.

INSTITUTIONAL							
TOTALS	200	150 (75%)	30 (15%)	8 (4%)	8 (4%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)

EPA NON-FACULTY

Title **	Total	White		Black		Other Minorities	
		Male(%)	Female (%)	Male(%)	Female(%)	Male(%)	Female(%)
Officials and Managers	10	6 (60)	2 (20)	1 (10)	1 (10)	0	0
Professionals	20	15 (75)	4 (20)	0	0	0	0
Technicians	40	20 (50)	15 (38)	3 (7)	3 (7)	0	0

ETC.

INSTITUTIONAL							
TOTALS	70	41 (59%)	21 (30%)	4 (5.5%)	4 (5.5%)	0	0

SPA

Title***	Total	White		Black		Other Minorities	
		Male(%)	Female (%)	Male(%)	Female(%)	Male(%)	Female(%)
Managerial	10	2 (20)	6 (60)	1 (10)	1 (10)	0	0
Professional	10	8 (80)	2 (20)	0	0	0	0

Technical

Office-Clerical

Custodial

ETC.

INSTITUTIONAL							
TOTALS	100	60(60%)	20 (20%)	10 (10%)	5 (5%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)

\*\* "Other Minorities" includes American Indians, American Orientals and Spanish Surnamed Americans; the term "Black" includes only Negro Americans, not foreign nationals who are of the black races.

- \*\* Detailed records for individual EPA Non-Faculty employees should be maintained on the basis of separate detailed categories of actual job title and classification (such as chancellor, vice-chancellor, librarian, research assistant, etc.); however, for purposes of the summaries required as part of the Affirmative Action Plan such employee titles may be lumped under more general generic titles, such as those here suggested, based on the prescribed federal compliance categories (viz. "officials and managers", "professionals", "technicians", etc.); in short, each employee must be assigned to one general category or another as appropriate, based on job content, skills requirements and qualifications, and responsibilities.
- \*\*\* Detailed records for individual SPA employees should be maintained on the basis of actual SPA job title classifications (such as stenographer II, housekeeping assistant, administrative officer I, statistical analyst II, etc.); however, for purposes of the summaries required as part of the Affirmative Action Plan such SPA classifications may be lumped under more general generic titles, based on the federal compliance categories, of the type suggested here. Again, it is necessary to make an appropriate assignment of individual specific jobs to the general categories.

B. Utilization and Availability Analyses

Collection and summarization of the data prescribed in the foregoing section permits an institutional assessment of "where it currently is and where it reasonably ought to and can expect to go" in terms of racial and sexual composition of the three basic employee complements of the institution. There are actually two closely related initial analytical processes prescribed by Order No.4. First, a determination must be pursued concerning whether there is a current "underutilization" of females or members of minority groups within the various occupational categories ("underutilization" is defined in the regulations to mean "having fewer minorities or women in a particular job classification than would reasonably be expected by their availability"); for example, are there fewer women employed as faculty members (either across the board or

within a particular discipline or department) than would be reasonably expected; are there fewer blacks employed in the EPA Non-Faculty category of "professionals" than would be reasonably expected; and are there fewer women employed in the SPA category of "technicians" than would be reasonably expected. Second, there must be a study of availability of females and members of minority groups within the various occupational categories. In fact, the two analyses are correlative, and the reasonable answer to one may supply the answer to the other; the focus of one is retrospective (i.e. to what extent has the contractor's performance in the past been deficient) and the focus of the other is prospective (i.e. to what extent can or ought the contractor change the ratios reflecting sex and race composition of the work force). The preferred approach would appear to be emphasis of the prospective inquiry; that is, how many females and members of minority groups are realistically available for recruitment and employment by the institution in the future? If the figures arrived at suggest that, in a particular occupational category, the current level of use of females and members of minority groups by the institution is consistent with computed availability, then no problem requiring remedial action exists; conversely, if the figures concerning estimated availability show a higher number or percentage of females and minority group members than is currently characteristic of the institution's employment profile, then remedial goals designed to correct the "underutilization" must be established.



The obvious primary difficulty is a reflection of the many variables which could be demonstrated to affect critically the question of "availability." The guidelines of Order No. 4 prescribe certain steps to be considered in estimating availability (Section 60-2.11). However, there remain questions about the reliability of any availability conclusions reached, as a consequence of omission from the guidelines of any reference to several factors which clearly can be influential. Most particularly, the guidelines do not appear to take cognizance of various "competitive" factors; for example, if the national pool of blacks holding required doctoral degrees constitutes two percent of the national total, is it realistic to assume that such black professionals are "available" to the particular institution to an extent which would permit achievement of a two percent representation of such persons on the institutional faculty within a given period of time; the unrealistic character of any such assumption is a function, among other things, of the fact that the competitive positions of all institutions, in the effort to recruit and employ the limited supply of qualified black professionals, vary significantly from location to location (e.g. salary, institutional reputation, living environment, etc.); it is unrealistic to assume that all institutions will share equally, on a statistically pro rated basis, the total pool of such persons who exist nationally. In short, how many different factors can and ought to be considered in determining "reasonable expectations" about availability, for purposes of assessing both past underutilization and future modifications?

We are left with a need to make "best reasonable estimates" on the basis of the rather gross statistical data which is available. Our discussions with HEW officials have not imparted much certainty to this inquiry, though they have acknowledged the difficulty of achieving precision. The primary point is that the objective of this analytical process is the establishment of "goals" rather than "quotas"; that is, the program adopted by the institution for modification of its employment profile is a set of guidelines to which it will devote its serious and concentrated effort, with the understanding that many variables may affect the achievement of goals posited and with the further understanding that the contractor will be afforded an opportunity (indeed will be required) to demonstrate the nonculpable reasons why such goals were not achieved, if in fact the results of serious effort fall short of original expectations. Thus, the availability conclusions arguably need not be as precise and certain as might be the case in situations where mandatory quotas were being imposed.

The processes for arriving at realistic estimates about availability will vary with the type of employment under consideration. Three basic considerations would appear to be constant for all types of employment; however. First, what is the geographic employment market area within which the institution realistically does and can compete (some institutions compete nationally and, indeed, internationally for faculty members, while others concentrate their attention on more limited regional demarcations; most institutions

compete for their SPA personnel, particularly in the case of lower rated classifications, within the urban or county area immediately proximate to the institution); this consideration is an obviously appropriate first limitation which ought to be borne carefully in mind in assessing availability. Second, within the defined recruitment market area, what is the gross availability of persons having the requisite qualifications for the various categories of employment; this approximation should include both currently employed persons as well as those who are potential members of the labor force (prospective graduates from formal qualifying educational experiences, unemployed persons, etc.); the bases for and specificity of computation will vary with the type of employment. Third, are there clearly identifiable and demonstrable factors which realistically limit the institution's access to or competitive opportunities with respect to members of the gross pool of available qualified persons; for example, if it is possible to demonstrate that all members of a particular occupational speciality within the market area are currently employed by institutions which afford their incumbents significantly higher average rates of compensation than could be offered by the institution seeking to employ them at an alternate location, it would seem that the availability conclusion ought to be adjusted accordingly.

The following are suggestions concerning the more particular types of inquiries and sources of information which may be used in connection with efforts to assess availability of the three basic types of institutional employment with which we are concerned:

1. EPA Faculty

Useful explanatory material provided by the Office for Civil Rights is attached as Appendix A. In addition, a bibliography of materials which addresses with varying degrees of pertinence and specificity the questions about female and minority group availability with academic fields of employment is attached as Appendix B.

2. SPA

Although the EPA Faculty category presents its special difficulties, because of the highly specialized nature of some of the qualifications which control the question of "availability", the SPA category can be quite troublesome also. Typically, available data tends to lump various types of jobs included in the SPA category in fairly broad categories (such as technical, clerical, managerial, etc.), and so it is frequently difficult to know whether some information regarding availability of "technicians" on the basis of sex and race really means that "TV Engineers" (for example) are in fact available. Acknowledging this type of problem, which necessarily induces a tendency to further generalize and estimate, the following sources of data will prove to be useful in the effort to achieve some conclusions about female and minority availability in the SPA field. The State Employment Security Commission, Research Bureau, has compiled 1971 tables which reflect the racial and sexual composition of

the civilian labor force for North Carolina, on both a state-wide basis and county-by-county basis; second, the Social and Economic Statistics Administration of the U. S. Department of Commerce has produced, on the basis of 1970 census data, a profile of the General Social and Economic Characteristics of North Carolina, which includes a breakdown by race and sex for broad occupational categories within the general North Carolina labor force, on both a state-wide and county-by-county basis; third, the North Carolina State Personnel Board has produced a 1972 compilation which shows the racial and sexual composition of the state-wide SPA workforce, by SPA category of employment. A combination and comparison of these three sources of information do permit some apparently reliable general conclusions about SPA availability. It is necessary, in combining the three sources of information, to make some job-title or occupational-category conversions in order to make the three sources of information somewhat consistent. Note further the importance of defining carefully and clearly the geographic recruitment market for the institution in the SPA area, viz. at many locations the recruitment market will be limited to the immediate geographic area, and pertinent county data should be used accordingly, rather than state-wide data. A sample effort of this type is attached as Appendix C (the



General Administration plan from which this is excerpted has not yet been the subject of a formal written HEW review; however, in conversations with HEW officials responsible for its evaluation, we were told that the approach here suggested was appropriate.)

### 3. EPA Non-Faculty

Perhaps the most difficult problem of availability analysis is presented by the EPA Non-Faculty category, because of its hybrid and highly eclectic nature. On the one hand, this category partakes of some of the characteristics of both the faculty and the SPA categories; on the other hand, there is a broad range of occupational categories included, ranging from chancellors, which are illustrative of one end of a spectrum, to librarians and various types of research personnel at a distinctly different point within the total spectrum. It appears difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at or to have any meaningful basis for positing availability conclusions concerning the highest rated academic administration positions, such as chancellor, vice-chancellor, etc.; on the other hand, it would appear appropriate with reference to certain categories of technical and professional employment within EPA Non-Faculty to use basically the same approach and the same sources of information as have been suggested for corresponding SPA categories.

### C. Establishment of Goals and Timetables

Following compilation of data concerning the current sex and race profile of the institutional workforce and after completing the availability analyses, these two sets of information are to be interfaced and compared for the purpose of detecting any "problem areas", i.e. deficiencies in the use of females and members of minority groups. In turn, deficiencies so discovered are to be addressed and corrected by the establishment of "goals" for employment of females and minorities within a specified time frame.

The regulations require that such goals be "significant, measurable and attainable." Two fundamental limitations on realistic goal-setting are apparent. First, it may not be appropriate to assume that gross availability figures for females and minorities in a particular category of employment constitute realistic indicia of actual availability to the particular institution; this matter was discussed at some length in connection with the above section on "availability analyses"; again, if the institution is prepared to identify clearly and to document some bases on which the availability conclusion can and should be qualified, then this would have a most direct bearing on the statement of realistic hiring goals. Second, the regulations do not require that any incumbent employees be displaced in order to make room for females or members of minority groups; on the contrary, any such action by the employer would in itself be violative of the equal employment opportunity-non-discrimination obligations, viz. this would be a discharge of an

employee because of race or sex. Therefore, a primary consideration in positing goals is the estimated number of employment positions which in fact will be available to be filled during the selected affirmative action time frame. The employer must compute a realistic estimate of such available slots, by considering anticipated new positions to be created and filled, retirements and resignations, and any other factors which could contribute to a pool of available spaces to be filled during the time frame for affirmative action efforts. For example, if the analyses of past utilization and prospective availability suggest a need to increase the representation of women in a particular category of employment by 10% over a three-year period, and this percentage figure translates into a numerical goal of five additional women, attention must then be directed to whether it is possible to make five positions available to be filled during the three-year period; if a consideration of attrition rates and new hires indicates that only three positions will be filled in the employment category in question during the three-year period, then the maximum goal would be three rather than five; further, it may not be realistic to assume that, of the available three positions, all three positions can be expected realistically to be filled by women; thus, a more reasonable goal under the circumstances may be only two women.

The time frame selected by the institution for achievement of established goals should be influenced by pertinent local considerations. The regulations suggest time frames ranging from three to five years.

Too short a time frame would impart to the effort an unrealistic character; too long a time frame for the achievement of significant progress could suggest dilatoriness.

Assuming that the affirmative action program for remedial hiring goals is to be based on a three-year period,

1. SPA goals must be stated on an annual basis; that is, the total three-year goal for improving the sex and race profile of the affected parts of the workforce should be broken down into three discrete goal periods;
2. EPA Faculty and EPA Non-Faculty goals may be stated on the basis of the total three-year time period adopted, although annual reporting of progress to date in reaching the three-year goal will be required.

The employment frame of reference for the statement of goals may vary. For example, with respect to faculty goals, it is permissible to state the goals in terms of individual departments or disciplines (English, Math, etc.) or in terms of larger basic units, such as schools or divisions. Choice of one or the other should be based on consideration of the administrative and operational structure of the institution and the nature of the deficiencies found pursuant to the self-analysis.

It seems clear that for purposes of conducting utilization analyses, projecting availability and setting responsive goals, the appropriate research unit will vary according to the type of employment in question. With respect to faculty employment, it would seem essential that the

individual departments assume responsibility for the basic analytical work; thereafter, it might be concluded appropriately that the actual statement of goals would be made on a division of school basis, involving combination of the results of departmental conclusions.

With respect to SPA employment, it would seem desirable to centralize the analytical process, rather than fragment it by reference to work locations related to schools, departments or divisions; it is acknowledged, however, that at some institutions the central personnel function may not be sufficiently developed to permit a high degree of centralization.

With respect to EPA-Non-Faculty employment, it would appear necessary to divide analytical responsibility between central and local facilities; for example, data concerning general administrative officers of the institution presumably would be retrieved and analyzed in the central office facility; on the other hand, various research and professional personnel who are assigned to particular departments, schools or divisions could be studied most effectively, in terms of utilization and availability, at the local corresponding department, school or division level; at the final end of the process, i.e., the statement of goals, there would be a need for considerable central oversight.

Sample sets of instructions which might be communicated to affected departments or schools as guidance in their efforts to address the matters of Faculty and EPA-Non-Faculty analyses are attached as Appendix D. Sample sets of worksheets and reporting forms for



use by departments and schools in conducting the required analyses for Faculty and EPA-Non-Faculty are attached as Appendix E. Sample sets of goal-setting worksheets are attached as Appendix F.

Note that the Affirmative Action Plan must explain in significant detail how and why you arrived at the conclusions stated with reference to utilization, availability and goals.

II. Identification of Additional Problem Areas (60-2.23, Revised Order No. 4)

While the analysis of current representation of females and members of minority groups and the establishment of any necessary remedial hiring goals is the critical core component of an affirmative action plan, this is by no means all that is required of a contractor in developing an acceptable program. Revised Order No. 4 covers many other topics, all of which must be addressed by the contractor. In our conversations with HEW officials, it became clear that they expect the plan to be based on and to consist of a quite literal and comprehensive response to and treatment of all points covered in Order No. 4.

Consistent with the basic principle that the contractor is responsible for analysing its own policies and practices, with a view toward discovering and correcting any conditions which detract from realization of equal employment opportunity (whether a reflection of the employer's discriminatory practices or policies or a reflection of broader social conditions not necessarily related to the immediate work environment which have the demonstrable effect of limiting opportunities for women and members of minority groups), Section 60-2.23 of Order No. 4 provides a checklist of possible problem areas which each contractor must analyze within the immediate employment context. Each item within this checklist must be addressed in the Plan. (Note that the organization of Revised Order No. 4 is such that a particular problem area or policy topic may be addressed at more than one point in the Order; the following discussion of the several items included within

Section 60-2.23 attempts to draw together all related references from other sections of the Order, so as to provide a comprehensive reference designed to assist you in addressing the "problem area identification" requirement in a reliable manner.) With respect to each of the following points, you must include in your affirmative action plan a description of the manner in which you conducted your analysis, the results of the analysis, the conclusions reached concerning either the existence or absence of a problem, and with reference to any problems thus perceived a clear description of the remedial actions to be undertaken and the time frames within which those efforts are to be accomplished. Note that Section 60-2.23 is divided into two complementary parts; part (a) is a statement of the subject matter which must be analyzed; part (b) is a statement of the various possible negative results of analysis which would require remedial attention; in the following outline each such pairing of (a) subject area with (b) problem manifestation will be treated as a unit for purposes of discussion.

- A. Analyze: "Composition of the workforce by minority group status and sex." [60-2.23(a)(1)]

*Each Unit*

The correlative possible problem which analysis may reveal is: "An 'underutilization' of minorities or women in specific work classifications." [60-2.23(b)(1)]

This analytical point is addressed, out of order, in Section I of this memorandum; see those previous materials for explanation (Section 60-2.11 and 2.12).

- B. Analyze: "Composition of applicant flow by minority group status and sex." [60-2.23(a)(2)]

*Each Unit*

There is no correlative possible problem described in subsection (b) of 60-2.23. This point relates obviously to the matter of deficient efforts of the contractor to adopt and use recruitment techniques designed to and which have the effect of producing a more representative recruitment pool, i.e. one containing significant numbers of females and members of minority groups who may compete for and be considered for employment. This subject is more properly considered in connection with the Revised Order sections dealing with "Development and Execution of Programs" (60-2.24) and "Internal Audit and Reporting Systems" (60-2.25); in other words, an analysis of applicant flow by race and sex really relates to the effectiveness of remedial efforts being pursued in connection with established employment goals, and thus the matter is left for subsequent treatment in later sections of this memorandum.

- C. Analyze: "The total selection process including position descriptions, position titles, worker specifications, application forms, interview procedures, test administration, test validity, referral procedures, final selection process, and similar factors." [60-2.23(a)(3)]

*Each Unit*

The correlative possible problems which analysis may reveal are:

1. "The selection process eliminates a significantly higher percentage of minorities or women than nonminorities or men."

[ 60-2.23(b) (3) ]

*Each Unit*

If a significantly higher percentage of the protected categories is eliminated by the selection process, this constitutes some evidence of possible serious problems, including a discriminatory bias which has been institutionalized through the adoption of certain testing or evaluation techniques or a discriminatory implementation of the selection program by individuals who are not sympathetic to the equal employment opportunity principle. In any case, such statistical evidence suggests a clear need to engage in further analysis to determine the cause; it is possible that further checking will reveal some type of discriminatory dynamic which can and must be addressed by specific corrective action; it is also possible that the statistical incidence of either minority or female rejection is explainable on a non-culpable basis, in which case no corrective action will be necessary. This general subject is addressed, in terms of corrective techniques, in section 60-2.24, Development and Execution of Programs, particularly subsections (a), (b), (c) and (d) thereof, which should be read with care. The components of this general problem of inordinately high rejection rates for females and minorities are treated in more detail in the following descriptions of possible problems.



- ~~Central~~  
Central
2. "Application and related pre-employment forms not in compliance with Federal legislation." [60-2.23(b)(4)]

We have received no definitive information from HEW Regional Office officials concerning the meaning of this reference to "Federal legislation"; they suggest only that this perhaps means that all such forms must bear the EEO legend, at least in short form, i. e. "An Equal Opportunity Employer."

- ~~Each Unit~~  
Each Unit
3. "Position descriptions inaccurate in relation to actual functions and duties." [60-2.23(b)(5)]

There are several respects in which such a finding would arguably be problematical, in terms of equal employment opportunity considerations, although the regulations do not purport to spell out the nature of such possible difficulties. The regulations do indicate, at 60-2.24(5), that the "contractor should conduct detailed analyses of position descriptions to insure that they accurately reflect position functions and are consistent for the same position from one location to another."

We may speculate that an EEO connotation would be involved as a consequence of inaccurate job descriptions in the following respects:

An inflated position description, which attributed to the job more content, effort, responsibility, etc., than was actually required, and which in turn would prescribe more experience or higher qualifications of an applicant than actually would be

necessary, would have the effect of dissuading certain applicants from applying or would eliminate more applicants from consideration than in fact would otherwise be appropriate; to the extent that females or minorities could be shown to bear an inordinate portion of the resulting disadvantage, a discriminatory dynamic might be demonstrated;

An inaccurate description could also be used subjectively, and thus for discriminatory purposes, by an unsympathetic employer; in the face of apparently high qualification requirements, the employer could waive such requirements for a particular applicant and insist on literal satisfaction of them by another;

In a perhaps more fundamental sense, inaccurate descriptions would constitute misinformation to those who otherwise might express interest in the position, and to the extent that this could be shown to work primarily to the disadvantage of females or minorities a discriminatory dynamic might be operative.

The obligation, therefore, is to analyze job descriptions to determine whether there is a sufficient correlation between the descriptive language and the actual job content; this is of primary significance in connection with recruitment activities, i.e. notice to prospective applicants of the nature of the job opening so that the individual may form a realistic

conclusion concerning whether he or she ought to make application for the job.

- Each Unit*
4. "Tests and other selection techniques not validated as required by the OFCC Order on Employee Testing and other Selection Procedures." [60-2.23(b)(6)]

"Test forms not validated by location, work performance and inclusion of minorities and women in sample." [60-2.23(b)(7)]

Tests of skills and knowledge, as well as other evaluation and measurement techniques which purport to assess an applicant's competitive position in relation to other applicants for an available position, must be verified on two counts; first, the inquiry being conducted through testing must bear some reasonable relationship to job-performance requirements; second, the testing or evaluation technique must be shown to operate effectively to produce reliable information. In general, the concern here is that no techniques of measurement be used which could be adapted to serving a conscious discriminatory purpose or which have built-in factors which have the effect of disadvantaging females or minority group members. Therefore, if any formal testing is utilized in connection with the evaluation of job applicants, all such tests must be "validated" in accordance with the provisions of The Department of Labor OFCC bulletin on Employee Testing and Other Selection

Techniques, 41 CFR 60-3 (included in the Higher Education Guidelines, HEW, Office for Civil Rights, which has been made available to the campuses previously). Many employers have concluded, in view of the expense and difficulty and possible limited value of test validation procedures, that they should abandon altogether various types of tests which they formerly used regularly in connection with job-applicant evaluation. With reference to tests and other selection techniques, note particularly the instructions contained in 60-2.24(d)(2) and (3).

5. "Referral ratio of minorities or women to the hiring supervisor or manager indicates a significantly higher percentage are being rejected as compared to nonminority and male applicants." [60-2.23(b)(8)]

This is, again, a general indicator of possible problems in the selection process which must be analyzed to ascertain whether there is any type of discriminatory dynamic operative.

- D. Analyze: "Transfer and promotion practices." [60-2.23(a)(4)]

The correlative possible problem which analysis may reveal is:

"Lateral and/or vertical movement of minority or female employees occurring at a lesser rate (compared to work force mix) than that of nonminority or male employees." [60-2.23(b)(2)]

[See also 60-2.22(b)(3) and (5)]

~~Each Unit~~  
central

Each Unit

This section requires that, in the event analysis suggests any such lesser mobility on the part of females and minorities, an explanation for this circumstance must be sought and if the causes are discriminatory in character corrective action must be taken.

- E. Analyze: "Facilities, company sponsored recreation and social events, and special programs such as educational assistance."

[60-2.23(a)(5)] [See also 60-2.20(b)(7)(ii) and (iii)]

The correlative problems which analysis may reveal are:

1. "Minorities or women are excluded from or are not participating in company sponsored activities or programs." [60-2.23(b)(9)]

Evidence of exclusion should be readily ascertainable and easily corrected; a more elusive problem would be the matter of failure of the protected classes to participate in various activities and a determination of whether any correctable discriminatory dynamics account for that failure in participation.

2. "De facto segregation still exists at some facilities."

[60-2.23(b)(10)]

The problem here described is self-explanatory, though some careful checking to determine whether informal group pressures may be operating to effectively segregate certain types of facilities may be necessary.

*Each unit*

*Each unit*

*Each unit*



F. Analyze: "Seniority practices and seniority provisions of union contracts."

[60-2.23(a)(6)]

*Each Unit*

In the absence of any seniority principles in University employment or any union contracts which would contain seniority provisions, this section would appear to be inapplicable to our circumstances. However, to the extent that any analogous practices or principles, particularly relating to such matters as promotion and merit increments, are operative in any category of employment, close analysis of the experiences of females and minority group members should be undertaken to determine whether any problem exists.

G. Analyze: "Apprenticeship programs." [60-2.23(a)(7)]

*trainee programs*

Again, in the absence of any such formal apprenticeship programs, this section would appear to be inapplicable.

H. Analyze: "All company training programs, formal and informal."

[60-2.23(a)(8)]

*Central*

The correlative possible problem which analysis may reveal is: "Minorities or women underutilized or significantly underrepresented in training or career improvement programs." [60-2.23(b)(13)]

I. Analyze: "Workforce attitude."

*Each Unit*

The correlative possible problem which analysis may reveal is: "Nonsupport of company policy by managers, supervisors and employees." [60-2.23(b)(12)] [See also 60-2.22(b)(4) and (8)]

This point suggests the need to analyze some rather elusive factors which may not be self-evident upon initial inquiry. The positive

objective is stated in section 60-2.24(d)(1) as follows: "All personnel involved in the recruiting, screening, selection, promotion, disciplinary, and related processes should be carefully selected and trained to insure elimination of bias in all personnel actions."

- J. Analyze: "Technical phases of compliance, such as poster and notification to labor unions, retention of applications, notification to subcontractors, etc." [60-2.23(a)(10)] [See also 60-2.20(b)(7)(i)]

The correlative possible problems which analysis may reveal are:

1. "Posters not on display." [60-2.23(b)(19)]
2. "Purchase orders do not contain EEO clause." [60-2.23(b)(18)]
3. "Labor unions and subcontractors not notified of their responsibilities." [60-2.23(b)(17)]

- K. In addition to the foregoing specific points which are treated correlatively in both section (a) and (b) of 60-2.23, the following miscellaneous "problems" are noted in 60-2.23(b) which, if they exist, should receive corrective attention:

1. "No formal techniques established for evaluating effectiveness of EEO programs." [60-2.23(b)(14)]

This point actually draws on and relates to several other sections of Revised Order No. 4 and therefore is not discussed separately here.

2. "Lack of access to suitable housing inhibits recruitment efforts and employment of qualified minorities." [60-2.23(b)(15)]
- This point, and the next succeeding one, was the subject of

*Each unit*

*sample/central  
central*

*Central*

*Central*

considerable discussion with HEW Regional Office officials; our questions concerned to what extent the contractor was obligated to conduct "analysis" of this factor which was remote from and not under the control of the contractor; in what manner should the contractor undertake to address such a problem if one is perceived to exist. We were assured that it is not HEW's view that a particular contractor need assume financial or other direct responsibility for housing deficiencies in the community; rather, this section, we were told, is intended to encourage contractors to participate, with advice, encouragement and such other assistance as may be practicable, in total community efforts to improve housing opportunities for members of minority groups (for example, through support of programs designed to insure effective operation of nondiscrimination laws or regulations; the development of public housing projects, etc.)

3. "Lack of suitable transportation (public or private) to the work

place inhibits minority employment." [60-2.23(b)(16)]

The comments made with reference to paragraph 4, above, are equally pertinent with reference to this point.

- K. centered*
- L. Various sections of the Revised Order No. 4, other than 60-2.23, and of the HEW Higher Education Guidelines treat "problem areas" which must be analyzed and which may require remedial action; they are treated here for purposes of comprehensive consideration of the total "self-analysis" exercise in which the institution must engage.

1. "Compliance of personnel policies and practices with the Sex Discrimination Guidelines of 41 CFR Part 60-20." [60-2.13(h)]

Careful study of Part 60-20 must be undertaken to insure that the institution's policies are consistent with the requirements on sex discrimination. *Leave policy (maternity)*

2. "In hiring decisions, assignment to a particular title or rank may be discriminatory. For example, in many institutions women are more often assigned initially to lower academic ranks than are men." (Higher Education Guidelines, page 7)

This requires analysis of placement practices, particularly with reference to academic employees, and a program of remedial action responsive to any finding that women have suffered a disadvantage attributable to sex discrimination.

3. "Anti-nepotism policies." (Higher Education Guidelines, page 8)

The recently adopted Board of Governors' policy on this subject, which applies to all campuses, has been validated by the Regional Office; thus, in terms of policy statements we have no problem; however, there must be assurance that the policy is implemented and applied in a manner that insures the absence of a discriminatory dynamic based on considerations of sex.

4. "Rights and Benefits-Salary." (Higher Education Guidelines, page 11)

Of critical concern under the Executive Order is the matter of possible salary differentials based on considerations of sex, i.e.

central  
Attach policy

central

central

ATTACH  
policy

Each Unit

violation of the "equal pay" concept. Accordingly, an analysis must be made of compensation practices and patterns to determine whether in any instances women are being paid less than men for the same work. A summary printout of average wage or salary rates for men and women in various categories of employment frequently will show a significant differential; if this is the case, then more detailed analysis to determine whether or not the difference is attributable to discriminatory dynamics must be undertaken.

SUMMARY: With reference to each of the foregoing points of analysis, the institution must include in its Affirmative Action Plan an indication that the matter has received appropriate attention; that is, that an analysis has been conducted (how it was conducted, what it consisted of), that a problem of this type does or does not exist, and that if a problem exists specific steps are set forth in the plan for correcting the deficiency (with a clear description of the nature of the remedial activity and the time frame within which the effort will be completed). Note that it may not be possible to complete all such analyses before submission of the Plan; we are assured by HEW Regional Office officials that it will suffice for present purposes that you state in your Plan (for example, with reference to the analysis of possible wage disparities based on sex) that an analysis is being conducted (describe the nature of the analysis) and will be completed by a specified date and that a supplement to the Plan reflecting the results of the analysis and the corrective measures being undertaken as a result will be submitted at a later specified date. This deferred treatment is not permissible with respect to the subject matter of Part I of this memorandum.



### III. Outline for Assembling Total Affirmative Action Plan

The preceding two sections of this memorandum treat the core analytical processes in which the contractor must engage incident to preparation of a written affirmative action plan. Once this work is completed, the results must be drawn together, along with other specified inclusions in an acceptable program, to form a written Affirmative Action plan for submission to HEW and for dissemination generally as a guide to the institution's intended course of action. The following outline is a suggestion concerning an appropriate and effective basis for organizing the written document.

#### I. Preamble (60-2.20(a), Revised Order No. 4)

The chief executive of the institution should set forth clearly the institution's commitment to the written plan, as well as a more general endorsement of the institution's commitment to the principles of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action.

#### II. Reaffirmation of Equal Employment Opportunity Principles (60-2.20)

A sample statement of equal employment opportunity principles and corresponding general institutional commitments, which may be adapted to use by the individual institutions in writing the plan, is set forth in Appendix G.

#### III. Publicizing the Equal Employment Opportunity Policy (60-2.21)

The regulations require that information about the plan, embodying both the institution's general commitments to principles as well as the details of the action program, be disseminated broadly, both among incumbent employees and to the community at large. The requirements

of Section 60-2.21 must be followed closely in preparation of this portion of the written plan; all points must be treated. A sample treatment of this topic is attached as Appendix H.

IV. Responsibility for Implementation of the Plan: General (60-2.22)

The basic objective of this section is to make clear assignment of responsibility, to identified individuals, for all parts of the plan which require implementing action, oversight, record-keeping and reporting. For purposes of written treatment of this subject, a division between general and specific areas of responsibility may be helpful. The various general headings of responsibility noted in Section 60-2.22 might be treated here, in the outline, with the naming of an executive (or executives) who is to direct and have general responsibility for administration of the affirmative action program; the components of his or her job as catalogued in Section 60-2.22 should be set out (essentially perhaps just repeated verbatim) in the written plan. Later in the plan, in connection with discussion of specific remedial corrective programs to be undertaken in response to any perceived deficiencies, specific references to the individuals responsible for the various aspects of such corrective programs should be made.

V. Identification of Problems (60-2.23 and 60-2.11 and 2.12)

This general heading subsumes the several components of the central core of an affirmative action program (i.e., Sections I and II of this memorandum). It may be organized, for purposes of meaningful presentation, in several different ways. Logically, it would appear

appropriate to address first the results of required analyses concerning the possible occurrence or existence of discriminatory practices or policies (refer to Section II of this memorandum). Next, a consideration of "underutilization" and "underrepresentation" should be presented (see Section I of this memorandum). It is quite possible that separate basic headings for these two large subjects should be used.

VI. Development and Execution of Corrective and Remedial Programs  
(60-2.24 and 60-2.26)

In fact this part of the program is an extension of Part V; in other words, the analysis of current practices and policies and the resulting identification of problem areas is to be followed by a statement of action programs responsive to problems discovered. Thus, it may be concluded that better organizational technique would consist of following each statement of a problem with an immediate treatment of the remedial action and the methods, timetables and responsibilities incident to the effectuation of the remedial action (for example, if the analysis of the current work force and a consideration of availability reveals an underutilization of women in professional positions, then the plan next would state remedial hiring goals, timetables, methods for achieving the goals, and assignments of responsibilities for effectuating the program). On the other hand, a separate treatment of action programs, as a section of the plan separate and apart from the section dealing with identification of problems, would be entirely appropriate. In either

case, the written plan must set forth in detail and with specificity the nature of the action program being undertaken. The various directions contained in Section 60-2.24 and 60-2.26 should be analyzed carefully and adapted to the particular institutional problems which have been identified.

#### VII. Internal Audit and Reporting Systems (60-2.25)

The program must specify the nature of record-keeping and data collection and analysis responsibilities, establish responsibility for all such activities and establish timetables for compilation and reporting; this must include a provision for annual reporting to HEW of results of operation to date for the affirmative action program.

A review of the regulations and interpretative materials supplied by HEW indicates that the following matters must be monitored, i.e., record-keeping processes established, collation and analysis responsibilities assigned and periodic reports compiled:

1. The basic individual employee data file, regularly updated (Tab J, Section A, HEW, Higher Education Guidelines), with appropriate periodic summaries.
2. Records of referrals, placements, transfers, promotions and terminations (60-2.25(a), Revised Order No. 4)
3. Formal reports from unit or school or division managers on a scheduled basis concerning the degree to which affirmative action goals are attained and timetables met (60-2.25(b), Revised Order No. 4)

4. Applicant flow data, by race and sex and applicant rejection rates by race and sex (60-2.12(1), Revised Order No. 4)
5. Periodic audit of any training programs, hiring and promotion patterns to discover and remove any impediments to the attainment of goals (60-2.22(b)(3), Revised Order No. 4)
6. Periodic audit to insure that each location is in compliance in areas such as:
  - (a) Posters are properly displayed;
  - (b) All facilities are in fact desegregated;
  - (c) Minority and female participation in University-sponsored educational, training, recreational and social activities.  
(60-2.22(b)(7), Revised Order No. 4)





1. Availability of Women and Minorities

A unique aspect of equal employment opportunity under the Executive Order is the required compilation of availability data on women and minorities for use as a measure of the contractor's equal employment opportunity. By comparing availability data with current employees, the contractor has an indication of how representative its workforce is of the persons qualified for employment in its institution.

The Department of Labor's Revised Order No. 4 (41 CFR 60-2.11(a) (1 and 2)) contains explicit guidelines for constructing an availability index for minorities and an availability index for women. These indices are particularly applicable in the case of nonacademic personnel.

For academic personnel the development of availability figures is slightly different, because the recruiting area will vary from institution to institution. It may be a national or even international one. Because the skills required for a particular position are often quite specialized, accurate information on availability may be more difficult to obtain.

OCR recommends the following procedure for determining availability figures for women and minorities for academic positions:

Many disciplinary associations and professional groups have data that show percentages of racial and national origin minorities available in certain

fields, and a 1968 study by the Ford Foundation (Office of Reports) provides percentages of Negroes holding doctorates. To determine the number of women available for senior level positions, the Office recommends that the contractor use data available from the National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel prepared by the National Science Foundation, and the U.S. Office of Education's annual reports on earned degrees. Another source is the National Research Council of the National Academy of Science. This data has been compiled by sex, but is now being compiled by race, as well. The NSF data is broken down by sex, specialty and subspecialty, highest degree, years of professional experience, and primary work activity. The OE data is broken down by sex, degree earned, school granting degree, and specialty. For women in junior positions, the Office recommends that the contractor consider the OE annual report of earned degrees for the last 5 years and current graduate school enrollments.

To the extent that an institution makes a practice of employing its own graduates, the number and percentage of graduate degrees which it has itself awarded to women and minorities in the past ten years or so should be reflected in the goals which it sets for its future faculty appointments.

For academic employees the basic national data on earned doctoral degrees will provide the basis for a utilization analysis of a contractor's workforce, unless the contractor can otherwise demonstrate that the labor market upon which it draws is significantly different from this base. For example, some institutions appoint a large number of new faculty from a particular group of graduate schools; such institutions may use data obtained from these schools to determine the availability of women and minorities. If the annual output of women and minorities from the primary feeder schools exceeds the national average, the contractor will be expected to use the higher figures to determine availability. If the output from the feeder schools is less than the national average, the institution will be expected to justify its use of such recruitment sources, or use the higher figures to determine eligibility.

## 2. Comparison of Current Workforce with Availability Data

The next step for the contractor is to compare the number of women and minorities in its current workforce with their availability in the market from which it can reasonably recruit. This comparison must be by comparable job categories. Wherever the comparison reveals that a hiring unit of the university (a department or other section) is not employing minorities and women to the extent that they are available and qualified for work, it is then required to set goals to overcome this situation.

Goals should be set so as to overcome deficiencies in the utilization of minorities and women within a reasonable time. In many cases this can be accomplished within 5 years; in others more time or less time will be required.

Goals may be set in numbers or percentages, and should reflect not only the number of new hires but also the projected overall composition of the work force in the given unit.

It is necessary to set goals that will overcome underutilization in the institution's work force within a reasonable period of time, not merely to set goals for new hires based on current availability.

In many institutions the appropriate unit for goals is the school or division, rather than the department. While estimates of availability in academic employment can best be determined on a disciplinary basis, anticipated turnover and vacancies can usually be calculated on a wider basis. While a school, division or college may be the organizational unit which assumes responsibility for setting and achieving goals, departments which have traditionally excluded women or minorities from their ranks are expected to make particular efforts to recruit, hire and promote women and minorities. In other words, the Office for Civil Rights will be concerned not only with whether a school meets its overall goals, but also whether apparent general success has been achieved only by strenuous efforts on the part of a few departments.



AVAILABILITY  
DATA

MINORITIES  
and  
WOMEN



---

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF  
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
Office for Civil Rights



Availability Data

Minorities and Women

The data, references, and documents that follow have been assembled to help interested persons, employers, and institutions of higher education in their search for information on this subject.

This compilation is by no means all that is available. It is, however, what is known to this Office at this time.

As additional data and publications become known and available, this compilation will be updated.

Higher Education Division  
Office for Civil Rights  
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare  
330 Independence Avenue, S. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20201

June 1973

DATA ON THE AVAILABILITY OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES FOR ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

MINORITIES

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE OF DATA</u>
Survey of Black American Doctorates The Ford Foundation Office of Special Projects 320 East 43rd Street New York, New York 10017		This survey, along with an accompanying study by Fred E. Crossland (Graduate Education and Black Americans) in 1968, found "less than 1 percent" of the doctorates in the nation went to blacks. More than half of the degrees earned were in education (28.6 percent) and in Social Sciences (26.3 percent). About 80 percent of the Black Ph.D.'s were men.  Excerpts from the two surveys are included under Tab A.
The American Bar Association 1155 60th Street Chicago, Illinois 60637		In a 1969-70 survey the ABA found blacks represented 2.7 percent of the total law school enrollment.  A related survey found 1 percent of the male lawyers and judges and 2.3 percent of the female lawyers and judges were black.  Excerpts from the ABA survey are included as Tab B.
Student Lawyer Journal The American Bar Association 1155 60th Street Chicago, Illinois 60638	18   June, 1971	A survey in this publication included racial data for eight professions in addition to the law. (See Tab C).

---

Prepared by the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Revised March 1973 (\*denotes new entry since August 1972)

Research by David M. Rafky of Syracuse University showed percentage breakdowns among blacks who hold doctorates. (See Tab D).

\*Teachers College Record  
Columbia University

226  
Vol 74, No.2  
December 1972

"The Black Scholar in the Academic Marketplace," a statistical and narrative account of problems, characteristics, opportunities, by David M. Rafky, City College of Loyola University, New Orleans.

\*Negroes in Science: Natural  
Science Doctorates 1876-1969  
Balamp Press, Box 7390  
Detroit, Michigan

A study by James Jay, with limited availability data.

\*Equal Employment for Minority  
Group College Graduates  
Garrett Park Press  
Garrett Park, Maryland 20766

A guidebook by Robert Calvert, with suggested procedures and some statistics.

Racial and Ethnic Enrollment 117-200  
Data for Institutions of Higher  
Education  
Office for Civil Rights, HEW  
Washington, D. C. 20202

This 1970 survey includes data, by race, for undergraduate institutions, as well as for medical, dental, law and other graduate and professional schools. Data for 1968 is available.

Directory of Public xiii  
Elementary and Secondary Schools  
Office for Civil Rights, HEW  
Washington, D. C. 20202

This survey includes the percentage of classroom teachers in public school systems in 1970 who were Negro, Spanish-surnamed, American Indian Oriental and others. Data for 1968 is available.

Minority Group Employment  
in the Federal Government  
U. S. Civil Service Commission  
Washington, D. C.

This 1970 data is by grade level and by individual agencies, for Negroes, Spanish-surnamed Americans, American Indians, Orientals and others.

College and University Faculty:  
A Statistical Description, 1970

See entry under Women and Minorities below.

Journal of the NMA 470  
National Medical Association Nov. 1969  
1717 Massachusetts Ave., N. W. Vol. 61  
Washington, D. C. No. 6

Distribution of black physicians in the U. S., by state and by graduating school. Later data for 1970 showed 2 percent of the nation's 317,000 physicians are black, most in California, New York and D. C. (See Tab E for excerpts)

Office for Civil Rights  
Department of Health, Education,  
and Welfare  
Washington, D. C. 20201

This agency has limited data of representation of various minority groups in nursing and doctors' professions.

Black Enterprise  
295 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10017

This monthly magazine from time to time publishes data on black representation in various fields.

National Minority Business  
Directory 1972  
1115 Plymouth Avenue North  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411

This directory has no cumulative data but provides names of minority persons in various professions, including advertising, architecture, banking, chemicals, data processing, electronics, food service and communications.

Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

The FCC has yearly cumulative data on minority representation in the radio and television industry. (National Association of Educational Broadcasters, Washington, D. C., compiles similar data for its portion of the industry).

U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Higher Education  
5301 Central Avenue, N. W.  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87108

Maintains information on Indian-Americans in Higher Education.

Office of Indian Affairs  
Office of Education - Room 1169  
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20202

Maintains information on Indian-Americans in Higher Education.

United Scholarship Service  
P.O. Box 18285 Capitol  
Fill Station  
Denver, Colorado

Maintains information on Indian-  
Americans in higher education.

Aspira of America, Inc.  
245 5th Avenue  
New York, New York 10016

Maintains information on Puerto  
Rican scholars.

Puerto Rican Research Center  
1519 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Maintains information on Puerto  
Rican scholars.

Puerto Rican Studies Departments  
at various universities  
Hunter College of the City  
University of New York, Fordham  
University (New York City),  
Rutgers University (New Brunswick,  
New Jersey), City University of  
New York

Possible sources of names of  
scholars in various fields.

\*Directory of Spanish-surnamed and  
Native Americans in Science and  
Engineering

List of individuals

Dr. Joseph Martinez  
464 Furnace Road  
Ontario, New York 14519

Cabinet Committee on Opportunity  
for the Spanish Speaking  
1800 G. Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20506

The committee published "Spanish-  
surnamed American College  
Graduates, 1970," which lists  
3,000 Spanish-surnamed graduates  
for 1970 with fields of study and  
degrees earned. (A breakdown,  
by field, for the list is included  
as Tab F)

Office of Spanish-surnamed Affairs  
Room 4544  
Department of Health, Education and  
Welfare  
Washington, D. C. 20202

Compiles a list of "Mexican-  
Americans Holding a Doctorate,"  
by field of study.



Dr. Amado Padilla  
University of California at  
Santa Barbara  
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Developing roster and data of  
Mexican-Americans holding  
advanced degrees.

Directory of Minority College  
Graduates 1971-72  
Manpower Administration  
U. S. Department of Labor  
Washington, D. C.

Names, addresses and fields of  
30,000 minority men and 30,000  
minority women receiving BA, MA,  
or PhD in 1971 or 1972. No  
cumulative data.

\*Black Academy of Arts and Letters  
475 Riverside Drive  
New York, New York 10027

Provides no data nor rosters  
but active in academic affairs.

Black Nurses Association  
792 Columbus Avenue  
New York, New York 10025

Compiles information about black  
nurses.

Caucus of Black Economists  
Room 607  
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Maintains a roster of 500 blacks  
in economics.

\*National Association of Black  
Accountants  
P. O. Box 726, FDR Station  
New York, New York 10022

Notifies its membership of  
university openings; has no  
availability data but estimates  
200 of the 125,000 certified  
public accountants are black.

\*National Association of Black  
Urban and Ethnic Directors  
P. O. Box 205, Manhattanville  
Station  
New York, New York 10027

Maintains information for and  
about minorities in urban  
planning.

\*Minority Recruitment Office  
American Society of Planning Officers  
1313 E. 60th Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Provides a study with numbers  
of minorities and women in urban  
planning education and provides  
resumes of those available.

National Bar Association  
1721 S. Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20009

Maintains information on blacks  
in the law and judiciary.

National Roster of Minority  
Professional Consulting Services  
Office of Minority Business Enterprise  
Department of Commerce  
Washington, D. C.

This data is not cumulative, but  
serves as a source of minority  
persons in the field of business.

WOMEN

SOURCE

PAGE

TYPE OF DATA

National Register of Scientific  
and Technical Personnel  
1966, 1968, 1970  
National Science Foundation  
1800 G Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

Number and percent of scientists  
by sex, for 17 separate fields;  
number of women scientists by  
field, highest degree, by type of  
employer, by primary work  
activity, by years of professional  
experience; also median income  
figures. Several variables of the  
data are available.

Earned Degrees Conferred:  
Bachelor's and Higher Degrees  
Bureau of Educational Research  
and Development  
U. S. Office of Education  
Washington, D. C.

The data for the proportion of  
doctorates earned by women, by  
area and field, 1960-69 is included  
as Tab G. The Office of  
the Chancellor at the University  
of Wisconsin has excerpted data for  
1967-69 for 33 leading institutions  
Lucy W. Sells of the Department of  
Sociology, University of California  
at Berkeley has organized the data,  
by sex, for the top five graduate  
institutions in selected disci-  
plines. All of the above  
statistics are available from  
Project on the Status and Education  
of Women, Association of American  
Colleges, 1818 R Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20009.

National Research Council  
National Academy of Science  
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D. C.

Number and percentage of  
doctorates to women by 26 fields,  
also by school, gathered annually  
since 1968. Also number and  
percentage of women receiving any  
graduate degree by area, school,  
and state. THIS DATA IS NOW BEING  
COMPILED BY RACE, AS WELL AS SEX.

Juris Doctor  
Magazine for the New Lawyer  
555 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10022

12  
March, 1972

An article by Anne Trebilcock, on  
leave from University of California  
Law School, listed increases in  
percentages of women enrolled in  
law schools, now nearly 19 percent.  
(See Tab H)

Women's caucuses and committees  
in the various professional  
associations and disciplinary  
associations

Digest of Educational Statistics 1970.  
National Center for Education  
Statistics 82  
U. S. Office of Education  
Washington, D. C. 89

Institute for College and  
University Administrators  
American Council on Education  
One Dupont Circle  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Handbook on Women Workers  
Women's Bureau  
U. S. Department of Labor  
Washington, D. C.

Boston Theological Institute  
Women's Institute Placement Service  
45 Francis Avenue  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Most groups maintain lists of  
women available in the field and  
some have data on the percentage  
of the field that is female. (See  
Tab I for a listing of these  
groups.)

Professional background and  
academic activity of college  
faculty members, by sex, 1969

Earned degrees conferred by field,  
by level, and sex 1968-69.

90 Number of first-professional  
degrees conferred in dentistry,  
medicine and law, by sex, 1968-69.

122 Average monthly salary offers to  
male candidates for master's and  
doctor's degrees, by field,  
1964-65 to 1969-70.

Women Academic Administrators in  
Higher Education (presidents, deans,  
vice presidents and financial or  
administrative officers). See  
Tab J.

Data on Women in the Labor Force,  
Employment by Occupation, Earnings,  
Educational Attainment, Laws  
Governing Women's Employment and  
Status, Bibliography on American  
Women Workers. Of only limited use  
in establishing availability in  
academic employment.

Maintains a data bank on women  
qualified to teach in theology.

\*Architectural Forum

46  
Sept., 1972

An article on "Women in Architecture" reported that American Institute of Architecture membership in 1969 was 233 female, 23,205 male. It quoted Department of Labor estimates that 4 percent of the nation's 33,000 registered architects and 20 percent of the 8,000 urban planners are female (1970 Census). See Tab K for excerpts.

\*Women in Communications, Inc.  
(founded as Theta Sigma Phi)  
8305-A Shoal Creek Blvd.  
Austin, Texas 78758

Has compiled percentages of women in each academic rank on journalism faculties nationally and numbers of women in journalism at individual schools. See Tab L.

\*Goals for Women in Science  
Women in Science and Engineering  
c/o Margaret E. Law  
Department of Physics  
Harvard University  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Narrative and statistics on availability and opportunities for women generally and at selected institutions. (See Tab M for excerpts.)

\*Minority Recruitment Office  
American Society of Planning  
Officers  
1313 E. 60th Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60637

See entry under Minorities above.

\*The Profile of Medical Practice  
Center for Health Services  
Research  
American Medical Association  
535 North Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60610

102  
1972  
edition

Women Physicians in Medicine by Barbara H. Kehrer, reports 7.4 percent of the U. S. physicians are female, includes other data on types of practice, medical school enrollment, etc. See Tab N for excerpts.

\*1971 Lawyer Statistical Report  
American Bar Association  
1155 60th Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60637  
1971 edition

This report showed women comprise 9,103 or 2.8 percent of the total attorneys in the U. S. The ABA has recently supplemented this report with new data on women in the law.



Bulletin of the American  
Physical Society  
335 E 45th Street  
New York, New York 10017

Vol. 17  
June 1972

A statistical portrait of women in physics and their availability using data from the National Research Council, the National Science Foundation, Directory of Physics and Astronomy Faculties of North American Colleges and Universities, 1970-1971, and an independent survey.

MINORITIES AND WOMEN

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE OF DATA</u>
National Research Council National Academy of Science 2101 Constitution Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C.		See entry under Women above.
The American Graduate Student: A Normative Description, 1971 American Council on Education One Dupont Circle Washington, D. C. 20036	16-92	Raw data, by race and by sex, for the following fields: bioscience, business, education engineering, arts and humanities, math and physical sciences, social sciences, health, law.
	17	Degree enrollments, by race and sex.
	104	Degree enrollments, by fields
	89-92	Percentage distribution of students in various fields, by sex, for all academic degrees.
		Analysis of this data is available from ACE.
College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description, 1970 American Council on Education One Dupont Circle Washington, D. C. 20036	12	Faculty appointments, by race and sex, in each type of school (two-year, four-year, universities, etc.) Also by job titles. The data shows 2.2 percent of American college faculty (1.8 percent of the male faculty and 3.9 of the female faculty) is black. See Tab O.
	14-15	Numbers of publications and hours taught, by sex and by type of school.
		Priority to teaching or research, by sex and type of school. Also by highest degree held. Analysis of this data is available from ACE.

U. S. Bureau of the Census  
Department of Commerce  
Washington, D. C.

American College Enrollment  
Trends in 1971  
Carnegie Commission on Higher  
Education  
1947 Center Street  
Berkeley, California 94704

\*Department of Civil Engineering  
3106 Civil Engineering Building  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois 61801

\*Minorities and Women in Science  
1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

U. S. Equal Employment Opportunity  
Commission  
1800 G Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

Committee on Equality of Opportunity  
in Psychology  
American Psychological Association  
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

The Census Bureau has data of various professions, by race and sex. The 1960 Census, for instance, found 212,408 lawyers and judges in the U. S., and 176 were female Negroes. The total number of females, including whites and Negroes, was 7,434. The Bureau publishes an annual catalog of available data.

8

Data showing trends in graduate enrollment between fall 1970 and fall 1971. See Tab P.

Has compiled a list of women and minorities who have been or soon will be holders of doctorates in civil engineering, engineering, engineering mechanics and allied fields.

A monthly survey of developments affecting scientific manpower and women power, including new sources of availability data. Published by Scientific Manpower Commission, Betty M. Vetter, executive director.

The EEOC has cumulative data by race and sex, in broad occupational categories, as well as for various professions.

Developing information on minorities and women in the field.

A Statistical Portrait of Higher  
Education  
Carnegie Commission on Higher Education  
1947 Center Street  
Berkeley, California 94704

\*American Society for Public  
Administration  
1223 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

Data on student characteristics,  
faculty characteristics, and  
expenditures that may be of help  
in developing affirmative action  
programs.

Maintains a data bank on women  
and minorities qualified in the  
field.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE OF DATA</u>
*Affirmative Action Campus Contacts		See Tab Q for a 1972 listing of affirmative action contacts.
*Project on the Status and Education of Women 1818 R Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20009		Maintains regular mailing of materials on affirmative action, availability, recruiting, suggestions, etc.
Directory of Afro-American Resources Race Relations Information Center (published by R.R. Bowker Company, 1180 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036)		Lists, describes and cross-indexes professional associations of blacks, disciplinary committees concerned with blacks, data sources and study centers.



Tab A

TAB A

## A Survey of Black American Doctorates

Conducted by James W. Bryant, program advisor,  
Special Projects in Education, the Ford Foundation

In the course of planning a program to increase the number of black Ph.D.s, the Office of Special Projects of the Ford Foundation conducted a survey of black men and women who hold the doctorate. The results support the generally held assumption that less than 1 per cent of America's earned doctoral degrees are held by Negroes. From a variety of sources, the names of 2,280 Negro Ph.D.s were obtained.\* For the immediate future the percentage is not likely to change, since another survey indicates that less than 1 per cent of the Ph.D. candidates at the close of the 1967-1968 academic year were black men and women.\*\*

**Table III      FIELDS IN WHICH DEGREES WERE CONFERRED**

Field	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Education	228	26.4	85	36.3	313	28.6
Social Sciences	242	28.0	46	19.7	288	26.3
Biological Sciences	120	14.0	22	9.4	142	12.9
Humanities	90	10.4	46	19.7	136	12.4
Physical Sciences	116	13.4	13	5.5	129	11.8
Other*	66	7.8	22	9.4	88	8.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>862</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1096</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*Includes Agriculture, Business, Engineering, Home Economics, and Religion.

6

**Table IV      EMPLOYMENT OF BLACK DOCTORATES**

Employment	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
College & University	729	84.8	208	88.9	937	85.4
Government	47	5.4	11	4.7	58	5.3
Social Agencies	42	4.9	11	4.7	53	4.8
Industry	28	3.2	1	.4	29	2.7
Other*	16	1.8	3	1.2	19	1.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>862</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>1096</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*Includes retired and self-employed persons.

The Ford Foundation  
320 East 43rd Street  
New York, N. Y. 10017

Office of Special Projects  
Division of Education & Research  
November 25, 1968

## GRADUATE EDUCATION AND BLACK AMERICANS

by Fred E. Crossland

During the summer of 1968, 105 American graduate schools of arts and sciences were asked to provide data about black Americans attending their institutions and receiving their degrees. Sixty-four were able to provide data about enrollment; sixty-three were able to provide information about recent Ph.D. recipients. The participating universities are listed in Attachment A. The data they furnished are summarized in seven statistical tables at the end of this paper. We are extremely grateful for their cooperation.

The collection of information about racial representation in graduate schools is complicated by two facts. First, it is impossible to be precise about something as imprecise as race. Men and women do not fit neatly into yellow, brown, red, black, or white pigeonholes. Second, in recent years it has become socially proper and legally necessary for institutions not to ask a man's race and not to keep racial records.

It was impossible, therefore, for most administrators to provide exact answers to our questions. For the most part, the raw data they sent us were estimates, educated guesses, recollections of former students, and hunches about current degree candidates. Despite the inevitable imprecision of individual items of information, the composite picture is remarkably clear and the patterns are consistent.

Nearly one third of all American doctoral degree granting institutions provided data; these institutions award more than one third of all earned higher degrees. They are not a small statistical sample; they are a large and representative group of America's leading universities. They represent the public and private sectors of higher education. They are located in all sections of the country. They are large and small, urban and rural. They are prestigious and relatively unknown to the general public.

All the responding universities are typical in that they are "predominantly white" institutions in a society becoming increasingly and belatedly self-conscious about its treatment of the culturally different. What these universities have to say about their own service to black Americans is important.

\*\*\* \*\*

The following three figures summarize the situation and indicate the scope of the problem:

- ... 11.5 percent .... this is the proportion of the total American population which is black
- ... 1.72 percent .... this is the proportion of the total enrollment in America's graduate schools of arts and sciences which is black American
- ... 0.78 percent .... this is the proportion of all Ph.D. 's awarded between 1964 and 1968 which went to black Americans

If the number of black American graduate students were multiplied sevenfold, it would only match the ratio of blacks to the total American population. The annual number of new black Ph.D. 's would have to be multiplied by fifteen to achieve the total population ratio. All the current black recruitment programs will not bring off such increases.

Nothing less than massive, concerted, and sustained efforts by the universities -- together with greatly increased student financial aid resources and vastly improved primary, elementary, and undergraduate education -- will bring about graduate enrollment "parity" for black Americans within a decade. Meanwhile, black administrators will continue to be under-represented in higher education. And students, black and white, will continue to have proportionately few black professors in their college classrooms and laboratories.

The sixty-four graduate schools responding to our questionnaire reported that only 1.72 percent of their students last year were black Americans. There were some regional differences. Nearly half the reported black students were enrolled in the large Midwestern state universities. Both the East and West were below the national figure. As might be expected, the South was above the average. However, although 40 to 50 percent of all black Americans live in the South, it appears that no more than 20 percent of all black graduate students attend institutions in that part of the country. It is likely that a substantial number of black students migrate from the South to low-cost public institutions in the Midwest. (See Table I.)

Twelve of the 64 responding institutions had fewer than ten black students last year, and only twelve reported more than 100. Of the latter, nine were public state universities and three were urban institutions (one public and two private).

Since the 1.72 percent black enrollment figure is more than double the 0.78 percent black Ph.D. figure, it is probable that black enrollment tends to be concentrated at the master degree level and that relatively few blacks continue to the doctorate. On the other



hand, it is possible that the number of new black graduate students in the last two or three years has increased and that there will be a corresponding increase of black Ph.D.'s in the near future.

In the past, the majority of black graduate students were seeking only to satisfy requirements for elementary and secondary school teaching and few had reason to work for the doctorate. That condition may be changing. More than half of the recent black Ph.D. recipients were already teaching at the college level, many at Southern predominantly Negro colleges. As both industry and higher education seek more credentialed blacks, there probably will be increasing numbers of blacks seeking to enter graduate school, enroll in a wider variety of fields, and work for higher degrees.

Sixty-three universities were able to provide data about recent black Ph.D. recipients. Thirteen reported that they had none between 1964 and 1968. Fifty reported that collectively they awarded 294 Ph.D.'s to black Americans between 1964 and 1968. (See Table III.) Among the fifty universities, fourteen granted just one each, and an additional eight universities awarded two Ph.D.'s each to black Americans between 1964 and 1968. The remaining 28 institutions awarded from 3 to 41 doctoral degrees to blacks during the five-year period. (See Table IV.)

The annual number of black Ph.D.'s has been increasing rather steadily in each of the four regions listed, but the percentage of Ph.D.'s going to black Americans has remained extremely low and fairly stable. There has been no significant change despite increasing public attention to civil rights, racial issues, and minority problems, and despite educators' preoccupations with compensatory programs and intensive recruitment of minority students. The interval from graduate school entry to the awarding of the doctorate typically is four or five years, so the result of recent and current efforts must be awaited. No doubt the number of black Ph.D.'s will continue to grow slowly, but there are no signs of sudden changes. After all, the black Ph.D.'s of 1972 are attending graduate school now and there simply are not that many now enrolled.

There appears to be no relationship between size of university and proportion of Ph.D.'s awarded to black Americans. The ten largest and the ten smallest institutions among the respondents have almost exactly the same proportion of black Americans among their recent Ph.D. holders. Black graduate students clearly are in short supply, but no section of the country and no size of university has a corner on the market.

Universities also were asked how many Ph.D.'s they expect to award to black Americans in 1969. Forty-six of the graduate schools responded. The estimates appear to be very generous and may reflect hope rather than expectation. But even if only half of the "hopefuls" for 1969 receive their Ph.D.'s, the 46 responding institutions will have record numbers of black doctoral alumni next year. It will be worth a second look.

\*\*\* \*\*

TABLE I

## ENROLLMENT IN GRADUATE SCHOOLS OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN 1967-68

Region	Universities asked	Universities responding	Total enrollment	Black American enrollment	Percent black American
East	39	24	39,381	467	1.19
South	24	12	21,151	577	2.73
Midwest	25	18	79,149	1,495	1.89
West	17	10	34,934	473	1.35
Total	105	64	174,615	3,012	1.72

Explanatory Notes:

1. The universities themselves provided the raw data upon which this and all subsequent tables are based.
2. The figures are for full-time and part-time enrollment combined.
3. Questionnaires were addressed to deans of graduate schools of arts and sciences at the 105 institutions included in Allan M. Cartter, An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (1966).
4. Data may not always be exactly comparable because universities keep records in different ways. For example, a few may have provided data for more than "arts and sciences" and included education, business administration, engineering, and perhaps other fields.
5. Data were sought for "Negro American" students rather than for "all black students", a category which would include black students from other countries.

TABLE III

## DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEGREES AWARDED FROM 1964 THROUGH 1968

	Academic Year	Total Ph. D.'s Awarded	Ph. D.'s to Black Americans	Percent to Black Americans
EAST (23 respondents out of 39 asked)	1963-64	1,221	9	
	1964-65	1,456	14	0.74
	1965-66	1,586	15	0.96
	1966-67	1,741	24	0.95
	1967-68	<u>2,015</u>	<u>17</u>	1.38
	Five years	8,019	79	0.84
				0.99
SOUTH (12 respondents out of 24 asked)	1963-64	692	1	
	1964-65	916	1	0.14
	1965-66	1,023	1	0.11
	1966-67	1,197	10	0.10
	1967-68	<u>1,271</u>	<u>6</u>	0.84
	Five years	5,104	19	0.47
				0.37
MIDWEST (18 respondents out of 25 asked)	1963-64	2,934	26	0.89
	1964-65	3,059	38	1.24
	1965-66	3,495	28	0.80
	1966-67	3,784	33	0.87
	1967-68	<u>4,219</u>	<u>41</u>	0.97
	Five years	17,491	166	0.95
WEST (10 respondents out of 17 asked)	1963-64	952	5	0.53
	1964-65	1,177	5	0.42
	1965-66	1,335	8	0.60
	1966-67	1,670	3	0.18
	1967-68	<u>1,708</u>	<u>9</u>	0.53
	Five years	6,842	30	0.44
TOTALS (63 respondents out of 195 asked)	1963-64	5,799	41	0.71
	1964-65	6,608	58	0.88
	1965-66	7,444	52	0.70
	1966-67	8,392	70	0.83
	1967-68	<u>9,213</u>	<u>73</u>	0.79
	Five years	37,456	294	0.78

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF BLACK AMERICAN RECIPIENTS OF THE DEGREE  
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DURING THE FIVE-YEAR PERIOD ENDING 1968 -

Number of black American Ph. D. 's	Number of universities				
	East	South	Midwest	West	Total
0	4	4	3	2	13
1	8	4	1	1	14
2	3	0	3	2	8
3	0	2	1	3	6
4	0	1	0	0	1
5	3	1	0	0	4
6	1	0	1	1	3
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	1	0	1	0	2
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	1	0	3	1	5
11	1	0	0	0	1
12	0	0	1	0	1
13	0	0	1	0	1
14	0	0	0	0	0
15-19	1	0	0	0	1
20-24	0	0	2	0	2
25-29	0	0	0	0	0
30-34	0	0	0	0	0
35-39	0	0	0	0	0
40-44	0	0	1	0	1
45 or more	0	0	0	0	0
Universities responding	23	12	18	10	63
Universities asked	39	24	25	17	105

Tab B



TAB B

# NEWS

FROM THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

American Bar Center, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637, Telephone (312) 493-0533  Chris Whittle, Director of Public Relations

Information Contact: Linda Sacia

Release: Immediate

## SURVEY REVEALS DATA ON BLACK LAW STUDENT ENROLLMENT

CHICAGO - Black students approximate three percent of the total enrollment in U.S. law schools, according to a survey conducted by the American Bar Association.

The survey revealed there are 1,605 black students out of 57,573 enrolled in the 125 law schools responding to the questionnaire and distinguishing between black and non-black students. This represents 2.7 percent of the total enrollment.

Out of the 142 law schools in the nation, eight returned the questionnaire but did not distinguish between black and non-black students, while nine schools did not reply at all.

The survey, conducted by the Committee on Civil Rights and Responsibilities of the ABA Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities, shows figures from the 1969-70 school year.

"The survey was aimed at determining precisely the number of black students being prepared to meet the serious need for minority lawyers in this country," said Louis Pollak, former dean of the Yale University Law School and chairman of the Individual Rights Section.

(more)

Survey on Black Enrollment - Final

Some representative figures are: University of Alabama, eight black students in a total enrollment of 317; University of California, Berkeley, 34 of 753; Yale University, 50 of 588; and University of Wisconsin, 10 of 248.

A related survey of 1966 showed that one percent of male lawyers and judges and 2.3 percent of female lawyers and judges were black according to the 1960 census figures. Percentages were significantly higher in such professional occupations as clergymen, physicians and engineers.

-0-

March, 1971

Survey of Black Law Student Enrollment  
1969 - 1970

Conducted by the Committee on Civil Rights and Responsibilities  
of the ABA Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities

State	Total Enrollment	Black Enrollment
Name of School	1969-1970 .	1969-1970
Alabama		
Cumberland School of Law	383	2
University of Alabama	317	8
Arizona		
Arizona State University (Tempe)	320	3
University of Arizona	323	3
Arkansas		
University of Arkansas (Fay.)	350	6
University of Arkansas (Little Rock)	128	4

(continued on page 36)

(Continued from page 21)

<b>California</b>		
Law of California (Berkeley)	753	34
Univ. of California (Davis)	340	10
Univ. of California (Los Angeles)	800	55
Loyola University (Los Angeles)	879	24
Law of Southern California	439	18
Univ. of the Pacific	559	9
California Western Univ.	236	No Reply Received
Univ. of San Diego	598	11
Univ. of California (Hastings College)	1173	13
Golden Gate College	358	8
Univ. of San Francisco	361	5
Univ. of Santa Clara	269	5
Stanford University	428	8
<b>Colorado</b>		
University of Colorado	357	17
University of Denver	646	Figures Unavailable
<b>Connecticut</b>		
University of Connecticut	421	7
Yale University	588	50
<b>District of Columbia</b>		
American University	623	9
Catholic Univ. of America	373	12
Georgetown University	1301	38
George Washington University	1659	51
Howard University	357	Figures Unavailable
<b>Florida</b>		
University of Miami	528	2
University of Florida	824	5
Stetson University	429	0
Florida State University	361	12
<b>Georgia</b>		
University of Georgia	411	Figures Unavailable
Emory University	363	25
Mercer University	222	Figures Unavailable
<b>Idaho</b>		
University of Idaho	119	0
<b>Illinois</b>		
University of Illinois	600	31
Chicago-Kent	546	25
DePaul University	642	11
John Marshall Law School	887	No Reply Received
Loyola University	403	7
Northwestern University	472	19
University of Chicago	459	13
<b>Indiana</b>		
Indiana University (Bloomington)	372	8
Indiana University (Indianapolis)	577	16
University of Notre Dame	351	17
Valparaiso University	152	3
<b>Iowa</b>		
Drake University	179	3
University of Iowa	428	20
<b>Kansas</b>		
University of Kansas	275	9
Washburn University of Topeka	300	2
<b>Kentucky</b>		
University of Kentucky	422	8
University of Louisville	428	5
<b>Louisiana</b>		
Louisiana State Univ.	546	1
Southern University	54	No Reply Received
Loyola University	522	9
Tulane University	361	4
<b>Maine</b>		
University of Maine	135	0
<b>Maryland</b>		
University of Maryland	535	20
<b>Massachusetts</b>		
Boston University	847	30
New England School of Law	150	1
Northeastern University	79	No Reply Received
Salem University	1537	9
Eastern College (Northampton)	550	18
Harvard University	1651	102



Michigan			
University of Michigan	1118	39	
Detroit College of Law	700	35	
University of Detroit	284	No Reply Received	
Wayne State University	928	51	
Minnesota			
University of Minnesota	547	7	
William Mitchell	368	1	
Mississippi			
University of Mississippi	299	22	
Missouri			
University of Missouri (Columbia)	333	1	
University of Missouri (Kansas City)	353	8	
St. Louis University	345	6	
Washington University	251	6	
Montana			
University of Montana	123	0	
Nebraska			
University of Nebraska	326	5	
Crofton University	265	3	
New Jersey			
Rutgers University (Camden)	227	13	
Rutgers University (Newark)	420	58	
Seton Hall University	659	14	
New Mexico			
University of New Mexico	171	0	
New York			
Union University (Albany)	360	2	
State Univ. of New York (Buffalo)	483	15	
Cornell University	412	5	
Brooklyn Law School	1048	12	
Columbia University	989	62	
Fordham University	760	7	
New York Law School	511	8	
New York University	861	38	
St. John's University	807	8	
Syracuse University	400	5	
North Carolina			
University of North Carolina	540	4	
Duke University	307	5	
North Carolina Central Univ.	102	77	
Wake Forest University	198	0	
North Dakota			
University of North Dakota	120	0	
Ohio			
Ohio Northern University	182	3	
University of Akron	350	16	
University of Cincinnati	309	5	
Cate Law School	302	11	
Cleveland State University	775	50	
Case-Western Reserve Univ.	310	12	
Capital University	247	11	
Ohio State University	440	8	
University of Toledo	475	17	
Oklahoma			
University of Oklahoma (Norman)	394	2	
Oklahoma City University	224	7	
University of Tulsa	231	0	
Oregon			
University of Oregon	300	2	
Willamette University	288	0	
Pennsylvania			
Dickinson School of Law	315	5	
Temple University	764	No Reply Received	
University of Pennsylvania	535	18	
Duquesne University	533	No Reply Received	
University of Pittsburgh	175	10	
Villanova University	433	6	
South Carolina			
University of South Carolina	496	Figures Unavailable	
South Dakota			
University of South Dakota	152	1	
Tennessee			
University of Tennessee	410	4	
Memphis State University	279	Figures Unavailable	
Vanderbilt University	363	Figures Unavailable	

<b>Texas</b>		
University of Texas	1468	Figures Unavailable
Southern Methodist University	578	2
University of Houston	497	5
South Texas College of Law	578	7
Texas Southern University	149	No Reply Received
Texas Tech University	186	2
St. Mary's Univ. (San Antonio)	412	3
Baylor University	304	1
<b>Utah</b>		
University of Utah	337	No Reply Received
<b>Virginia</b>		
University of Virginia	788	20
Washington & Lee University	185	1
University of Richmond	180	0
College of William & Mary	190	2
<b>Washington</b>		
University of Washington	356	8
Gonzaga University	159	2
<b>West Virginia</b>		
University of West Virginia	217	0
<b>Wisconsin</b>		
University of Wisconsin	248	10
Marquette University	289	3
<b>Wyoming</b>		
University of Wyoming	124	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>57,573</b>	<b>1,605</b>
From Schools which Responded <input type="checkbox"/>		

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>The Section Survey statistics were gathered over a period of a year and a half. Special appreciation is extended to Jerome Shustack, the immediate past Chairman of the Section, and H. Bruce Hamilton, the former Section Staff Director for Special Projects.

<sup>2</sup>See "Symposium: Disadvantaged Students and Legal Education - Programs for Affirmative Action," 70 U. Tol. L. Rev.

277 (1970). This issue comprehensively examines the crucial questions in this area.

<sup>3</sup>It is not without significance that the opportunity for these black candidates to be elected resulted largely from the litigation efforts of Charles Morgan, Jr., and other concerned attorneys.



TAB C

American Bar Association  
 Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities  
 Survey of Black Law Student  
 Enrollment

John W. Atwood  
 David F. James  
 David C. Long  
 Division of Public Service Activities  
 American Bar Association

---

Number of Blacks in Professional Occupations and  
 Black Percent to Total Number in Each Profession, by Sex, 1960

Professional Occupation	Number of Blacks	Percent of Total in Profession
<b>Males:</b>		
Clergymen	13,951	7.1%
Physicians and Surgeons	4,266	1.9%
Dentists	1,978	2.4%
Chemists	1,539	2.0%
Pharmacists	1,462	1.7%
Engineers	4,418	.8%
Lawyers and Judges	2,004	1.0%
<b>Females:</b>		
Physicians and Surgeons	490	3.1%
Professional Nurses	32,009	5.5%
Librarians	3,144	4.3%
Lawyers and Judges	176	2.3%





TAB D

by David M. Rafky

The assassination of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. spurred a number of traditionally "closed," predominantly white, non-Southern colleges and universities to recruit black faculty. However, the number of blacks at these schools is still small. Our study focuses on the status of blacks in the academic marketplace and the barriers to their employment.

Assembling a mailing list of blacks in white schools was no easy task. Letters requesting rosters of black professors were sent to deans, provosts, presidents and selected department chairmen of all four-year, degree granting, predominantly white, non-Southern schools with more than three hundred students. The following illustrates some of the problems that we had:

I would request you kindly to define more precisely what you mean by the term "black"? Am I right in supposing that you are seeking information regarding American faculty of African descent? Or do you wish West Indian and African faculty members to be included - or dark skinned faculty from other countries?

Ten of the faculty members who were labeled black by our informants returned their questionnaires with "white" indicated as their racial preference.

In addition, several large universities refused to provide us with names (evasively, we believe) because (1) to supply such information is "illegal;" (2) it is too expensive to "check the files;" (3) the impropriety of giving out names based on race without the permission of the individuals; and (4) "the whole thing is a sloppy approach

David M. Rafky, sociologist, is an assistant professor of education at Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

to a problem." Our repeated requests to the Office of Education were ignored. Therefore we contacted prominent black scholars and organizations in order to obtain the names of blacks at schools which refused to cooperate in the survey.

Another unexpected problem was establishing criteria for determining faculty status, since schools differ in their definitions of "faculty" - some in order to inflate the number of blacks on their staff. Several included part-time instructors, house mothers, guidance counselors and members of the school's custodial staff. We didn't include these blacks on our list.

An earlier survey by A. Gilbert Bellas (1969) indicates that our sample of 699 black faculty members in more than 184 non-Southern, white colleges represents as much as seventy-five to ninety percent of the target population. A comparison group of 699 whites from three hundred college bulletins was also selected and matched according to academic field, size, location and type (public or private) of institution. Because twenty-eight percent of the black faculty are women, compared to eighteen percent of the white sample, an attempt to match the two groups according to gender was unsuccessful.

Our questionnaire was mailed to the two groups in 1969. Seventy-nine percent of the blacks replied, in contrast to sixty-three percent of the whites. The Middle Atlantic states, where the largest number of Northern blacks live, contain the largest number of schools reporting one or more blacks on their faculty. Totally they reported 292 black faculty members. Blacks were rarely employed in the Mountain states.

Seventy percent of the white comparison group in our survey hold the

doctorate, compared to forty percent of the blacks. Blacks without the doctorate are both teachers and administrators.

Generally black men are more likely to hold the doctorate than black women in the sample, and the same is true for whites. Black doctorates are primarily employed by high quality public colleges and universities, while white doctorates are especially likely to be in high quality private schools.

While blacks and whites employed by high quality schools generally hold the doctorate, low quality schools apply different standards to whites and blacks. Of the blacks at these schools, forty-two percent hold doctorates, compared to sixty-eight percent of the whites. Tenured faculty, black or white, generally hold doctorates. Among untenured faculty, however, blacks are less likely (forty-three percent) to have a doctorate than whites (fifty-eight percent). This suggests that it is somewhat easier for blacks with limited credentials to obtain jobs at private high quality schools than for whites, and a great deal easier at low quality schools. Blacks may have an employment advantage in lower quality schools, but they are less likely than whites to be granted tenure at these schools.

Although the whites are "better" qualified than the blacks, the blacks are more likely to be at elite colleges and universities. Still, they remain in the lower ranks, more often than not, untenured even when in positions where tenure rules are applicable. Twenty-eight percent of the blacks hold ranks lower than assistant professor compared to eight percent of the white faculty members.

While the majority of blacks and whites are engaged primarily in

(Continued on page 65)

## RESEARCH

(Continued from page 6)

teaching, many blacks are connected with programs for "disadvantaged" students as teachers, counselors or administrators. Although more blacks than whites counsel students, the blacks are not full time or professional counselors. Rather, they seem to advise students as an adjunct to their academic duties.

Younger blacks tend to be recruited by the large lower quality schools — especially those in the West and New England. Older blacks are in better schools than their white counterparts. This is true even though blacks at all age levels publish less than whites.

Although blacks have been taking increased advantage of higher education in recent years, (the number of blacks with five years of college or more increased from 3,500 to 194,000 between 1947 and 1969) the proportion of black doctorate holders from 1964 to 1968 has remained stable at less than one percent of the total doctorates awarded in that period. Between 1947 and 1969 the number of black doctorates increased from less than 381 to 2,280, which matches the sevenfold increase in black faculty at white schools during that period.

The ratio of black faculty to black doctorates has remained constant but the predominantly white colleges are not absorbing many blacks with higher degrees. Thus the barrier to their employment posed by the lack of blacks with higher degrees may be lowered by increasing their employment opportunities in higher education.

Another major barrier to the employment of blacks in white academia is the attractiveness of other professions in government, industry, foundations and black colleges and universities. The pressure on black schools to recruit black faculty, coupled with the shortage of qualified blacks available for academic positions, may be inflating salaries in some black schools.

Ninety percent of the black faculty believe that some institutions

of higher education outside the South exclude black faculty. More than one quarter believe that blacks must be more qualified than whites to be hired or granted tenure at their school. In other words, they feel themselves to be better qualified than their white colleagues.

It may be argued that the new black recruit into the academic profession is cynical and does not have detailed knowledge about hiring and tenure granting procedures at his school. His older black colleagues, more familiar with administrative procedures, should have more accurate perceptions of the discriminatory practices. In fact, the older blacks are more likely than their younger black colleagues to accuse their employers of exclusionary practices. Only eighteen percent of the blacks under thirty believe that their school discriminates in employment compared to more than forty percent of those over thirty. This contradicts the notion that blacks who have "made it" in the white world tend to deny the existence or underestimate the importance of racial discrimination.

Few of the blacks or whites in this survey experienced difficulty in finding their present positions. Of those who reported difficulty, almost one half cited general job market conditions as the reason. Thirty percent of the blacks who had difficulty, however, believe that racial discrimination was responsible. This percentage may not represent the proportion of blacks who feel this way since some of the responses classified as "other" have racial connotations. For example, one black stated that his difficulties were due to "lack of housing for blacks in communities in which some colleges and universities are located." Another believed his problems stemmed from his "left-wing political background which might be tolerated for a white professor but not for a black." In addition, several blacks who had little or no difficulty in obtaining positions indicated that race was a positive factor in their employment. One candidate reports that he was "recruited as a result of the search for a black faculty member."

Of 554 black faculty members, eight percent stated that difficulty in finding their present job was caused by racial discrimination. This proportion

is relatively low compared to their widespread agreement that discrimination is practiced in higher education in general and in their own schools in particular. Only four percent of the younger blacks reported discrimination in finding a job, compared to more than ten percent of their black colleagues over thirty. Apparently young black doctorates entering the academic profession are not likely to encounter difficulties in finding a job because of racial discrimination; older faculty, regardless of highest degree and other qualifications more often report racial discrimination.

There are three major unintentionally erected barriers which discourage blacks from entering predominantly white faculties. One of the most subtle barriers involves the "feeder" process whereby professors and department heads recommend graduate students to schools with faculty vacancies. Edward Harris, a sociologist at Indiana University, describes in a 1967 survey instances in which blacks completing their graduate work in white Midwestern schools were discouraged by their academic sponsors from seeking positions in white schools with vacancies:

A black degree candidate learned from one of his professors that an opening existed on the faculty of a predominantly white southern college. The student examined the open file of job requests maintained by the department chairman and noticed the letter soliciting applicants for the vacancy in question. After making known his interest in the job to the department chairman he was invited to look through the open file. The letter from the school in question was conspicuously missing.

In 1961 James Moss and Norman Mercer sent questionnaires to the president or dean of 179 colleges and universities in New York State inquiring about racial hiring practices. Of the eighty-two administrators who responded, sixty-seven reported some responsibility for setting employment policy. Moss and Mercer describe the theme underlying the majority of their replies:

The benignly liberal attitude of the majority of college administrators and department chairmen who view "ethnic detachment" as a virtue in recruiting, rather than as a possible "screen" inhibiting the steady growth of culturally inclusive faculties.



This attitude was expressed in the Rafky, Pelles (1968) and Moss and Mercer (1961) studies as (1) irritation at receiving a request for information on the racial mix of their school, and, (2) stated policy of official indifference to cultural and racial background of the faculty, for example:

I consider it a pointless question to a college which hires human beings rather than whites, non-whites, etc. (Dean)

The final barrier to the employment of blacks is irrationality within the academic marketplace, due to the limited access to information and inadequate feeder processes blacks have in finding their first jobs. However, blacks and whites do differ in the methods they used to obtain their most recent academic jobs. Blacks, more often than whites, were invited to accept their present jobs. Two blacks report that not only were they asked to accept their present positions, but the positions were created at their request. Several blacks report that they were offered positions in response to student protest. Most, however, do not believe that they were hired as a result of student demands. Several were contacted by department chairmen or deans, but a few report offers by such people as the president of the university. All of these offers were unsolicited.

Almost equal proportions of whites and blacks were invited to accept their first academic posts. Of the blacks who entered the profession more than twenty years ago, nineteen percent were invited to accept their first position, compared to only eleven percent of the whites hired at the same time. That is, a generation ago, younger blacks were being invited into the academic profession. Today, however, the situation is reversed. Forty-one percent of the whites under thirty were invited to accept their present position, compared to only six percent of the young blacks. Young blacks entering the profession no longer receive invitations, but solicit jobs for themselves by sending mass letters or using personal contacts.

We are forced to conclude that blacks generally are not put at a disadvantage by the current methods used to obtain knowledge about posi-

tions. In fact, they (especially older blacks) seem to be sought out more than white faculty. But this tends to put at a disadvantage blacks who are not "visible," who do not participate in the academic grapevine.

As one might expect, tenured faculty of both races hold posts by invitation more often than untenured faculty. Blacks at private institutions, especially high quality schools, tend to be there by invitation regardless of tenure. For the whites, on the other hand, those in high quality public institutions who have tenure are most often there by invitation. The high quality private schools seem to be doing heavy recruiting of black scholars. Forty-four percent of blacks without the doctorate, who attended high quality graduate schools and have no publications, were invited to accept their present positions. This is not surprising since people with master's degrees and limited credentials have trouble getting jobs in any way other than "friends in high places." Without friends, they continue graduate work. Blacks with the doctorate from high quality schools who have published report jobs by invitation almost four times as often as whites with the same excellent credentials. Blacks with the doctorate from lower quality schools who have published report being invited to accept their present position no more often than whites with the same qualifications. However, if blacks hold only the master's degree earned at a lower quality school, they are more often working by invitation than whites with similar credentials, regardless of publications. These are primarily blacks who are counseling in and directing programs for disadvantaged students.

We pursued the matter of job invitation by asking, "How many unsolicited job offers have you had in the past year?" On the average, whites report 1.5 offers compared to 3.1 for the blacks for the academic year 1968-69. This is, therefore, a period of reverse discrimination in which blacks already in the academic profession are sought out by predominantly white colleges and universities. In addition, more than sixty schools requested our roster of black faculty. One black associate professor of history at a large state university told us that he was

offered nine positions within the past year. He said that he would not accept any of them because the offers were not merited by his scholarly work. As soon as he finishes a book he is researching, he will accept a position at an Ivy League school. Until then, he describes his attitude as: "Either I publish or you [white schools] perish!"

Blacks under thirty are not as sought after as blacks in general, and they are less willing to move than their older black colleagues. We found that the best qualified blacks (doctorates from high quality schools) are the most willing to move. The least qualified blacks (bachelor's degrees from low quality schools) report the fewest job offers and are least willing to move. Blacks with limited credentials who have good jobs are particularly likely to "stick with a good deal" and not risk looking for or accepting another position.

For those seeking new jobs, the highest degree and quality of graduate school have little effect on job offers. This suggests that contemporary career status is more important than earned qualifications; that is, "where you are now" and "what you have done lately" may be more important than "where you have been."

Therefore, a black with limited credentials who obtains a position at an elite college is more sought after than a black with better credentials who teaches at a lower quality school. This explains why blacks with only the master's degree who teach at elite schools because of "connections" are especially popular. Recruiters should note that tenured blacks at the lower quality public institutions are very willing to move, but they have the fewest offers.

The problem of "discrimination" in the academic marketplace is evidently more complex than appeared at the outset. Clearly some schools discriminate and others do not, but we do not believe that discrimination exists only in the system. Some barriers hinder entrance into the academic profession, while others make it difficult for blacks already in the academic profession to obtain jobs at some schools. This is a moot point, however, and we are sure that we have raised more questions than we have answered. ■





TAB E

TABLE 4.—DISTRIBUTION OF ACTIVE PHYSICIANS BY MAJOR PROFESSIONAL CATEGORIES—1967

	Black Physicians		U.S. Physicians	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Total Active	4,710	100	294,072	100
Patient Care	3,427	73	190,079	65
Other Practice	836	18	57,137	19
Training Programs	447	9	46,856	16

TABLE 5.—NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF BLACK SPECIALISTS OF CERTAIN CATEGORIES

	U.S. Physicians 1967	Black Physicians 1957	Per cent
Internal Medicine	42,325	540	1
General Surgery	29,687	479	2
Psychiatry	19,749	275	1
Obstetrics and Gynecology	17,964	425	1
Pediatrics	17,614	280	2
Radiology	10,877	109	1

TABLE 6.—NATIONAL MEDICAL ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP BY SPECIALTY AND SPECIALTY BOARD CERTIFICATION—1967

	Total NMA Members (100.0%)	Board Certified <sup>a</sup>	Per Cent Board Certified	Not Board Certified
Total Physicians	4,805	1,074	22.4	3,731
Allergy	4	0	0.0	4
Anesthesiology	79	27	34.2	52
Aerospace (Aviation) Medicine	9	0	0.0	9
Cardiovascular Diseases	14	3	21.4	11
Child Psychiatry	25	8	32.0	17
Colon and Rectal Surgery	1	1	100.0	0
Diagnostic Roentgenology	1	1	100.0	0
Dermatology	49	22	44.9	27
Gastroenterology	8	2	25.0	6
General Practice	1,867	16	0.9	1,851
General Preventive Medicine	10	6	60.0	4
General Surgery	479	206	43.0	273
Internal Medicine	540	110	20.4	430
Neurological Surgery	15	3	20.0	12
Neurology	22	5	22.7	17
Obstetrics and Gynecology	425	152	35.8	273
Occupational Medicine	10	3	30.0	7
Ophthalmology	78	38	48.7	40
Orthopedic Surgery	65	16	24.6	49
Otolaryngology	33	10	30.3	23
Pathology	56	31	55.4	25
Pediatrics	280	143	51.1	137
Pediatric Allergy	1	0	0.0	1
Pediatric Cardiology	2	2	100.0	0
Physician Medicine and Rehabilitation	22	7	31.8	15
Plastic Surgery	6	3	50.0	3
Psychiatry	275	81	29.5	194
Public Health	19	7	36.8	12
Pulmonary Disease	8	0	0.0	8
Radiology	109	74	67.9	35
Thoracic Surgery	14	12	85.7	2
Urology	78	40	51.3	38
Not Recognized (1)	65	34	52.3	31
Unspecified	136	11	8.1	125

(1) Includes 53 Administrative Medicine.

DISTRIBUTION OF BLACK PHYSICIANS IN THE UNITED STATES

Alabama	40
Arkansas	17
Arizona	4
California	396
Connecticut	14
Colorado	9
Delaware	7
District of Columbia	222
Florida	47
Georgia	64
Illinois	125
Indiana	55
Iowa	6
Kansas	15
Kentucky	14
Louisiana	33
Maryland	89
Massachusetts	18
Michigan	186
Minnesota	8
Mississippi	28
Missouri	74
Nebraska	6
Nevada	2
New Hampshire	1
New Jersey	97
New York	203
North Carolina	85
Ohio	118
Oklahoma	18
Oregon	4
Pennsylvania	108
Rhode Island	1
South Carolina	20
Tennessee	91
Texas	84
Vermont	1
Virginia	80
West Virginia	8
Washington	8
Wisconsin	15



TAB F



SPANISH SURINAMED AMERICAN COLLEGE GRADUATES

1970

TOTAL GRADUATES

PAGE 41

GRADUATING	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	TOTAL
	28	607	540	333	150	16	89	308	29	162	152	16	31	801	40	3302				

Compiled By

The Cabinet Committee On Opportunity for the Spanish Speaking  
Suite 712, 1800 G St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506



TAB G

**PROPORTION OF DOCTORATES EARNED BY WOMEN,  
BY AREA AND FIELD, 1960-1969**

Data source: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, *Earned Degrees Conferred: Bachelor's and Higher Degrees*. A publication of the Bureau of Educational Research and Development and the National Center for Educational Statistics, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office. (All public and private colleges and universities in the United States known to confer doctoral degrees are included in the survey. Professional doctoral degrees, such as M.D., however, are not listed.) The consecutive bulletins from which these original data were obtained are located in the Wilson Library Documents Division.

	Total Number of Doctorates Earned 1960-1969	Total Number of Doctorates Earned by Women 1960-1969	Percentage of Doctorates Earned by Women 1960-1969		Total Number of Doctorates Earned 1960-1969	Total Number of Doctorates Earned by Women 1960-1969	Percentage of Doctorates Earned by Women 1960-1969
<b>Agriculture, Total</b>	<b>4462</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1.77</b>				
Agriculture, General	115	1	.87	Health Education	88	26	29.55
Agronomy, Field Crops	956	5	.52	Recreation	30	4	13.33
Animal Science	872	21	2.41	Education of the Mentally Retarded	118	36	30.51
Dairy Science	252	4	1.53	Education of the Deaf (1964-1969 only)	6	4	66.67
Farm Management	13	0	.00	Speech and Hearing Impaired	339	67	19.76
Fish, Game or Wildlife Management (1961-1969) <sup>1</sup>	209	2	.96	Education of the Visually Handicapped (1964-1969 only) <sup>10</sup>	3	1	33.33
Food Science	385	16	4.16	Education of the Emotionally Disturbed (1965-1969 only) <sup>11</sup>	24	6	25.00
Horticulture	539	11	2.40	Administration of Special Education (1953-1969 only) <sup>11</sup>	14	4	28.57
Ornamental Horticulture	14	0	.00	Education of Other Exceptional Children <sup>12</sup>	391	126	32.23
Poultry Science	211	7	3.32	Agricultural Education	228	2	.88
Soil Science	568	2	.35	Art Education	194	52	26.80
Agriculture, All other fields	308	10	3.25	Business or Commercial Education	300	89	29.67
<b>Architecture</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8.00</b>	Distributive Education, Retail Selling	28	6	21.43
<b>Biological Sciences, Total</b>	<b>17,703</b>	<b>2448</b>	<b>13.82</b>	Home Economics Education	124	123	99.19
Premedical, Preental and Preveterinary Sciences	25	2	8.00	Industrial Arts Education, Nonvocational	224	1	.45
Biology, General	1949	395	20.27	Music Education	548	75	13.69
Botany, General	1653	185	11.25	Trade or Industrial Education, Vocational	181	8	4.42
Zoology, General	2262	318	14.03	Specialized Teaching Fields, All other	756	261	34.52
Anatomy and Histology	633	116	18.33	Nursery or Kindergarten Education	14	12	85.71
Bacteriology, etc. <sup>2</sup>	2095	355	16.94	Early Childhood Education	22	20	50.91
Biochemistry	2655	471	17.48	Elementary Education	1199	459	38.28
Biophysics	429	32	7.46	Secondary Education	966	154	15.94
Cytology	30	9	30.00	Combined Elementary and Secondary Education	21	4	19.05
Ecology (1961-1969 only)	37	2	5.41	Adult Education	303	46	15.18
Embryology	45	11	24.44	General Teaching Fields, All other	445	97	21.80
Entomology	1097	46	4.19	Education Administration, Supervision Finance <sup>4</sup>	7242	931	12.85
Genetics	672	61	9.08	Counseling and Guidance	2357	488	20.70
Molecular Biology (1968-1969 only) <sup>3</sup>	32	6	18.75	Rehabilitation and Counselor Training (1964-1969 only)	80	14	17.50
Nutrition (1961-1969 only)	156	45	28.85	History of Education, etc. (1964-1969 only) <sup>5</sup>	488	99	20.29
Pathology	271	15	5.54	Education, General	6286	1183	18.82
Pharmacology	783	87	11.11	Educational, Psychology (1964-1969 only)	875	224	25.60
Physiology	1145	169	14.67	Physical Education, Nonteaching (1964-1969 only)	36	9	25.00
Plant Pathology	692	19	2.75	Education, All other fields <sup>16</sup>	1296	286	22.07
Plant Physiology	203	12	5.91	Engineering, Total <sup>7</sup>	18,572	82	.44
Biological Sciences, All other fields	803	92	11.46	English and Journalism, Total	6471	1541	23.81
<b>Business and Commerce, Total</b>	<b>3046</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>2.82</b>	English and Literature	6322	1523	24.09
Business and Commerce, General	1372	33	2.41	Journalism	149	18	12.03
Accounting	268	18	6.72	Fine Arts and Applied Arts, Total	4035	678	16.80
Finance, Banking (1967-1969 only) <sup>8</sup>	53	1	1.89	Art General	99	18	18.18
Marketing (1967-1969 only) <sup>8</sup>	66	1	1.52	Music, Sacred Music	1473	199	13.51
Real Estate, Insurance (1967-1969 only) <sup>8</sup>	2	0	.00	Speech and Dramatic Arts	1978	314	15.87
Transportation (1967-1969 only) <sup>8</sup>	7	0	.00	Fine and Applied Arts, All other fields	485	147	30.31
Business and Commerce, All other fields	1278	33	2.59	Folklore (1965-1969 only)	29	8	27.59
<b>City Planning (1966-1969 only)<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>44</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4.55</b>				
<b>Computer Science and Systems</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.53</b>				
Analysis, Total (1964-1969 only) <sup>8</sup>							
Computer Science	89	3	3.03				
Systems Analysis	22	1	4.55				
Computer Science and Systems Analysis, All other fields	37	0	.00				
<b>Education, Total</b>	<b>26,369</b>	<b>5230</b>	<b>19.83</b>				
Physical Education	1143	313	27.38				

	Total Number of Doctorates Earned 1960-1969	Total Number of Doctorates Earned 1950-1959	Percentage of Doctorates Earned by Women 1960-1969		Total Number of Doctorates Earned 1960-1969	Total Number of Doctorates Earned 1950-1959	Percentage of Doctorates Earned by Women 1960-1969
<b>Foreign Languages and Literature, Total</b>	<b>4158</b>	<b>1186</b>	<b>28.52</b>				
Linguistics	551	133	24.14				
Latin, Classical Greek	506	128	25.30				
French	768	311	40.49				
Italian	47	17	35.17				
Portuguese	14	3	21.43				
Spanish	658	217	32.99				
Philology and Literature of Romance Languages	380	93	24.47				
German	678	171	25.22				
Other German Languages	27	5	18.52				
Philology and Literature of Germanic Languages	52	9	17.31				
Arabic	5	1	20.00				
Chinese	14	2	14.29				
Hebrew	23	1	4.35				
Hindi, Urdu (1961-1969 only)	2	0	0.00				
Japanese	12	2	16.67				
Russian	116	28	24.14				
Other Slavic Languages	68	20	29.41				
Foreign Language and Literature, All other fields	227	45	19.82				
<b>Forestry</b>	<b>558</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>.18</b>				
Geography	663	37	5.58				
<b>Health Professions, Total</b>	<b>1831</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>9.18</b>				
Hospital Administration	20	1	.50				
Medical Technology	2	0	.00				
Nursing, Public Health Nursing	18	17	94.44				
Optometry	16	1	6.25				
Pharmacy	563	24	4.26				
Physical Therapy, Physiotherapy	1	0	.00				
Public Health	418	62	14.83				
Radiologic Technology	3	0	.00				
Clinical Dental Services	24	4	16.77				
Clinical Medical Services	302	31	10.26				
Clinical Veterinary Services	250	4	1.60				
Health Professions, All other fields	214	24	11.21				
<b>Home Economics, Total</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>76.26</b>				
Home Economics, General	104	101	97.12				
Child Development, Family Relations	174	87	50.00				
Clothing and Textiles	53	52	98.11				
Food and Nutrition	134	103	60.60				
Institution Management or Administration	6	6	100.00				
Home Economics, All other fields	43	38	83.37				
<b>Law</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4.48</b>				
Library Science	140	38	27.14				
<b>Mathematical Sciences, Total</b>	<b>6166</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>6.50</b>				
Mathematics	5538	348	6.46				
Statistics	781	53	6.79				
<b>Philosophy, Total</b>	<b>1701</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>11.05</b>				
Philosophy	1520	155	10.20				
Scholastic Philosophy	181	33	18.23				
<b>Physical Sciences, Total</b>	<b>25,736</b>	<b>1179</b>	<b>4.59</b>				
Physical Sciences, General	93	3	3.23				
Astronomy	421	29	6.89				
Chemistry	12,963	894	6.82				
Metallurgy	213	0	.00				
Metrology	245	2	.82				
Pharmaceutical Chemistry (1961-1969 only)	289	13	.50				
Physics	8415	163	2.00				
Geology	2143	53	2.47				
Geophysics	203	3	1.48				
Oceanography	222	4	1.80				
Earth Sciences, All other fields <sup>18</sup>	170	2	1.18				
Physical Science, All other fields	359	18	5.01				
<b>Psychology, Total</b>	<b>9135</b>	<b>1845</b>	<b>20.20</b>				
General Psychology (1961-1969 only)	7071	1355	19.30				
Clinical Psychology (1961-1969 only)	151	163	25.04				
Counseling and Guidance	138	33	23.91				
Social Psychology (1961-1969 only)	309	68	22.01				
Rehabilitation Counselor Training (1964-1969 only)	36	8	22.22				
Educational Psychology (1964-1969 only)	137	37	27.01				
Psychology, All other fields (1964-1969 only)	793	171	21.56				
<b>Religion, Total</b>	<b>2825</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>4.99</b>				
Religious Education, Bible	368	49	13.32				
Theology	1417	49	3.46				
Religion, Liberal Arts Curriculum	860	39	4.54				
Religion, All other fields	180	4	2.22				
<b>Social Sciences, Total</b>	<b>18,662</b>	<b>2072</b>	<b>11.10</b>				
Social Sciences, General	261	27	10.34				
American Studies, Civilization, Culture	257	41	15.95				
Anthropology	842	202	21.44				
Area or Regional Studies	384	46	11.98				
Economics	3893	218	5.62				
History	4943	579	11.71				
International Relations	425	33	7.76				
Political Science or Government	2876	253	8.80				
Sociology	2361	403	17.07				
Agricultural Economics	1165	12	1.03				
Foreign Service Programs	11	1	9.09				
Industrial Relations	96	4	4.17				
Public Administration	283	23	8.13				
Social Work, Social Administration	480	174	36.25				
Social Science, All other fields	280	55	19.64				
Trade or Industrial Training	84	0	.00				
<b>Broad General Curriculum and Miscellaneous Total</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>14.74</b>				
Arts, General Programs	39	9	23.08				
Science, General Programs	84	9	10.71				
Arts and Sciences, General Programs	40	5	12.50				
Teaching of English as a Foreign Language	27	10	37.04				
All Other Fields of Study <sup>19</sup>	536	74	13.81				
<b>Total All Fields (areas) reported:</b>	<b>154,111</b>	<b>17,929</b>	<b>11.63</b>				

- When information was available from 1961-1969 this field was not given as a separate category in 1950-1959, and figures were computed based on information available. If the field was not listed as a separate category for more years than 1960-1961, the information was included in the residual category. Exceptions are noted.
- Includes bacteriology, virology, mycology, parasitology and microbiology.
- The status of this field prior to 1969, when it was considered separately, is not clear.
- 4, 5, and 6. As in 3, the same observation applies.
- 7 and 8. These entries are as above.
- 9, 10, 11, and 12. Subdivided under other categories in earlier years.
- Includes Special Learning Disability, Education of the Crippled, Education of the Multiple Handicapped.
- Includes Curriculum Instruction as well. These fields were separated for all but year 1963-1964, so it was necessary to combine them.
- Includes History, Philosophy, and Theory of Education.
- Includes the recently listed field of Educational Specialist.
- A breakdown on Enrollment was made from Earned Degrees Conferred: Bachelor's and Higher Degrees for the four academic years 1960 through 1961. Other sources investigated provided breakdown by field but not by sex.
- Includes recent field "Earth Science, General."
- Includes recent field "Interarea Fields of Study."





TAB H

# LWS DOCTOR

Magazine for the New Lawyer

Volume 2 Number 6

March 1972

Five-Year Increase in Number of Women at Accredited Law Schools			
Law School Year	No. Women Law Students	Total No. Law Students	Percentage of Women
1971-72	8,914	94,468	9.4%
1970-71	6,930	82,041	8.4%
1969-70	4,715	68,386	6.9%
1968-69	3,704	62,779	5.9%
1967-68	2,906	64,406	4.6%



TAB I

LIST OF WOMEN'S CAUCUSES AND COMMITTEES  
IN PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Source: The Project on the Status & Education of Women,  
Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St. N.W. 20009

ADULT EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (AEA)

Commission on the Status of Women in Adult Education  
Chairperson: Dr. Beverly Cassara  
10421 Courthouse Drive  
Fairfax, VA 22030

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF RELIGION

TF on the Status of Women - The Academic Study of Religion  
Chairperson: Elizabeth Schussler Fiorenza  
1223 N. Lawrence St.  
South Bend, IN 46617

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (AAA)

Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology  
Chairperson: Prof. Shirley Gorenstein  
Dept. of Anthropology  
Columbia University, New York, NY 10027

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Women's Caucus of the A.A.A.S.  
Chairperson: Ms. Virginia Walbot  
Dept. of Biochemistry  
University of Georgia, Athens, GA. 30601

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF IMMUNOLOGISTS (AAI)

Committee on the Status of Women  
Chairperson: Dr. Helene C. Rauch  
Dept. of Medical Microbiology  
Stanford University School of Medicine  
Stanford, CA 94305

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HEALTH & PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Committee on Women  
Chairperson: Professor Ione G. Shaddock  
Drake University  
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS (AAUP)

Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession  
Chairperson: Dr. Alice S. Rossi  
Dept. of Sociology  
Goucher College, Towson, MD 21204  
AAUP Contact: Ms. Margaret Rumbarger  
Associate Secretary, AAUP  
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Women's Rights Unit  
State-by-State Roster of Women Lawyers, being compiled by:  
Dr. Lee Ellen Ford  
336 Hickory St.  
Butler, Indiana 46721

AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY (ACS)

Women Chemists Committee

Chairperson: Ms. Helen M. Free  
Ames Co., Miles Labs., Inc.  
Elkhart, IN 46514

AMERICAN COLLEGE PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION (ACPA)

Women's Task Force

Chairperson: Dr. Jane E. McCormick  
Asst. to Vice-President of Student Affairs  
Penn State U.  
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

AMERICAN ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION

Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

Chairperson: Carolyn Shaw Bell  
Wellesley College  
Wellesley, Mass. 02181

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Women's Rights Committee

Chairperson: Marjorie Stern  
1012 14th Street  
Washington, D.C. 20005

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION (AHA)

a. Committee on Women Historians

Chairperson: Dr. Linda Kerber  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

(Staff Liaison:

Dr. Charlotte Quinn\*  
400 A St. S.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20003

b. Coordinating Committee on Women in the Historical Profession (CCWHP)

Chairperson: Dr. Sandi Cooper  
Richmond College  
CUNY Staten Island, NY 10301

\*Roster of Women Historians available for \$5.00 (contribution) from:  
Dr. Charlotte Quinn

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION (ALA)

Social Responsibilities Round Table (SSRT)

Task Force on the Status of Women

Chairperson: Ms. Michelle Rudy  
1403 LeGore Lane  
Manhattan, KS 66502

Roster of Women Librarians is being compiled by:

Margaret Myers  
Graduate School of Library Service  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY (AMS)

ASSOCIATION FOR WOMEN IN MATHEMATICS (AWM) (independent group)

Chairperson: Prof. Mary Gray, Dept. of Mathematics  
The American University  
Washington, D.C. 20016



AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION

Women's Caucus

Correspondents: Dr. Lynn E. Haun  
California State University  
Sacramento, Calif. 95819

Dr. Beatrice O. Pressley  
California State University  
Hayward, Calif. 94542

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION (APA)

- a. Subcommittee on Status of Women in the Profession

Chairperson: Prof. Mary Motherskill  
Dept. of Philosophy  
Barnard College, New York, NY 10027

- b. Society for Women in Philosophy (Independent group)

Chairperson: Hannah Hargrave  
Dept. of Philosophy  
Western Illinois University  
Macomb, Illinois 61455

AMERICAN PHYSICAL SOCIETY

Committee on Women in Physics

Chairperson: Dr. Elizabeth Baranger  
Physics Dept., MIT  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Roster of Women Physicists available for \$5.00 from:  
American Institute of Physics Placement Service  
335 West 45th St.  
New York, NY 10017

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION (APSA)

- a. Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession

Chairperson: Dr. Ruth Silva  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA 16802

- b. Women's Caucus for Political Science (WCPS)

Chairperson: Dr. Marie Rosenberg  
School of Business, University of Wisconsin  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (APA)

- a. Task Force on the Status of Women in Psychology

Chairperson: Dr. Helen Astin, Director of Research  
University Research Corp.  
4301 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20008

(Staff Liaison: Dr. Tena Cummings\*  
APA, 1200 17th St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

- b. Association for Women in Psychology (AWP) is an independent group,  
initially a caucus within APA)

Editor: Dr. Leigh Marlowe  
Manhattan Community College  
130 West End Ave., New York, NY 10023

Public Relations: Dr. Jo-Ann Evans Gardner  
726 St. James St.  
Pittsburgh, PA 15232

\*Roster of Women Psychologists available from:  
Dr. Tena Cummings

AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Women's Caucus

Chairperson: Ana O. Dumois  
Community Health Institute  
225 Park Ave. So.  
New York, NY 10003

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTS

Subcommittee on the Status of Women

Chairperson: Dr. Loretta Leive  
Bldg. 4, Room 111  
National Institutes of Health  
Bethesda, MD 20014

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR MICROBIOLOGY

Committee on the Status of Women Microbiologists

Chairperson: Dr. Mary Louise Robbins  
Medical School, 1339 H St. N.W.  
The George Washington University  
Washington, D.C. 20005

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Task Force on Women in Public Administration

Chairperson: Mrs. Joan Fiss Bishop  
Director of Career Services  
Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (ASA)

a. Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology

Chairperson: Dr. Elise Boulding  
Behavioral Science Institute  
U. of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80302

b. Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) (independent group  
formerly caucus)

Chairperson: Dr. Alice Rossi  
Dept. of Sociology  
Goucher College, Towson, MD 21204

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT (ASID)

Women's Caucus, ASTD

Steering Committee: Dr. Shirley McCune  
Center for Human Relations  
NEA, 1601 16th St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ms. Althea Simmons, Dr. of Training  
NAACP, 200 E 27th St.  
New York, NY 10016

AMERICAN SPEECH AND HEARING ASSOCIATION (ASHA)

a. Subcommittee on the Status of Women

Chairperson: Mrs. Dorothy K. Marge  
8011 Longbrook Rd.  
Springfield, VA 22152

b. Caucus on Status of Women in ASHA (same as above)

AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION

Caucus for Women in Statistics

Chairperson: Dr. Jean D. Gibbons  
College of Commerce and Business Administration  
University of Alabama  
University, Ala. 35486

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN GEOGRAPHERS

Committee on Women in Geography

Chairperson: Dr. Ann Larrimore  
Department of Geography  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS (AALS)

Committee on Equality of Opportunity for Women in the Legal Profession

Chairperson: Prof. Ruth B. Ginsburg  
School of Law  
Columbia University, 435 W. 116th St.  
New York, NY 10027

ASSOCIATION OF ASIAN STUDIES

Committee on the Status of Women

Chairperson: Prof. Joyce K. Kallgren  
Center for Chinese Studies  
2168 Shattuck Ave.  
Berkeley, CA 94705

ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN IN SCIENCE (independent group)

Co-Presidents: Dr. Judith G. Pool\*  
Stanford Medical School  
Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Neena B. Schwartz  
Dept. of Psychiatry, College of Medicine  
U. of Illinois at the Medical Center  
P.O. Box 6998, Chicago, IL 60680

\*Roster of Women Engineers, Scientists, Medical & Paramedical Specialists  
is available from: Dr. Judith G. Pool

BIOPHYSICAL SOCIETY

Professional Opportunities for Women of the Biophysical Society --

Caucus of Women Biophysicists

Chairperson: Dr. Rita Guttman  
Dept. of Biology  
Brooklyn College  
Brooklyn, NY 11210

COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION

a. Commission on the Status of Women in Art

Professor Linda Nochlin Pommer  
Vassar College  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

b. Women's Caucus

Co-Chairwomen: Prof. Ann Harris, Art Dept.  
Hunter College, New York, NY 10021

Ms. Judy Patt  
2429 Vallejo, San Francisco, Calif. 94132

GRADUATE WOMEN IN SCIENCE (Sigma Delta Epsilon)

President: Dr. Hazel Metz Fox  
1231 N. 38th St.  
Lincoln, NE 65503

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA (LSA)

LSA Women's Caucus  
Correspondents: Ms. Lynette Hirschman  
Ms. Georgette Ioup  
162 W. Hansberry  
Philadelphia, PA 19144

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION (MLA)

- a. MLA Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession  
Chairperson: Dr. Elaine Hedges  
Towson State College  
Baltimore, MD 21204
- b. Women's Caucus of the MLA  
President: Dr. Verna Wittrock  
Dept. of English  
Eastern Illinois U., Chalreston, IL 61920

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON FAMILY RELATIONS (NCFR)

Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities  
Chairperson: Dr. Rose Somerville  
Sociology Dept.  
San Diego State College  
San Diego, CA 92115

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH (NCTE)

Women's Committee  
Chairperson: Dr. Janet Emig  
Department of English  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Women's Caucus  
Chairperson: Mrs. Helen Bain  
NEA, 1201 16th St.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

NATIONAL VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION (NVGA)

NVGA Commission on the Occupational Status of Women  
Chairperson: Mrs. Thelma C. Lennon, Director  
Pupil Personnel Services, Dept. of Public Instruction  
Raleigh, NC 27602

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

- a. Women's Caucus  
Chairperson: Dr. Elizabeth Steiner Maccia  
Dept. of History & Philosophy of Education  
Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47401
- b. Committee on the Status of Women (same as above)

POPULATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Women's Caucus

Chairperson: Prof. Ruth B. Dixon  
Dept. of Sociology  
University of California, Davis  
Davis, CA 95616

PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CAUCUS (FWC)

P.O. Box 1057, Radio City Station  
New York, NY 10019

Pres: Margaret Anderson  
Rockland City Guidance Center for Women  
Palisades, NY

SOCIETY FOR CELL BIOLOGY

Women in Cell Biology

Chairperson: Ms. Virginia Walbot  
Dept. of Biochemistry  
Univ. of Georgia, Athens GA. 30601

SOCIETY FOR WOMEN ENGINEERS (independent group)

Executive Secretary: Winifred D. White  
345 East 47th Street  
New York, NY 10017

THETA SIGMA PHI

National Society for Journalism/Communications

President: Mrs. Fran Harris  
WNJ Stations  
Detroit, MI 48231

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE USA

Task Force on Women

Co-Chairpersons: Patricia Doyle and Elaine Homrighouse  
Board of Christian Education  
United Presbyterian Church, Witherspoon Bldg.  
Philadelphia, PA 19107

WOMEN THEOLOGIANS

Roster of Women Theologians is available from:

Elizabeth Dempster, Interim Director  
Boston Theological Institute  
Women's Placement Service  
45 Francis Ave.  
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

February 1973

TAB J



WOMEN ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION, AUGUST 1972

		PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS		PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS		TOTAL		
		Lay	Religious	Lay	Religious	Lay	Religious	Total
PRESIDENTS and CHANCELLORS	Arts & Sciences	10	--	13	139	23	139	162
	Professional, Technical & Vocational*	--	--	5	1	5	1	6
ACADEMIC DEANS and ACADEMIC VICE-PRESIDENTS	Arts & Sciences	41	--	68	155	109	155	264
	Professional, Technical & Vocational*	127	--	16	27	143	27	170
ASSOCIATE and ASSISTANT ACADEMIC DEANS	Arts & Sciences	10	--	5	3	15	3	18
	Professional, Technical & Vocational*	3	--	--	--	3	--	3
FINANCIAL and/or ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS	Arts & Sciences	36	--	34	113	70	113	183
	Professional, Technical & Vocational*	8	--	26	3	34	3	37
<u>TOTAL</u>	Arts & Sciences	97	--	120	407	217	410	627
	Professional, Technical & Vocational*	<u>138</u>	--	<u>47</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>216</u>
	Total	237	--	167	438	402	441	843**

\*Including health sciences, home economics, business and education

\*\*Of this total, 80 have participated in the Institute for College and University Administrators



TAB K

#### How many women?

No one knows how many women are in the profession, are registered, or are even members of the AIA.

The best information on AIA membership comes from a tally of women members made by the AIA staff in 1969. The total was then 233; it is now estimated at 250 to 300. Total corporate membership in 1971 was 23,233.

Reliable statistics on the number of architects will soon be available in the Detailed Characteristics volumes of the 1970 census. Meanwhile rough estimates come from Elisabeth Duncan Fountz, Director of the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor: 33,000 registered architects were employed in the U.S. as of late 1970, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, about 4% of them women. There were about 8,000 urban planners, about 20% of them women; this difference is "not too surprising," says Ms. Koontz, "since women often find fewer barriers to entrance into the relatively new and growing occupations not yet stereotyped as 'men's jobs.'"

In the 1969 *Handbook on Women Workers*, a compendium of facts published periodically by the Women's Bureau, the word "architecture" appears not once in the index or any tabulation. But women remain a small part of many professions, says the Bureau of Labor Statistics—1% of engineers, 3% of lawyers, 7% of physicians—despite growth in these professions.

Women generally earn about \$3 for every \$5 earned by a man, although this figure is as high as \$3.32 for "professional-technical" workers (four million of the 30 million women employed). This differential doesn't necessarily mean that women are receiving unequal pay for equal work; it reflects the fact that women are more likely to be in low-echelon jobs. Actually, only 3% of all women in the private sector earn more than \$10,000 a year, according to a White House staff member who is recruiting women into high-ranking government jobs. In fact women's income relative to men's has deteriorated in most occupations in the last 15 years, during a time when the number of employed women has hit a record high. Women, today, comprise two-fifths of the labor force.

How many women are studying architecture? David Clarke, Executive Secretary of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) reports "a 7% increase in women last year (1971-72 over 1970-71), and this year it's even bigger." But while the number of women is increasing, the relative position is not improving. In 1971-72, for instance, the ACSA statistics for U.S. schools show 20,569 full-time students in architecture and 1,520 part-time students; the 1,520 women students were 69% of the total. In 1968-69, however, with 20,765 full-time students and 1,183 part-time, the 1,183 women were 5.4%.

Time, in its special issue on "The American Woman," March 20, 1972, made this single observation on the profession: "Women architects have fared even worse than painters. Only 6% of the students in architecture schools are women, and only 1% of the members of the American Institute of Architects. In art, of course, statistics are not so important as the quality of talent, but it is hard to believe that women are as untalented as the statistics imply."

Aptitude measurement is the specialty of the Johnson O'Connor Research Foundation and its Human Engineering Laboratory, which has tested 300,000 people over the past 50 years. Of 22 distinct aptitudes—finger dexterity, tonal memory, "atopophobia," etc.—men and women are equal in 14, women excel in six, men in two. These two aptitudes are grip, or physical strength, and "structural visualization," or the ability to visualize things in three dimensions, an ability that "seems central to the technical scientific professions (engineering, architecture, surgery, mechanics, building)." However, "the exact figures are one woman in four, one man in two." A paper on "The Potential of Women" by the Human Engineering Laboratory [347 Beacon St. Boston, Mass. 02116] suggests that only cultural bias keeps these professions from ever remotely approaching a 25% female population.

FORUM-SEPTEMBER 1972



TAB L



Women on Journalism Faculties - 1971-72  
United States Colleges and Universities  
Academic Rank

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Women's per- centage of total</u>
Administrators: deans, directors, chairmen, etc.	* 177	177	0	0 %
Professor	377	370	7	1 3/4 %
Associate Professor	365	345	20	5 1/2 %
Assistant Professor	467	434	33	7 %
Lecturers	212	190	22	10 1/2 %
Instructor	266	229	37	13 3/4 %
Visiting lecturer or professor	19	16	3	15 3/4 %
Part-time Lecturer	114	106	8	7 1/2 %
Teaching Fellow	1	1	0	0 %
Extension Education	1	0	1	100 %
Others	<u>114</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8 3/4 %</u>
TOTAL	2,113	1,972	141	
Minus administrators duplicated in other academic rank lists	<u>159</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>0</u>	
ACTUAL TOTAL	1,954	1,813	141	7 1/4 %

\* at 170 schools

Schools with NO women on faculty	90	52 1/4 %
Schools with only one woman on faculty	48	28 3/4 %
Schools with two women on faculty	17	
Schools with three women on faculty	8	
Schools with four women on faculty	4	
Schools with five women on faculty	2	
Schools with nine women on faculty	<u>1</u>	
	170	

61% have none or only one woman on faculty



TAB M

Table 5.10a

Percentage of all physicians in various specialities who are women

Speciality	% Women	Speciality	% Women	Speciality	% Women
<u>Medical (total)</u>	9.0	<u>Surgical (total)</u>	2.4	<u>Other (total)</u>	8.9
Allergy	6.6	General surgery	1.0	Anesthesiology	14.0
Cardiovascular	2.8	Obstetrics	} 6.9	Neurology	6.9
Dermatology	7.0	Gynecology		Occupat'l Med.	3.1
Gastroenterology	2.3	Ophthalmology	3.2	Pathology	11.6
Internal Medicine	5.4	Orthopedic	0.5	Psychiatry	12.5
Pediatrics	20.3	Otolaryngology	1.0	Physical Med.	15.2
Pulmonary	8.0	Plastic	2.7	Preventive Med.	12.1
<u>General Practice</u>	4.2	Other surgery	0.4	Public Health	18.5
				Radiology	4.8
				Other	7.4

Table 5.10b

Percentage of all physicians in various professional activities who are women

Speciality	All	Office based practice	Hospital based practice	Other activity
General practice	4.2	3.6	9.6	7.7
Medical Specialities	9.0	6.4	13.5	10.9
Surgical Specialities	2.4	2.0	3.4	3.8
Other Specialities	8.9	8.1	9.7	8.9
TOTAL	6.7	4.6	10.5	9.0

Goals for Women in Science  
 Women in Science and Engineering  
 Boston, Massachusetts  
 August 1972



TAB N



THE PROFILE OF MEDICAL PRACTICE  
Center for Health Services Research  
American Medical Association  
1972 Edition, P. 104

TABLE 52 -- DISTRIBUTION OF PHYSICIANS AMONG SPECIALTY GROUPS<sup>c</sup>  
BY SEX, DECEMBER 31, 1971

Specialty Group	Number of Women Physicians in Group	Percent of Women Physicians in Group	Number of Men Physicians in Group	Percent of Men Physicians in Group
Total	22,563 <sup>d</sup>	100.0	296,136 <sup>e</sup>	100.0
General practice	2,462	10.9	53,896	18.2
Internal medicine	3,252	14.4	54,617	18.4
Surgery	855	3.8	69,154	23.4
Obstetrics/gynecology	1,421	6.3	18,349	6.2
Pediatrics	4,247	18.8	15,671	5.3
Psychiatry	3,209	14.2	21,241	7.2
Radiology	754	3.3	13,585	4.6
Anesthesiology	1,655	7.3	9,902	3.3
Pathology	1,435	6.4	9,471	3.2
Other	3,283	14.6	30,250	10.2

c-Source: Special Tabulations from Physician Records, 1971. American Medical Association  
d-Excludes 4,471 physicians (481 not classified, 3,539 inactive, and 451 address unknown).  
e-Excludes 21,653 physicians (3,048 not classified, 15,349 inactive, and 2,756 address unknown).

TABLE 53 -- APPLICANTS AND ADMISSIONS TO MEDICAL SCHOOL BY SEX,  
SELECTED YEARS 1929-1930 THROUGH 1970-1971

First-Year Class	Men			Women			Women as Percentage of Total Accepted
	Number Applicants	Number Accepted	Percentage Accepted	Number Applicants	Number Accepted	Percentage Accepted	
1929-30	13,174	6,720	51.0	481	315	65.5	4.5
1939-40	11,168	5,890	52.7	632	321	50.8	5.2
1949-50	23,044	6,750	29.3	1,390	400	28.8	5.6
1959-60	13,926	7,968	57.2	1,026	544	53.0	6.4
1966-67	16,554	8,267	49.9	1,696	856	50.5	9.4
1967-68	16,773	8,718	51.9	1,951	984	50.4	10.1
1968-69	19,021	9,116	47.9	2,097	976	46.5	9.7
1969-70	22,176	9,536	43.0	2,289	1,011	44.2	9.6
1970-71	22,253	10,203	45.9	2,734	1,297	47.4	11.3

TABLE 54 -- PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN IN SELECTED PROFESSIONAL OCCUPATIONS, 1970

Occupation	Women as Percentage of All Workers
Lawyers	3.5
College presidents, professors, instructors	19.0
Clergy	5.8
Doctors	6.8
Engineers	0.8
Dentists	2.1
Scientists	9.9
Biologists	28.0
Chemists	8.6
Mathematicians	26.4
Physicists	4.2
Nurses	97.0
Social workers	57.0
Librarians	85.0

1-Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population, 1960*, Vol. 1, table 202, pp. 528-33, in: Epstein C.F., *Woman's Place* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), p. 7.



TAB 0

Table 2. Demographic and Background Characteristics  
of American College Faculty, by Sex: 1969  
(Percentage Distribution)

Item Description and Question Number	All Institutions			In Two-Year Colleges			In Four-Year Colleges			In Universities		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
<b>Age (87)</b>												
Over 60 (born before 1909)	7.3	9.3	7.7	6.2	8.0	6.6	7.9	10.4	8.5	7.2	8.6	7.4
51-60 (born 1909-1918)	15.1	18.5	15.7	15.2	18.5	16.1	15.0	17.7	15.6	15.1	19.4	15.7
41-50 (born 1919-1928)	26.7	26.6	26.7	27.6	29.0	28.0	25.6	26.4	25.7	27.3	27.8	27.1
31-40 (born 1929-1933)	17.3	13.0	16.5	15.5	12.2	14.6	16.4	14.5	15.9	18.3	11.7	17.3
31-35 (born 1934-1938)	18.5	12.8	17.4	18.3	11.9	16.6	18.4	12.8	17.1	18.6	13.3	17.8
30 or less (born after 1938)	15.0	19.7	16.0	17.2	20.3	18.0	16.7	18.1	17.0	13.4	21.1	14.6
<b>Race (89)</b>												
White	96.6	94.7	96.3	99.1	96.7	98.4	94.2	91.3	93.5	97.7	97.7	97.7
Black	1.8	3.9	2.2	0.5	1.4	0.7	4.2	7.4	5.0	0.4	11.0	0.5
Oriental	1.3	1.1	1.3	0.2	1.4	0.5	1.2	0.9	1.2	1.6	1.0	1.6
Other	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3
<b>Citizenship (65 a,b)</b>												
Not U.S. citizen	4.0	2.8	3.8	0.8	1.3	0.9	3.3	3.2	3.3	5.1	3.1	4.8
U.S. citizen, naturalized	5.5	4.6	5.3	4.3	2.2	3.8	5.8	4.9	5.6	5.6	5.3	5.6
U.S. citizen, native	90.5	92.6	90.9	94.8	96.5	95.3	90.9	91.9	91.1	89.2	91.6	89.6
<b>Father's Educational Attainment (79b)</b>												
High grade or less	30.0	25.5	29.1	39.4	30.5	37.1	31.5	26.7	30.5	26.9	21.9	26.1
Some high school	14.4	13.7	14.3	15.2	15.0	15.1	15.4	13.6	15.0	13.6	13.3	13.5
Completed high school	17.5	17.4	17.5	19.1	20.1	19.3	17.4	16.0	17.1	17.2	17.7	17.3
Some college	12.4	13.7	12.6	10.8	15.9	12.1	12.2	12.3	12.2	12.9	14.2	13.1
College graduate	9.6	10.0	9.7	6.7	5.8	6.5	8.7	10.1	9.0	10.9	11.7	11.0
Some graduate school	5.0	7.1	5.4	2.7	4.5	3.2	4.9	7.8	5.6	5.5	7.5	5.8
Advanced degree	11.1	12.6	11.4	6.1	8.2	6.6	9.9	13.3	10.7	13.0	13.8	13.1
<b>Religious Background (78a)</b>												
Protestant	63.9	65.4	64.1	64.4	64.1	64.3	59.3	59.7	59.4	66.8	72.2	67.6
Catholic	15.9	21.3	16.9	21.8	28.2	23.4	18.6	24.3	19.9	12.7	14.8	13.0
Jewish	10.4	6.7	9.7	3.7	2.2	3.3	12.3	8.9	11.5	10.7	6.2	10.1
Other	3.4	2.7	3.3	3.8	2.8	3.6	3.3	2.9	3.2	3.4	2.6	3.3
None	3.3	2.6	3.2	2.4	1.4	2.2	3.1	2.5	2.9	3.7	3.3	3.7
No answer	3.0	1.2	2.7	3.8	1.3	3.1	3.4	1.6	3.0	2.6	0.3	2.3
<b>Current Religion (78b)</b>												
Protestant	47.1	51.4	47.9	51.4	53.5	52.0	44.6	46.7	45.1	47.8	55.8	48.9
Catholic	12.2	19.2	13.5	17.8	26.8	20.1	14.7	22.4	16.4	9.2	12.2	9.6
Jewish	7.3	5.4	7.0	2.6	1.6	2.4	9.0	7.5	8.6	7.3	4.9	6.9
Other	6.1	5.2	5.9	7.1	5.9	6.8	5.7	5.1	5.6	6.2	5.1	6.0
None	21.9	15.6	20.7	15.0	10.1	13.8	20.2	15.0	19.0	24.6	18.8	23.7
No answer	5.4	3.1	4.9	6.0	2.1	5.0	5.8	3.3	5.3	4.9	3.4	4.7
<b>Marital Status (85)</b>												
Currently married	87.0	47.4	79.3	86.0	50.3	76.7	83.7	45.6	74.9	89.4	48.1	83.2
Divorced, separated, widowed	3.0	12.4	4.8	2.8	12.2	5.2	3.5	12.9	5.7	2.7	12.1	4.1
Never married	10.0	40.1	15.9	11.2	37.5	18.1	12.8	41.5	19.4	7.9	39.8	12.7
<b>Number of Children (86)</b>												
None	29.3	65.3	36.1	29.7	61.9	38.0	33.7	64.8	40.6	26.2	67.3	32.3
One	16.7	12.3	15.9	18.0	11.5	16.3	16.9	12.8	16.0	16.4	12.0	15.7
Two	26.3	12.9	23.7	25.9	12.7	22.5	24.3	13.8	22.0	27.7	12.0	25.4
Three or more	27.7	9.6	24.3	26.3	13.9	23.1	25.1	8.6	21.4	29.7	8.7	26.6



TAB P



Enrollment trends in 1971 8

TABLE 6 Enrollment changes between fall 1970 and fall 1971 in four-year colleges and universities

	All*		All excepting specialized institutions		Public universities		Public four-year		Private universities		Private four-year	
<i>Total graduate (in all post-B.A. programs)</i>												
Total	389†	4.4 ‡	326	4.3	61	2.7	99	8.5	34	0.7	128	9.3
Men	372	3.7	314	3.7	61	2.4	95	8.0	33	0.7	121	8.8
Women	370	6.0	314	5.7	61	3.0	96	8.9	33	2.3	120	12.3
Black	196	38.1	159	39.8	32	53.1	42	29.2	17	45.8	65	31.2
Spanish surname	158	30.7	130	30.6	25	18.0	35	36.5	12	89.6	54	40.7
<i>First-time graduate (all post-B.A. programs)</i>												
Total	299	2.8	248	3.0	50	1.1	64	10.9	27	-1.2	103	3.4
Men	265	0.7	217	0.8	45	0.2	53	11.7	22	-4.4	93	-1.7
Women	260	4.7	215	4.6	45	-3.5	53	12.4	22	2.6	91	16.0
Black	131	11.2	102	12.2	16	15.2	22	-1.4	10	21.0	51	20.5
Spanish surname	103	35.8	82	33.0	13	-12.5	21	60.0	7	5	38	68.0

\*Includes professional and other specialized schools—medical, art, theological, etc.

† Number of institutions reporting data for fall 1970 and 1971.

‡ Percentage change between 1970 and 1971.

§ Data not available.

## Enrollment Trends in 1971

A Technical Report Sponsored by  
The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education



TAB Q

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CAMPUS CONTACTS

Alabama A & M University  
Normal, Alabama 35762

Dr. Henry Ponder  
V. P. for Academic Affairs

Mr. L. R. Patton  
V. P. For Business & Finance

Dr. Winfred Thomas, Dean  
School of Agriculture

Dr. James L. Dawson, Chairman  
Dept. of Agriculture Education

Dr. Robert R. Bradford, Chrmn.  
Dept. of Natural Resource &  
Environmental Studies

Mrs. Katie W. Ligon  
V. P. for Student Affairs

Auburn University  
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Dr. W. S. Bailey  
V. P. for Academic &  
Administrative Affairs  
President's Office

\* (Insert)  
University of Alaska  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Mr. J. Frank Brown  
Central Personnel Office

Arizona State University  
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Mr. Jack Penick  
Assistant Vice President,  
Business Affairs

University of Arizona  
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Dr. A. B. Weaver  
Executive Vice President

\*University of Alabama  
University, Alabama 35486

Dr. Joseph T. Sutton  
V.P. for Institutional Studies & Services  
P.O. Box 6156

also: Compliance Officer for U. of Ala.

University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, California 94720

Ms. Colette M. Seiple  
Affirmative Action Coordinator  
Office of the Chancellor  
200 California Hall

University of California, Davis  
Davis, California 95616

Mr. Dennis Shinek  
Personnel Office  
312 Mrak Hall

W. F. Dukes  
Vice Chancellor - Academic Affairs

University of California, Irvine  
Irvine, California 92664

Ms. Eloise Kloke  
Assistant Chancellor for Administratio

University of California, Riverside  
Riverside, California 92502

Mrs. Sue Scott  
Personnel Manager

University of California, San Diego  
P.O. Box 109, LaJolla, California 92037

Vice Chancellor Paul Saltman  
Affirmative Action Coordinator -  
Academic Personnel

Vice Chancellor Eud Sisco  
Affirmative Action Coordinator for  
Staff Personnel

Mr. Jack Douglass  
Affirmative Action Monitor

University of California, Santa Barbara  
Santa Barbara, California 93017

Mrs. M. K. Joyce  
Executive Assistant to the Chancellor

Colorado State University  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

Dr. Donald D. Rohdy  
Affirmative Action Director  
1835 Dayton Drive

University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Mr. Frank Ives  
Director of Staff Personnel  
Regent Hall 122

University of Connecticut  
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Ms. Gail Shea  
Box U-86

Bertram W. Wilson  
Personnel Services Division  
Box U-75

University of Delaware  
Newark, Delaware 19711

Mrs. Jeanette Sam  
Affirmative Action Coordinator  
307 Hullahen Hall

Florida A & M University  
Tallahassee, Florida 32307

Dr. Eva C. Wanton  
P. O. Box 326

Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Dr. Freddie L. Groomes  
200 Wescott

University of Idaho  
Moscow, Idaho 83843

Tom Richardson  
V.P. State & Administrative Services

Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Mr. Jerry Lacey  
Assistant to the President for  
Affirmative Action  
Anthony Hall, Room 309A

University of Illinois  
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Dr. Barry Munitz  
Vice President for Academic Development  
and Coordination  
415 Administrative Office Building  
Medical Center Campus  
Box 6998

Indiana University  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

Chancellor Sylvie Bowman  
La Rose Building  
Market and Pennsylvania Sts.

Purdue University  
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Dr. John W. Hicks  
Assistant to the President

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa 50010

Warren R. Madden  
Assistant Vice President for  
Business and Finance  
125 Beardshear

University of Iowa  
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Dr. George Chambers  
Vice President for Administration  
101 Jessup Hall

University of Kansas  
Manhattan, Kansas 66044

Dr. Juliet Shaffer, Chairperson  
Affirmative Action Board  
c/o Office of the Chancellor

Kentucky State College  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dr. A. J. Richards  
President Carl M. Hill

University of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Mrs. Nancy T. Ray  
Coordinator  
Affirmative Action Plan  
7 Administration Building

University of Maine  
Portland, Maine 04102

Dr. Donald R. McNeil  
Chancellor  
228 Deering Avenue

Mr. Herbert L. Fowle  
Vice Chancellor  
Office of the Chancellor  
107 Maine Avenue  
Bangor, Maine 04401

University of Maine  
Orono, Maine 04473

Mr. Paul Dunham  
E.E.O. Director  
Alumni Hall

Massachusetts Institute of  
Technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Mr. James C. Allison  
Asst. to President for Minority  
Affairs  
77 Massachusetts Avenue, Rm. 4-144

University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Mr. Fedele F. Fauri  
2014 Administration Building

University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Ms. Lillian H. Williams  
Deputy Equal Opportunity Officer  
419 Morrill Hall

Ms. Nancy L. Groves  
Equal Opportunity Officer, Academic  
Administration  
217 Morrill Hall

Mississippi State University  
State College, Mississippi 39762

T. K. Martin  
Drawer J

University of Missouri  
Columbia, Missouri 65201

Dr. A. G. Unklesbay  
Vice President for Administration  
321 University Hall

University of Nebraska  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Mrs. Barbara J. Coffey  
Assistant to the President  
303 Administration Building  
14th & R Streets

University of Nevada at Reno  
Reno, Nevada 89507

Mr. Harry Wolf

Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

Ms. Blenda J. Wilson  
Executive Assistant to the President

New Mexico State University  
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003

Mr. Richard Hermes  
Personnel Director  
Box 3AA



University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

Lawrence C. Yehle  
Director of Personnel  
1717 Roma N.E.

Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York 14850

Ramon E. Rivera  
Affirmative Action Officer  
317 Day Hall

State University of New York  
Albany, New York 12210

Dr. Kenneth M. MacKenzie  
Vice Chancellor for Personnel  
and Employee Relations

Dr. C. Eugene Kratz, Director  
Equal Employment Opportunity Programs  
99 Washington Avenue

State University of New York at Albany  
Albany, New York 12222

Mr. Leon J. Calhoun, Sr.  
Director  
Office of Equal Employment Opportunity  
1400 Washington Avenue

State University of New York at Stony Brook  
Stony Brook, New York 11790

Ms. Vera Rony, Coordinator  
Equal Employment Opportunity Program

North Carolina A & T State University  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

Dr. Theodore Mahaffey  
Administrative Assistant to the Chancellor

North Carolina State University  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Dr. Clauston Jenkins  
Provost's Office - 201 Holladay Hall

University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Mr. Richard Robinson  
Assistant to the President  
P.O. Box 309

North Dakota State University  
Fargo, North Dakota 58102

Mr. H. D. Stockman  
Vice President for Business and  
Finance

University of North Dakota  
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

Mr. Gerald M. Skogley  
Vice President for Finance

Kent State University  
Kent, Ohio 44240

\* Mr. James Ervin  
Director Human Resources Utilization  
Rockwell Hall

Miami University  
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Mr. William G. Slover  
Affirmative Action Officer

Langston University  
Langston, Oklahoma 73050

Mr. James Allen Simpson  
Director of Development and  
Public Relations  
P.O. Box 458

Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Mr. Gene Turner, Director  
Personnel Services  
Whitehurst Hall

University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, Provost  
Dr. Gene Nordby, V. P. for  
Administration & Finance  
660 Parrington Oval

Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Anthony Birch  
Fiscal Affairs

University of Oregon  
Eugene Oregon 97403

Mrs. Lorenza Schmidt  
Interim Director  
Office of Affirmative Action  
Room 8, Chapman Hall

Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Mr. Ray T. Fortunato  
Assistant V.P. Personnel Administration  
108 Willard Building

University of Puerto Rico  
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00931

Salvador Acosta Rodriguez  
Assistant to the Director  
Office of Academic Affairs  
Central Administration  
P.O. Box AD-U, P.R. Station

University of Rhode Island  
Kingston, Rhode Island 02881

Mr. Joseph C. O'Connell  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Administration Building

Mr. Eugene Mailloux  
Director of Personnel  
Lower College Road

Clemson University  
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Major General Allen W. Rigsby  
Executive Vice President

South Carolina State College  
Orangeburg, South Carolina 29115

Dr. Algernon S. Belcher  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

University of South Carolina  
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Dr. William H. Patterson  
Provost

South Dakota State University  
Brookings, South Dakota 57006

Mr. Wes Bugg  
Director of Finance

Tennessee State University  
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Dr. Charles Fancher  
Dean of Faculty

University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Dr. James E. Drinnon, Jr.  
Executive Assistant to the President  
206 Administration Building

Prairie View A & M College  
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Dr. Ivory Nelson  
Vice President for Research,  
Special Programs.

Texas A & M University  
College Station, Texas 77843

Mr. T. D. Cherry  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Room 205, Coke Building

Texas Southern University  
Houston, Texas 77004

Mr. Everett O. Ball  
Assistant to the President  
and Director of Personnel

Texas Tech University  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Dr. S. M. Kennedy  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Texas Tech University  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Mr. Carlton Dodson  
Resident Legal Counsel

Mr. F. J. Wehmever  
Associate Vice President for  
Administrative Affairs

University of Houston  
Houston, Texas 77004

Ms. Norma Schneider  
Staff Employment Mgr.  
Room 501E

University of Texas at Austin  
Austin, Texas 78712

Vice President Lorene L. Rogers

University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Mr. J. Leonard  
Civil Rights Officer  
Park Building

Utah State University  
Logan, Utah 84321

Dr. Richard Swenson  
Vice Provost

Dr. Evan Stevenson  
Asst. Vice President for Business

University of Vermont  
Burlington, Vermont 05401

Dr. Dolores Stocker  
Assistant to the President for  
Human Resources  
President's Office

Virginia State College  
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Dr. Walker Quarles  
V.P., Administration

Washington State University  
Pullman, Washington 99163

Wallis Beasley  
Executive Vice President  
422 French Administration Building

West Virginia University  
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Mr. Sandy Serpento  
Director of Personnel

University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Dr. Cyrena Pondrom  
Assistant to the Chancellor  
175 Bascom Hall

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Dr. Clyde Jaworski  
Director of Operations

University of Wyoming  
Laramie, Wyoming 82070

Dr. James Ranz  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Room 206 Old Main

Mr. John W. Jackson, Director  
Placement Service  
Room 218 Knight Hall

Mr. Nick Kaan, Jr.  
Director  
Division of Personnel  
Room 403 Old Main

ADDITIONS

State University of New York, Binghamton  
Binghamton, New York 13901

S. Stewart Gordon,  
Executive Vice President

Edgar L. Abbott  
Director of Personnel

University of Arkansas  
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

C. W. Oxford  
Administrative Vice President  
Administration 422

University of California System  
Berkeley, California 94720

Mr. James Goodwin  
575A University Hall

Wayne State University  
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Kenneth M. Smythe Esq.  
Room 991  
5050 Cass Avenue

Alcorn A & M College  
Lorman, Mississippi 39096

Rudolph E. Waters  
Vice President

University of South Dakota  
Vermillion, South Dakota 57069

Patricia Doll Gutzman  
Director, Personnel Services

Montana State University  
Bozeman, Montana 59715

C.C. Dye  
Acting Personnel Director

University of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Thomas N. Arnett  
Director of Personnel  
1633 Bachman Place  
Sinclair Annex 2, Room 2

Kent State University  
Kent, Ohio 44242

\* Susan Reis  
Office of Human Resource Utilization

Virginia Polytechnic Institute  
State University  
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Mr. Walter H. Ryland  
General Counsel

University of Massachusetts  
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Mr. Peter Kaplan  
Staff Associate - Administration  
President's Office  
One Washington Mall

University of California  
San Francisco Medical Center  
San Francisco, California 94122

Ms. Joanne Lewis=  
Affirmative Action Office  
200 University Building