

File

TO : THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY  
FROM : THE SECRETARY  
DATE : JANUARY 30, 1973

The Faculty Senate will meet at 4:30 P.M., Wednesday, February 7, 1973  
in 107 Currell.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. University Officers.
2. Committee Reports: Faculty Advisory Committee - Prof. Wood.  
  
Nominations Committee - Prof. Kasschau,  
(Advisory Council for the Baccalaureate program  
in General Studies).  
  
Grade Change Committee, (requests for grade  
change) - Prof. Porter.  
  
Academic Forward Planning Committee - Prof. Bain.
3. Old Business.
4. New Business.

Professor Porter, Chairman of the Grade Change Committee, has asked the Secretary to explain why numerous grade change requests do not appear in the current report. Grade change requests received after the Committee's January meeting will be processed at their next meeting. Consequently, these requests will be made at the March meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Sincerely,

*C. McFerron Gittinger*

C. McFerron Gittinger,  
Secretary

Enclosures:

Memorandum, Committee on Cafeteria Services - Prof. Rouse.

Grade Changes.

Supplement, Curricula and New Courses.

Supplement, Department of Biology course request.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Discrimination.

FACULTY SENATE  
December 6, 1972

The Faculty Senate met at 4:30 P.M., December 6, 1972, in 107 Currell with Chairman William H. Wesson presiding.

Faculty Senate minutes of the meeting of November 1, 1972, were approved as circulated. Chairman Wesson invited any member of the University faculty to Senate meetings and reminded them of their freedom to speak to the faculty body.

Under "Reports of Officers," Provost Patterson reported on Affirmative Action and its guidelines. He had been designated by President Jones to work with this phase of University operations. The Provost reported steps had been taken even before the guidelines had been received from HEW. A committee has been appointed which consists of 12 to 14 female members. In addition, a letter has been prepared by the President implementing Executive Order 11246 which directs non-discrimination in recruiting and promotion. Divisional heads are asked to keep records to provide proof of affirmative action. Printed guidelines cover seventeen pages of pertinent material. The University has an affirmative action officer who will report to President Jones, Miss Anna Durham. In this capacity she will oversee University compliance and entertain complaints. The guidelines refer to goal setting and it is our intention to comply. Provost Patterson then introduced Professors Young and Mandel who spoke to the Senate on the subject of Affirmative Action.

Professor Young's statement: An affirmative action plan is an outline of positive steps to be taken to equalize treatment of all persons regardless of race, religion, sex or national origin. A written affirmative action plan is required by the Federal Government of all institutions with federal contracts of \$50,000 or more and having 50 or more employees. These requirements are set out in Executive Order 11246, as amended in 1968. An affirmative action plan deals with all areas of employment, including recruitment, hiring, training, salaries, promotions, conditions, compensations and benefits.

Equal treatment does not mean that a person who has performed in a superior fashion cannot be paid more or promoted more rapidly than someone who has performed less well. It does mean that a deciding factor in hiring, salary, promotion, etc., cannot be sex, race, religion or national origin.

The following excerpts are taken from the HEW Higher Education Guidelines:

Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in the Executive Order  
Executive Order 11246 embodies two concepts: nondiscrimination and affirmative action.

Nondiscrimination requires the elimination of all existing discriminatory conditions, whether purposeful or inadvertent. A University contractor must carefully and systematically examine

all of its employment policies to be sure that they do not, if implemented as stated, operate to the detriment of persons on grounds of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. The contractor must also ensure that the practices of those responsible in matters of employment, including all supervisors, are nondiscriminatory.

Affirmative action requires the contractor to do more than ensure employment neutrality with regard to race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. As the phrase implies, affirmative action requires the employer to make additional efforts to recruit, employ and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded, even if that exclusion cannot be traced to particular discriminatory actions on the part of the employer. The premise of the affirmative action concept of the Executive Order is that unless positive action is undertaken to overcome the effects of systemic institutional forms of exclusion and discrimination, a benign neutrality in employment practices will tend to perpetuate the status quo ante indefinitely (pp. 2-3).

Two aspects of affirmative action have caused some confusion. The first is referred to as "preferential hiring." Executive Order 11246 forbids discrimination on the basis of sex, race, religion, etc., and that includes forbidding discrimination against white males. If a white male is clearly the best qualified candidate for a job, then you cannot discriminate against him and hire a less qualified candidate who might be black or female. However, there is one instance when you can give preference. This is when there are two equally well-qualified candidates, and one candidate is a member of a group against whom there has been, historically, a pattern of discrimination. Then and only then can you give preference to the excluded group.

The second aspect which causes confusion concerns the concepts of goals. Revised Order Four, which tells what has to be in affirmative action plans requires contractors to have goals and timetables included in their affirmative action plan. Goals are not quotas. A quota is a ceiling. For example, if a medical school says, "We are only allowing ten women in our freshman class," that is a quota. A goal is a positive target that you aim for. It is set by the institution, not by the Federal Government. It is established after a thorough analysis of data has been done. In regard to women, for example, once you see how many women faculty are in a certain school or department, and once you determine what the availability of women is in that discipline, then you set reasonable goals. You decide how many more women you should be able to have by 1974, 1975, etc. If you do not meet your goal, there is no problem as long as you can show a "good faith effort." But what is a "good faith effort?" It means actively recruiting women and minorities. It means contacting women's groups, black groups, women's caucuses and black caucuses in the various disciplines, and projects that are funded by various foundations to establish talent banks for women. It means advertising widely. If you still cannot find a good person who meets all qualifications, the government has no quarrel with you. But there has to be demonstrated an effort to open the recruiting process to all people fairly.

What does the government do if a university does not meet goals, and cannot show a good faith effort? In the past few years, HEW has caused more than 23 million dollars in federal contracts to be withheld from universities. Once the universities comply with the law they generally get their contracts back. In addition, different offices of the Federal Government can withhold some research grants.

To make sure that the University of South Carolina does not lose important federal contracts, we all need to be well-informed, and to make every effort to comply with the law.

Professor Mandel's presentation: Early this fall, the Affirmative Action Committee was appointed by President Jones. The Affirmative Action Committee was given the directive to write an affirmative action plan for the University. The committee met regularly this fall and has been working on such a plan. Although some model plans are available from other universities around the country, each plan must be tailor-made for the particular university structure. These affirmative action plans usually include a general statement of policy, that refers to Executive Order 11246 as amended.

An Affirmative Action Plan often includes statistics that suggest there may be a pattern of discrimination in salaries and ranks within the university. Such statistics have been taken by the Federal Courts as prima facie evidence of discrimination. These statistics usually include the numbers of women and minority groups persons in various ranks and the comparative salaries of these groups. In addition to rank and salary comparisons between men and women, comparisons for faculty are often made between the percentage of women and minority group persons in the available applicant pool and the percentages in the departments. For example, if the number of women graduates in psychology is 20-25%, then that is the expected percentage for women at any rank in that department.

For staff, the percentages of women and minority group members in the available pool are often taken to be the percentages in the local population. These percentages are then compared with the actual percentages of women and minorities at each staff rank.

The Affirmative Action Plan usually includes within it some statement on all the topics that are handled in detail in the HEW guidelines. Recruitment, hiring, promotion, fringe benefits, and leave policy to name a few major sections.

Lastly, an Affirmative Action Plan usually includes some statement about how the plan shall be implemented. Exactly who will do exactly what.

Many universities now have affirmative action officers whose sole responsibility often includes arranging salary equalization, sometimes negotiating back pay, and monitoring the process of attaining nondiscrimination in fact as well as theory.

Prof. Mandel suggested questions regarding the affirmative action to Prof. Young in the Foreign Language Department.

Vice President Brunton reported he, along with President Jones, and the Provost had met with the University Planning Committee. The University asked for permission to proceed with 7 million dollars in projects financed by student fees. A request was made to the State for 35 million for improvement on campus which will complete planned expansion for the 20,000 students anticipated in this decade. The request included funding for five projects: 19.8 million for a cultural center, 6 million for a behavior center, 2.6 million for a west parking garage, 3.5 million for completion of part two of the science building, and 3 million for coastal campus improvements.

Prof. S. Cochrane asked the Provost if the Women's Affirmative Action Committee had been consulted on the appointment of the University Affirmative Action officer.

The Provost replied that the committee had not been consulted. He continued by indicating the job today is not substantial, but in the near future, it may be a full time job. He reported that the establishment of an Office of University Counselling on the problem had been considered because so many of the problems are legal ones, and permission had been received from the Office of the Attorney General to have an attorney. He added there may be an addition to the staff later for such duties.

Associate Vice Provost Landen, Secretary of the Academic Forward Planning Committee spoke on the function of the committee and what the committee is doing. He continued by pointing out the committee was appointed last May and consists of President Jones, the Provost, Professors Bain, Coolidge, Cochrane, Simpson, Salzberg, and Mulvaney. The first meeting was May 22. He went on to say the committee met once a month during the summer and twice a month in the fall. Committee meetings usually lasted about an hour and a half. Initial activity of the committee was organization and plans for procedure. A paper was prepared summarizing the committee's function and procedure. He continued by stating the committee had been asked to take up matters from various committees. The May meeting was dominated by study of the Gravatt Report Proposal with a forthcoming report. One of the principles the committee began to operate under was an appointment of ad hoc committees instead of trying to do all the work themselves.

Associate Vice Provost Landen continued with a report on the Educational Foundation's fund raising goal of \$40,000 from the University faculty and staff. At this time \$39,625 has been contributed by the faculty and staff. Such results he indicated was evidence of sacrificial loyalty on the part of faculty and staff.

Professor Kasschau asked Vice President Brunton what had been done about finding a meeting room for committees.

Vice President Brunton replied that this matter was under study.

Under "Committee Reports" Professor Kasschau for the Nominations Committee stated that as a result of the mail ballot Professor Abernathy had been elected to fill the vacancy on the Welfare Committee.

Professor Kasschau reported the resignation of a faculty member, Webster Meyers, on the Student Supreme Court. Due to this resignation he nominated, on behalf of his committee, Professor Hindes to fill the vacancy on the Student Supreme Court. There were no further nominations and the Chairman reminded that he would call for further nominations at the close of the meeting.

Professor Wood, for the Faculty Advisory Committee, reported his committee had several items under consideration but had no report at this time.

Professor Howard Sanders, in the absence of Professor Porter, asked for approval of the submitted Grade Change Requests. The grade changes were approved.

Professor Ackerman for the Committee on Curricula and New Courses stated the committee had a supplement to the requests distributed with the minutes. [A copy of the supplement is provided with these minutes.] Professor Ackerman moved for adoption of Item I of his committee's report. This motion was adopted. Item II, section A was then proposed and approved. Item II, section B was proposed and approved. Item II, section C was proposed for approval. Professor Oakman asked that the word "Business" be inserted in the titles of course numbers 390, 490, and 590 as Computer Science had similar titles. Professor Hickman of the College of Business Administration said the additional word in these titles would be agreeable with the College of Business. The course titles would then read as follows: Business Information Systems, Business Systems Design, and Business Information Systems Applications. With the addition of the word "Business" in the titles of these courses section C of Item II was approved. Item II, section D through J were proposed and adopted. Item II, section K plus Theatre 586. DESIGN MOTIFS on the supplementary sheet were proposed and approved. Professor Ackerman reverted to the supplement sheet and the recommendations of curricula additions in the School of Nursing. He asked for approval of Items I and II. Items I and II on the supplement sheet were approved. Professor Ackerman then asked for approval of Item III of the Changes in Existing Courses and also Item IV which accompanied the published minutes. Items III and IV were adopted.

Professor John Herr distributed a supplement sheet for request of approval of two new courses from the Department of Biology. [A copy of the material is provided with these minutes.] Professor Herr asked for approval of these courses for the spring semester only. Discussion ensued as to the procedure of handling this request. Professor Carlsson moved for the question. Biology 305 and Biology 515 were approved for the spring semester only.

Next, Professor Caldwell, Faculty Director of Contemporary University, referred to the guidelines for the operation of Contemporary University. He asked for three changes from the original guidelines furnished in the November minutes. The first two are not curricula in nature. He then moved for adoption of Item I which was approved. In Item II, part (a) he asked that the word "must" in the first paragraph of the first sentence be changed to "should." With this change Item II was approved. He said that Item III would be referred to the Committee on Curricula and New Courses.

In the Report of the Secretary, Professor Gittinger read a note of appreciation from the family of Ross M. Coxe.

Under New Business, Chairman Wesson said that he had asked Professor Welsh to attend the Faculty Senate to talk about a lounge for the faculty. Professor Welsh said that he had no definitive report at this time as the committee needed to know exactly what the faculty wanted. He asked that a motion be made to take a survey on what type of facility the faculty would be interested in having and he would be happy to work on finding a suitable location after the need had been ascertained. This was made into a motion which was approved.

Professor Caldwell distributed diagrams of proposed changes in Russell House and suggested that if the faculty wanted a lounge in Russell House, the decision would have to be made soon.

Professor Rouse reported the committee on cafeteria service has been at work and would be sending out a memo on its actions.

Professor Scheiblich announced the December faculty Christmas party.

The Chairman reopened the floor for further nominations on the Student Supreme Court vacancy. There were no further nominations and Professor Hindes was declared elected.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectively submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "C. McFerron Gittinger".

C. McFerron Gittinger, Secretary

MEMORANDUM

TO: My Colleagues on the Faculty of the University of South Carolina

FROM: Sue T. Rouse, Chairman  
University Cafeteria Committee

At the suggestion of Dr. William H. Wesson, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, I want to let you know that there is a University Food Services Committee that is alive and living at the various designations listed below.

If you have any specific complaints, suggestions, compliments, etc. relating to the food services, we will be glad to examine them during our meetings. Just contact any member of the Committee--we want "in-put" from the faculty too. Our next meeting is scheduled on January 24, 1973 at 2:30 p.m. in Room 306, Russell House.

Perhaps you have noticed that the Faculty Dining Room at Russell House seems to be a bit crowded lately. If you wish, you are welcome to use any of the other dining facilities on the campus. (Bates House is on the board plan; non-residents must pay \$1.00 for breakfast, \$1.50 for lunch, \$1.75 for dinner.)

COMMITTEE:

Dr. Sue T. Rouse, Chairman (Education; 3886)  
Dr. Laurence N. Connor (Engineering; 4186)  
Mr. Douglas Fitzgerald (Vice-President, Business Affairs; 3128)  
Mr. Johnny Elliott (Student; 3608; Box 81232)  
Ms. Paula Kress (Student; 3569; Box U-82498)  
Dr. James A. Kuhlman (Government and International Studies; 3108)  
Dr. John E. Logan (Business Administration; 4893)  
Ms. Nancy Sox (Student; 3593501; Rt. 7, Box 34, Lexington)  
Mr. David Wessinger (Student; 4459; Box 87363)  
Ms. Linda Salane (Asst. Dir. Housing--Women; 2873)  
Ms. Debbie Smith (Student; 5774; Box U-82212)

Ex-Officio: Dr. William H. Wesson, Chairman, Faculty Senate  
Mr. David Spinazzolo, President, Student Body



## REQUESTS FOR GRADE CHANGES

FEBRUARY, 1973

Instructor	Student's Name	S.S. Number	Course-Section	Semester Taken	Grade Change
John Bauer	Turner, Susan		MU 110-1	Fall 72	C to B
John C. Bircher, Jr.	Sells, Rickie L.		MU X110-1	Fall 72	NC to C
Lauren E. Brubaker, Jr.	Allen, Thomas G.	-	REL 501	Spr. 72	NC to NCS
Joel S. Cleland	Atkinson, Willie E.		HST 102-5	Fall 72	NC to I
Lee J. Dudek	Barton, James R.		JOU 326-1	Spr. 72	NC to delete
John F. Duffy	Henault, Roger R.		HST 332	Fall 72	NC to C
Gary D. Faulkner	Bauer, David C.		MTH 121-22	Spr. 72	C to B
Gary Griepentrog	Anderson, James		BA 190-3	Fall 72	NC to I
Stephen N. Haynes	Allen, Thomas	-	PSY 410	Spr. 72	NC to NCS
Charles M. Israel	Watson, Gary H.		ENGL 287-5	Spr. 72	NC to C
Richard H. Kherlopian	Gatlin, Eugene S.		ED 725-2	Spr. 72	B to A
James A. Kuhlman	Bryant, Johnny		POL 201-4	Fall 72	NC to B
James A. Kuhlman	Hilton, John B.		POL 311-1	Spr. 72	NC to C
Barry Loewer	Townsend, Joe		PHIL 111-300	Spr. 72	NC to C
Lance Lufkin	Burns, James M.		SOC 101-1	Spr. 71	C to B
Kenneth E. Merritt	Walker, Charles M.		ECO 292-1	Fall 72	NC to C
R. Phillips	Stratos, Pamela		MTH 101-10	Fall 72	NC to I
Henry T. Price	Robinson, Stephen R.		JOU 306	Fall 72	NC to B
William F. Roller	Harvie, William P.		MTH 125-9	Fall 72	C to B
Barry Howard Rosen	Thomas, G. Allen	-	HST 102	Spr. 72	NC to NCS
Ignas K. Skrupskelis	Thomas, G. Allen	-	PHIL 202	Spr. 72	NC to NCS
A. Emerson Smith	Folsom, Joseph Glen		SOC 101-004	Spr. 72	NC to C
L. Sternbach	Hanson, Kenneth C.		MTH 121-005	Fall 72	C to B
Harold L. Vaughn	Yancey, Ann T.		EDU 725-003	Fall 72	NC to B
T. Edward Weston	Hiott, Sherrill C.		POL 201-002	Fall 72	NC to B
T. Edward Weston	Kelly, Bobby		POL 520-1	SU 2 72	NC to C
J.R. Wettersten	Beverly, Ollie		PHIL 102-5	Fall 72	NC to A

## REQUESTS FOR GRADE CHANGES

February 1973

Instructor	Student's Name	S.S. Number	Course Section	Semester Taken	Grade Change
William S. Ayres	Hungate, Anne E.		ANTH 101-05	Fall 72	NC to C
John Bauer	Graham, Timothy G.		MU 110-001	Fall 72	B to A
James M. Black	Elvington, Johnny K.		B.A. 374-002	Fall 72	B to A
Stephen C. Coy	Moore, Philip R.		ENGL 565-003	Fall 72	NC to B
R.A. Fleck, Jr.	Johnson, Ervin S.		ECO 291-6	Fall 72	NC to C
Robert C. Gibson	Kelly, Frank C., Jr.		AS 301-1	Fall 72	B to A
C.B. Graham	Milner, Edward L.		GIS 571-300	Fall 72	B to A
Peggy J. Hartley	Sterling, Beth		SPN 101-A	Fall 72	B to A
Robert J. Linn	Binder, Roseann		ENGL 287-5	Fall 72	NC to B
Merle Medhurst	Williams, Frank		GS 070-001	Fall 72	NC to C
Samuel Litman	Hing, Tong T.		ENGR 225	Fall 71	C to B
J. Edwin Sees	Jones, Richard L.		ENGR 230	Fall 72	C to B
Donald R. Sutherland	Tootle, Constance K.		ANTH 101-002	Fall 72	NC to C
Richard M. Uray	Hammarth, Christine		JOU 325-1	Fall 72	C to B
Steven J. Whitton	Vernberg, Eric M.		ENGL 282-001	Fall 72	B to A

## SUPPLEMENT

### COMMITTEE ON CURRICULA AND NEW COURSES

December 6, 1972

The following course was inadvertently omitted in the list of new course requests already distributed:

Theatre 586. DESIGN MOTIFS. (3) Practical and research projects into identification, isolation and selection of historic motifs for theatrical purposes. The scope of the material covers distinct design periods from the Egyptian Papyrus and Hieroglyphic elements to the present, including Greco-Roman, Medieval, Gothic, Baroque, Victorian and Art Nouveau.

It is the practice of the Committee to complete action prior to the Senate meeting on all material received by the first Monday of the preceding month. Action on the accompanying material could not be completed in time to distribute it with the minutes.

The Committee recommends the following items to the University Senate:

#### I. Curriculum addition.

##### School of Nursing

OPEN CURRICULUM. The Open Curriculum provides for the registered nurse to receive the B.S.N. degree by using 50 credits earned at the baccalaureate level at any regionally approved university or college, and 45 hours of professional credit through the licensure examination. Based on this academic and practical background the registered nurse is required to take under the aegis of the School of Nursing 30 additional hours of professional courses including three courses open only to registered nurses: 365, 465 and 466. Building on previous knowledge, experience and the three required courses, the R.N. student will take nine semester hours in Nursing major Cores I, II or III and twelve semester hours in Core IV.

Baccalaureate courses.....	50 hours
Licensure examination (R.N.).....	45 hours
Nursing 365, 465, 466.....	9 hours
Core I, II, or III.....	9 hours
Core IV.....	12 hours
	<u>125 hours</u>

## II. New Courses.

### School of Nursing

1. Nursing 365. EMERGENT CONCEPTS OF PROFESSIONAL NURSING. (3)  
(Prereq: Licensure in Nursing /R.N./) Emergent concepts, constructs and skills based upon theories of development, communications, health medical care systems and the dynamics of nurse-patient interaction. Applications in community life and nursing practice.
2. Nursing 465. DYNAMICS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP PROCESS IN NURSING. (3) (Prereq: Licensure in Nursing/R.N./, Nursing 365) Concepts, constructs and skills based upon theories of personality dynamics, family life, teaching-learning, group process and therapy. Dynamics of team nursing and multi-discipline delivery of health care to persons, families and groups with emotional and physical health problems.
3. Nursing 466. NURSING IN SOCIAL ACTION AND CHANGE. (3) (Prereq: Licensure in Nursing /R.N./, Nursing 365) Forces, strategies and mechanisms effecting social action and change. Application of the knowledge gained to dealing therapeutically with individuals and groups in high risk of pathological adaptation, dependency and dysfunction.

(The following eight courses, if accepted by the Senate, will form Core IV of the Nursing curricula)

4. Nursing 450. FAMILY NURSING PRACTICE IN THE MATERNITY CYCLE.(6)  
Core IV course. (Prereq: two Cores including Core I.) Concepts, constructs, and skills pertaining to selected aspects of health care during the maternity cycle; within the family context. Application in selected clinical settings.
5. Nursing 451. FAMILY NURSING PRACTICE IN CHILD CARE. (6) Core IV course. (Prereq: two Cores, including Core I.) Concepts, constructs and skills pertaining to selected aspects of wellness-illness continuum of child health, within the family context. Application in selected clinical settings.
6. Nursing 452. FAMILY NURSING PRACTICE IN ADULT AMBULATORY HEALTH CARE (6) Core IV course. (Prereq: two cores) Concepts, constructs and skills pertaining to health promotion, prevention of illness and health maintenance in long term care; within the family context. Application in selected clinical settings.
7. Nursing 453. FAMILY NURSING PRACTICE IN PSYCHIATRIC COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH (6) Core IV course. (Prereq: two Cores) Mental health and psychiatric nursing concepts, constructs and skills pertaining to nursing practice in selected psychiatric community mental health settings.

8. Nursing 454. FAMILY NURSING PRACTICE IN CARDIOVASCULAR CRISIS.  
(6) Core IV course. (Prereq: two Cores) Concepts, constructs and skills pertaining to pathophysiological changes, diagnostic measures and therapies concerned with cardiovascular disorders within the family context. Application in selected clinical settings.
9. Nursing 455. FAMILY NURSING PRACTICE IN RESPIRATORY DISORDERS.  
(6) Core IV course. (Prereq: two Cores) Concepts, constructs and skills pertaining to selected respiratory disorders; within the family context. Application in selected clinical settings.
10. Nursing 456. FAMILY NURSING PRACTICE IN NEUROSENSORY DISORDERS.  
(6) Core IV course. (Prereq: two Cores) Concepts, constructs and skills pertaining to selected neurological deficits and/or sensory deprivation; within the family context. Application in selected clinical settings.
11. Nursing 457. LEADERSHIP IN PATIENT CARE. (6) (Prereq: Nursing 422) Study and application of principles of leadership, supervision, staff development, teaching and management. Includes planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, teaching, evaluating, demonstrating the model of practice associated with the roles of team leader and head nurse.

SUPPLEMENT SHEET AS BASIS FOR  
REQUEST BY PROF. JOHN HERR

The Department of Biology, College of Science and Mathematics, requests approval of the following new courses for one semester only. The origin of this request began with the curriculum committee for the Department of Biology (Dr. W. D. Dawson, Dr. D. H. Rembert, Dr. E. F. Thompson, Dr. L. T. Wimer) and was subsequently approved by the Biology Faculty at meetings held November 6, 1972. The offering of these courses has been approved by the Acting Dean, College of Science and Mathematics, Dr. O. F. Schuette and the Head, Department of Biology, Dr. B. T. Cole.

Although an effort was made to submit this request through the University Curriculum and New Course Committee, the procedural steps within the department of Biology (Curriculum Committee recommendation subject to approval of the Biology Faculty, thence to the Dean) made it impossible for Dr. Ackerman's committee to review this request prior to the December meeting of the Senate.

In deference to our majors in Biology, and the needs of non-science students for Biology 305 (Heredity), it is hoped that these courses may be offered in the Spring Semester, 1973.

Biology 305. HEREDITY. A study of genetics for non-majors only. The course will consider the basic principles of genetics such as recombination, dominance, lethality, genes in population, and human genetics. Emphasis will be placed on examples relevant to the non-major. Three lecture hours a week. Three Credits.

Biology 515. ANIMAL DEVELOPMENT. (Prerequisites: Biology 101-102). This course represents a descriptive and an experimental approach to animal development. Classical topics such as fertilization, cleavage, gastrulation, and organogenesis will be discussed in detail; emphasis will be placed on developmental mechanisms which regulate these processes. Other topics such as morphosis and regeneration will also be discussed. Three lectures and three laboratory hours a week. Four Credits.

## REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SALARY DISCRIMINATION

Carol Carlisle  
Garrett Mandevielle  
Edward Mercer, Chairperson  
Lois Widing  
Margaret Young

### Abstract

All persons with faculty appointments at the University were included in this study, except those who held administrative positions of Vice-Provost and higher. In September, 1972, the gross average monthly salary of women was \$1284 and that of men \$1658, for a difference of \$374. Statistical analysis of the salaries reveal that a portion of this difference is related to factors other than the sex of the faculty member. However, after allowance is made for rank, educational level, school or college, years of experience and years of service to the University, women still receive an average monthly salary which is \$118 less than their male counterparts. This difference amounts to \$1062 for a nine month appointment.

A second fact revealed by this study is a general under-representation of women on the faculty. For those schools in which most faculty possess the doctorate, only 5% of the faculty with doctorates are women. Using the number of doctorates earned nationally in the period 1960-1969 as a critereon 12.1% of this faculty would be expected to be women. In two schools, LCD-Arts and Letters and LCD-Behavioral and Social Sciences the under-representation was statistically significant at the 1% level.

The Committee makes the following recommendations to the Affirmative Action Office:

1. A review of the salaries of all women faculty and action to correct any inequalities revealed.
2. Aid the departments and colleges in the recruitment of well-qualified women for faculty and administrative positions.
3. Prepare a comprehensive report to the Faculty Senate on the Status of Women at the University, dealing with all aspects of the University community--students, faculty, and staff.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Salary Discrimination was established by the Faculty Senate in the spring of 1972. Its purpose was to investigate the salaries of regular faculty members on the Columbia campus of the University of South Carolina, with reference to the possibility of sex-based discrimination in salary practices.

It was decided by the committee that salaries for 1972-73 rather than for 1971-72 would be used as a basis for the study. There were several reasons for this decision. First, during the summer several committee members were unavailable. The initial information obtained on 1971-72 salaries contained a number of errors. In addition, the data analysis was delayed because new computers were being installed. Finally, since the University was in the process of being reorganized, it was thought that the 1972-73 salary data would be more representative of the current status of faculty salaries.

In determining procedure, the committee decided to model its approach after a study of sex discrimination in faculty salaries that had been done at Indiana University in 1968. As in the Indiana study, five independent variables were selected: type of appointment (i.e., faculty, or faculty-administrative), rank, school or college, level of education (measured by the highest academic degree held), and professional "experience" (measured by length of time an individual has taught at U.S.C. and the length of time since this person completed his or her highest degree). It is evident that these data do not cover all the factors which help determine a person's qualifications for teaching and research; specifically, no account is taken of professional "productivity" or the quality of an individual's professional performance. Data which might serve as a measure of these factors were not easily available in the personnel files and the time required to devise suitable measures was not available to the committee members. However, the committee felt that the available data were sufficiently comprehensive to warrant analysis and that the resulting report would have the advantage of being comparable to other studies.

The necessary information for this study was provided by the Personnel Office and included school, rank, other titles held by the individual, salary, salary basis (i.e., 9, 10.5, 11 or 12 month appointment), sex, level of education, year the highest degree was awarded, and date of employment by the University. The final sample included all full-time employees of the University who



hold a regular academic rank, except for members of the administration at the Vice-Provost level and above. A total of 759 individuals are included.

Two of the variables used need some explanation. First an appointment was considered to be Faculty-Administration if a second designation other than academic rank was provided in the personnel records. Examples of such designations are Directors, Assistant Vice-Provost, Head, Dean, Acting Dean, Assistant Dean, etc. For the Education Level variable, the LLB or JD and Master of Social Work were designated as Advanced Professional Degrees. It was felt that the requirements of the MSW were sufficiently different from the MA/MS, to be placed in a different category. Other masters degrees were grouped in a second category and all other doctorates in a third category. Because salaries of faculty are based on appointments of different duration they were all converted to a monthly figure. For 9, 11 and 12 month appointments this was done in a straightforward manner. Since 10.5 month appointments are supposed to be equivalent to a 9-month academic year and one summer session, the salaries for these appointments were assumed to be equivalent to 115% of a nine-month salary.

Table I shows the distribution of the "faculty" at U.S.C. by sex and the several criteria used in this study. A similar table where percentages are computed based on the total for the category may be found in Appendix A.

In September 1972, the average gross monthly salary of men was \$1657.94 and that of women was \$1283.84, for a difference of \$374.10. However, there are many factors which affect salary such as rank, education, and experience. Examination of Table I shows that a larger fraction of the women hold lower paying positions than men (e.g., 71.1% of the women have rank of Assistant Professor or below, while only 49.7% of the men are in this category). Thus, at least a portion of the salary differential is related to sex differences on these other variables. In an attempt to make adjustments for these differences a regression analysis was performed using salary as the dependent variable. The independent variables were those discussed above.

Since most of the independent variables used in this study were categorical in nature, indicator variables were used to indicate category membership. For each variable then, one category was selected as the base category and the indicatory variable for that category was excluded from the regression equation.

TABLE 1

Frequency Distribution of the USC Faculty  
By Sex, Appointment, Rank, Educational Level, School or College, and Experience  
September, 1972

	Men		Women		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Rank	641	84.5	118	15.5	759	100.0
Full/Dist. Prof.	160	25.0	12	10.2	172	22.7
Assoc. Prof.	162	25.3	22	18.6	184	24.2
Asst. Prof.	249	38.8	43	36.4	292	38.5
Instr./Lecture	70	10.9	41	34.7	111	14.6
		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>
Administration						
Teaching Only	570	88.9	113	95.8	683	90.9
Teaching and Adm.	71	11.1	5	4.2	76	10.0
		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>
Highest Acad. Degree						
Doctorate	456	71.1	30	25.4	486	64.0
Masters	137	21.4	77	65.3	214	28.2
Bachelors	14	2.2	8	6.8	22	2.9
Adv. Prof. Deg.	34	5.3	3	2.5	37	4.9
		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>
Yrs. Since High Degree						
1	30	4.7	12	10.2	42	5.5
2	59	9.2	13	11.0	72	9.5
3	52	8.1	9	7.6	61	8.0
4	43	6.7	77	5.9	50	6.6
5	55	8.6	10	8.5	65	8.6
6 - 10 yrs.	168	26.2	24	20.3	192	25.3
11 - 15 yrs.	96	15.0	15	12.7	111	14.6
16 - 20 yrs.	63	9.8	11	9.3	74	9.7
21 - 25 yrs.	49	7.6	9	7.6	58	7.6
26 or more years.	26	4.1	8	6.8	34	4.5
		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>
Yrs. at U.S.C.						
1	95	14.8	30	25.4	125	16.5
2	89	13.9	22	18.6	111	14.6
3	81	12.6	14	11.9	95	12.5
4	70	10.9	5	4.2	75	9.9
5	38	5.9	7	5.9	45	5.9
6 - 10 yrs.	150	23.4	17	14.4	167	22.0
11 - 15 yrs.	50	7.8	9	7.6	59	7.8
16 - 20 yrs.	27	4.2	5	4.2	32	4.2
21 - 25 yrs.	16	2.5	1	0.8	17	2.2
26 or more years	25	3.9	8	6.8	33	4.3
		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>

College or School	Men		Women		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
LCD Arts and Letters	137	21.4	26	22.0	163	21.5
LCD Sci. and Math	103	16.1	8	6.8	111	14.6
LCD Social and Behs.	112	17.5	4	3.4	116	15.3
LCD Gen. Studies.	19	3.0	20	16.9	39	5.1
Business Admin.	83	12.9	2	1.7	85	11.2
Educ. and P.E.	80	12.5	22	18.6	102	13.4
Engineering	35	5.5	0	0.0	35	4.6
Journalism	15	2.3	0	0.0	15	2.0
Librarianship	5	0.8	5	4.2	10	1.3
School of Law	28	4.4	0	0.0	28	3.7
School of Soc. Work	13	2.0	3	2.5	16	2.1
Nursing	0	0.0	28	23.7	28	3.7
Pharmacy	11	1.7	0	0.0	11	1.4
		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>

The resulting partial regression coefficients represent adjusted average monthly salary differences between faculty in the category in question and the base category. The term "adjusted" used here is introduced to point out to the reader that in multiple linear regression a partial regression coefficient may be viewed as the effect of one independent variable while the other independent variables have been held constant. The variables representing years since highest degree and years of service were included into the equation as quantitative variables, but, since curvilinear relationships between salary and these variables were considered a possibility, second degree terms were also included. This method of analysis was selected because it allows all of the independent variables to be considered simultaneously and has proved to be adequate in previous studies of a similar nature.<sup>1,2</sup> The regression was repeated using a log salary model. In this model the differentials in salary are expressed as percentages. The fit obtained using the two models was very similar and the percent of variability in salaries which was predictable only increased by 1.6% (from 81.9% to 83.5%) when the log salary model was used. The regression coefficients obtained using both models are presented in Table II.

In the actual salary model, the coefficient for the female category was -\$118 per month which is significant at the 0.01 level. This may be interpreted to mean that women faculty members earn on the average \$118 less than male faculty members, after differences on the other variables in the study have been accounted for. A woman equivalent to a man in terms of all other variables included in this regression analysis earns about \$118 per month less than a man, or \$1062 less than a man for the usual nine month appointment.

In the log salary analysis the regression coefficient for the female was -0.040, suggesting salaries lower than men's by 4.0%, on the basis of their sex alone. A woman can expect to earn about 4% less than a man with the same type of appointment, rank, experience, and education, and in the same school or college.

So far the discussion has assumed women are equivalent to men in terms of the variables included in the regression equations, or that their characteristics are typical of the population. This assumes that females are proportioned

Table II

759 South Carolina Faculty  
Partial Regression Coefficients

## Actual Salary Model

## Log. Salary Model

Variable Set	Category	Coefficient	STD Error	Significance	Coefficient	STD Error	Significance
Appointment	Faculty	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Joint	\$ 68	24	.01	.018	.006	.01
Rank	Lect/Inst.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Asst. Prof.	219	25	.01	.082	.006	.01
	Assoc. Prof.	449	31	.01	.148	.008	.01
	Full Prof.	901	39	.01	.247	.010	.01
Sex	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-116	23	.01	-.040	.006	.01
Ed. Level	BA/BS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MA/MS	81	42	NS	.021	.011	NS
	Ph.D.	142	46	.01	.040	.012	.01
	Adv. Prof.	-53	76	NS	-.001	.020	NS
School/Coll.	LCD Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-
	LCD Math	65	23	.05	.018	.006	.01
	LCD Beh	75	23	.01	.025	.006	.01
	LCD Gen	-77	35	.05	-.029	.009	.01
	Bus. Adm.	336	25	.01	.090	.006	.01
	Educ. PE	44	24	.05	.017	.006	.01
	Engineer	229	35	.01	.059	.009	.01
	Journal	117	51	.05	.042	.013	.01
	Librarianship	289	62	.01	.088	.016	.01
	Law	461	71	.01	.111	.018	.01
	Soc. Work	155	64	.05	.041	.016	.05
	Nursing	116	44	.01	.050	.011	.01
	Pharmacy	64	59	NS	.026	.015	NS
Yrs. High		13.72	3.30	.01	.00312	.00084	.01
(Yrs. High) <sup>2</sup>		-.21	.080	.01	-.00005	.00002	.01
Yrs. USC		-12.20	3.56	.01	-.00286	.00091	.01
(Yrs. USC) <sup>2</sup>		.02	.11	NS	.00001	.00003	NS
Constant		\$978					
R <sup>2</sup>		.819			.835		

among the ranks, schools, education, etc. in the same manner as the faculty as a whole. This is, in fact, not true. In reality the fraction of women is greater than that for men in those categories associated with lower pay. This is shown in Table III, which presents the partial regression coefficients for categories and the percent of men and women in that category. The largest single factor in determining salary is rank, and here there are significantly more women in the lecturer/instructor category and significantly fewer women in the full professor rank category.

Related to this we observe a similar pattern for the education variable, there being significantly more women than men in the bachelor's and master's degree categories and fewer in the doctorate category. There are also proportionately more men who hold appointments requiring some administrative work so that the \$68 differential related to the faculty-administrative variable is working to the disadvantage of women faculty. A look at the Schools and Colleges in which both sexes are represented indicates proportionately more females in LCD-General Studies, the only college with a negative coefficient and, therefore, the only college with an adjusted monthly salary less than LCD Arts and Letters. There are proportionately more male faculty in the other two colleges of LCD, i.e., Science and Math and Social and Behavioral Sciences, both of which have modest but significant positive coefficients. In addition to the College of Nursing, which has an all-female faculty, there are proportionately more females than males in the School of Librarianship.

Looking at the quantitative variables of years since degree and years of service, the coefficients in Table II indicate that the former is positively related to salary, whereas the latter is negatively related. The significant negative coefficient for the square of the years since degree variable indicates that the relationship flattens out somewhat as this variable increases. Chi square analysis of the frequency distributions for these two variables presented in Table I indicate that there are no sex differences for years since degree but that sex differences are significant at the 5% level for years of service at U.S.C. Further analysis indicated that there were proportionately more females than males in their first year of service and proportionately fewer females in the 6 - 10 years of service category.

Table III

## Partial Regression Coefficients and Representation of Men and Women by Category

Variable Set	Category	%Women	%Men	If significant, Difference Favors	Partial Regression Coefficient
Appointment	Fac/Adm.	4.2	11.1	Men (.05)	\$ 68
Education	BA/BS	6.8	2.2	Women (.05)	
	Adv. Prof.	2.5	5.3	NS	-\$ 53
	MA/MS	65.3	21.4	Women (.01)	\$ 81
	Ph.D.	25.4	71.1	Men (.01)	\$148
Rank	Instr/Lect.	34.7	10.9	Women (.01)	----
	Asst. Prof.	36.4	38.8	NS	\$219
	Assoc. Prof.	18.5	25.3	NS	\$449
	Prof/Dist Prof.	10.2	25.0	Men	\$901
School	LCD-General	16.8	3.0	Women (.01)	-\$ 77
	LCD-Arts	22.0	21.4	NS	----
	Education/PE	18.6	12.5	NS	\$ 44
	Pharmacy	0.0	1.7	--	\$ 64
	LCD-Science	6.8	16.1	Men (.01)	\$ 65
	LCD-Social	3.4	17.5	Men (.01)	\$ 75
	Journalism	0.0	2.3	--	\$117
	Nursing	23.5	0.0	--	\$116
	Social Work	2.5	2.0	NS	\$155
	Engineering	0.0	5.5	--	\$229
	Library Science	4.2	0.8	Women (.01)	\$289
	Business	1.7	12.9	Men (.01)	\$336
	Law	0.0	4.4	---	\$461

The possibility that the under-representation of women in some of the higher paid schools simply reflects a lack of suitable candidates in those areas was tested by reference to the percentages of doctorates earned in each field by women in the period 1960-69. (This information was taken from a report by WEAL.)<sup>3</sup> Since 85.9% of the University faculty has been hired since 1960, it seems reasonable to say that the doctorates earned by women in this period would be a measure of the women qualified for faculty appointments. On this assumption, Table IV was compiled, which presents for comparison the following items: (a) the percentage of doctorates earned by women in the United States in 1960-69 in the discipline or disciplines represented in a given school (or college) of the University, (b) the percentage of the faculty with doctorates in that school of the University who are women, and (c) the percentage of all faculty members in that school who are women. Item (a) is indicative of the women available for faculty positions in the given area of study. In computing item (a) for this table when a school or college included more than one discipline, the available women doctorates were distributed in proportion to the doctoral faculty in the departments within that entity. A statistical comparison of these figures shows that the under-representation of females in LCD--Arts and Letters and LCD--Social and Behavioral Sciences is significant at the 0.01 level. However, in the data for the other schools and colleges which were compared -- including such relatively high-paying ones as Business, Engineering, Journalism, and Law -- the differences were not statistically significant. Thus a shortage of properly trained candidates in the higher paying schools is indeed a major factor in accounting for the exceptionally small numbers of women in those areas of the University faculty. While the under-representation of women is most obvious and serious in LCD-Arts and Letters and LCD-Social and Behavioral, in every school the fraction of women faculty with doctorates is below that expected on the basis of degrees awarded nationally.

Analysis: Men vs. Women

The regression analysis for the entire faculty indicates the general order of magnitude of difference between men's and women's salaries not attributable to the variables considered, other than sex. This analysis does not say how women's salaries are affected by these other variables as opposed to men's. For



TABLE IV

Women Doctorates on the Faculty at U.S.C. Compared with  
Doctorates Earned Nationally

<u>School</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>Percent of Doctorates Earned Nationally By Women (1960-1969)</u>	<u>Women Doctorates on Faculty % (Female/Total)</u>	<u>% Women Faculty</u>
LCD-Arts	22.9	10.9 (11/101)	16.0
LCD-Science	7.1	2.8 (3/106)	7.2
LCD-Social	12.8	0.0 (0/93)	3.4
Business	2.8	1.7 (1/59)	2.4
Education/PE	19.8	15.2 (10/66)	22.3
Engineering	0.4	0.0 (0/28)	0.0
Journalism	12.1	0.0 (0/8)	0.0
Law	4.7 <sup>b</sup>	---	---
Pharmacy	4.3	0.0 (0/9)	0.0
TOTAL	12.1	5.0 (25/469)	9.3 ,

<sup>a</sup>Schools and colleges omitted were: LCD-General, Librarianship, Nursing and Social Work. In these either the area was not sufficiently defined to calculate a percentage, or few of the faculty hold the Ph.D. degree.

<sup>b</sup>This figure for the Law Schools reflects the LLB or J.D. degree rather than the Ph.D.

example, while the analysis indicates Associate Professors earn, on the average, \$448 more than Lecturers and Instructors, it does not show whether this is true for men and women considered separately. Are the gains for promotion, duties, etc., equal for men and women?

In seeking to answer these questions, the regression analysis was repeated for men and women separately. Difficulty with this analysis arose because the female sample is quite small, and many of the resulting coefficients, although numerically similar to those for the male faculty, are not statistically significant.

#### I. Type of appointment

Men with both faculty and administrative appointments earned \$68 per month more than those without a joint appointment, while the regression for the female indicated a loss of \$41 (-1.7%). However, possibly due to the small sample size the latter figure is not statistically significant nor is there significance in the difference of the two coefficients.

#### II. Rank

The percentage gains by men and women for Assistant and Associate Professors relative to Instructors were essentially the same (8.0% and 14.5%) while for Full Professors women gained 23.9% to only 14.5% for men.

When these percent differences are converted to absolute dollar differences, however, the fact that the bases are different for the two sexes causes the adjusted increments for Full Professor to be \$801 for females and \$906 for male faculty. Although not statistically significant, this difference is surely worthy of note.

#### III. Education

A study of the gains associated with possessing degrees higher than a bachelor's indicated that women received \$25 (0.5%) and \$114 (4.0%) for a Master's and doctorate, respectively, while the corresponding gains for men were \$62 (1.5%) and \$127 (3.4%).

Of these figures only the increment for a male possessing the doctorate was significant. Therefore, a master's degree is not a particularly useful degree for a faculty member from a salary standpoint. The coefficient for the advanced professional degree for males was negative (-\$74) but not significant. This surprising negative value can be explained by the fact that most such degrees were held by law faculty and the large positive coefficient associated with the law school more than compensates for this. When a regression was run introducing

education level into the equation before the College/School variable set, this coefficient was positive. It was not possible to treat the advanced professional degree for women, since all females in this category were also in the School of Social Work, resulting in a linear dependency. The small sample size and correspondingly low power may account for the non-significance of the results for the females. Based on the data, holding the doctorate degree is important for male faculty members whereas no such statement can be made for females. However, it seems likely that this lack of significance is a result of the small number of women.

#### IV. School or College

The partial regression coefficients for this category, relative to LCD-Arts and Letters are given in Table V.

For females the only schools or colleges for which the data clearly indicate higher adjusted salaries than LCD-Arts and Letters are the professional schools of Business, Librarianship, and Nursing. Again lack of significance of some of the other coefficients (such as LCD-Social and Behavioral Sciences) may be due to the small number of females in the category. For the large male sample, however, all coefficients (except the one for Pharmacy) are significantly different from zero and indicate positive or negative adjusted salary differentials. When statistical tests were made to compare corresponding coefficients for males and females, no significant differences were discovered. That is to say, even the largest difference of \$99 favoring males in LCD Science and Math may not be adjudged as significant. This may, in part, be explained by the large standard errors associated with the female coefficients, again related to the small sample sizes, but nevertheless no inferences about the differences are possible. The figures at the bottom of the table were obtained by "predicting" the salary for each faculty member using all other factors (properly weighted) except college. The large differential in the base reference for men and women of nearly \$300 means that women in all schools and colleges receive lower average pay when the other variables considered are included.

#### V. Experience

In the analysis two variables were used to measure experience, years at U.S.C., and years since receiving the highest degree obtained. For the entire sample, longer service at U.S.C. was associated with lower salaries, while the

Table V

## Salary Differential for Schools Relative to LCD-Arts and Letters by Sex

School/College	Men		Women	
	Am't	%	Am't	%
LCD-Science	71**	2.2	-28	-1.7
LCD-Social	77**	2.6	99	4.1
LCD-General	-134**	4.8	-45	-1.5
Business	341**	9.2	309**	9.1
Education/PE	64*	2.4	-8	-0.5
Engineering	233**	6.1	---	---
Journalism	116**	4.2	---	---
Library Science	279**	8.4	366**	11.1
Law	469**	11.5	---	---
Social Work	153**	4.3	114	4.4
Nursing	---	---	150**	5.8
Pharmacy	82	3.1	---	---
<hr/>				
Ave. Salary for LCD-Arts & Letters with other variables distributed in same proportion as entire population	\$1531		\$1233	

One asterisk indicates the difference is significant at .05 level.

Two asterisks indicates the difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

All other figures are not significant.

number of years since the highest degree had been obtained was positively related to the salary. In the separate analysis by sex, similar results were found for the male population. For each year which had passed since obtaining his highest degree the male faculty member received an average monthly salary increase of \$15.50. There was a significant quadratic term which slightly decreased the effect of this linear coefficient for increasing years since highest degree. Thus the average increases for having their degrees for 5, 10 and 20 years were \$72, \$132 and \$218 respectively. The years of service at U.S.C. produced a coefficient of -\$11.90 in monthly salary per year and the relationship did not deviate significantly from linearity. In the case of females the linear coefficients obtained were +\$3.50 and -\$3.62 per year, but in neither case were these coefficients statistically significant. The female coefficient for years since highest degree is significantly less than the male coefficient at the 5% level. Based on these criteria a male faculty member's experience and service is related to his salary, while a similar statement cannot safely be made concerning his female colleagues.

#### Discussion

The statistical analysis performed as a part of this study reveals several facts about the salary structure of faculty at U.S.C. A discussion of anything which was not directly related to sex differences was avoided by the committee, because of the very limited scope of the charge given. A broader analysis of these or similar data may be of interest and warranted in the future.

The scope of this study was limited by the kind of information readily available from the Personnel Office. Therefore, we did not include certain variables which could be relevant to salary discrimination: length of time in rank, teaching effectiveness, and professional productivity. We did not consider whether or not marital status affected salaries, nor did we look at the salaries of men and women with academic credentials who hold part-time or non-faculty positions.

However, in examining recent studies done at other major state universities, we found that where these variables had been included, the results tended to support the conclusion that there exists a general pattern of discrimination against women faculty members. In a 1970 study of women faculty at Indiana

University,<sup>4</sup> there was an attempt to "match" men and women at the same rank and in the same department, whose professional qualifications (including research and teaching) were most nearly the same. Only those cases which the Dean of Faculties Office agreed were acceptable matches were used in the study. In twenty out of twenty-five matches that were examined, the salary differential favored men. The Indiana report states: "These results implied that, for at least the matched cases, the salary differentials could not reasonably be attributed to the legitimate areas of teaching, research or service."<sup>5</sup> In addition, to counteract the frequent charge that women scholars are less productive than men, the University of Pennsylvania report cites a study of women who received their doctorates between 1958 and 1963, which found no difference in productivity between men and women,<sup>6</sup> measured by the criterion of publication.

In looking into the effect of marital status, the Indiana report found that married faculty women are paid less than single faculty women, and that women with faculty spouses were paid less than those with non-faculty spouses. The marital status had no significant effect on the salaries of men.<sup>7</sup>

Numerous studies of the status of faculty women at major state universities across the country have revealed a general pattern of discrimination against women. The abstract from the Report on Women at the University of Delaware is one example of such a finding:

This study found the status of faculty women to be similar to that in other college studies: women are a small percentage of the faculty, are clustered in the lower ranks, are not tenured, are victims of nepotism rules, receive lower pay than men and have less chance than men for promotion. The administration of the University is, like the faculty, dominated by men.<sup>8</sup>

The University of Pennsylvania report also notes that "women are less visible in other aspects of the academic community, such as invited speakers, artists in residence, honorary degrees awarded, committee membership and University Senate membership."<sup>9</sup>

The University of South Carolina study, less comprehensive than most current studies of faculty women, deals primarily with sex-based discrimination in faculty salaries. A comparison of this study with the 1968 study of

Indiana University shows a remarkable similarity. The regression coefficient for females was very similar in both studies: -\$118 per month at U.S.C. compared to -\$98 per month at Indiana. When allowance is made for inflation, these figures are essentially the same.

Our study showed that of the \$374 per month average salary difference between men and women, \$118 per month is not accounted for by the other independent variables used. The analysis of women and men separately resulted in no statistically significant differences in the partial regression coefficients by categories. As pointed out earlier, in many cases this could be attributed to the small numbers of women involved in the study. Apparently, when the differential of \$118 per month is broken down into several categories, the partial differences become too small to be statistically significant. Of the other variables included in the study, no one of them is of major importance in accounting for the average salary difference between men and women. Nevertheless, the total difference is real and significant.

Other data showed that women are a small percentage of the faculty, are clustered in the lower ranks, and are rarely appointed to administrative positions. Average salaries for women in all ranks are lower than those of men. While women may make higher percentage gains in salary upon promotion, they never catch up with their male colleagues. It was also found that there were fewer women with doctorates on the faculty at U.S.C. than would be expected on the basis of doctorates granted to women nationally. These data suggest that there may have been discrimination in the areas of salary and hiring.

Based on these findings the Committee recommends that the University recognize its obligation to improve the status of women in our society, and begin by committing itself to a program which aims at admitting women to equal status as employees and as students. To develop this program the Committee recommends the following steps:

1. Through its Affirmative Action Office, the University should carefully and critically review salaries of women faculty members and take immediate action to correct any inequities.
2. The Affirmative Action Office should encourage and aid the departments and colleges in recruitment of well-qualified women for both faculty and administrative posts. Departments should aim for female representation in their

department at least equal to the national percentage of women who receive doctorates in that discipline.

3. Since the present study, although limited in scope, has suggested some discrimination against women in regard to salary and hiring practices, the Affirmative Action Office should undertake a more comprehensive study of the status of women on campus, including faculty, staff, and students. The following areas should be examined:

- salaries, rank, appointment, and tenure among women faculty (including part-time faculty).

- salaries and job classifications of women staff (including women with academic credentials who hold non-faculty positions).

- all major job classifications (including administrative posts) for adequate representation of women.

- all selection systems (including admissions, promotion criteria, recruitment and hiring, committee appointments) for disparate selection rates of women.

- criteria for scholarships, assistantships and financial aid to women.

- University programs, such as the athletic programs, for possible disparate division of funds.

- academic programs and courses concerning women.

- the selection of speakers, visiting artists and visiting professors, and honorary degree recipients for adequacy of consideration given to women.

- the maternity leave policy for faculty and staff.

- child care services.

- health services available to women.

- counseling and job placement services offered to women.

- the possibility of creating a women's center which would include a vocational counseling program and would develop through cooperation with local industry new employment opportunities and training for women.

The Committee recommends that this report be completed by December, 1973.



# Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> S. Berry and M. Erenburg, "Earnings of Professional Women at Indiana University." Mimeographed paper, 1968.

<sup>2</sup> Emanuel Melichar, "Factors Affecting 1966 Basic Salaries in the National Register Professions," American Economic Review, vol. LVIII, No. 5, part 2, Supplement, December, 1968.

<sup>3</sup> Women's Equity Action League, "Proportion of Doctorates Earned by Women, By Area and Field, 1960-69," distributed by The Project on the Status & Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1971.

<sup>4</sup> Study of the Status of Women Faculty at Indiana University, Bloomington Campus, Educational Resources Information Center, Washington, D.C., 1971.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>6</sup> Simon, Clark and Galway, "The Woman Ph.D.: A Recent Profile," Social Problems, 15 (Fall, 1967), 221-236. Cited in Women Faculty in the University of Pennsylvania, ERIC, 1971, pp. 9-10.

<sup>7</sup> Op. cit., pp. 43-45.

<sup>8</sup> K. H. Dahl, ERIC, 1971.

<sup>9</sup> Women Faculty in the University of Pennsylvania, ERIC, 1971.

# APPENDIX A

## Frequency Distribution of the USC Faculty By Sex, Appointment, Rank, Education Level, School or College, and Experience with Percents Computed on Basis of Total for the Category September, 1972

	Men		Women		Total No.
	No.	%	No.	%	
Rank	641	84.5	118	15.5	759
Full/Dist. Prof.	160	93.0	12	7.0	172
Assoc. Prof.	162	88.0	22	12.0	184
Asst. Prof.	249	85.3	43	14.7	292
Instr./Lecture	70	<u>63.1</u>	41	<u>36.9</u>	111
Administration					
Teaching Only	570	83.5	113	16.5	683
Teaching and Adm.	71	<u>93.4</u>	5	<u>6.6</u>	76
Highest Acad. Degree					
Doctorate	456	93.8	30	6.2	486
Masters	137	64.0	77	36.0	214
Bachelors	14	63.6	8	36.4	22
Adv. Prof. Deg.	34	<u>91.9</u>	3	<u>8.1</u>	37
Yrs. Since High Degree					
1	30	71.4	12	28.6	42
2	59	81.9	13	18.1	72
3	52	85.2	9	14.8	61
4	43	86.0	7	14.0	50
5	55	84.6	10	15.4	65
6 - 10 yrs.	168	87.5	24	12.5	192
11 - 15 yrs.	96	86.5	15	13.5	111
16 - 20 yrs.	63	85.1	11	14.9	74
21 - 25 yrs.	49	84.5	9	15.5	58
26 or more yrs.	26	<u>76.5</u>	8	<u>23.5</u>	34
Yrs. at U.S.C.					
1	95	76.0	30	24.0	125
2	89	80.2	22	19.8	111
3	81	85.3	14	14.7	95
4	70	93.3	5	6.7	75
5	38	84.4	7	15.6	45
6 - 10 yrs.	150	89.8	17	10.2	167
11 - 15 yrs.	50	84.7	9	15.3	59
16 - 20 yrs.	27	84.4	5	15.6	32
21 - 25 yrs.	16	94.1	1	5.9	17
26 or more yrs.	25	<u>75.8</u>	8	<u>24.2</u>	33

College or School	Men		Women		Total No.
	No.	%	No.	%	
LCD Arts and Letters	137	84.0	26	16.0	163
LCD Sci. and Math	103	92.8	8	7.2	111
LCD Social and Behs.	112	96.6	4	3.4	116
LCD Gen. Studies	19	48.7	20	51.3	39
Business Admin.	83	97.6	2	2.4	85
Educ. and P.E.	80	78.4	22	21.6	102
Engineering	35	100.0	0	0.0	35
Journalism	15	100.0	0	0.0	15
Librarianship	5	50.0	5	50.0	10
School of Law	28	100.0	0	0.0	28
School of Soc. Work	13	81.3	3	18.8	16
Nursing	0	0.0	28	100.0	28
Pharmacy	11	100.0	0	0.0	11