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“From Protest to Policy: Women’s Social Movement Activities in Los Angeles, 1960-1999,” a multi-year research project by the UCLA Center for the Study of Women examined the how grassroots advocacy has shaped gender-related public policy in the arts, employment, healthcare, and higher education through an analysis of local women’s groups in Los Angeles between 1960 and 1999. During this period, women’s community groups organized around gender-based problems their members encountered in their lives, their families, and their neighborhoods. The following annotated bibliography represents the key sources referenced while researching the development of Women’s Studies programs at Colleges and Universities in and around the Los Angeles area. The sources within this bibliography range from primary documents such as newspaper articles and oral histories, texts that represent the theoretical foundation for Women’s Studies as a discipline, to articles from the academics pioneering Women’s Studies programs in California’s higher education institutions.


The authors suggest that the end of racial affirmative action at the University of California will have the biggest impact for African Americans at the UC’s five medical schools, as African-Americans were more likely than members of other ethnic minorities to be accepted there. The report also compares the mean GPAs and MCAT scores of admitted White or Asian vs. non-Asian minority students. The authors conclude that the UC Regents’ decision was largely motivated by governor Pete Wilson’s political aspirations, and that it will have a negative effect on the number of Black doctors in California.


This Los Angeles Times article recounts a first amendment controversy over the attempt to ban sales of pornographic magazines at the California State University Northridge student store. Jill Schultz and student government president Zeke Zeidler lead the charge to prohibit the sale of pornographic magazines on the charge that these kind of magazines glorified violence against women. The article discusses how this type of controversy seemed to be gaining momentum around the state and country with other acts of protest regarding the sale of pornographic magazines, especially on college campuses or to college students. California State University Long Beach had recently removed the same magazines “without any fuss” as a business decision. Jerilyn Stapleton, a Cal State LA student and LA chapter representative on the California board of NOW, said she would
pursue a ban on that campus after the first of the year (Jan, 1985). Christine Littleton (then at UCLA law school) is quoted on the legal aspects of banning pornography that discriminates against women as a strategy to reduce gender-based violence and Burton Joseph (special counsel and attorney for Playboy) argues that the case is a First Amendment issue and similar attempts to ban pornography had failed.


This article discusses the controversial decision to appoint Angela Davis’ to the President’s chair by University of California, Santa Cruz. Various state legislators demanded her award be rescinded; however UCSC President Jack Petalson refused.


This article discusses the protest efforts of four women, affiliated with evangelical churches, who are campaigning around ‘morality’ issues to challenge the content of women’s studies courses at California State University Long Beach. One of these women, Jessica Shaver, met with Dean Simeon J. Crowther to request a review of the “women and their bodies” course curriculum - particularly the recommended course material Sapphistry: The Book on Lesbian Sexuality for its “lesbian lovemaking” illustrations. She followed up with a letter urging the inclusion of marriage and family in classes and recommended a conservative professor. At that time, Sondra Hale, director of the Women’s Studies program agreed to the review under protest. Meanwhile, other faculty in the Department saw this protest as a challenge to their academic freedom and decided to rally the support of the community by organizing a ‘Right to Teach, Right to Learn’ talk on campus and started a letter writing campaign to state legislators. Shaver contacted three republican state legislators who became involved and asked that the curriculum be reviewed. Barry Singer’s “psychology of sex” class has also been sat in on and letters of complaint received.


This article is a quick overview assessing the percentage of women faculty at both universities and colleges using survey data collected in 1976-1977 from 61% of the co-educational colleges/universities that are members of the AAUW. The findings of this survey concluded that the larger the surrounding community’s population, the greater the odds that a faculty member was female, but the enrollment of the institution itself had the opposite effect; for universities (but not for colleges), federal money was positively correlated with Women’s Studies programs and childcare/childleave policies; for universities (but not for colleges), federal funding and prestige were highly correlated with each other, but negatively correlated with the percentage of faculty in 1979 who are women; for both universities and colleges the percentage of female deans positively
effected the odds that a faculty member is a woman; smaller colleges were more likely to hire and retain women as faculty and as deans; at a large university, the larger the student body and the larger the percentage of female deans, the greater the odds that a faculty member is female; the more an institution was engaged in partner hiring, the greater the chances that a faculty member was a woman; for colleges, female-related policies (partner hiring, childcare, Women’s Studies programs) did not affect female faculty employment; and with the exception of partner hiring policies at large research universities, policy factors (as opposed to environmental factors) have “inconsistent or small effects” on faculty sex composition (197).


Berger Gluck examines the struggle to maintain feminist practices of collectivity throughout the existence of the Women’s Studies program at California State University Long Beach. Gluck describes the collective process of developing the Women’s Studies Program at CSLUB with faculty, students, and community members in the early 1970’s. She then goes on to describe the trajectory of the program throughout the 1970’s and early 1980’s from the collective, non-hierarchical structure in the beginning to the University’s decision to hire Sondra Hale to help “regularize” the program, ending with the attacks of the program by Christian fundamentalists within the community.


This article speculates on the reasons Black women outnumber Black men in the amount of PhDs awarded to African Americans. The article cites that in 1995, Black women earned 62.5 percent of all PhDs awarded to African Americans and the gap between Black women and Black men in doctoral degree attainment has continuously widened since about 1987. The (unidentified) authors surmise that the problem for Black men may come from a lack of Black male role models at home and in schools, lack of discipline in single-mother-headed households, peers’ attitudes that studying is “acting white,” and the pressures of drugs and crime. The authors also argue that affirmative action may have made an academic career enticing for Black men in the mid-1970s compared to other field that were still very closed to them, but the waning of university commitments to diversity and the opening of other professions may have contributed to the large drop in PhDs earned by Black men. The authors note in the final sentence that racism is still an issue, though it has become “unfashionable” to discuss it.


The authors of this study concluded that the educational attainment of Los Angeles women in 1975 is directly affected by the respondent's age, her sexual behavior in 1973, and her educational aspirations in 1973. The strongest indirect effects are: the mother's educational level as mediated primarily through the respondent's sexual behavior, the mother's educational aspirations and ethnicity as mediated through high school
curriculum, and the father's education, religious affiliation, and high school curriculum as mediated through the young woman's own educational aspirations. Consistent with other studies, there is a strong relationship between the mother's educational attainment, her aspirations for her daughter and the daughter's own aspirations, and the daughter's reported sexual activity, child-bearing, and marriage are important determinants of later educational attainment (Marini 1978; Rosen & Aneshensel 1978).

The authors of this study initially hypothesized that “liberal” Los Angeles in the midst of the 1970s—a period of substantial social change—might result in women having higher college aspirations and attainment that were not affected by the usual structural barriers. Instead, they found this did not turn out to be the case. Though L.A. women’s paths to attainment looks slightly more like men’s than like women’s in other areas, it was still more influenced by factors related to the family of origin than by peers or social changes. However, the authors state that it is possible social changes influenced all girls to have higher educational aspirations but remaining within the same order of rank (ie, poorer girls wanting less education than wealthier girls). The authors were surprised to find the behavior of respondents so traditional. The girls stated that their mothers were their primary confidants and they appeared to use their mothers as their primary role models in formulating their self-image.


This study found that although gaps in rates of higher education participation by gender narrowed considerably between 1965 and 1990, the degree of gender differentiation by field remained largely the same. Even across countries the patterns were very similar, with little difference between industrialized and developing countries. This finding echoes those of studies of occupational differentiation by gender. Although women now participate more in the workforce and both women and men consider economic returns, social rewards, and flexibility to attend to family, these factors may have different priorities for women as compared to men. These sorts of choices, including the kinds of life chances and rewards of educational decisions, are locally embedded. The study suggests that efforts to decrease barriers to individual choice in schooling (as opposed to universal mandated coursework) may actually increase gender segregation by field in education.


The author, an economics professor at California State University Northridge, submitted a letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times in which he decried the attempt to ban sex magazines at the campus bookstore, saying that it was a violation of the first amendment and an effort by zealots to intrude into other people’s personal lives.

This report examines enrollment, degree attainment, and persistence (degree attainment within a specific timeframe) by gender between 1976 and 2004. The study focuses on undergraduate education in California public institutions (University of Californias and California State Universities), though in some cases data from community colleges or private degree-granting institutions are included. Professional (graduate) degree attainment at University of California was also examined. The study found a consistent gender gap across all “major” ethnic groups (Black, White, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic). The study found that men were less likely than women to enroll, graduate from, or demonstrate persistence in post-secondary education. The gap between Black men and Black women was generally more pronounced than between genders in other racial groups. The original study did not attempt to discover reasons for the gender gap or its implications for policy, though the authors speculate about them in their closing section.


Chu examines Asian American Women’s Studies courses at University of California, Los Angeles. She reviews the course that she helped team teach as a student at UCLA the second year it was offered which aimed to develop materials on Asian American women; develop a theoretical framework that included race, class, and gender; developed Asian American women’s leadership skills; and promote consciousness raising. The course was ultimately adopted by the Asian American Studies program and subsequently more rigidly structured.


In this paper, Crawford and Smith examine whether or not senior African-American female higher education administrators in New York state had mentors, how mentoring helped them, and if they didn’t have mentors, how they maintained their positions and whether or not mentoring could have been helpful to them. The authors used life histories and interviews of 7 women who held, or had held, senior administrative positions at two-year and four-year, public and private universities in New York State. As none of the seven respondents indicated they had had a mentor, the article focuses on what characterized their careers without mentoring (circumstantial, unplanned). They also asserted the need for and importance of mentoring by a more senior person.

This article in the *Los Angeles Times* reports that Glendon Drake, vice president of academic affairs at California State University Long Beach, recommended no change to the Women’s Studies course curriculum. He is waiting for the complete investigation of Barry Singer’s class “psychology of sex.” Referring to the issue of the book and citing academic freedom, Drake commented, “I don’t think much of it… But it’s the principle not the book. There is no book that I believe does not have a place in the university for study.” Sondra Hale and other supporters saw this as a signal to end future interference and are continuing to write state legislators to not take action against the university.


This article from the *Los Angeles Times* reports on the controversy at California State University campuses over Women’s Studies courses offered at California State University Long Beach. The controversy sprung from contested course material and assignments, which triggered a system-wide review of all California State University campuses. The educational policy committee discussed requiring professors to post syllabuses at the beginning of each semester but postponed further discussion until after they reviewed curriculum policies on each campus. The full CSU board of trustees requested a discussion concerning Barry Singer’s class on ‘psychology of sex’ after it was found to have offered homework credit for sexual experimentation. Similar charges were levied against Women’s Studies instructor Betty Brooks for “promoting lesbianism” in her women’s studies course. Singer resigned and Brooks was suspended pending investigation of complaints saying “she showed a class a slide of her genitals and told women students to imagine themselves ‘doing things’ at the beach with the woman across from them.”


This article from the Los Angeles Times continues the reporting on the controversy surrounding Women’s Studies courses offered at California State University Long Beach. Jessica Shaver, one of the original adversaries of the Women’s Studies Department, called a “strategy-planning session” of 8 women and 2 evangelical ministers in her home upon learning about the decision to allow Betty Brooks to return to the classroom in the fall. The article reports that Shaver identifies as a former anti-nuclear activist and socialist who adopted Christ and conservatism and would like to start a support group for lesbians who want to change their sexual orientation. Nola Meredith, also present at the “strategy-planning session,” identifies as active in fighting against the equal rights amendment and monitoring the feminist movement. The group approved a petition banning “films depicting explicit sex and textbooks ‘detailing how to practice sadomasochism, sex with animals and sex with body wastes’” as well as prohibit classroom demonstrates of gynecological exams or at least remove lesbian students from
the room. The article also included the report that California State University Long Beach announced plans to change the Women’s Studies program and the Women’s Center.


This letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times by Camille A. Farrington displays her opinion regarding the controversy surrounding the content of Women’s Studies courses at California State University Long Beach that “Now 30 years later, enter our modern McCarthyism-equivalent, the moral majority.” Farrington feels that Republican leaders might feel the need to give into evangelical Christians when they attack women’s studies classes but it is not appropriate to sit by and let ourselves revert to the intolerant times of the 1950s. In her letter she urges “all free-minded people to support the academic freedom of instructors” as they attempt to expose students to alternative views so that they can learn and think critically.


This Los Angeles Times article announces the spring courses for San Diego’s Feminist Free University, a project by the Center for Women’s Studies and Services in San Diego, California.


This article outlines, by her own recollection, Freedman’s denial of tenure by Stanford’s Dean, despite the history department’s recommendation for her tenure and her decision to fight the case. After a year and a half of delays and reconsiderations the provost recommended that she be tenured and promoted while denying that any discrimination had taken place. In this article Freedman focuses on the support she received by feminists at Stanford and around the country who sent letters of protest to the Dean, how her predicament related to all women academics at that time, and what her fight against the Dean’s decision to deny her tenure had on the larger community of female academics.


After the Second World War and into the 1970s, the number of women faculty grew in absolute terms along with an overall growth in higher education. However, the percentage of women faculty relative to men decreased, and female faculty tended to be concentrated in lowest-tier positions, off the tenure track. Statistics on faculty by gender also obscured stark differences in the personal and professional lives of faculty men and
women, including substantially greater costs that women bore as “survivors” in a male domain. In this article Freeman seeks to understand these difference in personal and professional life as well as discuss what women faculty member are doing to advocate for change. Freeman begins by comparing the family backgrounds of male and female faculty and finds that they were quite similar, but she goes on to document the starkly different experiences and costs that affected faculty by gender, and the disparities only widened the more prestigious the institution. She found Marriage and childrearing had greater costs for women faculty than for men, women were paid less and given more (and more tedious) work, and they were concentrated in “feminine” fields, which were less valued than those in which men were the majority. She also discusses women faculty members’ organizing to change these circumstances at heir institutions. Women organized at the school-wide, statewide and national levels, bringing suit against universities under contract law when it was discovered that universities were exempt from the sex discrimination clause of the Civil Rights Act.


This anthology of writings by Chicana feminists was published, primarily, in journals and newsletters of Chicana organizations in the 1970s and 1980s. These journals include Encuentro Feminil, Revolucion, Chicano Federation Newsletter and others, as well as published thoughts on various Chicana and Chicano movement conferences held in Texas, California, Colorado, and elsewhere. Contributors include various people interviewed for their local activism, including Anna Nieto-Gomez, Francisca Flores, Consuelo Nieto, and Corinne Gutierrez. Several chapters include writings on education, the student movement, and Chicano Studies.


This paper used three longitudinal data sets from of high school graduates in 1957, 1972, and 1992 to understand the narrowing of the gender gap in college and its reversal. The authors found that college attendance rates were about at parity from 1900 to 1930, then men began to overtake women, with the peak of men outnumbering women in 1947 (2.3 proportion of men to women). By 1980 college-going rates for both genders had increased six-fold, but women had again reached parity and have since overtaken men. The study found that changing perceptions by women of future participation in the labor force (in the 1960s through the late 1970s), increased age at first marriage (for both, but affecting women’s decisions more than men’s), and the fact that boys have more behavioral problems than girls may account for not just the closing of the gap, but for its actual reversal.

In this *New York Times* article, Goodman begins with writing about the successful tenure case of Estelle Freedman at Stanford. He then explores “the testing time that will determine the place [Women’s Studies] will eventually occupy in America’s colleges” (2). He argues that while there are growing numbers of institutions offering degrees and minors in Women’s Studies, few have departmental status. He feels that this is due to the underlying question: “does [Women’s Studies] constitute, a least potentially, an academic discipline with a unique methodology?” (3). He answers this question with a variety of quotes from professors and ends suggesting that it is due to the “conflicts inherent in the wedding of ideology and scholarship” (9). He concludes by stating “Women’s studies has proven its value in drawing attention to long-neglected matters and in questioning conventional points of view. But as long as prominent practitioners seem bent on putting scholarship in the service of ideology, women’s studies will continue to be suspect even to relatively open minds” (9).


A news article from the *Los Angeles Times* about the lawsuit levied against the Women’s Studies program at California State University Long Beach. The article describes the main contention of the suit as the following: is the Women’s Studies program a legitimate academic program or a front for the training and recruitment of feminists and lesbians? The article reports that sixteen plaintiffs filed the suit in Long Beach Superior Court. Sharon Sievers, director of the Women’s Studies program, sees the suit as an attack on intellectual freedom and welcomes the opportunity to prove the validity of Women’s Studies as a discipline and cites the growth of the program to about 500 students a year.


In this article, Hale summarizes the Women’s Studies controversy at California State University Long Beach over the content of Women’s Studies courses from the perspectives of the Women’s Studies faculty themselves. She includes a brief timeline of the controversy and argues that Women’s Studies programs struggle with being born out of a political movement and adopted into an academic institution. She argues that this sets up a controversial relationship and cites the disconnect between the Dean’s external review of the Women’s Studies program in 1984 and the program’s feminist teaching methods (sitting in a circle, consciousness raising, collective work, valuing everyone’s knowledge), and feminist program governance (hired controversial activists to teach, hired community work not just publications when hiring, nonhierarchical governing for program decisions). Hale feels that during the external review these practices caused their program to be written off as a “time warp” with defensive faculty and students who have “fundamentalist fervor… testifying to the glory of their process, the wonder of their teachers, the satisfaction of their commitment, the change in their lives, but saying nothing about the substance of their education”(42). Hale feels the external reviewers missed the value of this type of education and deemed it a problem with the program.

Recognizing that classroom climate limited women’s experience of full equality in higher education even after the passage of Title IX (and despite the fact that the majority of undergraduates are women), this report identifies attitudes and behaviors of students and faculty that contribute to a “chilly,” and at times hostile classroom climate for women students. The authors highlight and describe ways in which faculty undermine women students’ confidence, intentionally or inadvertently shut them out of class discussions and activities, and limit their access to research opportunities, mentoring, and other opportunities for intellectual and professional development. The report also discusses the ways in which male students may impede women’s classroom participation by interrupting them, squeezing women out in classroom demonstrations, and taking over lab work or discussions. A brief section on female grad students and very brief sections on women of color and older/returning women students are included.

The authors emphasize the importance of classroom climate for women’s education and provide many recommendations for creating a more hospitable educational environment for women students. They recognize Women’s Studies courses and courses highlighting women’s achievements or perspectives as encouraging women students and enhancing their confidence. Hall and Sandler also list many specific, practical ways in which faculty, students, and administrators can promote a classroom climate that supports women students, including avoiding exclusive use of “he” in classroom discourse, surveying students and faculty about classroom climate, publicizing the issue, calling for research on classroom climate, and establishing formal or informal networks of support by and for women students. They include a brief section for “special groups” of women students, such as students of color or older/returning students, and a list of topics for future research.


This Los Angeles Times article is a review of “The Dark Madonna: Women, Culture, and Community Rituals” the first public event put on by UCLA’s Center for the Study of Women. It was to be the first part of a CSW project set to culminate in the spring with a performance by artist Suzanne Lacy. The audience had a strong negative reaction to the initial panel, which was made up only of White women. Subsequent sessions, however, were more ethnically diverse and focused more particularly on dark madonnas. The event seemed to end smoothly with discussion among participants and a closing ritual.

This *Los Angeles Times* article reported on the recipients of the L.A. Westside Caucus of the National Women’s Political Caucus Bread and Roses Award, Helen Astin and Joan Palevsky. Astin is the associate provost of the UCLA College of Letters and Science, a professor of higher education, and a founder of the Center for the Study of Women. Palevsky is Vice President and director of community education at Immaculate Heart College Center and a philanthropist who supports feminist causes. The event also included a panel discussion on the feminist agenda with panelists including the awardees, Yvonne Brathwaite-Burke, Gloria Steinem, and Lucie Cheng the director of the Asian American Studies Center and the Center for Pacific Rim Studies at UCLA. While Steinem called women “a third world country” wherever they are, Cheng asserted that there are differences of class and race among women and that women need not be the same, but only have some goals and a vision for the future in common.


This report concludes that the substantial drop in Black enrollment in higher education in California is due to the fee increases imposed to offset loss of state funding. They estimate that the fee increase paid by UC’s 7,000 Black students will be “repaid” through a proposed program that would increase tutoring and other services for minority students by $500,000 a year for two years. The authors estimate that about $100,000 of those funds would ultimately benefit Black students.


Jacobs reviews the literature on gender differentials in higher education paying particular attention to issues of access (in which women appear to be relatively advantaged vis-à-vis men), the college experience (in which women fare less well), and post-collegiate outcomes (in which women lag behind men). He asserts the need to distinguish between these three domains when assessing gender disparity in higher education, and acknowledges the need for further research into particular groups of women such as women of specific cultural groups, as he does not disaggregate the data by race, ethnicity, socio-economic class, or any other category. Jacobs concludes by calling for more theoretically oriented research to account for women’s status in the educational system, (as opposed to simply documenting disparities), and urges sociologists of education to turn their attention to gender. He asserts the need for specific research in the following areas: more cross-country studies, work that differentiates between aspects of the higher education process (access/experience/outcomes), the linking of experiences and outcomes, institutional development (as opposed to individual experience), and educational decision-making processes.

In this article, Jameson reviews the lessons that she has learned and makes strategy suggestions to others based on her struggle, and eventual failure, to keep her job and the women’s studies program at Loretto Heights College - a small, private liberal arts college in Denver CO.


This article in the Los Angeles Times offers a comprehensive overview of the controversy surrounding the Women’s Studies program at California State University Long Beach that started almost two years before the publication of the article. The article discusses the various parties involved, the lawsuits generated, and the reaction of the University to the controversy. The article also discussed the after effects this controversy had on the individual parties involved in the controversy and the other academic programs that came under scrutiny as a result of this controversy.


This source has a selection of photographs by Bettye Lane, a New York City photographer who has been covering the "renewed women's struggle for equality" since 1969. She has had over twelve exhibits of her photographs and won NOW's Susan B. Anthony Award in 1982.


In this article, Lindsay reviews the national legal history relevant to desegregation of higher education and of the status of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs); tracks degrees awarded in HBCUs to Black women as compared to majority White schools and White women, as well as the presence of Black women faculty; and looks at the efforts made by the University of Georgia to recruit female Black students and faculty.


The report reviews the literature and extends existing reports on the status of female faculty to include the latest data available at that time (2003-2004). It notes that the status of female faculty has improved markedly since 1972, when equal opportunity legislation became applicable to university faculty. Women have earned more doctorates, entered more fields (including predominantly male ones), narrowed the pay gap, increased scholarly productivity, and achieved more tenured positions in all types of institutions. However, the study found that there are still problems. The authors found that doctorates to women were low in traditionally male fields, and that women are still only 24% of the highest faculty ranks. Both men and women are now being hired more often as part-time
faculty. The salary gap has remained constant as is a little higher in 2003-2004 when looked at within ranks. The productivity gap has decreased, but the remaining difference may reflect women’s continuing disadvantage. The study also found there seems to be a continuing anti-women bias in hiring and evaluations, especially for situations that review work over the short-term or in a brief, cursory way.


This Los Angeles Times article reported on the UCLA Women’s Caucus in Political Science drafting resolutions to present at the Western Political Science Association meeting on 2-4 April, 1970, in Sacramento, California, in an effort to address the problem of gender discrimination in hiring and promotion. Eight of the resolutions were listed, and they included calls to redress historic sex imbalances in political science departments, changes to promotion criteria that negatively affect women (such as part-time work), and for reporting from the national organization on how to enforce existing anti-discrimination policies. Numbers of male and female faculty by ranking at Stanford and UCLA are also listed.


This Los Angeles Times article reports on some data published in Everywoman’s Guide to Colleges & Universities (The Feminist Press). The inspiration for the project came in 1980 when women’s organizations, concerned parents, and prospective students couldn’t find comprehensive information about women’s opportunities and experiences in colleges. Nearly 600 colleges and universities nation-wide responded to the request for information, sending in a self-report to be rated for the publication. The highest total rating possible was 15 stars, with three stars possible in the categories of women students in leadership positions, percentage of faculty who are women, women and the curriculum (including the presence of a research center about women), women and athletics, and affirmative action, sexual harassment policies, childcare, and other factors. The article reported that no school got 15 stars, but California did fairly well. UCLA and USC each got 6 stars. USC got the highest rating possible in the presence of women in leadership positions, and UCLA got the highest rating in the women’s studies curriculum, including the research center on women. It also got three stars for women’s athletics, but no stars for the women faculty ratio, which was only 18% with no women administrators in high positions. The ratio of women faculty to women students was also low: 3/100 vs. 13/100 for men.

This *Los Angeles Times Article* reviews the two-day conference “The Many Phases of Eve: Beyond Psychoanalytic and Feminist Stereotypes.” The conference was put on at UCLA to explore “the special dimensions and meanings that can emerge from being born and growing up female” and was organized by UCLA Extension and the Los Angeles Institute for Psychoanalytic Studies. The review said the conference seemed to represent a “truce” between feminists and psychoanalysts, making it possible for psychoanalytical theory to be used as a tool to understand women in a more complex way than Freud ever did.


O’Kelly uses census data from 1955 to 1974 to assess whether or not equal employment legislation has closed the pay gap between men and women. The first section of the paper reviews the history of this legislation, beginning with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. She then examines data on wages and salaries, determining that women lag behind men at every level of education and experience, and that at various points the gap has actually widened. O’Kelly concludes that legislation, though necessary, cannot ameliorate institutional sexism that pervades cultural practices from childrearing to religion, all of which affect the gender disparity in pay.


Bar graphs in this report show the percentage of faculty by gender and by racial minority (White/non-White) from 1985-2002. Women were 31% percent of faculty in 1985 and had grown to 45% in 2002. Non-White faculty went from 14% in 1985 to 24% in 2002. The authors discerned a “business cycle” fluctuation in hiring by gender and racial group, with a “trough” occurring from 1986 to 2001. During the trough, White faculty experienced the greatest losses, likely due to retirees, who were mainly white. The percentages of persons hired by ethnic group (Latino, African-American, Asian American, White) were also compared to the California state and national pools of doctoral candidates by ethnic group. The report found the percentage of ethnic minority faculty is similar to or greater than the percentage of that group with doctoral degrees.


On 8 February 2001, President Atkinson requested an account of UCLA’s efforts to promote gender and racial/ethnic diversity in faculty hiring. The resulting report lists these efforts. The first page of the report outlines the rates of female and ethnic-minority hiring in the past, noting that in the last 20 years, women and ethnic minorities made up only 30% of faculty hired in the College of Letters and Science. At the current rate of increase, it would take over 50 years to reach parity. It is surmised that the drop-off in
diversity in the 1990s (as compared to the 1980s) was due to a lack of attention to the issue.

Office of Strategic Communications, University of California. (2003). Moving toward faculty gender equity at UC.

This document is a brief bulletin of recent gains at the University of California-wide level (highlighting a few individual campuses) in faculty gender equity. The authors note that the “highs” of equity in hiring took place in the mid-1990s but then dropped once affirmative action was restricted. Equity in hiring varies widely by rank, and the long tenure of the academic career means that gender imbalances persist at high ranks. Furthermore, there is no central hiring office at UC, so nearly 600 departments have their own hiring processes. The document concludes with a list of steps being taken to address the problem, including President Atkinson convening the President’s Summit on Faculty Gender Equity in November of 2002. Highlights from individual campuses are also included. UCLA’s appointment of Rosina Becerra as Assoc. Vice Chancellor for Faculty Diversity was noted, as were the recommendations on faculty hiring and salaries by the campus’s Gender Equity Committee.


This short Los Angeles Times article reports on the ACLU civil suit stemming from the dismissal of Sondra Hale during the Women’s Studies program controversy at California State University Long Beach. It was reported that the Judge refused to allow 14 anti-feminists to intervene in the ACLU civil suit seeking the reinstatement of Sondra Hale, former director of the Women’s Studies program, because it is a personal, not political, case. The case is to determine whether the decision to not renew her contract was with cause.


This article from the Los Angeles Times reports on the ban of pornographic magazines at the California State University Northridge bookstore that had been voted on 5 to 4 on November 28 and was unanimously struck down by bookstore trustees. The ban, which called for employees to “remove all materials that ‘visually depict the explicit sexual degradation of and violence toward women or men,’” had not yet taken effect because store employees said they did not know how to interpret it. Trustees said they reversed the ban because of that problem and the censorship controversy it caused. They also voted down student government president and trustee Zeke Zeidler’s motion to hide the magazines from view. The trustees also approved a policy “directing employees to stock ‘a diverse array of non-instructional publications’ selected in consultation with faculty and student government leaders.”

A federal study using 1982-1983 data found that female faculty at every rank and type of higher education institution made less money than male faculty. The greatest discrepancy was at military colleges. The average discrepancy in California was 17%, though the study found that throughout the country on average, the pay gap was wider at higher ranks than at lower ranks.


This letter to the editor printed in the *Los Angeles Times* was from a former student of California State University Long Beach, and who took women’s studies courses and was upset with the controversy surrounding the program. In the letter, she states “I was a student at CSULB from 1970-1978 and took women’s studies courses which where in no way ‘inferior academically.’ We need these courses to present all alternatives so the students can make their own well-informed choices. Appalled at the prior article when John Haller, university vice president, said he saw no place for self-defense classes on campus because rape is a real reality on campus.”


The Project on the Status and Education of Women (PSEW), founded in 1971 as a project of the Association of American Colleges in Washington D.C., investigated attitudes and behaviors toward women faculty, administrators, and graduate students in order to help universities address discrimination, harassment, and devaluation, stereotyping, and other unfair attitudes and treatment. The report includes 100 recommendations, as well as appendices including the project budget, press releases, and workshop agendas. The report confirmed the existence of (often subtle and unnoticed) discrimination that affected the hiring and advancement of women professionals in higher education. It also uncovered substantial interest in campus climate issues and ways to address them.


This report assessed the classroom climate in higher education for female students. The reports is divided into five parts; addressing how teacher and student behavior create different experiences for male and female students, classroom pedagogy, women in the curriculum, gender and faculty evaluation, and recommendations for making classrooms
The authors analyzed qualitative and quantitative studies in classrooms and related settings at all levels. This included observational data, interviews, conference proceedings, email communications, video data, surveys, and research in linguistics, sociology, education, and women’s studies. The first section specifically addressed women of color, older women, women with disabilities, and lesbians (though not trans or bisexual women). The appendices of the report include ways that both students and professional organizations can address campus climate, as well as questions faculty can use to evaluate their curricula and classroom climate.


In this article, Sievers discusses the impact of the lawsuit on the Women’s Studies program at California State University Long Beach. She focuses on the effect that the lawsuit had on the content of the Women’s Studies courses as the administration ordered curricular and faculty reviews, challenged the teaching to vaginal self-exams, and continuously re-evaluated the Women’s Studies 101 course. “Within 3 years [of April 1982] all part-time faculty associated with teaching women’s sexuality, health issues, self-examination, or the course on the lesbian were pushed out of the Women’s Studies Program by the dean.” She ends by stressing that the program has survived, but questions the costs to the personal lives of the women who fought for the program and the integrity of the values that it stood for. Sievers concludes with the suggestions that the personal costs [of the controversy and lawsuit surrounding the Women’s Studies program] are heavy but WS can survive is we make a commitment and stick together.


This news article form the Los Angeles Times covers a poetry reading to a crowd of about 350 at University of California Irvine. The article also notes that Adrienne Rich conducted the poetry reading after serving as a visiting professor for six weeks at Scripps College in Claremont. That fall she would teach for one semester at San Jose State.


Townsend and Twombly assess the factors that may contribute to the fact that the majority of students and faculty—and an unusually high percentage of administrators—are women. They apply Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, and Allen’s framework for measuring an institution’s climate for diversity to existing literature to assess community colleges as equitable workplaces for women, including: “structural diversity,” “psychological climate,” “the historical legacy of inclusion/exclusion,” and the “behavioral dimension.” The authors conclude that community colleges are generally good places for women students, faculty, and staff, but this is largely the result of women’s organizing and/or the relatively low status of the community college as an educational institution.

UCLA offered a hastily assembled course called *Social Sciences 101: The History and Politics of Affirmative Action* in order to “encourage [students] to enter this important national conversation” on an upcoming proposition on the November, 1996 California state ballot to outlaw affirmative action. The course was co-created by Vice Provost of the College of Social Sciences Carol Petersen Hertzog, Dean of Social Sciences Scott L. Waugh, and Dean of Honors and Undergraduate Programs, Edward A. Alpers.


The Status report on the status of women at UCLA addresses the following topics: faculty, data on discrimination, recommendations for increasing women on the faculty, maternity leave, staff, improving the status of women on staff (managerial & non-managerial), students, academics, non-academic services (residency, health, childcare), and the establishment of a standing committee on the status of women at UCLA. The report found that among faculty women are underrepresented, mainly hired in irregular positions, and concentrated to a limited number of departments. In terms of staff at the university, the report found that while women comprised 55% of the staff, work-role stereotypes continued to be a problem. Finally, the report found that the academic counseling for undergraduates did not take into account women’s changing needs and values, more flexibility was needed for age of enrollment and course load for graduate students and job referrals for graduate students were conducted on an individual basis without any assurance of equal opportunity.


In this paper Volokh and Feng delineate the UCLA admissions rankings categories based on academics, socio-economic disadvantage, and race, then explain how these different rankings are combined to determine the entering class. They assert that race, rather than being a “tie-breaker,” becomes one of the most important factors in admissions. They recommend that racial preferences of any type be dropped, and socio-economic factors kept in. The editors of *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* note that this paper is one of the best they had seen on the conservative side of the Affirmative Action debate of the approximately 1,000 news articles and editorials published in 1995 up to that point. They further point out, however, that the article would need to be revised given the July, 1995 decision by UC to abolish all race-based preferences in admissions.

The article is a review of five different works that, according to the reviewer, exemplify the quality of, and the issues present, within Women’s Studies at the 10th anniversary of the discipline’s history. The works she reviews are as follows:


The assertion made in this article is that, despite the technical end of race-based Affirmative Action at the University of California, the practice isn’t going anywhere. They argue that the guidelines the University of California used in replacing its formerly race-based Affirmative Action criteria are so broad as to be able to admit students under the old race-based system if desired. The authors point out that doing this will, however, rest with the administration of each university though it seems that they generally do want to continue race-based Affirmative Action.

**For Further Research**

**Oral Histories**


Websites for Women’s, Gender, & Ethnic Studies Departments at Colleges & Universities in California


California State University, Long Beach. Department of Women's, Gender & Sexuality Studies homepage. Retrieved from http://www.csulb.edu/colleges/cla/departments/wgss/
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