

UCLA

National Black Law Journal

Title

Implementation: Your Plan is Accepted, What Next

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1f472283>

Journal

National Black Law Journal, 4(2)

Author

Doty, Margaret D.

Publication Date

1975

Copyright Information

Copyright 1975 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

WORKSHOP

Number 1

“Implementation: Your Plan is Accepted, What Next?”

Margaret D. Doty, Discussion Leader

Robert R. Randolph

Beverly C. Clark

Freddie L. Groomes

Discussion Leader - Margaret D. Doty, Assistant to Walter J. Leonard,
Harvard University

DOTY: Our first speaker is Mr. Robert Randolph, Chief of the Higher Education Branch of the Office for Civil Rights, Region 1, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Mr. Randolph.

RANDOLPH: The theme for the workshop is misleading. It implies two things, both of which are not mandated by federal regulations and both of which are really inconsistent with OCR policies. One, the first concept that it implies is that an affirmative action plan is something that is developed for the approving authority, namely, the Federal Government. In terms of higher education institutions, of course, that would be the Office for Civil Rights. And the second concept is that implementation is something that takes place once the plan has been accepted. Now both of these are actually incorrect, because the affirmative action plan should not be developed for the approving authority, but should be developed for the institution and for the beneficiaries of the affirmative action plan. That is, the affirmative action plan is that which—we will use Harvard since we are here—develops to improve its own employment procedures and it is developed for women and minorities either seeking employment at Harvard or already employed at Harvard.

Secondly, implementation is not something that begins at some point in the development of the affirmative action plan, at a point where the Office for Civil Rights has said your plan is accepted. Implementation in fact begins in the initial stages of development and is an on-going process. No affirmative action plan could even be accepted by the Office for Civil Rights had not implementation begun in the initial stages. Now to talk about implementation in terms of the various elements of an affirmative action plan. . . . An affirmative action plan contains employment policies. It contains procedures for the implementation of these policies. It contains analyses to identify problem areas. It contains corrective action to eliminate these deficiencies. And it contains goals and time-tables as a form of measuring your progress. So that when we talk about the development of an affirmative action plan and the implementation of an affirmative action plan and we talk about policies, first the institution reviews its existing policies

and makes whatever changes are warranted for these and develops new policies where they don't exist in the area of affirmative action. Now these policies have to follow federal regulations, but they don't need the approval of the federal government—the approval of the Office for Civil Rights. They are basically boiler plate in nature and they are geared to the complexities of the particular institution. Once these policies are reviewed and new policies are developed they would be implemented by disseminating these policies to the employees at the institution, by having meetings with department chairmen and with employees, by including new material at orientation sessions and by contacting outside groups which have a focus for minorities and women to elicit their help in implementing the program. There would need to be no approval by the Office for Civil Rights or any other agency in that regard.

One of the first areas to be looked at in developing affirmative action plans is the area of recruitment. New procedures need to be developed to identify minorities and women for future appointments. Once these procedures have been developed, then they can be implemented without the approval of the Office for Civil Rights. One of the first ways of implementing a new recruitment procedure might be in the search for an affirmative action officer. This procedure would begin early in the developmental stage with the intent of identifying someone who would have major responsibility for the development and the implementation of the program. Now many institutions don't recruit for the affirmative action officer. This in fact is not implementation. What a lot of institutions and the majority of institutions do, is that they identify an official of the institution who already has major administrative responsibility. And they give this individual additional responsibility for the development and the implementation of the affirmative action plan. This places too much of a demand on this individual's time, and so, therefore, the initial implementation of the program suffers. What should in effect happen, is that an institution should designate someone responsible in the early stages for the development of the program and relieve this individual of some of his or her major responsibility while the recruitment effort for the identification of a permanent EEO officer is underway.

You might say that the affirmative action plan addresses two audiences. It addresses those who are seeking employment and those who are already employed. The recruitment process is that which is addressed to the individuals who are seeking employment. For those who are already employed you are looking at the total employment process in terms of rates of promotion, terms of salary equity, in terms of conditions of employment, benefit packages, etc. Now in this regard the institution is seeking to identify any disparate treatment which might be in existence for its employees, and it is this phase of the program that at some point will need approval. Because what HEW does is review the analysis performed by the institution to identify the problem areas. Then we look at the corrective actions that the institution proposes to eliminate these problem areas, to see in fact if this corrective action is appropriate. Will it eliminate the deficiencies in the shortest period of time? The affirmative action plan and its development and implementation would not require the Office for Civil Rights or the other approving authority to actually grant approval for but the

latter phases of the program, that is the corrective action; the analysis and that which went into the analysis; the form of corrective action proposed for the program; and the goals and time-tables indicated for the program. It is our desire to have the institution eliminate the deficiencies in the shortest amount of time, thereby exerting a major effort to this and major resources to it.

What I have tried to imply to you is that affirmative action is a process. It's a process which will help the institution and which will benefit minorities and women. It is a process which begins early in a self-review and analysis of employment practices. It is a process which continues and which does not end until there is no longer any need for affirmative action. At this point you have equal employment opportunity.

DOTY: I would like to introduce Beverly Clark who has been the EEO Officer and Assistant to the Executive Vice President at Columbia since 1971.

CLARK: I would like to talk to you today about a different aspect of implementation. I am very interested in organizational structure and inter-personal relationships and the impact of these two factors on your ability as equal employment opportunity officers to implement your plan at your respective institutions.

The process of implementation of an affirmative action plan involves five main activities. They are distribution of the affirmative action equal opportunity provisions which are contained in the plan to the faculty and staff at your institution; coordination of the work of others who are in your institution; monitoring and auditing progress towards achievement of the plan's goals; appraisal and recommendations for the improvement of the existing plan; updating on a periodic basis the statistical data and other relevant information, for example, the whole revision of your present plan.

At some institutions of higher education all of these activities devolve upon the equal employment opportunity officer. But often these responsibilities are distributed among the institution's personnel, academic affairs, and then of course equal opportunity functions respectively. Undoubtedly, other variations also exist. Regardless of the choice which is made the goal is the same—successful implementation. While acting in pursuit of this common objective, the affirmative action officer comes face to face with the organizational structure of the college or university, and also moves along the paths of inter-personal relationships. It isn't very long before he or she feels the impact of both structure and people on the process.

This morning I would like to begin with a brief discussion of the nature of organizational structure in an academic institution. Perhaps at this workshop we will develop a general strategy which may be useful to affirmative action officers like ourselves in coping with this problem in institutions. Afterwards, I will focus on the area of inter-personal relationships, why they are important concerns, and how they contribute to completion of your goals. I would like to conclude with a short discussion of some of the techniques we use for monitoring and for reviewing and revision of the affirmative action plan.

Webster's Dictionary gives the definition of the word organization as

follows: "the act of organizing"; "the manner in which the branches of a service, etc., are arranged"; "individuals systematically united for some work"; and "a society". It goes on to give the derivation of the word as the Greek *organoa* which means an instrument. Strats and Sells in a book called, *Personnel Management*, say that an organization consists of the people whose attitudes and behavior are affected by the system of human relations in which they function. Now we can readily apply this definition to academic institutions whose sundry divisions and departments unite for the traditional purposes of education. But the manner in which they coalesce differ from institution to institution. The affirmative action officer must be aware of the intricacies and banalities of organizations as they exist in his or her respective institution.

Most institutional handbooks provide an organizational chart. That chart should be verified first as correct and up-to-date and then it should be subjected to critical study and memorized. You should understand how things really are decided and done in your school. You should understand whether the chart you see and the reality you observe mesh. How does the President relate organizationally to the Board of Trustees? the faculty to the Deans? the Deans to the President? the faculty to each? Faculty to students? Students to each other. Your understanding of these power relationships may be crucial to your ability to institutionalize a plan. For example, Deans are not always first among equals. Although they share the same title, you will find out in your institution which ones have the most power, which ones raise the most money, which ones enjoy the highest personal esteem and reputation in the university for being able to get things done. You will also recognize which senior faculty are the most highly respected and which faculty members are noted for their innovational abilities and talent in the direction of changing intransigent ways.

You want also to know who among your colleagues has done work in academic or public service in fields that are related to equal opportunity, civil rights and manpower planning. These are the people you will try to rely upon most heavily to help you implement the plan. You should know who they are, meet them, talk with them face to face, small groups, personally and obtain a face to face commitment from each of them to support the plan within your school. The faculty and key administrators represent top hierarchical relationships in university organization. However, there is also the fact of horizontal relationships which loom large in implementation pictures. These are the people who often are line managers but who may also be staff advisors or staff managers, such as yourselves. This is known by the term lateral or horizontal relationships. For example, the budget officer, the personnel officers, internal auditors, institutional research officers, computer programmers and system analysts, projects and grants officers, the comptroller of the university, the pay master, the treasurer of the university and many others. You should develop good working relationships with these key officers. Do not overlook the administrative assistant either. This individual is a very influential member of the department who more than likely will be the person who will be completing the forms and questionnaires and creating perhaps the statistical information you may request. This person works very closely generally with the department

chairperson.

Next there are relationships with advisory groups, informal and formal who can be of inestimable assistance to you in your implementation plans and also in the monitoring areas. Members of advisory committees, for instance, should be chosen with care. A run-away committee is not much help to anybody. You want people who are interested in what you are doing and who are interested in seeing the plan succeed and who represent different segments of the university or the college, and who are influential enough to get things done.

Communication networks should be established, both formal and informal—what I call feed-out networks. You want people to know what is happening in the field, the new developments that come through in form of new laws and orders and rules and regulations, revising Order No. 14, for instance. These people are indispensable in helping you digest and get inculcated into people who work day to day with you the idea of equal opportunity. Now mass communication, action surveys, briefings and orientation meetings are also very helpful. Other groups of people include union leaders. We don't hear very much about that these days, but there is a lot of cross-filing now going on. Institutions who are charged with discrimination in the courts who have a union representative will cross-file a charge of discrimination on the union because these groups represent employees and the contract that emanates from negotiation is supposed to be the operating document with respect to their employment benefits. This is a difficult area because it is also fraught with politics, but it is one you should keep in mind.

At Columbia we are in the process of completely revising this program for its content, for its wording, for its attitude. The first thing a person in your position would do after your plan is accepted, is to review this document. When you are not under the pressure of producing the document, you will find out that so much of what you said sounds so very defensive and it is not particularly encouraging to the individuals who are affected by this particular document. I know that if I did not participate in the development of this document and had to read it for the first time I would be overwhelmed by the defensive attitude that emanates from it. So, revision is part of your implementation process too. That is to review your particular plan, see where its shortcomings are in terms of the areas I just mentioned. Internally you should have developed systems by which information and recap, as opposed to feedout, can issue from the departments who are actually responsible for hiring the individuals.

We can talk for days on the type of forms or pieces of information, but we know what they generally are. We are talking about applicant flow data; we are talking about interview referrals, the number of interview referrals as opposed to the number of applicants for a particular job; we are talking about rejections after interview and the reasons therefor; we are talking about promotions and hirings; and we are talking about retention insofar as whether or not the minorities and women we hire make it through the system and stay with us or whether there is a constant flux. There is an old saying in the computer field about garbage in and garbage out, well this applies very effectively to the affirmative action plan.

Appraisals and recommendations, I think, are naturally part of the functions of the affirmative action officer. You should be in a position in your institutions to critically review the procedures and the systems you have developed and make policy recommendations to your chief executive officer, mostly the president, sometimes the executive vice president or chancellor for changes in the system. Now this is where that personal network comes into play. You can be a voice in the wilderness even though you are absolutely right if you don't have a constituency. Affirmative action in this day and time needs a constituency very, very badly. Thank you.

DOTY: Thank you, Beverly. Our next panelist is Dr. Freddie Groomes who is Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Human Affairs at Florida State University.

GROOMES: I was particularly pleased to be invited here to talk about a topic that I am particularly sensitive to, having been as many of you can see, born a member of the affected classes. I oftentimes say I was born to Negro parents, in a colored community and grew up to be a Black woman. But the truth of the matter is that it is very timely of Walter to have called this conference and I think this geographic location is also a very good one in that there is a lot of sensitivity in this area now, I understand. And the same kind that has been persistent in the other South for a long time.

Historically, Harvard and Florida State and other institutions of higher learning have been circumscribed by a devotion to search for truth. And by searching for solutions to problems facing the society, affirmative action is a natural. It is something that higher education institutions particularly should be actively involved in. Not only in seeking truth but demonstrating high ideals and a commitment to social justice and I think that that is what basically underlies affirmative action programs.

I am oftentimes on panels like this and I play the devil's advocate. I occasionally pick fun at the chief of OCR, but I feel very positive about Robert so I am not going to do that. I kind of pick at other affirmative action officers who think they are big chiefs, and of course I am not going to do that to Beverly because I feel pretty good about her. But I am going to say that OCR officials and affirmative action officers are oftentimes a big part of the problem. I am one, but fortunately now after about 2 and a half years in this new profession, I am convinced that the chief affirmative action officer in any institution, if you are serious about implementation, is the college president or the university president. It is not the affirmative action officer. We are not power people. Hopefully we influence power people, but we are not. And if you are serious about your topic here, which is "Implementation and Your Plan is Accepted, What Next?"; I have joked a little bit about changing it and saying "You have an Acceptable Affirmative Action Program, So What?"

The guidelines really make affirmative action programs a sophisticated promissory note. Now we at Florida State have a very comprehensive document. Yes, about the size of the one here from Columbia. We went through an extensive academic exercise and answered all the requests outlined under the higher education guidelines for Executive Order 11246, and I can quote verbatim all of those steps and I monitored very closely and

I worked with everybody and we put together a document that was accepted and was challenged by all kinds of people who finally said, "Okay, it's a good document". So what? Circumstances at the institution had not changed appreciably. Then I thought, well we have a road map. We have at least got something that is a point of departure. We have promised, now let's see what we are going to do about it. Are we in fact going to implement or simply sit back and say we have done our jobs? No, at Florida State University we thought, let's do something else. First of all, I think, educate the total constituency. And that does not limit itself to those at the institution. It also includes persons outside of the institution which impact of the effectiveness of a program. You need to have your chief persons in the community involved. In our community, being in capital city of Florida, Tallahassee, that is the governor, and we started with him. He had to make affirmative action a serious situation. We wanted the governor to demonstrate commitment. So he did what? He implemented a statewide affirmative action program which again has proved to be to a large extent, another exercise in academia. Nevertheless, we had a commitment and we tried to help educate the governor and others to demonstrate in a meaningful way their commitment.

We established policies, we disseminated these policies, and number one, we helped people appreciate some of the things that they weren't aware of. You see, the terms excellence, high standards, and all of that are just like "motherhood and country". And people are willing to say that I am all for affirmative action, but we have got to maintain excellence, we have got to have high standards. And I say well how is that in conflict with what we are talking about. It is not in conflict, but if you are really saying that I am not about to admit that I am a racist and I am not able to admit that I am a sexist, then that is a different story and sometimes that is what real implementation of affirmative action reveals, that some people are more committed to terminology than they are to in fact realizing some particular objectives.

We tried to dismiss some of the myths as part of our educational program; to help people in academia realize that both minorities and women were valuable resources to the successful realization of all educational objectives; and in fact to assist institutions in elevating their standards and in expanding some truths. We also activated, as Beverly said, existing organizational people or individuals to help us. Again, with the President being the chief affirmative action officer, we looked at how we could do things in a "non-traditional way". We are always talking about innovations in education, we tried to really innovate by looking at different strategies for getting people, rather than sitting waiting for applicants to come to the university, we went out to the persons in the field. We found that there were individuals who were not found in the availability statistics. On occasion, people are just not listed places. We found that just as individuals continue to tell me that, Freddie there are just not enough Blacks available, there are only X percent of Black Ph.D's in the country, etc., we said okay, prove to me that there are only that many. You see, it is just as difficult to prove that there are not, as it is to prove that there is. And we finally stopped playing those kinds of games. I had breakfast with Mary Lepper this morning and

she talked about some of the interesting things that they were doing and I said, "Here you go again, you are going to focus on all of that statistical stuff and that is fine as an academic exercise, but are you really ready to implement?" I am not so sure that my question was answered.

We looked at providing resources, and who can do that better than the president and the board of regents? Establishing priorities and where the funds of the institutions go—for everything that you want to do in an institution most times it takes money. Are we really committed to the extent that we are going to put the dollars there, put the dollars there to do the kinds of things that we can establish as priority? In this instance hopefully that was affirmative action objectives.

We established in our educational program that the affirmative action document was a living document. It was not something that we would prepare, get accepted and put on the shelf. Instead it would be constantly evaluated and adjustments would be made to update the document, or if we made errors, we would correct those. On occasion you find that in the initial stages you do make errors. For instance, I thought that I was the most important thing to affirmative action. That was a big mistake. And of course, a lot of folk helped me realize that and when I was sending out my memos and signing Freddie Groomes. What the heck does that mean, who cares? Well, it's a lot better when the President, if in fact he is the chief person at the institution—and I understand that that is not always the case, but certainly at Florida State it is—it made a big difference when he sent the memos and not only sent them out but he made general or public statements to back them up. You see, if a president is going to be effective, he or she has to be a strong person, a person who is willing to go against the top because it is not the most popular political posture to take. In our state presidents can have a lot of negative feedback from people on occasion. So the person—the chief affirmative action officer and the president—has to be willing to take on these kinds of things.

Beyond education we again get a little bit of what Beverly talked about, I think it would be important for you to do this, to look at the human side of things. We call it Human Affairs at our institution, but not only do we think in terms of under-utilization and bringing more people to the institution, we look at those persons who are there and try and make sure that we accommodate them to the extent that the psychological climate at the institution is a productive one. That people feel wanted, and that we don't use subtle means of having our initial figures reduced.

Let me tell you a cute little thing about what happened at our institution in our first stages. I was there about a year and found that when I compared the data on arrival with the data at that point we had lost people and I was criticized highly. They said you have been here for a year, an advocate for both minorities and women, and by golly, we have lost people. There are fewer of us now than there were when you came. Well, you know that really disturbed me and I became a little bit upset about that. I knew that I was part of the problem, but not that much. As I examined it we had just really learned to count, and when we learned to count we found that there really were not just as many as we thought initially. For instance, prior to our developing a more sophisticated strategy for counting that was simple, just

counting real people, whole people instead of parts as a whole, we found that on occasion, Black women were a double count. Freddie Groomes was also Black, obviously, some of us can attest to that. So there was two in the minds of many. I was listed in administration. But I also taught in the graduate school, so I was faculty. Faculty, Black, woman, administration—four. That seems like a joke.

We had instances where in learning to count people there were graduate student on one faculty line, a \$20,000 position cut four ways, \$5,000 for each grad student, but we counted all four of those white women on one faculty line. So we determined later to count one full-time equivalent, therefore, instead of four women that meant there was only one. So all we needed to do was learn to count and we lost almost 50% of the people who were supposed to have been there. Watch that. It is important. So our first year we didn't lose but we learned to count and subsequently since that time there has been some growth. We are almost back where they thought we were when I started.

Those kinds of things will make the difference in implementing affirmative action programs. It seems so simple and so basic. You see, it is not the complicated statistical analysis that they run sometimes that makes the difference. I have spent four years in institutional research, I really am a credentialed qualified person in the eyes of the traditional, can you believe that? But I have found that the simple things are the things that make the difference. So please don't let them get you caught up in all of that because I spent a whole year doing that, but it didn't make that much of a difference. When I start being very simple, when I start saying one and one makes two, and four times one is four, and all of a sudden you have one person instead of four persons. I have run through all of these computer printouts and you know, just volumes of material, added two statistical people to the staff, spent thousands of dollars in computer time and I could have told those people the first week what some of their problems were. That's the difference in implementation, and that's the difference in providing just an acceptable affirmative action program for the OCR folk. I am glad to hear Robert say that is not what they are looking for.

I don't want to insult your intelligence by talking about things that I consider important because most of the things that I consider important about life are simple. And I know you are very elegant and sophisticated people here in the Harvard surrounding and that might be demeaning, but please tolerate me for just a few minutes to tell you about some of the basic things that seem to make a heck of a lot of difference.

Straightening out some of the myths sometimes helps. I have had many, many department chairpersons tell me that the reason that they didn't have Blacks and women in some areas was because the Blacks and women didn't like to do certain kinds of things. So we had to dismiss some of the myths and that's part of the educational program. We have to help folk appreciate that women just love children and students. That's all right, but they also appreciate and love research. And they will publish at the same rate as non-women or non-minority persons. That Blacks enjoy academic challenge. Really, manipulative skills are fine, but we also enjoy some of the academic challenges. So they told me that we don't go in

certain areas. The truth of the matter is that we have not been allowed in certain areas; that the exclusionary practices and systematic discrimination, legal and otherwise in our country, have not allowed us into certain areas. Given access, and I don't just mean opportunity, I mean real access—see I am not going to get tied up with those terms—but given access to these programs in institutions and the kind of financial support which help people get through as it has meant all along, Blacks and other minorities and women do equally as well, and demonstrated on occasion that they even do better. You see when you have been number two as long as I have, you try harder. That ain't no joke, folk, that is real. And subsequently sometimes, you just do better.

People are more alike than different we discovered, and as soon as we started determining some basic kinds of things—and that may not seem important to you, but it meant the difference between being able to interact with people on a real level instead of just an academic level. And I am not putting down academics because I believe in that. But the politics of all of this, it is important to sit with those guys at lunch and talk about real things because you see they play their part on the administrative council, (that is the policy-making group) you know, and I have one vote like everybody else and I would get there and I would be prepared. I would do all of my research and I would come in with my recommendations, my position papers and I would stand up, and I would do all my things and then the president would entertain and then finally, they would come up with not a vote but a consensus. I kept being on the short end of that consensus. I knew I had done all of my work, and I knew it was rational, and I knew it was scientifically sound. What happened? They had their meetings over lunch and cocktails and on the way to the gym and everywhere else and when I got there it was just an exercise. So don't worry about being on all of those committees, folk. I made a recommendation that there had to be minority representation and women on all major committees of the institution. That was important to me but that ain't where it happens. Learn the politics, learn where it happens—in the locker room. It is important that you be where the action is when the discussion are going on. I became an assertive, I *was* an assertive woman. I became an aggressive Black woman and invited a lot of those guys to lunch with me, and picked up the check too, incidentally. I talked with them, and sort of helped get them on my side about some things. All of a sudden some of the decisions in a meeting went my way. Boy, did I get excited. It was working a little bit.

But not only that, my office is really in the president's office and we interact informally, and that is important. You need that if you are affirmative action officers. You need casual access to the president. Not a conference every Monday at 9 or Wednesday at 2, but informal access so you can just chat and say, "hey, did you know . . ." As he writes his next set of memos, he includes that. Or, he is on his way somewhere and he drops a little information about what's going to happen and you get on the ball and start writing support for legislation to do some things—just casual access. Then it also gives you credibility when people throughout the institution realize that the president might listen to you once in a while, because they feel that you are sort of important.

I think you need to look at all positions at the institution, administrative positions, faculty positions and non-academic positions as well. This is a part of affirmative action that we don't always talk about. I think here you concentrate mostly on the academics and I think that is important, but we were very concerned not only with looking at utilization and making sure that people were appointed at the faculty level, but where at the faculty level? Where are the women and the minorities concentrated? Generally at the entry level positions. We thought that we needed to try and bring some people in who had some special qualities and could therefore distinguish themselves to the extent that they could be brought into this as full professors. We thought it was important not only to hire more faculty, but persons in policy-making, decision-making positions.

At our institution we have a president and a vice president, provost, dean and etc. So we wanted provosts appointed, we wanted deans appointed. You know, I really wanted to staff the place to the extent that I could help them in such a way that I would work myself out of a job. You think I did it in three years? No. It will be a long time before I am unemployed as a result of not being needed in that regard. We have now come to the place where we have provosts, associate provosts; we have deans that are minorities, and women in some areas other than home economics and nursing and the social sciences, where we are very, very popular. We are getting them into the hard core positions, and we are getting them into positions of responsibility. If you are really serious about implementing affirmative action, you are going to have some of that. And it isn't going to happen as a result of everybody working their way up through the general way, because that isn't the way most people got there. Our President came that way, but most of the other presidents didn't. They were appointed. Somebody knew them, respected them or owed them something and gave them a job. So we are saying give that kind of consideration, not opportunity, to minorities and women. That is the difference between effectiveness and simple complying to the guidelines as outlines in the higher education booklet.

These are the kinds of things that we are doing at Florida State and these are the kinds of things it takes to make the biggest difference—the education of the people towards the program and the action steps—actually implementing the action steps. It should be an action program, and all action programs that are effective include corrective action. Unfortunately, the higher education guidelines simply request good faith effort, which is another exercise in pretty language. Good faith effort does not yield results. Corrective action in fact does. When you evaluate your policies and procedures and find that accidentally, of the women in the three categories of faculty, administrative, professional and career service, the majority of the women at our institution, 43% of them, are in the career service lines—secretaries and assistants to—and that Blacks are in the labor-oriented kinds of positions, if you are going to have an effective program then you need to correct that. That is where a lot of folk accuse us of reverse discrimination, preferential treatment. Well, what we are really talking about is sharing preferential treatment and sharing the situation that men have enjoyed for so long. I don't apologize or any longer engage in debate on that particular

subject. According to the historical practices in our United States it is important to immediately respond, and that does not mean long range or 10 or 12 years, you have got to accommodate those persons who have been deliberately and systematically excluded. Therefore we are talking about looking at our numerical goals. We are talking about hiring with consideration for high quality and enhancing the institution.

These are the kinds of things that represent what we have at our institution as effective activity. We look at the kind of practices that are prevalent in terms of the community. And I said, you need to involve more than just the university. The housing authorities—there are those who are concerned about where people will live when they come to the community. Whether you can afford a house, or whether you can be allowed in the community are two different things. Most of them can afford the house but sometimes they can't afford the difficulty in securing it or remaining there after they are in. Those kinds of things I think you should also include. Considering the fact that the State of Florida is an equal opportunity state, just as this area is, you wouldn't think we would have problems in housing still. But we have a few. And we have fewer every day because as I said we have incorporated members from the entire cabinet into our affirmative action program so it gives us a legitimate means of monitoring what happens in the Department of Administration, and therefore, making appropriate recommendations, and when we don't get them the kind of support we want, we just verbalize it on TV and radio, print it in the paper, sometimes that helps. Better still we have a deliberate effort on to get minorities and women into the significant government posts in our state and that's making a difference.

Affirmative action effectiveness cannot happen in an isolated office of affirmative action officer. It is everybody's business and that is the thing that has made a great difference at Florida State.

The affirmative action program if successful will be the first step in attracting faculty and staff to universities that have not previously had them. It is the beginning in allowing the university to reflect more closely the sexual, racial and cultural mix of our society. It is a candid admission that we are a pluralistic society in which there are many disparate views about what we have been and what we are as a people. It is my belief that if we are serious about pursuing the democratic ideal which so distinguishes America, then we must begin to include those persons whose voices have been silent—so muted by practice of exclusion. Indeed the problems confronting our education and indeed the nation require a searching and critical analysis. Women and minorities have not been permitted for the most part to occupy a central role in higher education, to formulate policies and to have their perceptions of reality hold sway. It is not that I am convinced that these groups are to be the Messiah, bringing with them all the answers to all the problems, because they are human too. Often there is someone who is not as committed to the past and present. We have to define a new kind, a new perception that will allow us to better understand where we have come from and where we are.

If for no other reason, affirmative action is wholly consistent with practices that should prevail within the university, and that should be reason

enough for all of us to support it, not simply to comply with the guidelines, but to effectively respond to the greater needs of this our nation. Thank you.

DOTY: Thank you, Freddie. Now we will have questions and answers and I would just ask that you direct your questions to one of the panelists if that is possible.

QUESTION: I wonder if each of the panelists would talk about the mechanism for coping with grievances of affirmative action within their schools, and whether Mr. Randolph could talk about how HEW would like to see grievances handled within the university, having to do with biases of the affirmative action plan.

CLARK: We have at Columbia a different system for each broad classification of faculty and staff. We have research officers, administrative officers, supporting staff, unionized supporting staff, and of course faculty. Each of these operates differently, independently. The unionized procedures result probably in binding arbitration. We heard earlier in this program that an individual's rights are not abrogated by that process, they can continue into civil rights legislation. At Columbia we haven't really thought about that. I am glad to hear somebody here put that to rest so I can go back and tell them. I want to be on the faculty side, we have the procedure for two years but we have only had one instance of its use. I think the faculty complaints are almost always generated through HEW or EEOC. But we have only had one and that was horrendous. It took us three years to resolve that particular problem. Now, that is in and out of departments, in and out of administrations; it really was terrible and we know that we have to overhaul that process. For the other groups that I mentioned, the process is not really conducive for redressing charges of discrimination because of the confrontation element. You must discuss this first with your immediate supervisor. Now what do you tell your immediate supervisor? "I think you are a racist." What is your supervisor's response? "No, I am not." You get nowhere. It is automatic that you are going to get nowhere in that situation. We are now going to look into that. I have a case that I am involved with internally operating through the grievance procedure for administrative offices. It is showing all of the tell-tale signs that the standard grievance machinery is inoperable for cases of discrimination. You have to be some kind of a lawyer to really put your case before the administration. You are a single individual opposing Columbia University who has resident counsel, university counsel, all the top brass, all the best bonds at its disposal, and you are allowed to elect someone to represent you, but that person has to be an officer of the university. It is a circular in a way, and we are beginning to see through the use of that process because for administrative offices it hasn't operated.

QUESTION: Just related to what you were just talking about, what is your particular role in that vis-à-vis the individual?

CLARK: I am available for "individual" consultations. In other words, somebody does not know what to do, how to do it, or if they should do it, they come to me to talk about it. I do not direct them, I do not give them an evaluation of the merits of their case. I am not an advocate in that respect.

But I encourage the use of the system, and in encouraging the use of the system we find impairments.

GROOMES: At Florida State we have what we call the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission, the local commission, and we have an Equal Opportunity Employment Committee. The Committee evaluates broad policy and looks at practices within the institution and looks independently at how they can adjust those so that we can have fewer cases of discrimination filed against us. The Commission on the other hand, deals with individual cases, persons who have reason to believe they have been excluded or discriminated against because of basically race and sex. The Commission is comprised of representatives from the three work categories, academic, administrative or professional, and career service. It has the assistance of independent attorneys. It operates on an informal kind of basis. It is considered the judicial process but what in fact happens is that an individual reports a situation and that Committee with the endorsement of the president can go in to any department and define the situation to the extent that they determine whether or not policies have been violated, and whether they think that they can substantiate the claim. If in fact they find that the person has a legitimate complaint, then the recommendation goes to the president for his consideration. If in 30 days he has not answered, the recommendation of the Committee stands. If he in fact cannot move on the recommendation, then he advises them accordingly. We have found that it is to our advantage to move on them positively and for the most part we are getting at this point more people going to the internal Commission than the EEO Commission that operates in the state and in the Region because they have such a tremendous backlog that most people are no longer turned on to using that particular source and therefore it helps us. I get copies of all reports regarding it and try in my own way to expedite the evaluations. We have found that we are getting a little bit of credibility. Recently, we had sixteen women to get salary adjustments that ranged from \$1,000 to I think one was as much as six thousand and some odd dollars. And that was really good for us. They started believing that we were serious. We had one Black male that had been terminated inappropriately who was given his job back with a promotion and those kinds of things help. So we are actually fortunate now to have this Committee working. It didn't at first because again we tried to look for racial and sexual representation instead of people who made differences in the institution as it stood.

QUESTION: How is that whole operation funded? Is the President elected to use money in the institution for that purpose?

GROOMES: Affirmative action at our institution is a regular part of the institution's operation. It is not an adjunct activity. Money that is provided for recruitment of people is used for recruitment for minorities and women. The university's operational budget is prioritized in affirmative action. So where there is a need for that kind of thing, yes. It is not a special fund though. It is in the ordinary operation. It does not require special legislation to do affirmative action if the chief person is responsive. We have also had a situation where now administrators at the institution are evaluated on their total effectiveness and all of the manifest objective activity as well as

responsiveness to affirmative action. In the President's policy it is stated that each administrator will be evaluated for promotion and increase in salary based on his or her effectiveness for all of these things, included in that is the realization of affirmative action objectives. It is a bonus in a sense, but it is really a matter of rewarding people for doing their jobs. Because it is an individual's job at the institution to not respond to just a segment but to the broad population. For the first time in the history of Florida that has been included in the descriptions for administrators and it is making a difference. I don't believe that people do things they don't get paid for necessarily, but they are responding to it.

CLARK: Could you explain how people are chosen or elected to the Commission? And also, do they get time off to do the work of the Commission, or is this in addition to their other work?

GROOMES: That has been reported as one of the difficulties. They do not get time off. They do get the support of the departments. Nobody can actually be penalized for going to the meeting. We tried, well, I tried, independently to see if through them, by just asking if they were having difficulty making the meetings—in evaluating this whole process, that is one of the recommendations we have in now, that the persons serving on that particular committee, at this point be given release time. For the first 16 or 18 months, it wasn't necessary because nobody used it. But now that they have established some credibility, it is really picking up business and so they find that they are in a lot of sessions. So it has now become necessary for us to suggest that they be given release time. In fact, we are saying that they get credit for research in this area, because in fact, that's what they are doing, they are researching problems and difficulties and that is a bona fide reason to have persons publish. In fact we have one woman member right now who is doing an article on strategies for defeating traditional structures.

QUESTION: And how are the members chosen?

GROOMES: Okay, we had the Faculty Senate make recommendations. We had the organization which represents career service make a recommendation of a person for them, the Black professional organization made a recommendation and then we had all of the colleges send a representative so that is about 11 members. We had a document on the construction and procedures and I would be more than happy to send you a copy if you will write me at the institution in the President's Office.

DOTY: Our grievance procedures sound quite a lot like Columbia's. Each union contract at Harvard has the procedure written right into the individual union contract. For all non-teaching staff, we have structured grievance procedures which are included in the plan.

COMMENT: The long procedure has deficiency as I look at it, it hasn't been used in the final step. If you have a procedure and it isn't used, then that's something that you want to look at. It results in final and binding arbitration for non-teaching support staff and it results in an advisory fact-finding for the professional and administrative staff to the President. The procedure itself is three years old, it was revised to include cases of discrimination two years ago and nobody has gone to that final step. It is

available.

It stresses the unfortunate interaction at the earlier stages and that has been most helpful. The existence of procedures where it is known—especially in an institution like this (Harvard) that is highly decentralized—where it is known that finally the particular situation is one that can go beyond anybody in that power structure, and if it were a supporting staff person, can be settled. It would require the governing board of the institution since they have given the power in this particular case to a hearing committee to finally decide this situation. We realize that that's in place, and of course people down in the structure that start dealing without grievance look on it very seriously.

QUESTION: What about on the faculty level?

DOTY: Each of the faculties has its own grievance procedures at the faculty level and it is included in "Tentative Recommendations for the Discipline of Officers"; there are certain broad recommendations given by the Committee on Governments, then each Dean adapts them for his/her own faculty. They are not really as structured as those for staff.

QUESTION: If the grievance was not resolved in the faculty is there some central organization?

DOTY: Yes, well then it would be, it would go to the Corporation, which is the President's

COMMENT: There is no Faculty Senate at Harvard. From what I can understand of the procedures, the organization of Harvard at the faculty level is highly decentralized with a great deal of autonomy resting with each.

QUESTION: And if it is not resolved on an individual faculty level then it goes to the Corporation?

BUTLER: It could go. It is quite likely that something like that would go outside the institution.

RANDOLPH: We of course have not mandated how grievance procedures should be structured, because there may be a need for them to vary at different institutions. However, we have found that we are in the process of analyzing various grievance procedures in affirmative action plans. We have found that when they are fragmented, they cause a lot of problems to you personally. At many institutions the faculty is treated one way and the administrators are treated another way, and the support staff is treated even a different way with different types of procedures for each. Now I don't see the need for this in terms of discrimination or affirmative action. I think that the best mechanism would be to have one procedure for all employees. If an employee felt that he or she was being discriminated against because of race, color or national origin, then he or she would have a body to take the grievance to. What we have found quite often, several people who have come to HEW with a grievance, we have said to them have you pursued this internally, and they have not been able to find out where to go. They have gone to their administrator and they tried to use that and they say, well no, because of the peculiarities of your situation you should go to the faculty, or

you should see this person, and so the person really doesn't know because of the complexities of the system, how to get relief in the whole situation. So that a simple system, more along the lines that Freddie mentioned, wherein there is a committee or a group to look at all types of grievances that relate to discrimination or to the implementation of the affirmative action program, we have found to be the most successful.

QUESTION: Bob, would you suggest then that you have one procedure for grievances arising out of the affirmative action plan and another for other grievances? I am thinking now of grievances on the basis of age, which may arise with a Caucasian male.

RANDOLPH: Well, if age was considered a discriminatory inclusion in that grievance then it would come under the affirmative action program, because the affirmative action program would address discrimination in all forms. Even though the Executive Order does not cover age discrimination, if it is a form of discrimination, the affirmative action should cover it.

CLARK: There is an academic affairs committee that is a senatorial committee at Columbia. They operate under the code of academic freedom and tenure which is included in the statutes of the university. That is a very loosely worded set of procedures for the resolution of grievances. The key to that was whether or not the Senate committee wishes to hear. They can decline.

GROOMES: Responding to the gentleman here, the EEO Commission at Florida State does respond to age as a result of the recent guideline which says you cannot discriminate against people 40 years of age and over, so that we not only get minorities' and women's concerns directed at us, but occasionally get the physically impaired and handicapped as well as the aged.

QUESTION: I want to address my question to Mrs. Groomes relating to the plan and see whether or not she can give us some ideas. In the state of Louisiana we are as you know in litigation. Primarily the problem is that we have traditionally three Black universities that want to remain so. By that I mean they have a sort of pride and were it not for that there would be no problem in Louisiana because they are integrated. How do you, do you have a comparable situation in Florida, and if so, how do you include that in the affirmative action program?

GROOMES: We have an acceptable affirmative action plan and we now have an acceptable state desegregation plan. Louisiana as I understand did have some of the same kinds of difficulties we had in Florida. You in particular have the same kind of problems we have in Tallahassee, in that we have Florida State University and Florida A. and M. University. However, I am glad that you said that if you didn't have that institution with all that pride and its Blackness, that you wouldn't have a problem. It is quite different from what we have in Florida. The problem is not that Florida A. and M. is an institution that considers Black pride as significant, but what I think we have and suspect that you might have is the fact that historically the traditionally Black institution had not been given the same kind of

resources and subsequently there has been inequity in funding.

In spite of that there has been survival, they have learned to respond in spite of that, and now they are saying that one institution is better than the other. It was designed for the purpose of segregating people and now they want to place the burden of adjustments on the institution that was created as a result of racist attitudes of the people, not because of Black pride. I don't think Florida is that way and I suspect that Louisiana is not that way either. It is not just a matter of Black pride at the institution but also in the eyes of many if it is a traditionally Black institution, it is assumed to be inferior and what has happened most often is that it is not assumed, but in fact, underfunded. It was treated as a second class institution and it had to overcome that. And so right now, it has demonstrated that the graduates of those institutions have gone on and they have made a tremendous contribution in general. And that we are looking at ways now of making sure that that particular institution does not pay the cost for the whole system's activity. And I think you might want to ask some particular questions. We have a coordinator in the State University System's office that I question because we had a President who retired from an institution and he needed some years and they had to put him somewhere so now he is at the Board of Regents serving as coordinator for desegregation. I do think that was unfair and most unresponsive and we are reporting it and I want to see what HEW does about it. The whole activity they are going about now is they are doing crazy things like providing incentives for white faculty to go to the traditionally Black institutions. They will give them a \$10,000 bonus for relocating. I think it is ridiculous. I don't really think it is undesirable duty, but the implication there is that it is undesirable so we will pay you \$10,000 if you will buckle in, and grin and bear it. But that is what they are doing and people are moving.

They are doing other kinds of things in terms of exchanging students, there are cooperative programs between Florida State and Florida A. and M. University. They are moving now toward equity in salaries. The persons who have worked at the traditionally Black institution made less than people doing comparable work at the other institutions. But they work as hard and harder in some instances because they had less to work with in terms of facilities, equipment, travel, etc. In spite of that however, I think Florida A. and M. University deserves to remain an autonomous institution. I am not so sure that I am optimistic but I hoped to believe that the legislative bodies in that state are really serious about maintaining it. I really think that they are playing the green smoke thing now. They know that the Black community has been up in arms and they can't do it immediately, but I am not so sure the long range plan is what I would like to think about. And that's what I say here and that is what I say there. I am not so sure it is fair, and I am not sure they ought to be allowed to get away with implementing it at all.

QUESTION: Is this a specific element approved in the desegregation plan?

GROOMES: Well, yes, it is listed in there as creative strategy to attract more white instructors at traditionally Black institutions, the same thing for

students. Right now they also give special scholarships to white students who will go to Florida A. and M. who have high scores on the College Entrance Examination Boards. They are buying super scholars to go to that school that didn't have super scholars which I am also opposed to.

QUESTION: Our school is actively recruiting faculty at different levels, but the problem is we have many minority faculty who are in the upper tenure and we are coming up against cut-off points in terms of tenured faculty. I wanted to know if the panelists would address the issue of affirmative action and tenure as it pertains to minorities and women. Not the anti-discrimination part, but have you come up with any instances where faculty have been approved for tenure but they cannot be tenured because of the cut-off point for them. What happens in terms of affirmative action?

GROOMES: I am not sure I understand cut-off point.

QUESTION: For example, at our university we have 60% of the faculty who can be tenured, and we have a couple of instances that are coming up where minority faculty, Black women, have been approved by their departments for tenure but cannot be tenured because of this cut-off point. I wanted to know if you have had any instances of this.

CLARK: Well, I am not sure that there have been instances that parallel the examples that you are giving at Columbia. We are operating on a five-year plan. The affirmative action plan and the five-year budget plan are meshed. We do know a number of positions that will be funded for the next five years. We do know which positions will be tenured, we know what tenure lines exist. When a person reaches the "cut-off point," the department makes a recommendation and convenes an ad hoc committee. That ad hoc committee determines whether or not the person gets tenure. So our system is a little different. Persons who have not gotten tenure through that process who claim discrimination have not come through an internal grievance redress machinery but have gone outside. This includes white males by the way.

GROOMES: I don't think that our system parallels the question that you are raising either, but let me say that we do look at the rate of turnover regarding faculty and the like in establishing numerical goals and we do address that in terms of trying to get consideration for minorities and women who have been traditionally excluded and sort of share the preferential treatment at this point. So we do have a higher rate of persons moving into tenure lines from protected classes than we have had historically.

RANDOLPH: In our review at HEW, we have not encountered this problem. It has not been brought to our attention. But, I could see where if it did exist the university could provide some new means of retaining those individuals without giving them tenure. Let's say that a department was in a 60% category for tenure, but the need for the course was such that the need for that particular instructor existed. The university could retain that person on a year to year contractual basis until some point at which time tenure could be granted. Now this of course would probably require modification in

their existing procedures.

CLARK: This would require major modification in the existing procedures.

RANDOLPH: Well, that could be accomplished. Some institutions are modifying their tenure structure.

GROOMES: How did your institution handle the situation on cut-offs before affirmative action?

COMMENT: What happens is that people were given terminal contracts. If there was a 60% cut-off point and people reached that point they were given a one-year contract and told that they would have to leave. There are a couple of instances where minority faculty had been given very strong votes of approval for tenure and because there is not that much turnover in faculty it looked like they would have to leave after the one-year contract.

COMMENT: This is a problem that exists all over. I am not in a university or college structure, I am the director of a division that deals with the law against discrimination in the entire state and this happens often where a person does have the number of years for tenure but then because you have 50-60% and they get to this point, they are just let go. There has been no particular remedy for gaining tenure except if it's handled in an inequitable manner and we have found this in many instances particularly dealing with women.

GROOMES: I think that the current trend in higher education, or at least some of the issues in higher education, for instance collective bargaining, tenure and affirmative action have been established as diametrically opposed. I don't think that those things are going to jibe necessarily. In the State of Florida we are just moving into collective bargaining and I think that is going to take care of part of your question because I am not so sure that tenure may not be going out. If it does it would sure help.

COMMENT: We solved tenure in our college by eliminating it. Those people who were on tenure retained it, of course, but nobody gets tenure anymore. We give five-year contracts so that everybody has an equal chance of staying throughout a lifetime if so decreed by the department.

RANDOLPH: Would you identify your institution?

ANSWER: Rhode Island School of Design.

QUESTION: I just want to ask her whether they treat white males the same as they treat minorities?

COMMENT: I am not talking about discrimination or nondiscrimination. I wanted to know whether there was an affirmative action counter-part. Beverly mentioned earlier that it is a kind of an open door, you come in and before you are ready you go out. I was wondering whether there is anything going on in other institutions to keep this from happening.

GROOMES: It would be that same problem, the 60% perhaps is 100% white male or pretty close to that so I think that what she is saying is that there is a great need to do something about infiltrating that 60% cut-off

group.

COMMENT: In addition to recruitment goals at our institution, Dartmouth College, we do have promotion and tenure goals for women and minorities and we hope that over a period of five or ten years there will be so many new promotions from the protected classes into the senior ranks.

COMMENT: One I want to say that HEW (John Bynoe and Bob Randolph) has been very helpful to us in terms of giving us the flexibility to take the approach that we thought was appropriate. We don't deal in the traditional concept of affirmative action. We deal in power. We talk about power. We talk about it in terms of who makes decisions and who should be educated for what purposes. Who should be selected to run not only America, but the world. We are sitting now at the seat of one of the most powerful institutions in the world, Harvard. We don't have special assistants in charge of affirmative action because we find that that doesn't work. One of the things that disturbs me greatly and has since I have been here is that I think we need to at the next conference, wherever it may be held, have a dichotomy. Those of us who have been in this business for over ten years and those who have come into the business can share your ideas. The \$190—I don't have any problem with. I represent the President of the University of Massachusetts and I have an unlimited expense account, but there are some people in financial aid who should be here with very good ideas who couldn't afford to come because the institution could not, or would not pay the \$190. That's the first thing.

The second thing is I, the gentleman here raised the question about historically Black colleges, not Negro. I was in Atlanta in April and Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie, representatives from those agencies, decided, the policy was set then, that they would not, could not, offend the public law of the land, they could not in good conscience support any longer public institutions that violate the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Which means in essence that public institutions that have been historically Black are no longer going to be viable because they can't get the money. Every time they have a disturbance like they had at Southern University they become a part of the University of Louisiana, University of Maryland Eastern Shore which used to be Maryland State. They have also decided that there are 15 Black schools that will survive, Atlanta University Complex will be one group. Howard University will survive because it's a line item under HEW, it's a Federal institution. Then you have of course Fisk and Meharry. This to me is a significant aspect of affirmative action that we never talk about. This to me is one of the things I am interested in talking about. It may be that I have been in the business too damn long. I am not interested in testing. All I know is when I talk to my good friends who happen to be Jewish in New York, and after we have had two Martinis or two Chivas on the rocks they tell me, you know 35% of the undergraduates at Harvard are Jewish, those are those who identify themselves as Jewish. I don't want to argue about whether or not we need to talk about who's been more oppressed. The fact is I don't want to talk any more about testing. That session on testing was offensive to me. The fact is testing is a way of life in America and in the world. What do I need to do to teach the students I am teaching,

particularly Black and other minorities and/or women, that hey, this is what you need to get into Harvard. And when I read in the *New York Times* two weeks ago that if in fact you are going to be successful in business in terms of those who have been successful, however you define that, Harvard is a school to go to. The only issue I am raising is affirmative action should be dealing with power not grievance. It should be dealing with who makes decisions. We have five personnel officers on our campus, five, a campus of 40,000 people, 23,000 students. One person can't deal with it. We have four personnel officers, but the power is in the personnel committees who select faculty. The deans are so intimidated by the union and we have a student union also, that they sign off in a *pro forma* way. But they aren't accountable when we go to court, when Bob Randolph puts the ring on us and says hey, you have got to do something about this. The fact is the person, or the group who made the decision was the personnel committee in English but you sue the university and unfortunately many people find out that they end up suing the corporate counsel.

You have got to talk about who makes decisions about who gets in, who hires and who fires. Faculty committees hire and fire. Even though they are not called that and in fact there is a violation. Sitting next to the President does not answer it. But if in fact you can't make decisions, you are not doing anything.

COMMENT: I have a comment, not a question. I have the feeling that what is really coming out all through this is we are really talking about politics but we don't say it out loud. And I think Dr. Groomes tried to say that power and politics is where it's at, and not the testing and all those kinds of nice things. Those are a lot of tools. I know that right after Dartmouth I was down at Maryland and the one thing we felt was that the whole purpose for our office was political strategy. Who has the power and how do you get to that person? You have got to know something about political strategy. It's not all nice and happy and friendly. It's not that we don't all love each other now. It's dirty politics all the time. You have to know who to put pressure on, where, and you have to crank those groups up and you have to say now is the time to put the pressure on A, B, and C. You have got to make things happen by influencing the power structure or becoming the power structure, one or the other. But nobody ever said anything about that word.

CLARK: I didn't say it but I was alluding to it when I talked about the organizational structure, how it actually functions and to get in on that, and who the influential people are and get them in on what we are doing. I think that addresses the question.

COMMENT: At the risk of an over-simplification here. I am not sure how things work at colleges and universities but I think at some other institutions, in industry, the very survival of these industries, the very survival of these institutions will depend upon good management. Affirmative action is just good management. I would respectfully suggest that indeed when you have an institution whose total budget for its operational monies is represented to a large degree through federal contracts and grants, it makes a difference in the heads of the chief executive officers. I

understand what this woman is talking about and appreciate and think she has addressed herself very well to these issues and that is where it's at. Particularly as she talked about her one vote versus a consensus that is made on a golf course or lounge or somewhere else. When you say to a physician who is practicing and he has a million dollar reseach grant, you say pal, the ball game is over unless you do what is supposed to be done he understands that. He makes some things happen. And that to me is a lot of leverage.

DOTY: Thank you. I would like to thank our panelists for the discussion.