

CHAPTER 1 - THE HISTORY OF THE WOMEN'S COMMISSION

IN THEIR OWN WORDS

During the academic year 1970-71, a small group of women began meeting to discuss the role of women on the University of Miami campus. Although the problems at Miami were apparently no greater than those at universities throughout the country, there was need here, as elsewhere, for reform. The impetus for the Women's Commission came from representatives of the Associated Women Students who asked administrators and faculty members to join them in planning programs, Ti-Grace Atkinson, a radical feminist, spoke to a large group and stimulated our thinking about the women's movement. In the Spring, we sponsored a day-long program on women in academic life for students and many university administrators. By the Fall of 1971, eleven strong and united in purpose, we asked President Henry King Stanford for his support, and he responded by appointing us the University of Miami Women's Commission to assist him in considerations of the status of women ("1974 Report," 2).

These eleven women met for two semesters before writing a persuasive and influential letter to President Stanford asking for his support of "the special needs and interests of all women with the University Community (Abrams, et al., 1)." In this letter, the women expressed their concern over the University's response to the changing roles of women in society and on college campuses. They stressed to President Stanford that they felt that the "University can and, we believe, must more effectively provide opportunities for women to realize their full potential within and beyond the educational and social context of our

institution...which applies to women students, staff, and faculty (Abrams, et al., 1).” Within two months, these eleven women were able to meet with President Stanford to discuss the status of women at UM.

The President followed up this meeting with a letter directed to the University of Miami Women’s Commission. In the letter, President Stanford clearly stated his support of the group and granted the appointment of the eleven women involved, as the first members of the Women’s Commission. He also made mention of the administration’s interest in promoting opportunities for women in area of employment at UM which was one the Commission’s great concerns at that time. President Stanford closed this letter to the newly formed and appointed Women’s Commission by stating, “I am convinced that we, the administration, the Commission, and other agencies (local and national) interested in changing the nation’s thinking with regard to women, can cooperatively speed up the achievement of our objectives (Stanford,1).” What a promising start to an organization committed to promising a better future for women at the University of Miami! As **Audrey Finkelstein** said in our interview with her,

It was a cooperative effort, I mean you have a Rita Deutsch, Phyllis Franklin...you’ve got all these women I’ve mentioned. It’s not just one person, it ends up one or two open their mouths or have the ear of someone. I believe that the Women’s Commission then and now has a two-fold responsibility of making women aware of their rights and responsibilities and secondly - and doing

something with it. You really have to raise the level of expectation in these circumstances, but as I say, I put responsibility with rights.

This original group of eleven women proved they could be responsible with their rights when they made the push for the President's support of their organization and its objectives.

IN THE EYES OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Initially, the Commission chose to limit membership to fifteen women because they felt this would be a workable number for "planning, organizing, and testing the goals and purposes of the program ("New Honor," 2)." In the Fall of 1978, membership was opened to anyone on the UM campus who was interested in furthering the goals and objectives of the Commission. Additionally, the members chose this time to restructure the organization into ten working committees (*UM Women's Commission*, 1). The chairperson of each committee would then represent their committee on the Commission's Executive Council. The committees of the Women's Commission consisted of the Grievance Assistance Committee, the Salary and Tenure Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the Speakers Bureau, the Student Welfare and Programming Committee, the Employee Welfare and Programming Committee, the Library Acquisition Committee, the Hiring Practices Committee, the Strategy Committee, and the Committee on Committees. (A listing of the committees' responsibilities and objectives can be found in section two of the notebook attachment.)

Each of these independent committees and their goals were created to directly correspond with the Women's Commission's overall goal strategy.

Within their first three years, the University of Miami Women's Commission accomplished a great number of unprecedented, unexpected achievements which directly contributed to the improvement of the status of women on campus. The Commission was able to meet the goals and expectations created by the group's founding members in 1971. (A listing of these goals can be found in section two of the notebook attachment.) All of these accomplishments were documented in the group's 1974 Report on the Status of Women at the University of Miami. One of the Commission's primary concerns was to be granted the opportunity to recruit and invite an influential woman to speak at a UM graduation. Members of the Commission worked with Dr. Stanford to invite the University's first female commencement speaker, Dr. Rita Hauser, attorney and representative to the United Nations. During this same time period, members of the Women's Commission also made speeches, published articles, and taught courses at UM on the subject of Women's History. Throughout the years, the Commission collected a library on feminist subjects and published booklets of interest and concern to university women.

During these first few years, the Women's Commission conducted a survey on the need for an on-campus day care facility. This research and subsequent demand for a facility ultimately led to the creation of the day care center at the Episcopalian Church on the UM campus. The individual chosen to serve as the director of this first day care facility, the UM/Canterbury Center, was a member of the Women's Commission ("1974 Report", 5). When the Women's Commission distributed whistles to women students and employees on

campus as a preventive device to be used in a potential assault, the school received world-wide attention and publicity (Montgomery, 3C). The Women's Commission played an active role in various other activities on the UM campus by assisting individual women, sponsoring programs for students and staff, and participating in national organizations for women's rights and advancement.

In the Fall of 1972, the Women's Commission was afforded the opportunity to participate in an influential and responsive position at the University. Dr. Carl McKenry, Vice President for Academic Affairs, requested that the Women's Commission's faculty members create and serve in the role of the Women's Advisory Committee on Academic Affairs ("1974 Report," 7). The twelve women identified were representatives of all academic sectors and were requested to serve as liaisons between the Academic Affairs Division and the Women's Commission. They were asked to advise the administration on specific problems of women and to make the administration aware of any procedures at the University that may demonstrate unequal treatment of women. Earning this type of recognition through their contribution was the primary goal of the beginning group of women who formed the original Women's Commission.

The founding members' drive and determination to support and promote the status of women at the University of Miami has continued to thrive in the minds and hearts of the organization's later members. Throughout the years, the University of Miami's Women Commission has made various other significant contributions to the status of women employees and students on the school's campus. Following its inception in 1971, the Commission issued several status reports on women at the University of Miami. The first,

which was published in 1974, suggested that women on the UM faculty “have been accorded a place...manifestly inferior to man’s and have often been excluded from choice positions altogether (Rosenton, 1E).” President Stanford’s reaction to the report was encouraging through his commitment to the wide dispersal of the report, so that “all members of the academic community [could] read it and make an extra effort to remedy the inequities (Rosenton, 1E).”

However, when the Commission published their 1977 Status Report, the results were all too similar and familiar to the information obtained by the members conducting the research for the report three years prior (Hatton, 1E). Still strongly motivated to trigger change on campus, the Women’s Commission continued to fight the battle against salary and hiring differences for women at the University. In another effort to document and educate the University community on women’s issues, the Women’s Commission conducted a survey of all women in AO3 positions at UM in order to gain their outlooks and opinions on the status of women on campus. This report which helped to identify the crucial concerns of women at UM was submitted to the University’s administration, along with the Women’s Commission’s recommendations, for action and improvement on campus. (A copy of this survey and the Commission’s recommendations can be found in section one of the attached notebook.) From this, the Commission started their tradition of developing their annual publication of “The Climate for Women at the University of Miami: Current Weather Report.” This report includes the “Sun Spots” and “Cold Waves” at the University which identifies the positive and negative contributions to the status of women employees and students at UM. (The 1997 report can be found in section two of the notebook attachment.)

As the priorities and objectives of the Commission changed, so did their committees' foci. In the 1980s, the Commission responded to the needs of the women on campus by adding the following committees: Training and Development, Rape Assistance and Sexual Harassment, and Athletics. The Training and Development Committee took on the responsibility of planning and coordinating the Women's History Month each year for the Commission and all of the University community. Its members were charged with arranging for the panel of speakers and the subsequent events that were involved in the month's activities to include films, discussions, seminars, and the "Take Your Daughter to Work Day (Piloto, 3)." It was the goal of the Rape Assistance and Sexual Harassment Committee to create and support the school's Surrogate Mothers program and the Sexual Assault Response Team, as well as programs educating the staff and students of UM on the effects of sexual harassment and assault to women on the college campus (Ouedens, 1). The Commission's Athletic Committee came into existence following the implementation of Title IX on college campuses. Their mission was to identify and encourage changes in unequal funding and facilities for female athletes at UM. Similarly, the Women's Commission became involved in the demand for women to be admitted to Iron Arrow, one of the highest honors attainable at the University.

The Women's Commission was also responsible for the initiation and success of the University's offering of a Minor in Women's Studies (Rovira, 2). Initially, the program met with some resistance from the administration and some departments who felt that women's studies would lead university women in the "wrong direction." The Women's Commission was committed to the program and pushed for courses to be offered in Women in Politics,

Women in Literature, Women Authors, and the Psychology of Women. As the interest level of the faculty and students grew, more courses were added to the curriculum and the Commission was able to gain recognition for a minor in Women's Studies by the University. (A current listing of courses offered in Women's Studies can be found in section seven of the notebook attachment.) Rita Deutsch, Assistant Dean for the College of Arts & Sciences, and other members of the Women's Commission are still committed to having a Major in Women's Studies recognized at UM.

Two of the Commission's and the University of Miami's first and most influential leaders in the area of support for the status of women have since passed away. The Women's Commission still honors these two women today by giving awards in their names to the person and student making the greatest impact on women's issues at UM each year. These awards are presented to the recipients at the Annual University of Miami Women's Commission breakfast held each Spring.

As the saying goes, "A woman's work is never done!" Although this statement may have discriminatory origins, it is all too true for the women who have committed themselves throughout the existence of the University of Miami Women's Commission. Their dedication and sense of responsibility to the women of the University community is what has lead to their unmeasurable contributions to changing and promoting the status of women on the University of Miami campus. Without this organization and its faithful, courageous members, this University would still be working to achieve what is normally accomplished "all in a day's work" for these women!

CHAPTER 2 - FROM MAKING HISTORY IN THE COMMISSION - TO MARKING THE FUTURE OF WOMEN AT UM

The Women's Commission offers two awards each year to deserving members of the University community. The first award that the Women's Commission initiated was the May A. Brunson Award. This award was named in honor of the University's second Dean of Women and is given annually to the person within the University community who most contributes to improving the status of women on campus. The Commission also contributes to the University Library for the purchase of books and periodicals related to women's studies following the announcement of this award each year. The books are known as the May A. Brunson collection. The second award, the Louise P Mills Award, is given to a student at the University who exhibits "leadership, creativity, caring and high academic performance." Traditionally, these awards are given at the Women's Commission annual breakfast meeting held each Spring at the UM Faculty Club.

The first of these two influential women on the campus of the University of Miami to be recognized with an award dedicated to her memory and service to women's concerns was May A. Brunson. Dean Brunson came to the University of Miami in 1946 following World War II. She graduated Magna Cum Laude from Judson College in Marion, Alabama in 1935 and continued there as an English Instructor, Director of Admissions, and Dean of Students. While holding these various positions, Dean Brunson began her studies at Columbia University Teachers College where she received both her M.A. in 1945 and her Ed.D. in Student Personnel Administration in 1957. Her dissertation, An Integrating Process in

Education, was published by Columbia University and was used in counseling programs across the country.

Dean Brunson began her career at the University of Miami as a Counselor for Women and was later named to various other influential, committed positions, to include: the Associate Dean of Women in 1954, the Dean of Women in 1955, and the acting Dean of Students in 1965. While at UM, Dean Brunson was a member of a great number of educational organizations throughout the local community and the world. She was a member of both the American Association of University Women and the American Association of University Professors. She also chaired the Regional Interviewing Committee for Exchange Teachers for the State Department and the U.S. Office of Education. Dean Brunson was also involved in college honor societies, one of which was Alpha Lambda Delta. She held the office of National President of that organization in 1966. Her contributions to ALD were so great that the group decided to offer a \$2,000 graduate study fellowship for the 1972 school year in her name. Even with her outside commitments, Dean Brunson's dedication and love for her students did not go unnoticed. Each student had a personal conference with Dean Brunson prior to their graduation. Therefore, it was somehow seemingly appropriate that she was found dead in her office one night following a late night of conferences with students. President Stanford reflected on his memory of this determined and dedicated servant to the University of Miami, and particularly the women on campus, when he said at her funeral, "[Her] qualities of bearing, poise, courtesy, dignity, mannerly behavior all connoted a great respect for herself and her fellow man. She represented true aristocracy, not of economic or social cast, but of intellect and spirit."

One noted recipient of the May A. Brunson Award was Joe Frechette, Director of Public Safety for UM (Prospero, 9). Audrey Finkelstein shared with us his story and his “converted” commitment to women at UM in our interview with her.

Audrey Finkelstein and Phyllis Franklin were members of the search committee when the University was interviewing candidates for the position of director of public safety. Under their leadership and because of their insistence on being a part of these search committees, women’s perspectives were able to be voiced in the hiring process. Apparently during the interview Joe Frechette had with the search committee, he made reference to Phyllis as being “cute.” Not surprisingly, this led to both Ms. Franklin and Ms. Finkelstein’s objection to Frechette being hired for the position. The University hired him regardless of the discriminatory comment. Later, after having spent a great deal of time and effort working with the Women’s Commission on campus safety issues, Mr. Frechette assured the group that he had certainly learned from them. Ironically in 1990, the Women’s Commission gave Mr. Frechette the Women’s Commission’s May A. Brunson Award. The award was given to him for having employed an unprecedented number of women in the public safety department and given them the opportunity to serve in positions of some authority. For example, Frechette hired Jane Gailey who started as a dispatcher with the department and over time was promoted to Coordinator of Parking, an administrative position. Additionally, he gave budgetary funds for his employees to attend workshops in

areas of sexual assault and battery. In turn, these women gave lectures and workshops on the subject matter. Ms. Finkelstein closed by stating that, "Now by the way it isn't that we, the Women's Commission, misjudged him, but we had an influence on him. It isn't that he wasn't prepared for his job, it just wasn't a dimension he had thought of. So we were a positive influence on him, not a threat."

Louise P. Mills was a graduate of the University of Miami where she received both her bachelor's and master's degrees. Following her own pursuit of education, she taught education for several years at UM before being appointed to the position of associate dean of women in 1963. She succeeded Dean Brunson in 1970 as the dean of women. In 1971, when the university combined the offices of the dean of men and the dean of women, she became the assistant dean of personnel, a position she held until her retirement in 1981. Dean Mills was involved in many local organizations in the Coral Gables community even after her retirement. She was also a former president of several influential, educational organizations, to include: the Florida Association of Women's Deans, the Southern College Personnel Association, and the UM's Women's Commission of which she was one of the founding members. Louise P. Mills served the University and its community for over 30 years, as a student, an educator, a volunteer, and an administrator. William Sandler, former dean of student personnel, remembered Dean Mills by sharing that a great amount of the work she did was done as a volunteer, in addition to her duties as dean, in order to assist in a

variety of ways throughout the University. He concluded his thoughts by adding that, “Everyone who knew Louise will feel like they lost a true friend.”

CHAPTER 3 - FROM SEXUAL HARASSMENT CONCERNS ON CAMPUS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ASSAULT TASK FORCE

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

In 1978, several members of the Women’s Commission were invited to speak at the gathering of the University of Miami’s Administrative Council. The retreat was held that year in September prior to the start of the 1978-79 school year. Although the Commission had been working for women’s issues at the University since its inception in 1971, this year marked the first time that members from the Women’s Commission had been invited to attend or speak at the Administrative Council Retreat. The Women’s Commission portion of the program was led by their current president, Audrey Finkelstein, who spoke on The Concerns of the Women’s Commission at the University of Miami. Always striving to find the positive in anything seemingly negative situation, Ms. Finkelstein opened her talk with solid, stimulating statements. Her objective seemed to be to have her portion of their presentation lean more heavily on the positive side, so that it would carry the other women through their more serious, argumentative speech topics which dealt with the discrimination of women on the campus of the University of Miami. Her intention was for the Women’s Commission segment of the retreat with a complementary, persuasive introduction and therefore, began by saying:

We are very encouraged that the concerns of women are part of the continuing concerns of the University that you’re meeting here to deal with today. That

we are here with you suggests to me that you really want to know about the condition of women in the University of Miami family so that we can really move forward together towards betterment and equity. We are essentially together at least in the sense of wanting what's best for the University and that it be the best and what affects one segment, I think, affects it all (Dunham, 67).

Ms. Finkelstein's goal was to try to gain the support and consideration of the men representing the University on the issue of women's concerns and the Women's Commission. What better opportunity to inform and educate these men than the Administrative Council Retreat. This retreat was a gathering of all influential men, and for the first time, women, at the University of Miami. Their purpose was to address any and all concerns affecting the faculty, staff, and students at the school. Ms. Finkelstein continued by saying:

I hope that I don't have to really remind you all that as a Women's Commission, we don't manufacture the problems. It really is not how we get our kicks. We get bombarded with problems. We try to deflect them when we can and when they should be and so there's a lot of stuff that you never hear about. We're sometimes your buffer and when that's appropriate, we're glad. Others we do pass on to you because you're the only ones that can do something about them and they are things that something ought to be done about...some of these that we share with you today, or at any time they come up, may be feelings, as well as fact, but you people deal with people and you know you've got to deal with feelings, as well as fact (Dunham, 67).

Ms. Finkelstein made more statements of concern in her speech which were deserving of consideration by the administrators gathered there that day. She addressed concerns at the University related women's athletics, the hiring and salaries of women employees, the need for a woman in the central administration, the treatment of and attitudes against women on campus, and "academic rednecks." Ms. Finkelstein withdrew from explaining further what was meant by "academic rednecks," stating instead that she thought Dr. Stanford would want to hear more of an in-depth description about this and the various other issues that "chip

away” at the University that he should be aware of. The first was “academic rednecks,” a topic that Phyllis Franklin of the Women’s Commission had unfortunately been exposed to on many occasions as a university administrator. She would also discuss other related issues, for she was in the position to have to deal with these types of concerns every day on campus.

Phyllis Franklin’s talk was directed at these “academic rednecks” on the campus of the University of Miami. “Academic rednecks” were identified as men who made derogatory comments to women in the workplace and in the classrooms at the school (Dunham, 78). They were guilty of sexual harassment with their tasteless statements and unwanted flirting. Many of these men believed that a woman’s place was still in the home, or “in his bed,” and not on the college campus. Ms. Franklin knew this would be a tough subject for the men at the retreat to hear about that day and to hopefully discuss later. Sexual harassment was a subject often talked about by women on the campus but had never been addressed by the administration and faculty of the University among who may have even been guilty of such acts. Ms. Franklin recognized this unwillingness in these men to address these concerns and decided that including them in her talk at the retreat would be a perfect introduction to finding a solution to the actions and comments of these “academic rednecks” at the University. She began her speech that day by saying:

The problem is that when men make remarks about women, they are not able to recognize them as discriminatory. [Another] reason it’s difficult to talk about sexist remarks is that often when women do complain that discriminatory remarks are hurtful, people say - “you have no sense of humor, you’re nitpicking, you are too concerned with trivial matters.” I’d like to convince you, or at least make you start thinking about this, that such remarks are not trivial and concern about them does not mean a lack of humor, but that they really are hurtful. I know that this is going to require almost an act of faith on your part - a kind of acceptance of our word that such remarks are hurtful to women (Dunham, 78).

Ms. Franklin then shared with the members of the retreat a story about a female student whom she had created from stories that had been told to her by a group of women students at UM . This fictional student was created in order to hide the identities of the real women who had experienced these true-to-life episodes of sexual harassment in their classrooms and around the campus. Ms. Franklin asked the men of the group to imagine that this fictional student, Sally, was their daughter, their kid sister, or even their wife, in order for them to be able to better relate to the victimizing events that this student was subjected to.

As Ms. Franklin's story unfolded, Sally was forced to watch slides of naked women while her professor commented of the different parts of their female anatomy in a sexual manner. In this same class, she was called a "libber" and a lesbian for wanting to do a project on women's issues. (This term "libber" was equivalent to "nigger" for an Afro-American student.) In another class, Sally had to endure comments about women belonging in the home and that the only reason they chose to go back to school after getting married was that they must be in "unhappy marriages." She also was forced to listen to remarks from a professor about how all women are "over-emotional" and "tend to overreact." Another professor made two derogatory comments related to women during one class period. He first said that the men of the class might as well get used to it, "all women are dirty" and followed this by calling on Sally in class by saying, "You with the super structure." Sally was also told that she must be "abnormal, not really feminine" because she had achieved the highest score in her science class of mostly men. Ms. Franklin wanted to also make certain the administrators at the retreat were aware that the sexual harassment was not limited to just

these episodes, that many others were occurring all over the campus of the University of Miami to “Sally” and other women just like her.

All of these events related to sexual harassment in the classroom had been relayed to Phyllis Franklin during a secret meeting of women students at the University. The women met in secret that previous Spring because they were fearful of the reaction of their professors if they were to make complaints to the University’s administration about sexual harassment in the classroom. The students did invite several women administrators to attend their meeting. The purpose of this gathering was to discuss the treatment of women students on the campus and search for solutions. In this meeting, they shared with Ms. Franklin and others, their concerns related to the verbal assaults and unwarranted sexual harassment by professors in the classroom. They came to these women administrators for help and now Ms. Franklin and the Women’s Commission was appealing to the Administrative Council for *their* help, their understanding, and their initiation and leadership for putting an end to sexual harassment at the University of Miami.

From their first identification of sexual harassment at the University, the Women’s Commission recognized that the women being subjected to this unfair treatment were being “excluded from their classes, set apart, and isolated by such remarks (Dunham, 80).” Ms. Franklin tried to impress upon the men in the audience just how severely these women’s sense of self-worth was being affected. Additionally, she added that often the goal and result of these sexually harassing remarks made by professors was to gain the support of the males in the class. Ms. Franklin asserted that these types of comments brought together the men of the classroom to “share a moment of mild superiority and self-satisfying laughter at the

expense of the women in the classroom (Dunham, 81).” She also added that these women often feel very self-conscious and embarrassed because of these situations. Over and over again women students expressed to these women administrators that they were being made to feel as if they are outsiders in the classroom when derogatory comments were made by professors about women and their role in society. The Women’s Commission’s objective to stop sexual harassment on campus and offer support to women in crisis did not end with their plea to the Administrative Council. Because of the Women’s Commission’s identification of these issues surrounding the treatment and recognition of women on campus, their interest grew and their support continued to roll over into other areas of even graver concern affecting women at the University of Miami.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

The Women’s Commission’s involvement in another form of sexual discrimination on campus was through their development of the Surrogate Mothers program in 1974 (Hoffman, 1). This organization was created by a small group of women who were already working on one of the Women’s Commission’s committees. These women had expressed a concern for assisting women within the University family who had been victim to sexual assault. The Surrogate Mothers program, which eventually developed into the Assault Task Force and the Sexual Assault Response Team, was designed to offer a “little hand-holding” to victims of rape or attempted rape (Oudens, 1). The program was coordinated with the University Public Safety Office. The way in which the program worked was that when Public Safety was called out to assist a woman, she was asked if she would like someone from the Task Force to

come and help her in any way. The volunteer from the Women's Commission on "duty" that week would then be called in for assistance. Many times a victim of the assault would want another woman to be there with her during the police questioning or to accompany her to the Rape Treatment Center - someone there perhaps just to hold her hand and offer support.

Each of the women who volunteered to assist with the Surrogate Mothers program and later the Assault Task Force attended training conducted by Dr. Dorothy Hicks, gynecologist and director of the Jackson Memorial Hospital Rape Treatment Center. She was assisted by Denise Moon, a social worker at the Rape Treatment Center. At the training session, it was stressed to the volunteers that they were not there to assist the victims as medical workers or University administrators. Instead, they were there to act as "empathetic listeners" absent of any judgment of the situation. Several police officers also attended this training to explain to the volunteers what they could expect from the actions of the police in rape and attempted rape cases. Although rape was not a big problem on the campus at this time, everyone involved, from the volunteers from the Women's Commission to the police, agreed that having a program such as the Surrogate Mothers and ultimately, the Assault Task Force, was a worthy contribution to victims of sexual assault. As Denise Moon of the Rape Treatment Center stated, the student would need "an intermediary person to hold her hand, to give guidance...if we can be of help, then we're available (Oudens, 1)."

Volunteers for the Surrogate Mothers program and the Assault Task Force included women from all areas of the University. The Women's Commission's members who were volunteers for the Assault Task Force included: Maggie Blake, assistant director of the UM

News Bureau; Audrey Finkelstein, UM alumnus and President of the Women's Commission; Dr. Janet Canterbury, endocrinology; Polly Cook, Wesley Foundation; Rita Deutsch, English; Dr. Helen Fagin, Judaic Studies; Dr. Mary Ann Fletcher, immunology; Jane Gailey and Elizabeth Reynolds, Public Safety; Pearl Krohn, UM Desegregation Center; Dolores Pementa, College of Arts and Sciences; and Joan Wieser, personnel director (Oudens, 1).

Not only did these women represent the Women's Commission, but their assistance and time volunteered through these programs represented their commitment to ensuring that the campus was a safe and supportive environment for the victimized women of the University family. This same dedication and concern continues to be present in the membership of the Women's Commission with their involvement in the Sexual Assault Response Team.

CHAPTER 4 - A BALANCED PLAYING FIELD -

WOMEN'S ATHLETICS AND IMPACT OF TITLE IX AT UM

RECRUITMENT AND FACILITIES

In 1972, the University of Miami was sited for violations against the newly instated Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. The primary violation sited was that female athletes were not afforded the same access to facilities or privileges as the males were. Title IX states that, “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” Simply put, equivalent treatment, benefits, and opportunities should be afforded to both sexes. This was not the case at UM when Title IX was introduced. The Women’s Commission was aware of the unjust practices of those involved in the athletic department of the school and without hesitation demanded that these practices be corrected. The Women’s Commission’s role in this plight to fight the discrimination of UM’s women athletes was led by Phyllis Franklin, a UM faculty member. **Rita Deutsch** reflected on this period at UM in our conversation with her, stating:

Phyllis Franklin went to Atlanta because of the great inequities that existed in terms of practice hours and facilities in the athletic department. At that time Title IX was already in place and was being violated within the UM athletic department. For example, one of the things I remember was that if women’s tennis team was playing and the men’s team wanted to practice the women were

told to get off the court. Once, there was even a woman's tennis match they had to stop playing because the men were scheduled to begin playing.

One the subject of the inequalities of funding and facilities, Ms. Finkelstein added that,

I think that in order for the women to get to their showers (not even, it was a changing room) they had to go through the boys' locker rooms. I remember we took a great stand on this matter.

This "crusade" ultimately led to an increase in funding and improved facilities for female athletes, but these changes were not achieved without a long, tedious battle fought by the relentless members of the Women's Commission. Without their consideration of and commitment to these women involved in UM athletics, changes and corrections within the athletic department at UM in relation to Title IX would more than likely have occurred at a much slower, unnoticed pace of progress.

In 1981, almost 10 years following the introduction of Title IX, Lin Dunn, UM's Women's Basketball Coach, wrote a concerning memorandum to the Athletic Director, Harry Mallios, on the subject of recruiting women athletes. In her memo, Coach Dunn shared a conversation she had had with a highly recruited, nationally ranked athlete she was attempting to sign with UM with Director Mallios. The athlete had made several disheartening statements to the coach on the previous day, to include: "Coach, I like your

team. I like the academic potential at Miami, and I think I'd like working under you, however, I just can't see myself spending four years in your gym. It looks like if the University really supported your program, they'd put more bleachers in the Lane Center. I'm sorry Coach, but your facility is my main reason for not coming to Miami (Dunn, 1)." Coach Dunn saw this athlete's comments as a clear indication and a "gross example of the discrimination between the playing and practice facilities afforded men but not afforded women" within the UM athletic department (Dunn, 1). This was also especially disappointing for Coach Dunn because both the women's basketball and volleyball teams had shown significant progress over the previous three years and because of their record, the programs were now able to attract high caliber athletes to UM. But without equal facilities, equipment, and funding, these athletes would not be coming to UM.

In response to Coach Dunn's suggestions, the Campus Sports and Recreation (CSR) Department Advisory Board agreed to initiate plans to select a site and find a donor for an 8,000 seat athletic/convocation center on campus for the women's teams to utilize. They did not agree to further investigating the option Coach Dunn had presented of adding portable bleachers to the Lane Center and restructuring its current layout in order to create a more feasible floorplan for use by the women's teams. The CSR Advisory Board concluded by reminding Coach Dunn that, "We support the Women's Intercollegiate Athletic program, the Men's Intercollegiate Athletic program, and a recreational sports program for all students, faculty, and staff on campus. The Lane Recreation Center must continue to be used for its intended purpose - those programs sponsored by Campus Sports and Recreation (Parks, 2)."

Following a letter of complaint filed against the University of Miami by Dottie Richardson-Gomis, a senior women's basketball player, the Office of Civil Rights division of the Education Department sent a team of investigators to explore the controversy at UM. Coach Dunn told the investigators that she would like to see the Lane Center revamped to include portable bleachers, locker rooms, and rest rooms to support those competing on the University's women's athletic teams. Even when the athletic department was under threat of having to face charges of non-compliance with Title IX, the CSR Advisory Board would not back down. Norm Parsons, the CSR director, stated that, "Upon completion of the Lane Center, the University signed a covenant with the city of Coral Gables that the building may never be used for men's basketball. Now that the women are talking about drawing the type of crowds that men would, the covenant applies to them, too. The Center was simply not built to handle spectators (Smith, 4B)." The women's teams had been practicing in Lane Center since 1975 only because there was no other facility that could be used. The CSR did, however, issue a statement which its 14 board members unanimously endorsed, "We do not support the concept of an on-campus football stadium when the women's intercollegiate athletics program, especially basketball and volleyball, is lacking adequate practice and game facilities (Smith, 4B)." Throughout this struggle and slow progress, the Women's Commission and its members strongly stood behind the women, athletes and coaches, involved in the UM athletic programs.

FIGHTING LOW BUDGETS

Within the same calendar year, the women's athletics program was forced to endure yet another series of seemingly discriminatory decisions by the University's athletic department. In October of 1981, Coach Dunn submitted another memorandum to the school's athletic director, Harry Mallios. This memo presented her request that the women's basketball team be given the permission and funding necessary to allow them to travel to Tennessee to compete in a tournament out of their region. Coach Dunn felt that because the UM athletic department would be receiving \$250,000 to \$300,000 from the nationally televised football game against Penn State, the department should be able to fund this important trip for her basketball team. This trip was essential to the future of women's athletics at UM because at that time AIAW guidelines made it mandatory for all schools to compete at least once outside of their region during the season. By failing to meet this guideline, the team would not be considered for the Region III Tournament and UM's top female athlete, Sylvia Wilson, would lose out on the chance of being named an All-America. By writing this memorandum to the A.D., Coach Dunn was making a final plea to the athletic department in hopes of creating a better future for the basketball team and the entire women's athletics program at the University of Miami.

On that same day, A.D. Mallios wrote a memorandum in response to Coach Dunn's. He first reminded her of their conversation in his office the previous day during which he had explained that the money from the Penn State game had already been figured into the budget, therefore it was not "extra" money to spend freely. Additionally, he shared with Coach Dunn that the Vice President for Financial Affairs, David Lieberman, had informed him in September that the overall budget of the athletic department would have to be reduced for the

1981-82 school year. “Budgets for both the men and women’s teams would be affected equally,” he said (Mallios, 1). A.D. Mallios cited those reasons for his disapproval of the basketball team’s trip to Tennessee. Due to the limitations of the budget, the women would not be permitted to compete outside of their region.

Throughout this ongoing contention over whether the women’s basketball team should be afforded funding from within the athletic department in order to attend this crucial tournament, the Women’s Commission remained actively involved. This was apparent in many ways. On both of the before mentioned memorandums, Audrey Finkelstein, President of the Women’s Commission, was “copied” and given first-hand notification of the progress *and* dilemmas facing the women’s athletic program. There were only three individuals “copied” on these memorandums and those were Ms. Finkelstein, President Foote, and Mr. Lieberman, Vice President for Financial Affairs. This made it clear to the athletic department and the rest of the University how directly involved and influential the Women’s Commission and its dedicated members could be on campus, particularly in issues affecting female students and employees.

Disappointment also struck the women’s volleyball program in the Fall of 1981 when they were told by A.D. Mallios that they would not be able to attend the Cincinnati Invitational they were scheduled to compete in. Mallios announced to the team on the Monday prior to the weekend tournament that their trip would have to be canceled due to budget restraints. Instead, the women on the team and the coaching staff instead felt that the cancellation of the trip must have been a direct result of the UM football game held that previous Saturday. Their perception was that the football game had not produced enough

revenue to support the women's volleyball team's trip. Apparently, the football team did not draw the expected amount of fans for its game that would be needed for ticket sales, to in turn cover the approximate \$4,000 cost of the volleyball team's trip to Cincinnati. Coach Holt expressed her resentment for Mallios' decision in her remarks in a Miami News article, "Peanuts, that's what \$4,000 is compared to the entire football budget (an estimated \$2.5 million). I'm sure there's more waste in the football budget than there is money in ours (Smith, 1C)."

Both coaches, Dunn and Holt, believed that if the football team had been able to draw the additional 18,000 fans expected to attend the Houston game the weekend prior to their volleyball tournament, that Mallios would have never canceled their scheduled trip. However, Mallios blamed the overrun budget during the previous school year by the women's volleyball team for his decision to cancel the trip. The program had been \$8,000 over budget during their 1980-81 season, half of which was spent to fund their trip to the same tournament. Coach Holt had scheduled for the team to compete in the Cincinnati Invitational in 1981, again thinking she had "Harry's blessing" to do so (Smith, 1C). Although Mallios must have understood how important this trip was for the volleyball team, in terms of recruitment and publicity, he made the decision to cancel the trip and stay within the budgetary parameters of the athletic department and its individual teams. Mallios told The Miami Herald that, "[He] had to make a tough decision. It [was] the first time we ever had to do it. I'm committed to the women's program, but I'm also committed to staying with the budget (Brennan 1D)."

In this same article from The MiamiHerald, Mallios refused to answer any questions directly related to the outcome of the football team's success at the Houston game but did add that, "If, during the course of the year, the football team goes above and beyond the revenues we expect, then the other sports may benefit. But I told the coaches not to count on that (Brennan, 9D)." Additionally, Mallios explained just why he had waited so long to tell the women's volleyball team that their trip would need to canceled due to budgetary reasons that had actually existed prior to the start of their season. He stated that he had waited "until the last minute to see if we might get the Texas game on TV (Brennan, 9D)." Just as Holt had suggested the travel plans of the women's volleyball team *were* ultimately determined by the success of the men's football team.

Following Mallios' cancellation of the volleyball's team trip to the Cincinnati Invitational, Coach Dunn decided to withdraw the UM women's athletic program from hosting the AIAW tennis tournament during the Spring season. Although hosting the tournament would have brought in an additional \$7,000 to the women's athletic budget, Coach Dunn felt that when Mallios canceled the trip, the "tennis tournament wasn't worth the hassle it would have been." She added, "It wasn't a vindictive thing. It's just that I'm not stupid (Brennan, 9D)." Perhaps Coach Dunn was acting on the strength of the Women's Commission and their strong backing of the women's athletic program at UM when she made this seemingly rebellious and pronounced decision.

The decision to cancel the team's trip to the tournament had what will forever remain an undetermined impact on the women's athletic program at UM. In an editorial in The Miami Hurricane, it was suggested that by choosing to not fund the volleyball team's trip to

Ohio, Mallios was actually “punishing” the women on the team (“Mallios to team,” 6). These members of the volleyball team had been conducting daily practice sessions with rigorous workouts in order to prepare for the tournament and when their trip was canceled, they lost all incentive to train for any further competitions for fear they would be denied the opportunity to participate. Also, by not attending this invitational, the volleyball team risked not being invited to attend any future tournaments. The team’s spirit was quite evident when in response to Mallios’ decision, one of the women athletes, feeling so badly for her team members, offered to give back half of her scholarship for that year in order to help ease the financial burden of the team’s trip. Eventually, her offer was not considered, it was able to catch the attention of those who were directly involved with decision making related to women’s athletics although its impact was not immediate.

Ultimately, the University of Miami, as a whole, lost out due to this cancellation of the volleyball’s participation in the tournament. Competitions such as these large invitationals provide valuable recruiting opportunities for UM athletics. Many athletes want to attend a college that can afford to send their athletes on road trips to more competitive tournaments. Additionally, the school’s athletic program is a form of advertising to potential college students who are also interested in the academic part of the University as well. The earlier mentioned editorial reminded readers that, “Women’s athletics, as a whole, is pitifully overshadowed by the other elements that make up athletics at UM. While the big teams partake in the pie, the women are left in the crust (“Mallios to team,” 6).” These issues are what continued to drive the members of the Women’s Commission that were directly

engaged in organizing and supporting the plight for equal funding and treatment of women athletes and their programs at UM.

CHAPTER 5 - CARELESS TO ON-CAMPUS DAY-CARE - THE UM/CANTERBURY PRESCHOOL

On November 13, 1990, the Women's Commission held a "town meeting" in the Flamingo Ballroom of the Whitten University Center to discuss the issue of daycare at the University. The Commission organized this panel discussion about child-care alternatives on the campus for the children of employees and students of the University. All of the school's top administrators were invited to attend this meeting which drew over 300 concerned members of the University family. The Women's Commission's goal was to demonstrate to the University's administrators, what a great concern the child care issue was to so many people on campus, including faculty members and graduate students with small children. Their plea for adequate campus child care facilities was initiated at this "town meeting," but ultimately led to an extended debate with the leaders of the University that lasted for several years.

Initially, the administration argued that there was no funding available in the University's budget for a revamped child care facility at the Episcopalian Church on campus. Additionally, they insisted that there was no available space or suitable location for a new facility on the UM campus. A 1991 editorial in The Miami Hurricane suggested several possible locations for a new day care facility to be built. The author suggested,

Perhaps a temporary facility could be set up at the West Laboratory Elementary School while the Canterbury site is refurbished and its standards raised. Or maybe the administration should look at investing in some nearby land that could be developed into a proper child-care facility...The questions and excuses provided by the administration explaining its lack of concern over the issue of day care could all be answered efficiently if those with the power

looked into it deeply enough. And if UM continues pushing forward, upward, and outward, it may soon find that its foundations just can't take the pressure. Should it continue such rapid expansion without first taking precautions on the homefront? ("UM day," 2)

This editorial represented the sentiments of many of those in attendance at this "town meeting." Their feeling was that if the school could not provide for them an adequate on-campus facility necessary for caring for their children during the work day due to a lack of funds or space, UM would soon be lacking committed employees and students on its campus. Members of the University family would be forced to look to other employment options within the community.

After endless debates and panel discussions, it became apparent to the administration that the already existing Canterbury Day Care would need to be renovated to accommodate the increased number of UM employees and students wanting to enroll their children in the on-campus day care. Months following the initial "town meeting" called by the Women's Commission, UM officials met with the Canterbury Day Care Center's board of directors to discuss plans to expand the existing structure. It was decided that the University would give a one-time commitment of \$560,000 for a total renovation and expansion of the facilities and the programs associated with Canterbury.

In the Fall of 1992, the "new and improved" Canterbury Preschool opened its doors for the increased enrollment of children from the University's family in this "state-of-the-art child-care center." In an article from the Veritas, documenting the opening of this new facility, The Women's Commission was given full credit for having convinced the administration of the University that a facility such as this was desperately needed (Hoffman,

1). It was said that the Women's Commission had claimed the center as a "victory." They were credited for their commitment to the issue of child care on the UM campus and with accomplishing the revamping of the child care program at UM. It was their initiation of the initial "town meeting" and planning sessions that followed that led to the convincing of University administrators that a renovated day-care facility was needed for the children of UM's greatest assets - their employees and students. The President of the Women's Commission at that time, Rhonda DuBord, credited the support the Commission had received from other members of the UM family for pushing to have the center refurbished. She stated in the same Veritas article that, "We (The Women's Commission) were the initial force in the revitalization of the new child-care center on campus, but until you get other women involved and active there won't be a voice. The child-care center is an investment in employees (Hoffman, 1)." Clearly, this is an example of how the Women's Commission continues to work for improvements on the UM campus for all its employees and students, women and men, of all races and socio-economic backgrounds.

CHAPTER 6 - MORTAR BOARD'S MOVEMENT TO EQUAL HONORS IN IRON ARROW

Nu Kappa Tau, the university's oldest women's honor society, was founded in November of 1937. "Its purpose was to honor the most outstanding girls on campus, to foster school pride in intellectual pursuits, to advance University of Miami ideals, and to promote fellowship among its members ("New Honor", 1E)." The founding members of Nu Kappa Tau (NKT) consisted of the Dean of Women, four deans of academic schools, and the chairman of the faculty committee on organizations. The first charter group was comprised of nine women from the University. It was some of these same women that later initiated the creation of the University of Miami's Women's Commission, to include Audrey Finkelstein. The organization quickly adopted a constitution and initiated tapping ceremonies. Women were chosen for membership based on their academic, leadership, service, and character skills. Being inducted as member of NKT became the highest honor a woman could achieve at UM.

Following the establishment of NKT on the UM campus, the group members started to work towards gaining membership in the national women's honorary society, Mortar Board. Subsequently, when May Brunson accepted the position of Dean of Women in 1955, one of her main objectives was to have NKT accepted into Mortar Board. Dean Brunson worked to gain the support and assistance of three women UM faculty members who had been involved in Mortar Board on their former campuses. Each of women wrote to the national Mortar Board office to appeal for the acceptance of UM's NKT as a charter of Mortar Board.

The support for NKT on campus extended to the President's office. President King made a "university-wide appeal" to the University community in an attempt to recruit individuals on the UM campus who had experience with Mortar Board and its charters in the past ("New Honor," 1E). The response was significant and a University of Miami Alumni Mortar Board group was formed. This organization's founders consisted of faculty members and local residents were held Mortar Board memberships. They were able to come together to create a petition in support of UM's recognition in Mortar Board. The efforts and dedication of this group at UM were convincing to the national office of Mortar Board and NKT was chosen to be recognized as a charter in 1965.

On May 14, 1965, Mortar Board, the nation's top senior honor society for collegiate women, was installed at the University of Miami. On this historical day, 120 members and alumni of UM's NKT were inducted into the prestigious women's national honor society. Mortar Board's national president, Mrs. George C. Stafford from Syracuse University, presided over the ceremony. The members and alumni of Nu Kappa Tau and the University community had achieved their goal - the acceptance of the University of Miami as a charter in Mortar Board.

The tradition of dedication and determination of the women who originally created NKT at UM continues to persist in the Mortar Board chapter. In 1990, the group won the Most Improved Chapter in Florida at the Mortar Conference that year. The purpose of the Miami Mortar Board Alumni Club continues to be, "to provide an opportunity for alumni of Mortar Board Chapters to meet together, to advance the purpose of the national organization

and to render such assistance to the University of Miami Chapter as may seem appropriate (Wright, 5).”

Many of the same women who were involved in the original gathering that led to the creation of Nu Kappa Tau were also involved in the development of the University of Miami’s Women’s Commission. It was their same determination to change the University to improve the status of women on campus that led to their conception of the Commission. However, it is also important to understand that although the women of the University did unite for causes such as NKT and Mortar Board, they were hesitant to push for controversial, discriminatory changes on campus. This was evident in their lack of involvement in insisting for the admission of women into Iron Arrow. In the Women’s Commission’s 1974 Report on the Status of Women at the University of Miami, the members wrote that , “some women students on campus have pressed for integration in Iron Arrow, our men’s honorary society. When the Commission and the Women’s Academic Committee examined the problem, they decided the membership in [Iron Arrow] was not important enough for women to spend their time, either to fight for inclusion or to establish a society for women. A complaint was filed by another group.” In our conversation with **Audrey Finkelstein**, she discussed her association, and that of the Women’s Commission, in relation to honor societies on the UM campus - from the creation of Nu Kappa Tau through the admission of women into Iron Arrow:

When I came to the University of Miami in 1934, Iron Arrow was a respected, university men’s honor society. Without anything of touch and bother then because

that wasn't the mode in those days, we formed the women's honorary. We called it Nu Kappa Tau, which is now Mortar Board. Then the time came with all these titles for students and wanting a "square deal" and Iron Arrow was a real good thing to have on your resume. It was really having a foot up to going on to the next step after having graduated from here. We said, you have got to let women in. They said, no way, men have theirs, women have theirs. But we said, you don't give women a discount when they enter the university, so they have to have access to all the goodies!

Eventually, President Stanford said that Iron Arrow had to take women or get off campus. They got off campus. But they were sued in court. I remember the Women's Commission being downtown in the courtroom - it was like the bride's side and the groom's side, the men were sitting there in their jackets and the women were on the other side. They won, they lost, they won. They tried negotiating, but they finally decided to admit women. They told President Foote that they would come on campus and take women. I said, no, they should take women then come on campus! From the very first, they took, not a token woman, but a goodly number of women. They have ever since.

But that wasn't the end of my quarrel, because the men wore jackets. When the women came in they gave them vests. We said, what's with the vests? Well, they said women are different, women's clothing is different.. So we said, yes, but this is not clothing, this is ceremonial dress. The fact is that they are now in jackets!

REFERENCES

- Abrams, et al. Letter to President Henry King Stanford, *Creation of the University of Miami Women's Commission*, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, September 22, 1971, pages 1-2.
- Brennan, Christine. *UM money crunch spikes volleyball trip*, The Miami Herald, September 27, 1981, pages 1D and 9D.
- Deutsch, Rita and Finkelstein, Audrey, *History of the University of Miami Women's Commission*, Interview conducted April 21, 1998
- Dunham, Bruce. Proceedings of the Administrative Council Retreat, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, September 10-11, 1978.
- Dunn, Lin. Memorandum to Harry Mallios, *Recruiting of women athletes*, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, March 12, 1981, page 1.
- Hatton, Nancy Webb, *Status of UM women has changed little during past 3 years, commission claims*, The Miami Herald, November 11, 1977, page 1E.
- Hoffman, Rebecca. *Two decades of achievements mark work of Women's Commission*, Veritas, Fall 1992, page 1.
- Mallios to team: no dough, no go*, The Miami Hurricane, October 16, 1981, page 6.
- Montgomery, Louise. *UM coeds will whistle a different tune*, The Miami Herald, October 13, 1973, page 3C.
- New Honor for UM*, The Miami Herald, May 15, 1965, page 1E.
- Oudens, John. *Rape Task Force is there to help*, The Miami Hurricane, March 11, 1981, pages 1 and 4.
- Parks, Ron. Memorandum to Lin Dunn, *Untitled*, April 2, 1981, pages 1-2.
- Piloto, Connie. *Events to celebrate women's accomplishments*, The Miami Hurricane, March 7, 1984, page 3.
- Prospero, Ann Reaben, *Support of women wins awards at Commission meeting*,

Veritas, May 1990, page 9.

Rosenton, Ena. *UM report: Women get 'inferior' role*, The Miami Herald, May 16, 1974, page 1E.

Rovira, Ivonne. *More women's studies courses needed*, The Miami Hurricane, December 2, 1977, page 2.

Smith, Mike. *Lane Center inadequacy poses UM problem*, The Miami News, April 11, 1981, page 4B.

Smith, Mike. *Volleyball trip lost in football budget*, The Miami News, September 25, 1981, page 1C.

Stanford, Henry King. Letter to the University of Miami Women's Commission, *Appointment of the University of Miami Women's Commission*, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, November 17, 1971, page 1.

UM day careless, The Miami Hurricane, November 1990, page 2.

UM Women's Commission to form 10 committees and restructure, Veritas, September 1977, page 1.

The University of Miami Women's Commission, Report on the Status of Women, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, 1973-1974.

The University of Miami Women's Commission, Report on the Status of Women, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, 1976-1977.