

Spring has sprung

Here's appropriate weather for the first day of spring: partly cloudy with a high near 67; 40 percent chance of rain today and tonight.

The Daily Tar Heel

Serving the students and the University community since 1893

Adoption

Legal hassles and red tape often thwart adoptees' efforts to find their original parents. See story in Weekender.

Volume 87, Issue No. 117/113

Thursday, March 20, 1980, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

News/Sports/Ads 933-0248
Business/Advertising 933-1163

Report: women lack representation

By GARY TERPENING
Staff Writer

The status of women faculty members at UNC must be evaluated in light of an overwhelmingly white male power structure, according to a report released this week by the Faculty Council Committee on the Status of Women.

"Women are virtually absent from the ranks of department chairpersons, the most powerful people in the University on matters of hiring, tenure and promotion," the report states. "There are two women department chairpersons in Academic Affairs; two in Health Affairs. Except for the dean of the School of Nursing, there are no women deans, vice chancellors or chancellor. Women are thus absent from the power structure of the University."

The report, which will be discussed by the Faculty Council Friday, states that there is a clear perception among female faculty that at the highest levels of the University administration

there is a commitment only to the letter, and not the spirit, of affirmative action.

Whether justified, the report states, the existence of this perception is itself a cause for concern and a motivation for legal action by those who feel they have no recourse within the University.

"It (the perception) may also be a deterrent to the hiring and retention of qualified female faculty members, who may prefer to accept offers at universities noted for their good faith in dealing with women faculty," the report states.

The feeling that the affirmative action process at UNC is imperfect results from two kinds of problems, the report states: inadequacy of formal rules and regulations and informal discrimination.

The report notes that the affirmative action officer at UNC is a part-time position and that many universities employ a full-time administrator in the position. The affirmative action office should be directed by a full-time

officer, the committee recommends.

Douglass Hunt, vice chancellor for administration and the University's affirmative action officer, was unavailable for comment on the report's recommendations Wednesday.

The report also states that written procedures for hiring, promotion and tenure do not yet exist in every department in the University. "Until it is possible for every entering assistant professor to read a description of her department's procedures, and thus to know when, how and in what manner her performance will be evaluated, women will not be treated fairly in certain circumstances," the report states.

Rules alone cannot prevent unfairness from entering tenure decisions, the report states, and factors other than those identified as criteria for tenure often enter into the decision-making process:

• Some departments have few women faculty, making the integration of new female faculty difficult.

• Departments with few women professionals tend to be rigid in their standards for female behavior.

• Departments tend to have higher standards for women than men for tenure qualifications.

• Because of a dissimilar percentage of female students and female faculty, many women faculty spend inordinate amounts of time counseling and advising students.

The report compares the percentages of faculty by rank—professor, associate professor or assistant professor—and states that the most striking fact is that since 1974, 31 male professors and no women professors were hired.

"As long as they (women) are grossly underrepresented in these ranks," the report states, "they will be unable to influence departmental and University policy, especially as it concerns the tenure process for assistant professors."

According to the report, in 1979 women made

up 5 percent of all professors, 17.9 percent of all associate professors and 26.5 percent of all assistant professors.

A decline in percentages of assistant professors since 1977, the report states, is inexplicable because it comes at a time when the pools of qualified female Ph.D.s are increasing both in quantity and quality.

"This decrease will diminish the size of the pool of females eligible for promotion and tenure," the report states.

It states that it is instructive to compare the 1980 report with one made by the first Committee on the Status of Women in 1973.

"That so many of the recommendations remain the same in 1980 as they were in 1973 suggests to us (the committee) that the University has not implemented affirmative action," the report states. "The credit for the

See WOMEN on page 2

Women not denied funds says aid director Geer

By GARY TERPENING
Staff Writer

A recently released report by the Faculty Council Committee on the Status of Women charges the University with financial aid discrimination, but Director of Student Aid William M. Geer said Wednesday the report contains inaccurate data.

"The data in the report is misrepresented by the Committee on the Status of Women in every financial aid category," Geer said. "The student aid office will report to the Faculty Council on Friday afternoon correctly interpreted data in all categories of student financial assistance. This will show that there is no discrimination against women or any other category of students by the student aid office."

But Joan W. Scott, chairman of the Committee on the Status of Women, said Wednesday the data in the report

was collected from evidence supplied by the Office of Student Aid.

"When the report was written about a month ago," Scott said, "we (the committee) made repeated requests for discussion of the figures, but the requests were denied. When his (Geer's) office was asked to verify the figures, the reply was that the figures were accurate."

The financial aid report, part of a larger report on the status of women at UNC scheduled for discussion by the Faculty Council Friday afternoon, states that although the UNC student body is now 52.6 percent female, women receive less in each of the four categories of financial aid: grants, loans, employment and scholarships.

"What is surprising," the report states, "is that female students last year received \$800,000 less in grants, \$700,000 less in loans, \$1 million less in job compensation and \$450,000 less in



Will Geer

scholarships. Knowing of no reason why women students' needs should be less, the committee is gravely concerned by these disparities."

Geer said there is not now and there has never been any discrimination in the awarding of student aid for any reason, including race, sex, age or geographic origin.

Committee to review Moody's tenure denial

By LYNN CASEY
Staff Writer

A special UNC Board of Trustees committee will review today the denial of tenure to an assistant professor of geology who has charged her department with exhibiting sex discrimination and personal malice against her.

Geology professor Judith B. Moody, who has taught at UNC since 1974, was denied tenure in February 1979 by the Department of Geology. She appealed the department's decision to the Board of Trustees in January.

Trustee Chairman Ralph N. Strayhorn appointed a three-person committee to investigate Moody's charges. This is the second such committee to be named to review a denial of tenure. The first committee was appointed last fall to review Sonja B. Stone's denial of tenure.

Moody, who specializes in

geochemistry, petrology and mineralogy, first appealed the department's decision to the Faculty Hearings Committee in May 1979, but the committee ruled that there was no substantial proof of sex discrimination or malice in the department's decision.

The Faculty Hearings Committee considers three types of charges—tenure decisions wrongly based on a free speech issue, discrimination based on race, sex, religion or national origin or personal malice.

Moody criticized the review process because it does not consider the merits of the faculty member. Only a professor's department judges his or her performance.

Moody was the first woman hired as an assistant professor in the geology department and the first woman to come up for tenure in that department. Because of her minority position she said she feels like a fish in a bowl being



Judith Moody

inspected by her male colleagues. She said she believes more is expected of her because she is a woman.

"The problem is if you are the only woman in a male department you are in a token status and that puts you in a difficult position," Moody said.

See MOODY on page 2

Zoning ordinance remains problem

By CINDY BOWERS
Staff Writer

The Chapel Hill Planning Board Tuesday heard strong protests against a restriction in the town's proposed zoning ordinance which would limit to four the number of unrelated people who could live in a single dwelling unit.

"Is alienation of the University students worth the passage of this restriction?" asked Joni Walser, housing coordinator in student Body President Bob Saunders' administration.

"This housing ordinance would restrict the number of students living in town," Walser said. "I don't need to tell you that this would anger students."

"Granted, we (students) are a transient part of the population, but we are a significant part," Walser said.

Despite the protests, a motion made by Board member William Rohe to drop the controversial restriction from the proposed ordinance died when no one would second it.

"I'd rather wait till we could come up with a substitute, board member Don Francisco said.

Opposition to the restriction also was voiced by representatives of the Orange County Association for Retarded Citizens and other residents who fear it would make the establishment of group homes for disturbed citizens difficult.

Town Planning Director Mike Jennings also voiced doubts about the practicality of the housing restriction.

"The enforceability is something we have to be honest about," Jennings said. "Self-enforcement is the only way—it's not something that can be enforced by a building inspector."

Planning Board Chairman Roscoe Reeve said, "I'd very much like to throw this family definition out. It's got too many problems in terms of its implications."

As chairman, Reeve was unable to second the motion to kill the housing limitation.

Before its discussion of the controversial restriction, the Planning Board heard a presentation made by Linda Shaw of the town's Human Services Department. Shaw described some of the housing problems in Chapel Hill that have led to the consideration of the proposed restriction.

"The University is a major element in the (housing) problem because it is a major user of housing," Shaw said.

"The growing number of students (and) the lack of adequate dorm space...encourage this (a housing crunch)."

"The percentage of students renting houses in low-income neighborhoods has also concerned us," she said.

"Students can pool resources and afford rents that low-income people can't."

One reason for the housing restriction was to limit the number of students who could pool resources and outbid low-income families for housing. Some supporters of the restriction say the limitation would give low-income families an advantage in the competition for housing.

But Jennings said later the restriction actually might cause more problems for low and moderate income citizens by intensifying the competition with students for housing.

"There's the potential that if we did limit the number living in a unit to four and made it economically unfeasible for students to rent units in Lake Forest, they might seek out low-cost units in Pine Knolls."

In an informal gathering before the Planning Board meeting, University officials briefed some board members on plans for the proposed student athletic center on Manning Drive.

University Planning Director Gordon Rutherford, Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance John Temple and architect Joseph Hakan presented plans and a scale model of the 22,000 seat facility.

The University will make its application to the town for a special use permit in May. The Town Council must grant the permit before the center can be built.



DTH/Matt Cooper

Blowing bubbles

Sallie Hughes enjoys a gift from a friend, and as "Julie's Birthday Bubbles" float slowly toward the sky, their rainbows reflecting a familiar childhood pastime, a patch of grass near Lenoir Hall becomes the sunny playground or backyard from days gone by. For more spring-related stories, see page 6.

Consumer group reports

Nursing home in trouble

By CINDY BOWERS
Staff Writer

Pine Ridge Nursing Center of Chapel Hill may lose its license and be forced to close if it does not begin adequate employee training and patient screening programs by April 14, June Milby of the state Department of Human Resources said Wednesday.

But Milby also said an investigation by the state Attorney General's office into charges of physical abuse of patients at the Chapel Hill nursing home failed to turn up enough evidence to prosecute the management of the center.

"There were some allegations of patient abuse which were not substantiated," she said. "(The Attorney General's office) did not find enough evidence to go ahead with any legal action."

The investigation of the local nursing home began after Friends of Nursing Home Patients, a local consumer health group, complained about two incidents of patient abuse at the home. The case was turned over to the state after the Orange County Department of Social Services conducted a

preliminary investigation.

FNHP's complaints about the center arose when a resident of Pine Ridge telephoned the group and reported witnessing two cases of abuse on Jan. 20.

The anonymous caller said he saw two orderlies use bodily force to remove a patient from another patient's room. He also said he saw the same orderlies shove a patient into his room and then heard the sound of a slap.

"I took those complaints to the Orange County Department of Social Services," Richard Schramm, FNHP director, said. "They found sufficient reason that patient abuses had occurred."

Charles Parkinson, administrator at Pine Ridge, Wednesday refused to comment about the alleged abuse incidents.

But he did say, "We did our own investigation and they (the orderlies) are not here now. We've got new management coming in, and they're totally different people."

Nationwide Health Care Management, owned by William M. Phillippe of Charlotte and Clyde Parker

See NURSING on page 2

UNC court to hear appeal about GPSF referendum

By LYNN CASEY
Staff Writer

Craig Brown, a UNC law student representing five UNC students in a Student Supreme Court case will ask the court today to void the results of a Feb. 5 referendum which guarantees funds to the Graduate and Professional Student Federation.

Brown is asking that the results of the referendum, which passed by a required two-thirds margin, be voided because the polls on the day of the election were open only 11 a.m.-4 p.m. The General Elections Laws require the polls to be open 11 a.m.-5 p.m. That requirement was approved by the Campus Governing Council in 1977, but Brown and Elections Board members were not aware of it until last week.

The referendum, an amendment to the student constitution, guarantees the GPSF 15 percent—approximately \$18,000—of the activities fees paid by graduate and professional students.

As counsel for the five plaintiffs, Brown had filed earlier complaints against the Feb. 5 election. The Supreme Court decided Feb. 26 to hear the complaints. Since then, both the plaintiffs and the defendants—Elections Board Chairman Scott Simpson, former CGC speaker Rhonda Black and former GPSF president Roy Rocklin—have been gathering evidence and soliciting witnesses while waiting for the court to set a date for the hearing.

Because Brown considers the evidence to conclusively show that the referendum should be voided, he will ask the court to make a summary

judgment and void election results without holding a hearing.

The court will hear Brown's motion today at 5 p.m. in the Carolina Union. If the court rules against the summary judgement motion, it will set a date for a hearing so that it can review all the complaints and evidence and decide whether to void the election results.

Supreme Court Justice Roy Cooper said if a hearing were held, it would be held the beginning of next week.

Wayne Rackoff, a UNC graduate student and counsel for the defense, does not believe the complaints lodged against the election are sufficient to void the outcome.

"In any elections case, I believe the Supreme Court must balance whatever errors might have occurred against the obvious fact that in most campus elections the popular will is easily discernible by the vote tallies," Rackoff said.

Graduate students turned out in record numbers for the GPSF referendum. The final vote on the referendum was 2,105-956. Elections Board Chairman F. Scott Simpson said.

The plaintiffs in the case are Brad Lamb, Kathi Lamb, David Wright, Elizabeth Barlowe and Barbara High.

The original suit was brought by Brad and Kathi Lamb on behalf of the Campus Governing Council. The other three plaintiffs are named in the suit to represent the interests of the spectrum of students the suit claims were discriminated against because of alleged election irregularities.



Brown



DTH/Craig Ling

Pine Ridge nursing home could lose its license...investigators found inadequate personnel training