

WOMEN'S STUDIES AT THE CLAREMONT COLLEGES; A Short History

Feminist organizations within American universities and colleges tend, in terms of their primary focus, to fall into one of three categories: 1) Women's Centers providing extra-curricular support and activities for women students; 2) research centers, serving feminist scholars; and 3) Women's Studies programs offering a major, minor and sometimes a graduate degree. Within this schema, the Claremont program, like those at over 600 other institutions of higher education, clearly falls into the third category: It is primarily academic. It is distinguished from almost all other programs, however, by its particular intercollegiate character.

In 1977, the year the National Women's Studies Association was founded, there were 276 Women's Studies programs in existence, including one in Claremont. Pitzer had established a major in 1975; created ID26, "Women in American Society" as an introduction to the concentration in 1976; and was offering about 8 other "Study of Women" courses (plus numerous 'related' ones) each year. By contrast, no courses were being offered at the Graduate School, Claremont Men's or Harvey Mudd, and only three were available at Scripps. Pomona also offered only 3 or 4 courses a year, but had possessed since 1972 a Commission on the Education of Women, temporarily funded by contributions from an anonymous donor and the LeBus Foundation.

Headed by Jean Walton, Vice-President of Student Affairs, the Commission addressed itself to the need both for more women on the Pomona faculty and for greater attention to women in the curriculum. In pursuing its second responsibility, it brought speakers like Sheila Tobias to campus, organized an interdisciplinary Women's Studies course, and funded temporary faculty appointments in Women's Studies. In February 1978, the Commission sponsored a two-week visit by Gerda Lerner, a trenchant, feminist historian. Her visit was the turning point in the development of Women's Studies in Claremont.

Invited to campus to give advice on improving the education of women at Pomona (as well as a public lecture and a short seminar for undergraduates), she insisted on viewing Claremont as a whole. As news of her intercollegiate perspective spread, women faculty and students from all campuses flocked to hear and talk with her – and each other. (I remember standing with Laurie Larwood in the doorway of a packed room all one evening, straining to hear the wide-ranging conversation she had sparked. To two feminists isolated at CMC, it felt like the first misty rain after a long drought. We were not, it turned out, the only ones to feel that way.) Gerda made it clear that we had to cooperate to grow, but that with cooperation we should be able to build "a wonderful Women's Studies program."

Energized by her 'voice from the burning bush,' a group of women faculty and administrators (including representatives from all six colleges) began meeting regularly that spring under the leadership of Jean Walton. They built up a list of sympathetic faculty and staff, organized two colloquiums and a reception (funded by Howard Brooks, Provost of the Claremont University Center) and created and distributed a brochure (funded by the various Admissions Offices) listing all Women's Studies courses for 1978-79. The number of courses offered jumped, moreover, from 15 to 27.

In May of 1978, with the backing of Provost Brooks, the Women's Studies faculty were recognized by the Council of Presidents as an Intercollegiate Field Committee. Such rapid recognition reflected both the nature and the interests of the Claremont system. Since foundations liked to fund the innovative ventures such intercollegiate cooperation might produce, it was in the interests of the presidents, and of the Provost in particular, to encourage their existence and vitality. On the other hand, since field committees possessed little real power or funding, the cost of recognizing them was minimal. It did, however, confer legitimacy and has remained the basis from which we operate. (We changed our

name to Field Group in 1985; we were by then clearly too large for the term “committee” to be meaningful.)

The (now official) Coordinating Committee continued to organize course brochures and Field Committee receptions, while delegating authority to a separate Colloquium Committee. In addition, it established a task force to investigate library holdings; wrote and distributed to all faculty a notice and explanation of its existence; collected and distributed a list of faculty able and willing to teach some aspect of Women’s Studies. Sheer exhaustion, produced by piling these responsibilities on top of already full work-loads, soon convinced the Committee that it must seek help.

In December 1978, the Field Committee authorized an appeal to the presidents to establish and fund the office of Coordinator of Women’s Studies. The decision to risk such a request was made easier by the realization that Jean Walton was retiring from Pomona in June 1979 and could be the first Coordinator. That she was the choice of the women’s community was made clear to all involved. The respect her years as Dean of Students at Pomona had developed among colleagues at all colleges was our greatest advantage, a guarantee of our seriousness.

One issue the Field Committee faced – as do all Women’s Studies programs – was the degree of centralization it wished to achieve. Was it preferable to localize Women’s Studies faculty in one department with its own funds for hiring and retaining faculty? Or was it preferable to accept that funding, hiring and tenuring would remain in the hands of traditional departments? Centralization meant cohesion and curriculum control, but also isolation and insecure funding. Decentralization promised wider influence and (with tenuring) greater stability, as well as the danger of foot-dragging and divided loyalties. On a theoretical level, the issue has never been resolved since both optimistic and gloomy forecasts have proved to be well-grounded.

For Claremont women, the debate was resolved by the practical difficulties posed by an intercollegiate structure. The colleges had traditionally guarded their appointment and tenuring powers jealously. Procedures for joint appointments (in Theatre, Black and Chicano Studies, Joint Science, etc.) were developed only after elephantine negotiations and were usually cumbersome. In its proposal for a Coordinator, the Field Committee avoided this labyrinth. Appointments, promotion and tenure were left in the hands of individual departments and colleges, as were decisions concerning majors, concentrations or minors. What the Coordinator could best provide was social and intellectual support and administrative coordination. (The title was deliberately chosen and has been consciously retained because it reflects the non-hierarchical, cooperative character desired in the office.)

Our modest proposal was, nonetheless, debated at the highest levels for a whole semester. The Council of Presidents and the Academic Dean’s Committee were cautious and raised many questions. Was Women’s Studies just a passing fad? (No one yet took it seriously enough to recognize its “perniciousness.”) Would individual colleges (like CGS, HMC, CMC) actually benefit from its existence? Would its establishment encourage other intercollegiate programs (Classics, Asian Studies, IR, etc.) to demand their own coordinators? Etc., etc.

The Gordian knot was finally cut by President John Chandler, who volunteered Scripps to act as the “lead college:” Scripps would provide housing, most of the funding, and supervision. Though the other presidents accepted his offer, the final resolution was a temporizing one. The very existence of the office would be (and was) reviewed in 1981-82. (The intercollegiate evaluation committee, headed by Kathleen Wicker of Scripps, recommended “the continuance and strengthening of the Office and program.”) The monetary participation of other colleges would be voluntary, and has been marked by yearly debates about who would contribute and how much.

In 1979, however, permission and funding were more important than worries about the future. Jean Walton became Coordinator that summer and held the position for four years. She was followed in the office by Susan Seymour (1983-85), Anne Bages (1985-88), J'nan Sellery (1988-91), and Sue Mansfield (1991-). Since administrative work for Women's Studies is inadequately recognized in promotion deliberations, all later coordinators have been tenured. Each has brought different strengths and interests to the office, as well as new energy.

The first office was a room in the Humanities Building, which could barely accommodate two people! (We have moved 4 or 5 times since then – not always to larger spaces.) Funds for the colloquiums, receptions and membership in NWSA were covered by the Provost's office for one more year and then integrated into the Coordinator's budget, which also covered secretarial help, office supplies and travel funds. (The Coordinator was expected to attend NWSA conferences and to keep in touch with other Women's Studies programs.) Though the position was defined as part-time, being Coordinator was in fact – given the minimal nature of secretarial assistance provided (285 hours total in 1979-80) – close to a full-time (and exhausting) responsibility.

Feminist values and the teaching orientation of the Field Group suggested from the beginning that ties with feminist students were appropriate. Indeed, initially the Coordinating Committee established a close liaison with the student-run, intercollegiate Women's Center then located at Pitzer. Over the years, however, student organizations have tended to be based in individual colleges and to ebb, flow and change names. An attempt in 1985-86 to give all of them representation on the Coordinating Committee produced mainly chaos and an unwieldy size, plus a reminder from Paula Goldsmid, Scripps Dean of Faculty, that we were primarily an academic body. In recent years, moreover, many of the undergraduate colleges have provided space and/or support within the Dean of Students offices for their own Women's Centers.

* * * * *

The legitimation and growth of Women's Studies has been accomplished through a variety of means, all of which have required (and still do) substantial, voluntary commitments of time and energy from feminist faculty and staff. In areas where such volunteer interest has not existed, growth has necessarily been slow and sporadic. On an on-going basis, however, the Coordinators, with committee support, have organized colloquiums and co-sponsored feminist events, hosted Field Group meetings and receptions, published twice yearly course brochures and quarterly newsletters.

In addition, short-term funding has been sought and secured for activities intended to foster the growth and influence of Women's Studies. During the 1980's, the existence of a Mellon Grant for Faculty Development administered by Scripps, Harvey Mudd, Claremont McKenna and Pitzer, and later a Mellon Grant for Fresh Combinations, administered by all six colleges, provided obvious targets of opportunity. We also sought and secured funds from the Holistic Teaching and Learning Grant administered by Alvin White, the Mellon Core Committee at Pomona, the Center for Research on Women of Wellesley College, the Pomona Commission on the Education of Women, etc. In almost every case, applications demanded that we outline existing resources, a concise plan and expected results, plus a fairly detailed budget. It is fair to say that there have been no "free lunches."

In the first years, our major effort was addressed to faculty seminars, involving 25-35 participants each, which met four or five times a semester in someone's home, beginning with a catered dinner. The evening was devoted to a lecture (often by a feminist scholar of national stature) followed by discussion of the talk and the assigned readings. The first three semesters addressed issue of "Women and

Achievement,” while the fourth focused on “Women, Power, and Empowerment,” reflecting our concern with developing young women’s potential. Only with the fifth semester was the connection between “Feminist Theory and Women’s Studies” addressed. The seminars were invaluable as tools for developing a sense of sisterhood and as a way of introducing new or newly interested faculty to the ideas and goals of Women’s Studies.

Then followed a period marked by activities intended to enlarge our influence within the academic community in general. Our first conference, “Traditions and Transitions: Women’s Studies and a Balanced Curriculum,” was a two-day event publicized throughout southern California. Over 160 people pre-registered and more “dropped in.” Sixty were from other campuses and 30 were Claremont faculty who had never before attended one of our meetings. Following up on the issue of integrating Women’s Studies into the mainstream, we sent three faculty to a conference on “Moving Towards a Balanced Curriculum” held at Wheaton College in the summer of 1983. Eight “Faculty/Staff Interdisciplinary Study Groups” were organized the following year as an attempt – with uneven results – to further the same broad strategy.

Since 1984, the issue of restructuring the whole curriculum has received less attention. On the one hand, more and more courses now include women in the syllabus. On the other hand, our optimism about quickly reshaping the entire curriculum has been dampened by the recognition that, as Petty McIntosh warned at the 1983 conference, we were not ready even to conceptualize how any discipline could be “redefined or reconstructed to include us all.”

Since the first conference was a “faculty only” affair, the next ones were developed in response to expressed student interests and concerns. The 1984 one-day conference, “Invisibility in Academe: Lesbians in a Heterosexual Culture,” was confined to the Claremont community and drew about 200 participants. The 1985 conference on “Building Bridges: Using Feminist Education in the Workplace,” was a joint venture with the regional branch (PSWSA) of NWSA and was financed primarily through registration fees. Although space constraints forced us to limit enrollment to 150, there were participants from 21 other schools in attendance. Both conferences, moreover, directed the attention of the Women’s Studies community towards the values and value of its own curriculum.

* * * * *

Except for the introductory course, ID 26, course offerings in Women’s Studies initially were strictly the result of individual faculty initiative and reflected existing, accidental, strengths and interest. Increasingly since 1982, the Field Group has attempted to overcome the weaknesses and unevenness created by our lack of control over appointments and our inability to reward innovation. In the process we have used a variety of indirect techniques to develop and shape our program.

As a first step, a comparative and thorough review of course offerings was undertaken in 1981-82 by an ad hoc Committee on Curricular Development. Its report stressed the fact that, though offerings by both Black and Chicano Studies faculty, anthropologists and historians provided unusual breadth of coverage, our curriculum, compared to that of other programs, suffered from a lack of interdisciplinary courses, as well as courses on “minority and working class women in America” and the women of Africa and Latin America. It also led to the establishment of a permanent Curriculum Committee to encourage and supervise appropriate and/or needed developments.

The attempt in 1985 to develop a Mellon proposal to address such omissions forced us, however, to recognize that our committees were almost entirely Euro-American in make-up. Thus the desire to be more inclusive led the Women’s Studies community to face some of its own weaknesses. As a necessary

start, both the Coordinating and the Curriculum committees were reorganized to include representatives chosen by Black Studies and Chicano Studies faculty and staff. (We also began a self-conscious and continuing effort to bring younger women onto our committees.)

The reformed committees then tackled the problem of creating a more interdisciplinary structure for our offerings while providing a model of the kind of perspectives and concerns proper for Women's Studies concentration. As a result, we secured Mellon grants (1986-89) to support the development of three upper-level, interdisciplinary and team-taught courses on "The Politics of Gender." Each course was deliberately committed to an "emphasis on the interaction of gender with class, race, and ethnicity, sexuality, and third world and international conditions in establishing and maintaining hierarchies of power."

In 1988, six years of lobbying presidents and deans for a major appointment finally paid off with the offer of a MacArthur Professorship in Women's Studies. Our definition of the new position, calling for "someone whose training, research, and teaching interests focus on women of color and whose work would foster both critical analysis and appreciation of the cultural, political and socioeconomic situations of such women nationally," reflected a continued concern with inclusiveness. We left to the Deans the choice between Pitzer and Pomona as the site for the new position and in the end received two chairs.

The conference held in 1990 on "The Challenge of Diversity: Race, Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Higher Education," was intended both to highlight our new Women's Studies appointments and to continue our emphasis on diversity. (By this point, the Mellon funds were exhausted. This conference was funded by the California Council for the Humanities, Dr. Margo Goldsmith, the Ford Foundation Program for General Education of Pomona College, the Garrett Fund of HMC, plus 14 other organizations, departments and individuals at the Claremont Colleges.) With an attendance, which ranged from 200 to 500 over a three-day period, the conference illuminated both our strengths and the chasms which still divide women. The seminar and workshop being proposed for this fall (1991) are an outgrowth of the plain speaking, hurt feelings, and renewed commitment the conference provoked.

* * * * *

Over the last two decades, the gender make-up of the faculty as a whole has changed. As late as 1970, only 11% of the full-time, academic appointments in Claremont were held by women. In 1990, 27% were female (12% at CGS; 18% at CMC and HMC; 29% at Pitzer, 32% at Pomona and 46% at Scripps). Moreover, 53% of these women were tenured (as compared to only 36% in 1970).

As a result of these changes and the steady work of the Women's Studies community, both the Field Group and course offerings have steadily grown. In the process, the nature of each has changed. In the initial years, for example, anyone who expressed minimal sympathy with the program was automatically included in the Field Committee. Today membership is limited to those who teach or plan to teach Women's Studies courses, or are willing to work for the program. The result is a Field Group of over 100 women and men with "a strong interest in Women's Studies." (An extended mailing list of about 500 friends and sympathizers is used to keep the wider community apprised of developments, speakers, receptions, etc.)

A similar change has occurred in the nature of courses listed as "Women's Studies." Initially any course which focused on women, regardless of the approach adopted, was accepted as a Women's Studies course, a policy which reflected the initial weakness of both our program and early feminist theorizing. Starting in 1989, however, courses adopted as Women's Studies offerings were defined as exploring "issues of race, class, sexual preference, and gender as they affect the development of women in a variety

of cultural contexts.” They are also expected to “examine paradigms based upon recent women’s scholarship that contrast with the question androcentric assumptions in traditional methodologies, theories and research.”

Despite these restrictions, we offer almost 50 courses yearly and close to 65 on a regular basis. (This puts Claremont solidly in NWSA’s category of “larger programs.”) Our offerings cover, moreover, a full range of levels from the most elementary to senior seminars. Majors have been established at Scripps and Pomona as well as Pitzer; minors are in place at CMC and HMC. (Students at the latter schools can arrange a major in Women’s Studies at one of the other colleges – and have done so.)

Recent years have also seen closer relations developing between the Field Group and the Graduate School and School of Theology. For many years there were few faculty with an interest in Women’s Studies at those institutions, so that the Coordinator sometimes sought in vain for graduate representatives for the various standing committees. In recent years as more women have been hired, this problem has been overcome. The establishment in 1989, as a result of a single large donation, of a chair and an MA program in Women’s Studies in Religion has also strengthened our presence among graduate students and faculty. At the same time, because most members of our Field Committee are involved primarily in undergraduate education, ties between them and women graduate students remain slender.

In addition, as the Coordinator and the Field Group have demonstrated that the program kept growing and that Women’s Studies could raise supplementary funding, the Office budget has slowly been increased. Being Coordinator is still a part-time position, but its occupant has a full-time Administrative Assistant plus substantial help from work-study students. Computers, a printer and access to a VAX have replaced an aging typewriter; adequate office equipment and furnishings have been acquired. The physical office has also grown into a set of 2 rooms (about three times the size of the original one) and the office is (if barely) able to accommodate committee meetings. Unfortunately such growth has been accomplished at the expense of location, since the rooms are not longer centrally located.

The history of the Intercollegiate Women’s Studies Program in Claremont is obviously not yet ended. Over the years, the Field Group has sporadically undertaken internal reviews combined with planning for near – and long-term development. The bare-bone proposals which emerge from this process then become the basis for more detailed planning as well as on-going lobbying and negotiations. Failure to achieve such goals immediately is regarded simply as a challenge to try again. Another ad hoc review and planning committee will probably be established in the near future.

Sue Mansfield
August 1991

Bibliography

In addition to materials in the files of the Women’s Studies office and the Special Collections at Honnold, see C. N. Musil, ed., NWSA Directory of Women’s Studies Programs, Women’s Centers, and Women’s Research Centers (1990); “The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1990-1991; Appendix I,” Academe. Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, (March – April 1991); and S. Rodman, “Claremont: No Place for a Lady,” Claremont Collegian, 14 October 1970, p. 3.

Historical Addendum: 1991 – 1996

Sue Mansfield

I. Women's Studies Research and Teaching Center

Although the idea of establishing a Center was first broached in the mid-80's, attempts to define the character and thrust of such a center were not undertaken until 1991 – 92. The process was a prolonged one, involving both the Coordinating and Curriculum committees and the collegial field groups at Pitzer, Pomona, and Scripps. The final document was a compromise between the more scholarly and activist members of our feminist community as well as a conscious reflection of the emphasis on both teaching and research which characterize the Claremont faculty.

After approval by the Field Group in the late spring of '92, the Proposal was submitted to the Academic Deans and the Presidents. Since Scripps was the Intercollegiate Program's "lead college" and the only women's college in Claremont, active conversations were begun with its deans and president. (Scripps has had four Deans of Faculty since 1991-92.) By the winter of 1992, it appeared that a Scripps-owned building on Dartmouth would be made available, once Campus Security (which then occupied it) was moved to larger quarters.

While the Intercollegiate Program waited for space for a Center to become vacant, the Field Group began to discuss whether and how some elements of the proposed Center might be established in the interim. Ad hoc committees were created in the fall of 1992 to investigate the feasibility of developing, with existing resources, either an internship, a community out-reach program or some form of curriculum and research support. The report of these committees to the Field Group in the spring of 1993 made it clear that an effective internship or community outreach program would require substantial additional funding and commitment of time. However, it seemed possible that some teaching and research activities might be developed on the basis of existing funds and prior to the establishment of residential scholarships.

Acting on the recommendations of the ad hoc committees and the consensus developed in the Field Group meeting, the Coordinating Committee decided in the winter of 1993 – 94 to abandon the traditional policy of sponsoring six colloquia a year as well as co-sponsoring other feminist events in Claremont.(1) The monies released by this and other adjustments to our operating budget were then reallocated to provide for a new set of events: An annual Intercollegiate Women's Studies Lecture, a curriculum development seminar and a series of faculty research seminars. The seminars, understood as a three-year experiment, were to be held in conjunction with catered dinners and to serve as possible model for Center events once the residential scholars program was in operation. The implementation of this new policy began in 1994.(2)

In January 1994, when Campus Security had finally vacated the building on Dartmouth, Ginnie Gessford, my administrative assistant, and I visited it and drew up informal architectural plans showing how the various rooms could be used and submitted these plans to the Coordinating Committee. (The building was somewhat small for the purposes we had in mind

and could only have provided rooms for two residential scholars, but it would have provided a cozy and fairly central location for the Center in its first decade.) Later that spring we discussed the repairs and changes which would be needed to make the building suitable for a Center (and their cost) with the Scripps financial officer. The Coordinator was also asked to provide a tentative budget for the first five years of the Center.

At the same time, we were made aware that, though Scripps had, until now, not charged the CUC rent for the office space provided for the Women's Studies program, rent would be charged for the enlarged space required by the Center. Since this substantial increase in the Intercollegiate Program's budget would be of concern to members of the Academic Deans Committee (ADC), Women's Studies faculty at all the colleges again discussed the plans and their importance with their own deans. In late November 1994, however, the Coordinator learned that the house on Dartmouth would not be available as a site for the proposed Center. (There has never been a clear, public explanation of this decision.) While the ADC and the President and Dean of Faculty of Scripps assured us that they favored and were supportive of the idea of a Center, it was also clear that it is likely to be at least another 4 – 5 years before space for the Center becomes available.

II. Curriculum Developments

The category of "related courses" in Women's Studies, created in the 70's to help flesh out our offerings for potential majors, was abolished by the Field Group on the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee in the spring of 1994. (Since 40 – 50 primary courses are offered yearly the need for the "related courses" was long since past. Indeed, it was not clear that related courses were actually being used as part of any Women's Studies major, while many courses which offered substantial women's studies components and allowed students to do feminist research projects had simply never been submitted for inclusion in that category.) In the last two years, in conjunction with this change (and the shift of the Pitzer Field Group from Women's Studies to Gender and Feminist Studies as its title), the Curriculum Committee has both encouraged faculty who used to teach "related courses" to turn them into primary courses and begun accepting courses focused on gender as Women's Studies courses as long as they are taught from a feminist perspective.

A category of "upper level Women's Studies courses" was established at the same time in response to the needs of students majoring in Women's Studies. The Intercollegiate Program has for several years had, in the inter-disciplinary courses focused on "The Politics of Gender" and the Senior Research Seminar, four upper-level courses for which prior work in Women's Studies was a prerequisite. However, none of our other undergraduate offerings (although many were upper-level courses in a traditional discipline and had prerequisites in that discipline) required prior work in Women's Studies. As a result, majors often found themselves bored while the faculty exposed other students to basic feminist theory or methodology. The new policy was implemented in 1994 – 95 and currently provides majors or advanced students in Women's Studies with about a dozen courses for which prior work in Women's Studies or ethnic studies is either a formal prerequisite or an assumption built into the way the course is taught.

A review of course offerings was undertaken by the Curriculum Committee in 1992 – 93 as part of these two shifts in basic policy and led to a more general review of our curriculum. Material on the course offerings at USC, UCLA, Stanford and SDSU were acquired in the fall of '94 and compared with the core of our offerings (i.e., the 30 or so courses which were offered at least twice in the last three years.) The strengths and weaknesses were spelled out in a memo developed in the spring of 1995 – but no further action has been taken to address the weaknesses.

The special course brochures, listing all Women's Studies courses (complete with descriptions, times, etc.), have become less necessary as a result of several recent developments. In the spring of 1994 the registrars of the five undergraduate colleges finally developed a tabloid style and very complete "Undergraduate Schedule of Courses." From the point of view of the various intercollegiate programs, however, the initial publication of this Schedule failed to gather all of our offerings into a single, clear grouping. A meeting with members of the intercollegiate registrar's committee, which representatives of the Black and Chicano Studies departments also attended, was arranged in the winter of 1994 – 95. As a result, the Schedule has been modified in ways which come close to meeting the desires of the Intercollegiate Program. In addition, the Coordinator's Office acquired a WWW page this winter and the Curriculum Committee has begun to consider the possibility that a combination of a WWW page listing the full description of all our offerings plus the "Schedule of Undergraduate Courses" may make it possible to eliminate – or at least severely curtail – our traditional Course Brochure. This would release substantial funds for other purposes.

III. Women's Studies Conferences

The Workshop on "Affirmative Action – and Beyond", held on Friday afternoon, September 18, 1992, was a response organized by an ad hoc committee of European-American women to the complaints and unhappiness expressed by feminist women of color during the conference on diversity held in the spring of 1989. Envisioned as a "how-to" workshop, it was held on Friday afternoon, September 18, 1992 and attracted over 100 faculty, including six deans and five presidents.

While relations with the various ethnic studies departments have been good in recent years, and have included joint cooperation in dealing with the registrars and the new intercollegiate budgetary officer, there has been no real follow-up on the work begun with this conference. At one point, the Women's Studies Coordinator and the chairs of the Black Studies and Chicano Studies departments (both of whom were, at that time, feminists active in the Women's Studies field group) held exploratory meetings and considered developing some kind of joint conference or program. Unfortunately, the ethnic studies chairs ran into some deep reservations about such cooperation when they took the idea to their faculty and the proposal was dropped as not yet workable.

A Conference on "Teachers and Students Learning Together" was sponsored by the Pacific Southwest Women's Studies Association (PSWSA) in April 1991. It has been the sub-theme of the four conferences held since then and will be the sub-theme of the conference scheduled for this April. The conferences were held at U.C. Irvine for the first four years and in Claremont in 1995 and 1996. Students from southern California colleges and universities play a

critical role in planning and organizing the conferences and are the major presenters at the small break-out sessions. Claremont undergraduate and graduate students have taken an active role as presenters since 1993 and been important members of the planning committee in recent years. Last year's conference was attended by 60 Claremont students (out of a total registration of 300) and over 20 Claremont students presented papers or participated in workshops they had organized.

IV. Intercollegiate Budgets

Looking back it is clear that in the fall of 1993 the ADC began the process of trying to handle the budgets of the various intercollegiate studies programs in a more systematic and comparative fashion. Their intent was not immediately made clear to the various groups affected by this new approach - and, indeed the deans may have been feeling their way forward. Unfortunately, the first result of this new attempt to achieve "parity" was a reduction in the support provided for the office of the Coordinator of Women's Studies. The initial plan - to reduce the course release time provided for the Coordinator from three to one since the chairs of the Black and Chicano Studies departments only received one - was never carried out. However, starting next year the Coordinator will be released from only two courses. There has been no matching increase in the release time allocated to the ethnic studies departments.

The shift was a shock both to the Women's Studies program, coming as it did almost simultaneously with the news that the Center was being postponed indefinitely, and to the leaders of the Black and Chicano Studies departments. It made clear to all of us the fragility of our financial base and the "down-sizing" potential lurking behind talk about "equity." In a meeting with the new administrator charged with collecting budgetary data for the ADC, the chairs/coordinators of the three major intercollegiate programs were explicit that the differences in their programs needed to be recognized and that "equity" should not be achieved by reducing all of the different line-items of support to the lowest common denominator. We may need, in the future, to have such discussions with the ADC itself.

* * * * *

- (1) When the Intercollegiate Program was established, the only feminist speakers appearing on campus were those we sponsored; that was no longer the case. The \$250 honorarium offered such speakers had, moreover, ceased to represent a respectable sum and there were no monies set aside for travel. Co-sponsorship had become a matter of distributing \$50 and \$100 to 20 - 30 events - all of which were likely to be held whether they received funds from us or not.
- (2) Evelyn Nakano Glenn was the 1994 Lecturer; Jacqueline Alexander gave the 1995 Lecture. Karen Barad (Physics, Pomona) gave a five-meeting curriculum seminar in the spring of 1995 on "feminist theory and science;" the curriculum seminar in February 1996 will focus on "feminist pedagogy." Two faculty research seminars were held in 1995 and three more are planned for March/April 1996.