

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network: A Failed Search for Common Ground

Peter G. Wallace

On 22 March 1993, nineteen support staff and administrators attended a meeting in Shineman Chapel at Hartwick College. Late in the fall of 1992, the Gender Issues Committee, a standing committee of the faculty, had sponsored an open forum to discuss the effects of gender differences on the work place at Hartwick. At the forum, Christina Beebe, secretary for Student Services, expressed her frustrations over poor compensation along with the absence of professional development resources, an evaluation system for staff, and a designated advocate for staff concerns. In all, she argued these factors demonstrated "the overall lack of recognition of her constituency by the college hierarchy." In the ensuing months, many staff members had approached Beebe to thank her for her courage to speak out for them. In response she and other staff members had decided to meet as a group "to discuss issues of concern and how best to open avenues between support staff, administration and the faculty."¹

Meanwhile as part of its response to the forum in the fall of 1992, the Gender Issues Committee had explored establishing a "Women's Concerns Network." Barbara Lilly, Director of Off-Campus Study, provided a brief background of the plan to the women gathered at the Chapel. Following the forum, Lilly had approached the Gender Issues Committee with the model of a Women's Concerns Committee as it was being currently developed at the University at Albany. There the committee was tied to the University Commission for Affirmative Action, which gave the Women's Concerns Committee official status. The Albany model incorporated faculty, professionals, secretaries, clerical staff, and students. It lobbied for women on campus and served as their advocate. Finally that committee provided members with opportunities for leadership, sponsored programs for women, and facilitated networking among women. Lilly suggested that such a group could be instituted at Hartwick. She reminded her co-workers that in order to be successful they needed to engage the faculty, which was "the strongest constituency" on campus, and that "[i]f we collaborate, we will have a much better chance of getting our collective concerns heard." Following discussion Lilly and Margaret Schramm, Associate Professor of English and Chair of the Gender Issues Committee, promised to explore the possible formation of a staff-based Women's Concerns Committee with the assistance of the Gender Issues Committee.²

Rhonda Wing, secretary for Special Programs, then suggested that the group advocate for a corporate chart or some form of classification that would have the College determine "what job skills and education [were] required for different jobs on campus."³ When vacancies would occur, the job and its skill levels would be posted and a proper search among applicants would follow. All staff could immediately determine whether they were qualified for the job and if the opening represented a promotion within the institution.

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

The group completed its meeting by identifying five concerns, that they hoped the proposed Women's Concerns Network would address: **1)** inequities in compensation; **2)** the current evaluation process; **3)** recognition (by which they meant inclusion in decision-making bodies such as committees and task forces); **4)** professional development; and **5)** the absence of advocacy, framed succinctly by the following quote: "Faculty have their council. Administrators have their retreats. Staff have nothing."⁴ It was out of this meeting that the Women's Concerns Network was born. The issues raised that day would challenge the Network throughout its existence. Many of them remain serious concerns among staff at Hartwick to this day.

As a historian of the Reformation, I normally study the long dead. It is an odd experience to research the living and a historical experience in which I was a participant. My goal in this essay is to introduce the major issues that my co-workers attempted to address a decade ago, to outline the history of the Network, the term which the members eventually used to define themselves, from its inception to its dissolution in September 1996, and then to reflect on what the Hartwick community might learn from the courageous staff women who formed and nurtured this group. There are three main threads to the brief history of the Women's Concerns Network, and these roughly coincide with phases in its rise and fall. First, this grass roots movement worked positively to build morale, nurture community, and empower women. Second, the Network forced the administration, President Richard Detweiler and his Cabinet, to recognize inequities in compensation and job classification and then to attempt to resolve these. Finally, the flawed process of addressing these bread and butter issues soon strained relations between the staff and the administration, and members of the Network ultimately found themselves ground between the expectations of their co-workers and the resistance of the President and some members of his Cabinet. The following essay will trace these three threads in a review of the Network's history from the spring of 1993 until the fall of 1996.

I. Building Community

Women on the staff, secretaries and receptionists, created the Women's Concerns Network from the bottom up. The act of forming the Network enhanced their morale and self-esteem. It was the first step toward the primary goal of improving the work experience for women on the staff and, in doing so, inevitably for everybody. Working in a process distinct from normal patterns of administrative governance, the founders had many obstacles to overcome. In the weeks following the initial meeting, Christina Beebe recruited nineteen women, seven administrators, eight staff, and four faculty members to join the "network" and attend its second meeting on 19 April 1993. At that gathering the group initiated a debate that would be an ongoing theme at its meetings by asking whether the name, Women's Concerns Network, was a "discriminatory" and "gender labeled" title.⁵ As a critical step in their effort to define themselves and their goals, the initial members formed a sub-committee with representatives from the three divisions (Staff, Administration,

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

Faculty) to develop a mission statement. This seems to have been in part a reflex to defend this extraordinary new group, for they felt that they should include the mission statement in all correspondence, so that "everyone within the campus community would be aware of what our purpose and objectives are."⁶ The sub-committee worked on the mission statement through the summer. Meanwhile in an effort to disarm any concerns among the upper administrators who comprised the President's Cabinet, Beebe communicated regularly with President Detweiler to ensure that he was in support of the movement, even offering to allow him to review the mission statement before making it public.⁷ The members revised the working draft of the mission statement in September and voted on a final version when they met 15 October 1993. Their mission would be:

to provide the organizational structure for an on-going review and analysis of issues related to equity for women employed by Hartwick College. To those ends, the Network will identify and work on issues of common concern and general interest to campus women, establish priorities for action, request advice and cooperation from the College community, and plan strategies to promote equity for women at the College.⁸

To achieve these goals the members elected their first Executive Board representing the three divisions: from staff - Rhonda Wing, Nancy Wilson, Accounts Payable Clerk, and Connie Mravlja, Human Resources Coordinator; from administration - Barbara Lilly, Sandra Carroll, Director of Alumni Relations, Susan Gotsch-Thomson, Dean of Academic Affairs, and Judy Walsh, Assistant Bursar; and from faculty - Margaret Schramm, Mary Snider, Assistant Professor of French, and David Wrobel, Assistant Professor of History.

Over the next three years, the Women's Concerns Network continued its efforts to raise morale among its constituents by sponsoring trips to New York and Boston, faculty-staff appreciation days held at Laura's coffee house, bowling parties, golf outings, and picnics.⁹ Network members organized and realized all of these activities without a budget. If the group needed money, members had to beg for discretionary support from their home administrative offices or the President. At the time, even the office of Human Resources had no budget for such activities. In the spring of 1995, the Network sponsored a "bring your daughter to work day."¹⁰ One of the Network's most successful efforts was a volunteer orientation program through which two members of the Network - ideally a faculty and a staff member - gave a tour and had lunch with each new College employee.¹¹ The Network also joined with the Gender Issues Committee in an exhaustive fund-raising effort that brought noted columnist and feminist, Ellen Goodman, to Hartwick's campus that same spring.¹² In these efforts the Network and the administration shared a common goal of enhancing staff morale and made significant progress. In all, the Women's Concerns Network worked tirelessly to build a Hartwick community, initially with the

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

support of most top administrators, including President Detweiler, who participated in eleven sessions of "coffee and conversation" in various offices around campus, as part of a program initiated by the Network.¹³ Most importantly, Susan Gotsch, as Dean and later Vice President of Academic Affairs demonstrated her commitment to the Network's mission by serving on its first Executive Board and voicing public support for its efforts throughout its existence, even during the stressful final months.

II. Bread and Butter Issues

Though cooperation with administration characterized efforts at improving morale, ultimately the Women's Concerns Network sought to address bread and butter issues, involving equity in pay and a publicly acknowledged classification of job responsibilities, which brought the members into a more confrontational relationship with administrators. Rhonda Wing had raised these issues at the first meeting; and during the summer and fall of 1993, Connie Mravlja explored compensation and position classifications by conducting an external review of salaries and job descriptions at our marker schools. Hartwick College faced a budget shortfall in the fall of 1993, and to resolve the crisis President Detweiler had appointed a special "blue pencil group," which identified several staff positions that were cut - without consulting the staff. As a result, by January 1994 classification, compensation, and staff input into decision making had come to the forefront as critical issues of immediate concern for women and men across campus.

When the Network met on 19 January 1994, Connie Mravlja shared her position analysis, which highlighted clear inequities between Hartwick and neighboring four-year liberal arts institutions.¹⁴ Armed with this data, Mary Snider and Mravlja had earlier met with President Detweiler, and he had promised them that he would address salary issues gradually in the future, with a possible "salary correction" in the budget for 1994-5. In the meantime, new concerns had arisen regarding the President's decision not to appoint a full-time affirmative action officer despite the approval of the Board of Trustees at their fall 1993 meeting, the process employed for the recent staff cuts, and newly initiated surcharges for staff purchases of computer equipment, which essentially was charging a fee for employee benefits.¹⁵ The Network's Executive Board added these to a growing list of "talking points" to discuss with the President.

The Network's call for an overall classification structure and the President's promise to address salary issues apparently succeeded at the February 1994 meeting of the Board of Trustees, following which Detweiler announced that monies would be available "to redress compensation inequities."¹⁶ The President proposed forming a task force to explore how best to improve equity under what he dubbed the "People Initiative." From the outset members of the Network sought staff representation on this critical group.¹⁷ When the initial task force included no support staff, the leaders of the Network turned again to their faculty constituents on the Gender Issues Committee for support. Both groups sent letters to the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee calling for representatives from the staff on the

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

People's Initiative Task Force. In their letter the executives of the Network noted that, "[w]e represent over 170 women in both staff - and administrative-level positions, accounting for 71% of the non-faculty employees." They asked for equal representation of faculty, administration, and staff to advise the President.¹⁸ The Faculty Salary and Budget Committee sent its own letter to the President in support, asking him to establish a committee of "previously elected staff and administrators" to advise him on issues of salaries and budgets. There were no elections, but ultimately Rhonda Wing, one of the Network's founders and a leader in calling for a classification structure, was appointed to the task force.¹⁹

The task force eventually recommended the selection of an outside agency to assist the College in establishing a formal classification system. The Dr. Bernard Ingster Counseling Services in Resource Management offered the College a detailed and lengthy survey form that was to be completed by all support staff members and administrators below the Cabinet level describing their duties and tasks. This apparent victory for equity, however, would become the source of deep division among the staff and would ultimately lead to the Women's Concerns Network's dissolution. The President, for whatever reason (many staff members believed cost), chose to purchase the Ingster documents and to administer the survey internally rather than pay the outside experts. The administration initiated its proposed self-classification process in the late fall of 1994. With employees left to their own devices, the process penalized staff members whose supervisors were not committed to reclassification or who offered little to no guidance on how to complete the complicated forms. Some staff members were expected to complete the forms on their own time rather than at work. Many complained of the document's length and detail, yet most recognized that their only hope for equity would be to provide as much detail as possible.

In the spring of 1995, the Network was at the height of its engagement in campus affairs, sponsoring numerous events, including Ellen Goodman's visit, helping initiate a thorough review of campus wide policies on sexual harassment and assault,²⁰ and becoming the vehicle for articulating growing staff concerns about the reclassification process.²¹ There was a window of opportunity for meaningful exchange between President Detweiler and the staff through the medium of the Network. The administration begged for patience and trust until the review of all the documents could be completed, while the staff, hungry for information, fed on rumors and innuendo. The Network found itself the unpopular messenger in both camps.

By mid-September with part of the new structure in place, the Vice President for Finance, John Pontius, met with the Executive Board of the Network. At the meeting he spelled out the full and now nearly-completed process for the first time. The Cabinet had established separate classification committees for staff members who were "exempt" from overtime pay and those eligible for overtime, who were designated as non-exempt. Staff members themselves comprised these committees and reviewed their colleagues' individual self-reports for position

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

classification. The committees would then submit recommendations to the President and his Cabinet for their "consideration and approval." The Cabinet would in turn review and revise the structure and finally move to a process of "salary identification."²² The process had been completed for the exempt staff and pay adjustments would go into effect in December.²³ The process for the non exempt staff would be completed early the following year. The Executive Board shared concerns about the process that had been expressed by staff and offered to survey all staff members to assess their expectations as this critical but lengthy and relatively secretive process came to a close. The Network felt such a survey "would provide valuable information for the Cabinet's consideration."²⁴

As a faculty member and co-chair of the Network at that time, I drafted and distributed the questionnaire and then collated over thirteen pages of single-spaced responses. The Network asked four questions: "1) What are your concerns about the process of reclassification and its future implications? How might the administration meet your concerns to your satisfaction? 2) What are your expectations about the outcome of reclassification? How do you expect it to affect your position? 3) What would be helpful to know about the structure, your place in it, and the place of other positions? 4) Do you have any other concerns or issues that we have missed?"²⁵

In mid-November the Network shared the results with administrators and staff members.²⁶ The general tone was cautiously optimistic. Staff expressed concerns about poorer status in classifying long-time employees who had joined Hartwick with much lower initial salaries, while recruiting newer employees required higher entry-level pay. Many challenged the decision to have fellow employees determine their co-workers' classifications. Some feared that reclassification would be used for cutbacks. By far the most critical demand was that the classification system be made public because in wake of the process many staff members no longer trusted Cabinet. The President had initially determined to provide limited copies of the structure and require employees to submit requests in writing to their supervisors to view the report. With the resolution of the final classification structure handled ultimately through Cabinet and an apparent reluctance to make the structure public, the new system appeared to allow long-established networks of patronage and favoritism to be justified by the new "equitable" structure. In the end, and perhaps in response to the Network's report, the President decided to make the structure public.

Sharing the finished, in-house product as a whole after months of closed-door meetings marked by complicated assessments and decisions while the community's anxieties and expectations grew proved disastrous. Within a working community as small as Hartwick's, inevitably it would not be difficult to put a face on each position. Even a document without flaws would have exposed real and perceived inequities, as each employee finally saw how her worth was "valued" in comparison to her co-workers. In the end what could have been a process that helped realize the dreams of the nineteen women who first imagined that a Women's

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

Concerns Network would advocate their interests, instead exposed the staff's deepening distrust of the President and Cabinet and nurtured divisiveness among the staff members themselves, often along gender lines, but also among women and men. In its efforts to express the community's growing concerns about "reclassification gone wrong" the Network soon took on the role of a proto-union without any of the protections legally provided to labor organizers. The shift brought about its demise.

III. The Demise of the Network

The completion of the reclassification process marked a critical turning point for the Network. The strain of publicly representing the staff and its interests had begun to take its toll. In April 1995, two years after co-founding the Network, Barbara Lilly resigned from her position at the College after having been demoted.²⁷ Two months later Rhonda Wing, who had first called for a meaningful system of classification, left Hartwick. Christina Beebe held on for another year, but she had stepped down from active involvement with the Network. In June of 1996, she left to take a position as a legal secretary. Of the fifteen administrators and staff members who attended the original meeting of 19 April 1993, only four are still employed at the college. More telling perhaps, of the ten women who attended the volatile meeting of 19 January 1994, during which demands for salary equity and position classification were first raised none, including the tenured faculty member, Mary Snider, remain at Hartwick.

The Network's founders had publicly advocated for position reclassification from the beginning. For better or worse, they became identified with the flawed Ingster process and dependent on the President who had authorized it. As early as the spring of 1995 the Network's Executive Board found itself pushing the President to communicate the positive promise of reclassification and to "rally the troops."²⁸ Detweiler agreed to meet with various constituencies, but the effort failed to reduce anxieties and distrust. The staff members on the Executive Board began to feel anxious themselves following Barbara Lilly's resignation, as rumors spread that employees involved with the Network would be targeted for cutbacks.²⁹ To clear the tense atmosphere, the Executive Board sought a face-to-face meeting with the President and his full Cabinet.³⁰ On 21 May 1995 after three failed attempts to schedule the meeting, I wrote a letter to President Detweiler. In it I assured him that "[t]here is no list of grievances or demands. The Network is not a union or an association of workers looking for power." I noted that we were trying to build morale through public dialogue, which required the appearance of the Cabinet's support of the Network as the forum and voice for staff concerns.³¹ Four days later, representatives of the Executive Board finally met with Cabinet and apparently resolved the tensions. On 1 June President Detweiler wrote to the Executive Board that he "enthusiastically endorsed" their efforts and promised that Cabinet members would attend future Network meetings.³² The Network had weathered a crisis, but its future was only as clear as the outcome of the College's position reclassification

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

process.

As noted above, when completed in the early fall of 1995, the new classification structure for exempt staff members raised as many concerns as it resolved. The Network sought to improve morale by serving as a conduit for those concerns and tensions appeared to lessen following a Network sponsored "open forum" with the President and the distribution of pay increases, including back pay, in November and December. Gradually, however, exempt staff members grew frustrated with the new structure and their individual classifications within it as they came to understand it more fully. They also felt residual anxieties about the level of support they could expect from supervisors in appealing their classification. Furthermore, the non-exempt employees had yet to receive their reclassification and the pay raises. In both cases, the Network was the only visible agent for worker advocacy and the only public forum for employees to discuss their concerns. Sustaining these roles depended on the grace of the President and his Cabinet. As tensions grew, both the administrators and the staff came to see the Network as the problem.

In February 1996, the Network restructured its Executive Board into three branches modeled on the new classification structure, with a chair for each division: Mary Dillon, Director of Publications, (exempt); Connie Mravlja (non-exempt); and Peter Wallace (faculty). As the Hartwick community awaited the completion of the classification process for non-exempt employees, the Executive Board began work on a handbook to assist both exempt and non-exempt employees in understanding the new classification system. The Network also called for the establishment of an appeals system and clear guidelines for job descriptions for new hires.³³ Such a structure would have realized the model first imagined by Rhonda Wing, but in the end these goals remained unfulfilled. In March, the administration finally distributed the new non-exempt model comprising four classification levels as compared to the nine identified for exempt staff members. The sharp differences between the two documents seemed to relegate the non-exempt staff, nearly all of whom, except the campus security officers, were female, to lower status and poorly compensated hourly rates.³⁴ Even the prospect of slight increases in pay failed to mollify the growing anger and frustration of non-exempt staff, who turned to the Network with a list of grievances over the disappointing outcome of the reclassification process.³⁵

In May when the Executive Board shared these concerns with President Detweiler, he threatened to withdraw his public support from the Network. Henceforth he would offer no budgetary support for programming. He also required that all meetings be open and that the Executive Board should shift its focus from compensation and classification to "such issues as morale and professional advancement."³⁶ Caught between the call for advocacy from our co-workers and the President's ultimatum, the Executive Board decided to survey the community about its assessment of the Network's efforts to date and ideas on what future role the Network should play. We distributed four hundred questionnaires and received only forty-eight responses, primarily from women on the staff.³⁷ The apparent low level of

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

interest was disheartening; worse yet there was little sense of common ground.

In her response one woman among the exempt staff succinctly summed up the history of the network: "Originally, I believe[d] that the Network was formed to create an advocacy for support staff. It later became more of a group involving all of the Hartwick community when people realized that their concerns overlapped. More recently, it has been involved in the reclassification process. I'm not sure it has been or is effective at present." Many others raised concerns about the Network's effectiveness in addressing the "overlapping concerns" of all of the Hartwick community. One female faculty member felt that the Network was a "secretaries" group." More troubling was the response of one woman with non-exempt status, perhaps a secretary herself, who saw it quite differently:

I thought the Network was established to provide advocacy for non-exempt (support) staff members. It has not served as such. It has become more of a committee made up of exempt staff members. I don't believe that the Network has helped foster better morale on campus. Lately it has only made the situation worse.³⁸

Many shared this view. One non-exempt woman bluntly note that "The Network has become a group of people who don't really grasp what the issues are....[M]any times I would leave the meeting feeling as if the issue was lost in the political dealings of the administrators and the sometime extremist attitude of the faculty." When asked if they would attend future meetings, one woman responded "no, not any more."³⁹ Like the President, but for different reasons, staff members felt that the Network had become too "focused" on the reclassification process. Some asked the leaders to continue to advocate, to provide a forum for staff, and to take the heat, but others noted that, despite the Network's efforts to raise issues, the group lacked real clout.⁴⁰ After reviewing the varied, rich, and thoughtful responses of our co-workers, the Executive Board decided to put the Network's future to a vote in early fall.

On 11 September 1996 as the new school year began, about twenty members gathered to discuss three options: to refine the Network's mission to the parameters laid out by President Detweiler; to continue to advocate on issues of compensation and workers' concerns without the support of the President and Cabinet; or to disband. The vast majority felt that the Network could not be what the President wanted it to be without addressing the fundamental economic problems that had soured morale, nor could it continue to exist without his support. Those present considered calling for a campus wide vote on collective bargaining, but in the end they decided to disband.

As the tenured faculty member on the Executive Board, I assumed the role of public spokesman for that meeting. In a memo addressed to the Hartwick community, I traced the history of the Network and concluded:

The problems which brought the Network into existence have not

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

gone away. The need for constructive dialogue, not just from the top down but from the bottom up, remains just as strong as it was four years ago. The current atmosphere on campus, however, is not conducive for discussion of these issues. Thus the Network will fall silent. In this our last statement, we strongly encourage the Cabinet to find some mechanism, which will allow employees to voice their concerns without fear of retribution, which will create an environment conducive to communication and mediation, and which will help build a stronger Hartwick community. Silence may give the appearance of consensus, but that appearance is false.⁴¹

Earlier the President had addressed a letter to the Executive Board, reflecting on our shared desire for a "happy and productive staff." The issue he felt was a difference in strategy. He viewed the Network's approach as facilitating and legitimizing emotions. His approach on the other hand would "bring people quickly to acknowledge reality, to understand different perspectives, and to engage constructively based on the best available information." His model, he believed, would enable constructive engagement rather than emotion. He thanked the members of the Network for their efforts and promised to move forward with new efforts to find solutions for the issues the community confronted. He proposed a reassessment of the community's status in five years, September 2001.⁴² Given circumstances both at Hartwick and in the world, the meeting never took place.

The Network was more than an episode in Hartwick's history. Its rise and fall were driven by forces of real inequity - nearly always masked by gender stereotypes about women and work - that exist in almost all institutions. The founders, Christina Beebe, Barbara Lilly, and Rhonda Wing, knew this and sought to rally women in the Hartwick community to come together as women to address common concerns. Early on, however, doubts about the focus on women implicit in the debate over the group's name complicated efforts to unite women at Hartwick and later to unite workers at Hartwick. Nevertheless during the Network's history, several dozen women from Hartwick's support staff, administration, and faculty found in this group a vehicle to exercise leadership and at times their individual and collective voices. Many of the ideas and programs, which they initiated, have become components of Hartwick's workplace. In the end when they stepped forward to challenge inequities in status, compensation, and power directly, they found that collectively they could not achieve the leverage needed to move Hartwick's institutional inertia. Part of their (our) failure derived from an inability to bring support staff, administrators, and faculty together to push for change, to find common ground, in part because inequities of status, compensation, and power divided women themselves. The debate over whether these issues were women's concerns or those of men and women further complicated their efforts. These challenges continue to confront the women of Hartwick and women everywhere.

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

End Notes

1. The document consulted for this research are housed in the Paul Fenimore Cooper Archives at Hartwick College. They are housed in two boxes HC/NET 1 & 2 that form part of the holding in the Hartwick College Collection. Internal to each box, are numerous folders. For reference documents will be identified by box number, folder title, and date. Where documents lack a date, reference will be made to a heading or initial phrase. For longer documents page numbers will be provided. The quotes in this paragraph come HC/NET 2, Minutes, 22 March 1993, p. 1. All references to the position held by individuals identified in this article come from the College phone directories for the year in question.
2. All quotes *ibid*.
3. *Ibid*.
4. *Ibid.*, p.2.
5. It would not be until September 1995, that the members would vote to call themselves The Network. "Sensitive to the original foundation of the committee, it has been the experience that over time the name of the committee has proven too restrictive and narrow for the broader issues the members address." HC/NET 2, 14 September 1995, p. 2.
6. HC/NET 2, Minutes, 4/19/93.
7. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, actually minutes from the meeting of 15 September 1993.
8. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, to Bill Brophy from Connie Mravlja, 20 October 1993.
9. HC/NET 2, Minutes, 27 February 1995. Twenty-five people went on bus trip to New York City, they planned another to Boston; Faculty Staff bowling at Elks Club on 10 March; 90 people attended a faculty staff appreciation day at Laura's Café. Financing came from departments on a rotating basis. See also HC/NET 2, Memorandum, Golf at Ouleout Golf Course, nine holes and barbecue on 21 July 1995.
10. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, e-mailed minutes of 13 April 1995 meeting. Leslie Kamlet agreed to coordinate the "take your daughter to work" days.
11. Leslie Kamlet was also central to this operation. *Ibid*.
12. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, 12 January 1995; and HC/NET, Memorandum, 3 February 1995.
13. HC/NET 2, Minutes, 26 January 1995. At this meeting the members argued that the coffees were a good idea, but they believed it might be improved with a question and answer session involving multiple offices. They implemented these changes with the President's support the following month. See HC/NET 2, Minutes, 1 February 1995; and Minutes, 27 February 1995.
14. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, 25 January 1994. She also reported an unsuccessful attempt to have the Department of Labor conduct a job analysis on campus.
15. HC/NET 2, Minutes, 19 January 1994, p. 1.
16. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, 22 February 1994.
17. Judy Walsh voiced this concern at the initial meeting following the announcement. See *ibid*.
18. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, 2 March 1994. For the supporting letter from Gender Issues, see *ibid.*, verso.
19. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, 11 March 1994.
20. The Network helped put together a group with cabinet level leadership to work on the sexual harassment policy. HC/NET, Memorandum, 6 February 1995. The Network had asked for this group to form because of concerns general knowledge about the policy and the infrastructure to enforce it HC/NET 2, Minutes, (actually a memo dated 6 March 1995 with minutes of Sexual Harrassment Policy Work Group from 1 March 1995, p.1.
21. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, e-mailed minutes of WCN meeting 8 June 1995, see also *ibid.*, 10 August 1995.
22. HC/NET 2, Minutes, 15 September 1995.
23. In fact the administration met this deadline. HC/NET 2, Minutes, 16 November 1995.
24. HC/NET 2, Minutes, 15 September 1995.
25. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, 6 October 1995.
26. For the full text, see HC/NET 2, Memorandum, 8 November 1995.
27. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, 7 April 1995.
28. HC/NET 2, Minutes, 1 February 1995.
29. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, e-mail minutes of meeting of May 11 1995, p. 1.

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...

30. The first possible meeting was scheduled 17 May. Ibid.
31. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, Letter from Peter Wallace to President Detweiler, 21 May 1995.
32. HC/NET 2, Memorandum, 1 June 1995, letter from President Detweiler to the Executive Board of the Network; see also HC/NET 2, Memorandum, e-mailed minutes of WCN meeting, 8 June 1995.
33. HC/NET 1, WC Executive Board, Research, 6 February 1996.
34. At the time full-time secretaries on ten-month schedules made less than \$12,000.
35. Among the concerns raised by the non-exempt staff at a general meeting held on 14 March 1996 were "discontent regarding personal ranking, membership composition of the Position Classification Committee, incomplete instruction and guidelines for preparation of forms, lack of consideration relative to experience and workload, not enough levels to differentiate appropriately, no comparison of non-exempt and exempt responsibilities, many employees feel they have no advocacy, fear of retribution, lack of supervisors' support" among other factors. HC/NET 1, Materials Non-Exempt Study, Minutes, 14 March 1996, p. 1-2.
36. The exact date of that ultimatum is not identified in the sources, but its thrust is clear from the second survey of late May 1996, see HC/NET 1, Network Fall 1996, Memo, 25 June 1996; and HC/NET 1, Network Fall 1996, undated memo (probably early September) entitled The Network. Quote comes from the undated memo.
37. HC/NET 1, Network Fall 1996, memo 25 June 1996 from Peter Wallace to Executive Board Members of the Network.
38. All quotes from *ibid.*, p. 2.
39. All quotes from *ibid.*, p. 3.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
41. HC/NET 1, Network Fall 1996, 18 September 1996, Memorandum to the Hartwick Family.
42. HC/NET 1, Network Fall 1996, Letter from Rick Detweiler to Peter Wallace, 16 September 1996.

The Hartwick College Women's Concerns Network...