

THE HISTORY OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS FOR WOMEN
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

by
Sheryl Marie Szady

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1987

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Robert T. Blackburn, Chairman
Professor Gwendolyn S. Cruzat
Associate Professor Murray E. Jackson
Assistant Professor Phyllis M. Ocker

©

Sheryl Marie Szady
All Rights Reserved

1987

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Bob, Gwen, Murray and Phyllis for their guidance and encouragement during the entire dissertation process.

To the staff of the Bentley Historical Library, I extend my sincere appreciation for their research assistance and unceasing retrieval of the substantial volumes of the Michigan Daily and the many other materials.

I am grateful to Bob, Gerlinda, Barb, Mike, Libby, Percy and Dick for their understanding and consideration during the course of this study.

To my parents, I extend a special thank you for their continued understanding and support of my endeavors.

And finally I would like to thank Marie Hartwig who provided the unique resources and environment in which to conduct this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES v

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

 Significance

 Statement of the Problem

 Limitations

 Terminology and Abbreviations

II. THE EARLY YEARS 9

 Physical Training

 Interclass Competition

 Women's Athletic Association

 Intercollegiate Competition

III. THE BELL ERA: 1923-1957 31

 Bell's Concept of Competition

 Organizational Structures and Finances

 Competitive Formats

 Competition Policies and Practices

IV. THE TRANSITION YEARS: 1957-1973 80

 Hartwig's Concept of Competition

 WAA Student Leadership and the Campus Environment

 The DPEW/WAA Concept of Extramural Opportunities

 Organizational Structures and Finances: 1957-1970

 Advocacy of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics

 Women's Sports Clubs in the MSCF

V. VARSITY INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: 1973-1981 . 127

 The First Year

 Program Formalization

 Varsity Athletics for Women

Title IX
Competition and Funding

VI. CONCLUSIONS 188

- Findings
- Implications
- Recommendations for Further Study

BIBLIOGRAPHY 201

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Average Period Frequencies by Type of Competitive Date (1924-1957)	49
2.	Average Period Frequencies by Type of Competitive Date (1957-1973)	91
3.	Average Period Percentages by Type of Opponent (1973-1981)	184
4.	Average Period Frequencies by Type of Competition (1973-1981)	185

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study is a history of women's intercollegiate athletics at the University of Michigan. The history covers the period before the formal affiliation of the women's athletic program with the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference from 1922 to 1981.

The focus of the study is on the organization and administration of the women's intercollegiate athletic program during this period. The evolving status of the program is viewed through its policies and practices. The views, concepts, and philosophies of women's athletics attributed to the administrators, advisors, coaches, and participants reflect the status of the program. The impetus for change in the women's intercollegiate athletic program also is presented.

Significance

Through historical analyses of programs and units of universities, a greater understanding of the controls and influences on higher education is attained. The University of Michigan is a diverse higher education institution composed of academic as well as non-academic components. These components of the University have evolved to their current status through the influences of a variety of events. Internally, the factors range from the administration's attitudes toward, and perceptions of, each component, to political and financial considerations. External influences stem from organizational affiliations, federal legislation, and societal values. As a program of the University of Michigan, the history of women's intercollegiate athletics reflects influences originating from within the women's athletic program, from the departmental level, from the central administration of the University, and from external sources.

The history of women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan provides a perspective of the past on which to base the future. The women's varsity intercollegiate athletic program, which was initiated in 1973, has a historical record that extends back to the first intercollegiate telegraphic competition in 1922. This study chronicles the transition of the program from the telegraphic riflery

matches of the 1920s to the varsity competition of the 1980s.

Statement of the Problem

The history of women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan has not been recorded, and has been addressed previously only in a limited manner in six dated tangential documents. These are Johnson's 1943 master's thesis "A Brief History of Physical Education for Women at the University of Michigan," two 1937 Department studies "The History of the Physical Education for Women in the University of Michigan" and "The History of Women's Athletic Association, University of Michigan," Hartwig's 1967 historical chart "The History of the Women's Athletic Association, University of Michigan," Appelt's 1928 study "The History of the Women's Athletic Association," and Gjelsness's 1956 study "Women's Athletic Association." The documents on the Women's Athletic Association provide limited insight into women's intercollegiate competition, one of a variety of sponsored activities.

The following research questions are addressed in this study:

- (1) What was the influence of Margaret Bell and her interest in the Women's Athletic Association on women's intercollegiate athletics at the University of Michigan?
- (2) To what extent have the programs, policies and philosophies of women's intercollegiate athletics at

Michigan been aligned with the national organizations governing women's athletics?

(3) How did organizational and administrative changes in Physical Education affect women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan?

(4) What was the role of the sports club era (1970-73) in the transition to varsity athletics?

(5) What was the effect of Title IX on women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan?

Limitations

This study of the history of women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan is confined to the period prior to its formal affiliation with the Big Ten Conference in 1981. Michigan's affiliations with national organizations governing women's athletics had an impact on the women's program in terms of philosophy and policies. The competitive scheduling and program operations were determined independently by Michigan. Under the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference, the governance structure changed, resulting in a decrease in institutional autonomy. The end point represents the beginning of a significantly different operation of the University of Michigan's women's athletic program.

The focus of the study is also limited to the participation of women in Michigan women's intercollegiate athletics. The participation of Michigan women athletes in

other programs is not considered. No comparisons are made with the men's athletic program at Michigan.

The chronology of this study was derived from sources within or affiliated with the University. The Michigan Historical Collection of the Bentley Historical Library proved to be a significant resource for materials. University offices and departments also provided materials.

These two sources were complemented by the personal papers of Marie Hartwig, including many basic materials which had not been retained by University units. In addition, conversations with Hartwig over a two year period allowed for verification and understandings beyond that found in the written primary sources. Information was also received from a limited number of individuals in the Ann Arbor area.

Former participants in women's athletics at Michigan were an anticipated source of data. These women, however, while very eager to lend assistance to this study, did not exhibit vivid recall of their athletic experiences. Nevertheless, these women displayed a strong identification with the current women's intercollegiate athletic program.

The integrity of this study, as other histories, relies on the existence and availability of pertinent materials. When gaps occurred in the data it was often impossible to differentiate between missing data and non-existent data. This study treated the occurrences of no data, after thorough investigation, as non-existent.

Terminology and Abbreviations

For the purpose of this paper the general term "women's intercollegiate athletics" refers to the genus of women's athletic competition involving two or more collegiate institutions. It is used in contrast to girls' interscholastics athletics, women's professional athletics, men's intercollegiate athletics, and intercollegiate debate. The use of the term "intercollegiate athletics" should not be confused with "varsity intercollegiate athletics" or "varsity athletics," a once popular definition in women's sports history.

The following University of Michigan abbreviations are used:

DPEW - Department of Physical Education for Women.

WAA - Women's Athletic Association.

ACRICS - Advisory Committee on Recreation, Intramurals
and Club Sports.

MSCF - Michigan Sports Club Federation, and any of its
predecessors.

CSIAW - Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for
Women.

ACWIA - Advisory Committee on Women's Intercollegiate
Athletics.

Board in Control - Board in Control of Intercollegiate
Athletics, and any of its predecessors.

Recreation - Recreational Sports Program, and any of its
predecessors. A men's program prior to 1970.

UM - The University of Michigan.

MHC - Michigan Historical Collection of the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

HPP - Marie Hartwig Personal Papers, Ann Arbor, MI.

The following abbreviations for national organizations are used in the context of this study:

AAHPER - American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation founded in 1885 (the parent organization for the DGWS).

DGWS - Division of Girls' and Women's Sports (1957).

Predecessors were:

CWA - Committee on Women's Athletics (1917).

WAS - Women's Athletic Section (1927).

NSWA - National Section on Women's Athletics (1932).

NSGWS - National Section on Girls' and Women's Sports (1953).

NAGWS - National Association for Girls' and Women's Sports (1974).

ARFCW - Athletic and Recreation Federation of College Women. Merged with DGWS in 1961.

Predecessors were:

ACACW - Athletic Conference of American College Women (1917).

AFCW - Athletic Federation of Collegiate Women (1939).

NAAF - Women's Division of the National Amateur Athletic Federation (1923). Merged with NSWA in 1940.

AIAW - Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (1972).

Predecessors were:

Tripartite Golf Committee (1956) which consisted of representatives of DGWS, AFCW and the National Association for Physical Education of College Women (NAPECW).

NJCESCW - National Joint Committee on Extramural Sports for College Women (1957).

CISW - Commission on Intercollegiate Sports for Women (1966).

CIAW - Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (1967).

Big Ten - Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives (1896).

NCAA - National Collegiate Athletic Association (1906).

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY YEARS

The University of Michigan began operations in Ann Arbor in 1837. The Act of 1837 (Michigan), which specified the organization and government of the University, stated that the University would "provide the inhabitants of the State with the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of literature, science, and the arts... [and] shall be open to all residents of this state, who may wish to avail themselves of its advantages..."¹ Despite this comprehensive intent, the student body during the early years of the institution was exclusively male.

"Agitations" by women to gain entrance to the University began in 1858. Finally, in January 1870, Madelon Stockwell was permitted to take the entrance examinations, and was admitted to the sophomore class. According to Angie Clara Chapin, a Michigan graduate of 1875, studying was the

¹ Michigan, Act of 1837, sec. 2, MHC, UM, Ann Arbor, MI; and Dorothy G. McGuigan, A Dangerous Experiment (Ann Arbor: CCEW, 1970), p. 15.

principal activity for the women students, as she wrote "we had no dramatics, no athletics."²

The concerns about women entering Michigan were plentiful:

It is somewhat amusing now to recall the numerous objections made to the admission of women to the University, especially by our well educated and able faculty. They raised many objections: First, that they were not strong enough physically to do the work; second, that they did not possess the mental qualities necessary to master the higher branches of knowledge; third, that it would cause untold disaster to the moral atmosphere of the University; fourth, that it would lower the standard of requirements in the University and turn it into a mere female seminary.

...It is very curious to note that not a single prediction, of the wise and learned men in our University faculty, turned out to be well-founded.... They were not quite as strong, many of them physically, as the men, but being more used to indoor work, and being uniformly of better character than the men, they have endured the hard work as well, if not better, than their brothers.³

The women students at Michigan quickly dispelled most of the concerns by their performance. However, the physical concern was not refuted as easily by the Michigan women, in light of the prevailing Victorian ideal of womanhood.⁴

² Michigan Alumnus 8 (June 1902):422; Michigan Daily, 2 March 1896, p. 4; and McGuigan, p. 30.

³ Michigan Daily, 16 December 1899, p. 7.

⁴ McGuigan, p. 53; and Ellen W. Gerber, et al., The American Woman in Sport, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1974), pp. 9-15.

Physical Training

In response to the concern regarding physical stamina, colleges and universities developed programs of "physical training" to monitor and promote the health of their women students. Michigan's President James B. Angell appointed Dr. Eliza M. Mosher, a physician and an 1875 Michigan medical school graduate, as the first Dean of Women in 1896 to supervise the women students. Within her responsibilities were the provision for physical training of the women students, the monitoring of their health, and personal counselling.⁵ However, women students had participated in organized physical activities prior to this appointment.

In 1893-94 the recreational sport activities for the women students were informal with the exception of a local class:

The favorite amusements of the college girls are walking and tennis. Numerous private courts furnish opportunity for the latter and the four mile Boulevard winding over the hills, together with the river roads, are a constant temptation to pedestrians. There is no gymnasium as yet in operation but many of the girls belong to Delsarte classes which meet together for half an hour daily in a Practice Club of two hundred and

⁵ Proceedings of the Regents' Meetings, October 1896, p. 668.

fifty. The walk around the campus, one mile in length, is also patronized by those in search of exercise.⁶

With the opening of Waterman Gymnasium in the fall of 1894, physical training for women was offered during morning hours by an instructor of the men's gymnasium, Keene Fitzpatrick. The philosophy of the physical training program is evident from a statement about the new building: "In the conduct of the gymnasium the aim is not so much the development of a few gymnastic experts as the provision of wholesome physical exercise for the many."⁷

Construction of a women's gymnasium began in March 1896.⁸ In the fall of 1896, physical training classes for women were held in the parlors of the building while construction continued on the gymnasium and the remainder of Barbour Gymnasium. Because of abundant voluntary enrollment, the classes were not stipulated as a required addition to the curriculum.⁹

Mosher, as Dean of Women, was in charge of the gymnasium and the organization of the women's physical

⁶ "1894 Intercollegiate Correspondence," Hartwig Personal Papers (HPP), Ann Arbor, MI.

"Delsarte classes" refer to a physical training regimen of that era in the art of pantomime. Dorothy S. Ainsworth, The History of Physical Education in Colleges for Women (New York: Barnes, 1930), p. 9.

⁷ Calendar of the UM, 1894-95, p. 33.

⁸ Due to the designation of Waterman Gymnasium as the men's gymnasium, women had initiated a campaign for a women's gymnasium in 1891. Proceedings, February 1896, p. 587.

⁹ Michigan Daily, 27 October 1896; and Proceedings, October 1895, p. 516.

training instruction. The classes consisted of muscular strengthening and improvement exercises (known as "correctives"), basketball, Delsarte activities, and Swedish gymnastics.¹⁰ In 1897-98 the instruction included tennis, basketball, gymnastic games, and bicycling.¹¹

As the health benefits of physical training became apparent, the Regents wanted to insure that most entering students received this instruction. Physical training became compulsory for men and women of the freshman classes in the Literary and Engineering Departments in 1898.¹²

In 1896-97 eight tennis courts were constructed adjacent to Barbour Gymnasium, with two courts reserved for women. This was the only outdoor sport opportunity provided for women, "but the courts were in so conspicuous a place that they were decidedly unpopular."¹³ Women's participation in physical activities was a private matter

¹⁰ Correctives-"It was believed that all students had some defects and that they could and should be remedied by individual attention....The Sargent theory was based upon the more general theory that physical training was a corrective or curative process.

The purpose of Swedish gymnastics was to increase circulation and respiration, to assist digestion and to increase nervous control...It was believed the muscular control displayed in the gymnastic lesson carried over into poise and self-discipline." Swedish gymnastics included work on travelling rings, climbing ropes, horizontal ladders, and other apparatus. Ainsworth, pp. 17-18.

¹¹ Calendar, 1896-97, p. 32; 1897-98, p. 34; Michigan Daily, 27 October 1896.

¹² Proceedings, June 1898, p. 251, and November 1898, p. 310.

¹³ Alumnus 15 (October 1908):20.

that appropriately occurred only in the presence of other women.

"Open Days", public exhibitions of physical training skills by women students, were held as a culminating activity of the year's instruction from 1897 through 1909. The exhibitions received much fanfare, and were well attended by University women and invited guests. The Open Day program of 1898, prepared by Mosher and Snyder, consisted of demonstrations of dumbbell exercises, Swedish gymnastics, marching, fencing, wand, fancy steps drills, and a basketball game.¹⁴

Interclass Competition

The inclusion of basketball in the physical training regimen was the first competitive team sport for women at the University of Michigan. Beyond the basketball activities in the physical training classes, competition occurred between teams differentiated by graduating class years (interclass competition). The interclass competition was organized by a "committee" with representation of the four classes, and was first recorded in 1898.¹⁵

The basketball game in the Open Day of 1898 featured the freshman team playing the sophomore team for the

¹⁴ Ibid, 1898-1908; and Michigan Daily, 1898-1909.

¹⁵ Gladys Appelt, et al., "The History of the Women's Athletic Association" (DPEW study, [1928]), p. 2, HPP.

University championship. This game was particularly significant because of the prior announcement that the champion interclass team would play a Michigan State Normal College team. The Open Day game ended in a tie, and the intercollegiate game was not reported.¹⁶ Nevertheless, this was the first indication of intercollegiate athletic competition for women at Michigan.

Interclass games attracted women's participation and paralleled interclass activities organized by the Director of Waterman Gymnasium for men students at Michigan during the same era. Characteristics of male competitive sports also appeared in the women's activities. In 1901 special training was offered to women participants of the interclass games, and the Open Day basketball games began to feature the university championship team versus an all-star team of players selected from the other three class teams.¹⁷

While the women's interclass model resembled the men's activities, a sharp line of distinction existed. Both intercollegiate and interclass sports were supported for men where women were limited to interclass activities: "The enthusiasm for the game [basketball] here at Michigan is centered in the work of the four class teams, and not in one all-star team, as no competition with other colleges is

¹⁶ Michigan Daily, 7, 15 April 1898.

¹⁷ Ibid. and Alumnus, 1901-02.

allowed."¹⁸ The question of training women for competitive athletic events was addressed by eighteen Deans of Women from midwest universities in November 1903. The majority opinion was directed only at their disapproval of the intercollegiate aspects of the athletic contests for women, and not the competitive aspects of interclass events.¹⁹

Another discernible aspect of women's sports was the matter of spectators. While the exhibitions of the early years were designated as "open", the audiences were composed of women students and invited guests. "Open" interclass basketball games were cited in 1902-03, with the following explanation of "invited guests":

Each class carefully trains its best girls for the [interclass basketball] games, which, win or lose the championship of the University. These are very exciting and three of them are 'open,' that is, the girls in the gymnasium are each allowed to invite a gentleman friend and many delicate attentions [primping] are lavished upon the athletic girls just before the eventful day.²⁰

These were exceptional occasions in an era of secluded participation in women's sports. Despite the women's activity apparel of voluminous bloomers and middy blouses, the procedure of inviting guests prohibited the "open" events from becoming spectacles for any male observers.

Mosher resigned as Dean of Women in 1902 and was replaced by Myra B. Jordan, a 1893 Michigan graduate who was

¹⁸ Inlander 13 (May 1903):286.

¹⁹ Alumnus 10 (January 1904):166.

²⁰ Inlander 13 (May 1903):286.

not a physician. Alice G. Snyder, an assistant to Mosher with a medical degree from Michigan, took over the physical training and health responsibilities previously delegated to the Dean of Women, and became Director of Barbour Gymnasium in 1902.²¹ These dual responsibilities reinforced the significance of the medical and health orientation of the physical training curriculum.

In 1903 an indoor interclass track meet, or "Indoor Meet" was held for women students. Jordan organized the first Indoor Meet with a definite competitive format in contrast to the exhibition qualities of the Open Days. The Indoor Meet had competition in a variety of track, gymnastic, and miscellaneous events including the 30 yard dash, 30 yard hurdles, relay race, running high jump, running broad jump, springboard jump, stationary and travelling rings, horse work, giant stride, ball throwing contest, basket event, hopping race, and potato race. Both class and individual winners were noted, with record times and distances.²²

Originally touted as an annual event, a lack of entries forced the 1904 Indoor Meet to be abbreviated and combined with an open exhibition. The Meet was totally canceled in

²¹ Snyder resigned in the spring of 1904, and Helen E. Brooks, M.D., from Boston, became Director of Barbour Gymnasium the following fall. Alumnus 11 (November 1904):85; Calendar, 1902-03, p. 39; and Proceedings, October 1900, p. 570.

²² Michigan Daily, 29 March 1903.

1905. However, it was revived in 1906 and continued through 1926.²³

Women's Athletic Association

Under Brooks' administration a meeting was held on April 21, 1905 at which plans for a Women's Athletic Association (WAA) were discussed. The formation of the WAA was motivated by the need for program expansion and the use of Ferry Field. Women students were dissatisfied with the limitations the committee system imposed on interclass basketball. They wanted to expand the sports spectrum beyond interclass basketball and sought a systematic organization and supervision of these and other sports. In addition, lacking an athletic field of their own, the women desired to use part of Ferry Field (the men's athletic field managed by the Athletic Association, the organization which sponsored men's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan) to introduce the sport of field hockey. The women thought that organizing into a WAA would lead to the appropriate recognition by the Regents to secure athletic privileges at Ferry Field.²⁴

²³ Ibid., 1903-09; and Alumnus, 1905-08.

²⁴ The use of the men's field was subsequently disapproved by Angell and Jordan, although an alternate (Palmer Field) was considered. Michigan Daily, 1905-06; Appelt, p. 2; and Alumnus 7 (April 1905):338.

In late May a WAA constitution was presented, accepted by the women students, and officers were elected. The WAA was described in the following account:

The athletic association for the girls at Michigan is an entirely new thing, although almost all women's colleges and many coeducational schools of the country have them.

The membership of the athletic association will comprise all college girls and will serve as a league, with regularly elected officers, for the direction of girls' sports. At first the only sports to be included in the work of the Association will be basketball, baseball and tennis, but the possibilities of the association are unlimited. The primary object of forming such an athletic association is to stimulate interest among all the college women for the sports of the girls.

The constitution, ...has been compiled from constitutions of the girls' athletic association from all over the country.²⁵

The WAA sponsored interclass competition that determined University champions, along with various social functions. These sport activities were a competitive extension of the physical training program.²⁶

The new WAA was met with great enthusiasm by the women students. While the organization functioned through student leadership, there was a definite affiliation to the office of the Director of Barbour Gymnasium, and later the Department of Physical Education for Women. The women's physical training staff had a significant influence on the philosophy and direction of the WAA activities which went well beyond the provision of facilities, equipment, activity

²⁵ Michigan Daily, 24 May 1905. Baseball for women was initiated at Michigan in May 1905. Michigan Daily, 19 May 1905.

²⁶ Ibid., 24, 25 May 1905; and Alumnus 1905-09.

supervision, assistance in scheduling, and office services for students. This was in contrast to the pre-1894 years of independent student control of men's athletic activities under the Athletic Association. By sustaining a controlling influence, the women's staff avoided the problems that plagued men's football programs at that time, namely, professionalism and over-emphasis.²⁷

Similar to participation in their athletic organization, women participated in a different form of student life than men, which, while it had blossomed since 1870, was nevertheless seen as having a unique origin:

The women do not expect 'like opportunities' for men and women,...for instance, in athletics, in oratory and debate, in certain college publications, and social activities. The essential part is that the University curriculum, as offered to the women of the University, is the same as is offered to the men...

The women are making activities for themselves. For a long time...the women of the University were accustomed to withdraw within themselves and take no part in University life as a whole. This attitude has not entirely died out yet....The social life which centers in Barbour Gymnasium has no exact counterpart in the life of Michigan men and doubtless will not until the Michigan Union clubhouse is built. The women of the University have also entered athletic activities, although...they lack the incentive furnished the men by the block M as a mark of signal prowess.²⁸

Although women "lacked the incentive of the block M," other forms of recognition existed. A perpetual silver trophy cup was awarded to the University women's basketball

²⁷ Michigan Daily, 24 May 1905; and Michael S. Nyikos, "A History of the Relationship Between Athletic Administration and Faculty Governance at the University of Michigan, 1945-1968" (Ph.D. dissertation, UM, 1970), pp. 6-8.

²⁸ Alumnus 6 (March 1907):233.

champions of 1905, and a similar trophy was acquired for the interclass tennis champions in 1906. A schedule of athletic awards was adopted by the WAA in 1909. A point system was structured that awarded a large blue M on a felt circle after a specific number of points were earned by participating in WAA activities, in contrast to the varsity block M awarded to men for participation on intercollegiate teams; however class numerals were awarded to women for competing on a class team in a similar manner to the men's program.²⁹

Another similarity of the WAA and the Athletic Association were their self-supporting natures. Revenues for the WAA were drawn from membership dues, gate receipts of women's basketball games, and fund-raising activities. The propriety of male spectators at the women's games remained a matter of contention, and continued to be solved by the use of invitations. However, only under the WAA's administration was a charge for the invitations noted. Admission to women's interclass basketball games by ticket or invitation was noted in the WAA minutes until 1913. The procurement of revenues was a constant concern of the WAA.

As noted earlier, the University women desired an athletic field on which to play field hockey. In 1908 the Women's League (a comprehensive campus organization for

²⁹ Ibid. 7 (April 1905):334; Michigan Daily, 27 March 1903; DPEW, "History of Physical Education for Women in the University of Michigan," 1937 and DPEW, "History of WAA," 1937, HPP.

women's activities formed in 1890) obtained "Sleepy Hollow", which was later dedicated as Palmer Field in 1910.³⁰

In April 1910 Jordan and Bigelow³¹ petitioned the Regents for a one dollar fee to be paid annually by women students with a threefold purpose: 1) To provide a maintenance fund for Palmer Field, 2) To allow the field to be open to all University women, and 3) "To prevent the use and government of the field from falling into the hand of WAA."³² The petition reflected a situation of that era. In 1892 the Regents had assigned Ferry Field to the Athletic Association with an understanding about its care and maintenance. The control and use of Ferry Field was therefore regulated by the Athletic Association, and later the Board in Control of Athletics. Evident from the petition was the fact that Bigelow and Jordan did not want the WAA to similarly control Palmer Field, or be burdened by

³⁰ Palmer Field was assigned to the Women's League because it could hold property as an incorporated organization. The WAA was not incorporated. "History of the Women's League, 1907-08," Michigan League Papers, MHC; and Michigan Daily, 30 September 1908.

³¹ In the spring of 1907 Brooks resigned, and Bertha Stuart, M.D., an assistant, was named acting director for 1907-08, and director for 1908-09. Catherine Bigelow followed as director from September 1909 through the fall semester of 1913-14. Laura Post served as director for the interim winter semester. Alice Evans became director in 1914-15, and held that position through her leave of absence in 1918-19. Marion Wood served as acting director during Evans' leave, and was named director the following year. Wood served in that capacity through 1922-23. Michigan Daily, 1907-23.

³² Proceedings, April 1910, p. 694.

the financial responsibility of the endeavor. The WAA was experiencing financial problems at the time and had limited participation in sponsored events to WAA members who had paid dues. Open access to Palmer Field would insure all women, as well as physical training classes for women use of the field.³³

The 1910 petition was tabled by the Regents. However, the Athletic Association presented the concept of an athletic tax on all students to the Regents in December 1911. Similar taxes were in use at Eastern schools. The athletic tax was passed by the Regents in January 1912 and was received favorably by the University community. The entire five dollar tax paid by men was turned over to the Athletic Association while the women's tax was divided, with two dollars earmarked for the Athletic Association, and three dollars for the Palmer Field Fund. In return all students received free admission to all men's athletic contests and reserved seats at the football games. The WAA did not receive funding from the athletic tax.³⁴

In June 1912, representatives of the Women's League and WAA met and announced a merger. The WAA became the Athletic Committee of the Women's League. Reportedly the merger was an apparent consequence of the lack of funding from the student athletic tax and apparently rescued the WAA from

³³ Ruth Gjelsness, "WAA" (DPEW study, 1956), p. 3, HPP.

³⁴ Michigan Daily, 14, 16 December 1911; 27 January 1912.

being abolished, though this financial exigency is not documented specifically. Previously the WAA had been sponsoring numerous fund-raising activities to meet its expenditures. In the new structure as the Athletic Committee, the Women's League continued the WAA's programs and award system, and paid all associated expenses. Athletic leadership was appointed through the League's Board.³⁵

The women's athletic program functioned as the Athletic Committee for three years. In October 1915, the Committee was reorganized into the Athletic Department of the Women's League, an early step toward independence. A "tag day" was held to stimulate interest and support:

Michigan women are realizing the possibility of athletics, and an association of their own, and that they have already gone a long ways to forming this union. It also means henceforth women are going to give their hearty support to their teams in all branches of athletics, and that class loyalty is on the increase. Wear a tag to help the cause along.³⁶

The effort was successful as 250 tags were distributed. Jordan and Evans supported this endeavor and spoke at the ensuing athletic meeting.³⁷

Another successful tag day was held in 1916-17 by the Athletic Department of the Women's League and rallied more

³⁵ Ibid., 2 June 1912.

³⁶ Ibid., 20 October 1915.

³⁷ Ibid., 21 October 1915.

support for women's athletics.³⁸ Again seeking autonomy for the WAA, a constitution for an independent WAA was presented to the Women's League Board and was received favorably on 2 June 1917. The Athletic Department accepted the constitution five days later. With the approval of the faculty (presumably Evans and Jordan), the WAA separated from the Women's League. The independent organization elected its own officers and was once again self-supporting as of 1917-18.³⁹ (The WAA retained its independent status until its demise in 1969-70.)

In 1919-20, the WAA was invited to send a delegate to the conference of the Central Section of the Athletic Conference of American College Women (ACACW).⁴⁰ The president of the WAA, Lucy Hoffman, attended the conference, and the University of Michigan's WAA subsequently became affiliated with the ACACW.⁴¹

This affiliation with the ACACW, and active participation in the events of the organization continued into the late 1960s. The Michigan WAA closely aligned itself with the philosophy and principles of the ACACW.

³⁸ Tag days continued through 1919-20. Michigan Daily, 13 October 1916.

³⁹ Michigan Daily, 4 October 1917; Women's League Minutes, 12 June 1917, Michigan League Papers, and WAA Minutes, 2 June 1917, WAA Papers, MHC.

⁴⁰ The ACACW, a conference of collegiate WAA's, was started in 1917 by Blanche Trilling, a physical education faculty member of the University of Wisconsin.

⁴¹ WAA Minutes and Reports, 1919-20, WAA Papers, MHC.

While this allegiance led to some organizational changes within the WAA, the significant influence occurred relative to the competitive model and program of athletics for women.

Intercollegiate Competition

A men's rifle club was organized at Michigan for competitive purposes in 1907. When a woman entered the rifle range in December 1915 and proceeded to give an excellent exhibition of shooting skills, the men were amazed, dismayed, and hoped that she would not compete for a position on their team. She did not. In February 1922 a rifle class was offered to women by Major Willis Shippam of the Reserved Officer Training Corps (ROTC). Soon thereafter, Shippam sought to form a women's intercollegiate rifle team at Michigan, as women's teams were functioning at Illinois, Northwestern, and Michigan State College. A challenge match was accepted with Illinois for March 25, 1922, although no results were recorded.⁴²

This was another indication of intercollegiate, although telegraphic, competition for women at Michigan and reflected a growing trend toward competitive athletics for women. This followed the reference made to an intercollegiate basketball game in 1898 between the Michigan women's interclass champion and an Michigan State Normal

⁴² Michigan Daily, 1907-22.

College team. However, the two 1903 statements, one by a student and the other from a conference of Deans of Women, indicate that intercollegiate competition for women was not approved. This same sentiment was alluded to by Bigelow in a 1911 article disclosing the termination of basketball as a sport for women at Michigan State Normal College, citing its strenuous nature. This also signaled the discontinuation of Normal's intercollegiate competition. Bigelow commented that basketball would continue at Michigan as long as it was "properly conducted."⁴³ Competitive opportunities for women continued to expand, although they were "properly conducted" as interclass activities.

The ACACW had adopted a stand against intercollegiate athletics for women at their 1918 national conference, and the Central Section supported the decision in 1920 as reported to the WAA:

ACACW is opposed to intercollegiate athletics, believing that they tend to commercialize the sport, and to specialize a few at the expense of the majority. The aim of the Conference is to interest all--sports for sport sake.⁴⁴

In 1919-20 Michigan State College arranged a Spring tennis match with Michigan. However the match was canceled because of Michigan WAA's affiliation with the ACACW in 1920 and the acceptance of the organization's stand against

⁴³ Ibid., 8 January 1911.

⁴⁴ Report of the Delegate to ACACW, 1920, WAA Papers, MHC.

intercollegiate athletics for women.⁴⁵ Ironically though, the 1921 ACACW conference consisted of meetings and an open swim meet, with Michigan's delegate, Phyllis Wiley, taking 2nd place in the breaststroke, and 3rd place in the "540 foot relay."⁴⁶ Undoubtedly the meet was intercollegiate in nature, although the open status may have indicated that team scores were not tallied, or a winner determined.

Prior to 1920 the lack of movement by the WAA toward intercollegiate competition reflected the students' compliance with the philosophy of their mentors. However, women independently participated in intercollegiate events that were organized by outside groups, when they were accessible. Furthermore, their accomplishments were reported to, and publicized in, the student newspaper. An example of this phenomenon occurred in 1917 when the Michigan delegates to a Young Women's Christian Association conference took part in an organized intercollegiate swim meet and took top honors that had gone previously to the University of Wisconsin.⁴⁷

A woman student's editorial of 1920 criticized Michigan for lagging behind other institutions in terms of intercollegiate athletics for women and intimated that the subject had "long been discussed" on campus. Women skilled

⁴⁵ Michigan Daily, 23 March 1920; and WAA Minutes, 31 October 1919, WAA Papers, MHC.

⁴⁶ Michigan Daily, 23 March 1921.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 9 October 1917.

in athletics were on campus and needed the incentive of intercollegiate athletics to participate.⁴⁸

Interestingly, a man first proposed an intercollegiate team for women at Michigan in 1921-22. The phenomenon of women working with male instructors in physical training classes was not unusual at Michigan, because ROTC instructors had taught military drilling to women students during World War I. An ROTC officer, Major Shippam, announced the Illinois match in March 1922, organized the first women's riflery team, and arranged a competitive schedule in the Fall of 1922. The women's rifle team was accepted into the WAA in November 1922 and athletic points were awarded to participants. In the 1923 riflery season, 17 women competed on the intercollegiate team and won one of six matches.⁴⁹

The intercollegiate riflery competition for women began 11 years after the men's team started competing. The women utilized the same structural format. Challenges for matches were exchanged during the fall preceding the winter shooting season. Competition took place in "telegraphic matches", with the competing teams shooting simultaneously at their own ranges under agreed upon terms. Scores were exchanged by mail and the winners determined. Multiple matches were fulfilled often by one session of shooting and by sending

⁴⁸ Ibid., 26 February 1920.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 1922-23.

the same results to a number of challenged schools. The women's team was announced prior to each competition day, based on the best scores shot in recent practice rounds.⁵⁰ The indirect nature of the competition enhanced the acceptance of riflery as the first intercollegiate sport for women at the University of Michigan.

Michigan women had progressed from the rigors of Swedish gymnastics and correctives in the course of physical training, and the introduction of basketball and the inception of interclass competition in a variety of sports to intercollegiate telegraphic riflery matches. The formation of the WAA marked the beginning of an organization significant in the expansion of sport opportunities for women for many decades.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 21 January 1911; 18 January 1923.

CHAPTER III

THE BELL ERA: 1923-1957

In 1923 Margaret Bell, M.D., succeeded Marion Wood as Director of the Department of Physical Education for Women (DPEW) and served as its leader for 34 years. Bell's dual appointment as the director of DPEW and as a physician in the University Health Service renewed the medical affiliation with women's physical education which had lapsed since Bertha Stuart's resignation in 1909. Under Bell's supervision women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan slowly evolved within the WAA.

Bell's Concept of Competition

Between 1923 and 1957 women's participation in sports were influenced strongly by Bell. In her position as department head, combined with her personality, her medical background, and her Eastern education at Sargent School of

Gymnastics,¹ Bell was the authority on physical education for women at Michigan. Bell's reign and influence at Michigan were typical of a group whom Hult refers to as "the great white mothers."² These women were long tenured university leaders of women's physical education who made a significant impact on collegiate women's physical education during this era.³

Bell strongly advocated the participation of all women in sports activities throughout her tenure. "My idea of sports does not include the ideal of large audiences, but in contrast, every girl in the role of a participant" and "We want the biggest crowds possible out this year....Everyone on a team" are representative of Bell's intentions and

¹ At the turn of the century, professional programs in physical education were located in the East. The Sargent School of Gymnastics (Cambridge, Massachusetts) and Boston Normal School of Gymnastics, later affiliated with Wellesley, provided significant leadership in physical education.

² Conversation with Joan Hult, LaCrosse, WI, 26 May 1985.

³ Bell held many prominent leadership positions in AAHPER, WAS, and NSWA during the 1920s and 1930s, including President of AAHPER in 1938. Her participation is reflected in her concept and philosophy of women's athletics. "DPEW Annual Reports," 1927-57.

promotion.⁴ DPEW statistics indicate that she was successful in increasing women's sports participation.⁵

While promoting participation by all women students in DPEW and WAA activities, Bell's disapproval of women's varsity athletics appeared in the early years of her leadership.⁶ The incongruity of varsity athletics with her concept of sports participation is apparent in her perception that the purpose of the WAA was to:

...promote interests of the whole rather than the part of the women, and to foster the spirit of play as a socializing and educational factor. It concerns itself with the interests of every woman in the University and not only those who are particularly interested in athletics.... As intercollegiate games are barred to the women of this University, interclass and intramural games receive the attention that would otherwise be centered on intercollegiate games.⁷

⁴ Michigan Daily, 28 March 1925; 25 September 1923.

⁵ Inspection of the 1924-57 decade averages of annual ratios of DPEW participation in non-required sport activities to the Ann Arbor campus enrollment figures for women, show increasing participation during the Bell era. During 1924-30 the average of annual ratios was .70, from 1930 to 1940, .81, and .85 for 1940-50. The large increase in the average, to 1.21 during 1950-57, can be attributed mainly to the opening of the women's pool in the spring of 1954. "DPEW Annual Reports," 1924-57.

⁶ The term "intercollegiate athletics," used by Bell in her statements, referred to the men's varsity model of athletics. This point of view mirrors those of the NAAF. Michigan Daily, 5 January 1926; and Paula D. Hodgdon, "An Investigation of the Development of Interscholastic and Intercollegiate Athletics for Girls and Women From 1917-1970" (D.Phyl. Ed Dissertation, Springfield College, 1973), p. 57-8.

⁷ Michigan Daily, 19 October 1924.

Bell stated a variety of reasons for her opposition to the promotion of varsity athletics for women at Michigan in 1926:

'Were intercollegiate athletics for women superimposed upon a secure foundation, then most certainly I would favor a plan for intercollegiate rivalry. There is no question in anyone's mind that the highest grade of competition has limitless possibilities in the contribution it may make in the development of character. But I do not believe that the women of the University are ready for this.

'In the first place there is a sad deficiency of gymnasium equipment....Before we can have any hope of putting out a winning team we must make it possible for all women to participate in play. Many can not be ignored in order to perfect a few....Furthermore, in order to have the desire to play, one must have a certain amount of skill to motivate the desire. This skill the American system of education does not develop...Women's athletics will not be patronized as those of men....It is a mistake to feel that this will be a unifying force for women. Much trouble has arisen from girl's athletic teams following the example of men's teams. I think a girl should be a girl. The social position of women does not stand this exploitation and competition.'⁸

A 1928 article titled "Intercollegiate Athletics Cannot Develop At Present, Says Dr. Bell" offers additional reasoning:

'Intercollegiate athletics for women is a Utopian ideal,...but in the existing situation they can have no place at the University of Michigan.

'Extramural competition for girls...is not indicated at the present time because: First,...there are few schools where the training of the inferior poorly trained student would not be neglected for the one of superior abilities and training, which would necessarily be the case with limited staff, limited play space and equipment....'

Pointing out the endless facilities and an endless staff were requisites for the success of intercollegiate sports, Dr. Bell said that...intramural games needed to be organized and extended much more before there was any

⁸ Ibid., 10 December 1926.

possibility of developing varsity teams.

One of the greatest objections to sponsoring intercollegiate athletics at the University,...is that smaller colleges and secondary schools throughout the state would immediately follow the suggestion and also experiment with extramural games. While Michigan possesses the resources...in small schools without large staffs, play space, and means, the experiment would be unfortunate.

'Secondly,'...continuing her reasons against extramural contests, 'the skill of average players is not so developed that it is necessary to go outside for competition, if the intramural program is all inclusive.'

Presenting her third objection,...'It is a serious mistake for women to emulate men. Women as a result perhaps of tradition alone, are not prepared yet to stand publicity and exploitation well. The exposure is too much and many good qualities becoming to womanhood are apt to be sacrificed.'⁹

Bell's statements indicate three bases for opposing women's varsity athletics. Her first basis centered on the notion that any resources (staff, funding, facilities, or equipment) allocated for women's varsity athletics would result in fewer resources for the physical education and recreation programs which serviced more women.

Bell's second basis reflected her concerns about the physical effects of varsity athletics on women athletes and the objectionable characteristics of the men's model of varsity athletics. Bell believed that participation in varsity athletics could disrupt the functioning of the female reproductive system. Caused by the emotional and physical strain of the intense competition, this disruption was contrary to the natural order, she contended:

⁹ Ibid., 30 November 1927.

...Women are responsible for the future of the race in the bearing and rearing of children.

We begin to play basketball just about as we begin to mature, when we are growing most rapidly. These physiological changes go on from about twelve years of age until the early twenties. During this long period of adjustment, we should plan to do everything that is suited to our best development. Therefore, certainly strain should be avoided particularly in the early stages.¹⁰

Bell contended that physical strain, or over-exertion, was a result of the lack of the physical stamina and skill level to compete efficiently at the varsity level. This was due to the absence of physical training and skills training prior to entering college. Physical strain, she believed, could occur in varsity competition or in training.¹¹

However, Bell perceived that attainment of a high level of fitness was not necessarily beneficial in the long term. Furthermore, strenuous competition brought emotional strain, which also disrupted the menstrual cycle:

In regard to vital capacity, it is only desirable to develop as much vital capacity as will be used in the years after the player is through with competition. There is no virtue that we know of now in developing air cells in the lungs that are not used throughout life. In fact, this lung tissue may be hazardous for it is so quiet and the circulation so scant that this extra lung tissue may become the seat of infection....

...Girls will not play competitive team games nearly as long as boys will because the great majority will marry and have children. Most girls would not tolerate the strain of boys' basketball well-played, first, because very few girls no matter how much they trained and practiced could develop the skill of the basketball star; secondly, every normal girl menstruates regularly.

¹⁰ Margaret Bell, "The Doctor Discusses Basketball," in NSWA Basketball Guide 1948-49, ed. Marie D. Hartwig (New York: Barnes, 1948), p. 38.

¹¹ Michigan Daily, 27 November 1927.

I believe the average girl should continue her sports right through her period. But I am opposed to competitive play during at least the first two days of the period. The obvious reason is that competition adds nervous or emotional strain. Emotional strain, excitement, worry and nervousness are capable of causing menstrual irregularities.

...The bulk of women playing under competition of a strenuous character often experience irregularity in their periods and many develop menstrual pain. I have studied thousands of these cases and, while I believe that there should be few limitations during the period, I would be inclined to adhere to this recommendation for the betterment of all girls. I call this taking a responsible attitude--this interest in the welfare of the great majority.¹²

Thus the avoidance of physical and emotional strain to perpetuate the regularity of the menstrual cycle and health of the participants were a basis for Bell's opposition to varsity athletics for women.

The third basis for Bell's opposition to varsity athletics for women involved the men's model of varsity athletics. Bell disapproved of the excess publicity, exploitation, commercialism, and hero worship that accompanied successful men's varsity programs.¹³ To have women's athletics replicate the men's model, or use men's sports rules which would lead to that end, would not be in the women's best interests:

In my opinion girls who play boy's rules are too often placed in an undesirable position. They must have a man coach because he knows more about the coaching of complex team play and about competition. The next thing that happens the girl is imitating the man's style of play. Then she begins to act in too boyish a manner.

¹² Bell in NSWA Basketball Guide 1948-49, pp. 38-39.

¹³ See Howard J. Savage, American College Athletics (New York: Carnegie Foundation, 1929).

Next she is spending too much time perfecting basketball skills and team play. Then, having acquired the skill, she becomes a "star." Next she must play in public. She demands not only men coaches but professional men as referees. Out of town games are scheduled.

Do I believe that all the time spent and the contacts made in this type of activity are desirable for the development of the best type of womanhood? I do not!¹⁴

and

Production of stars defeats our aims, -we are trying to develop team play....This brings on other objectionable features-desire for outside competition and all the emotional strains that goes with stars, and exhibition.¹⁵

Bell felt that women's sports programs should be conducted by women, thus insuring the propriety of attitudes and activities promoted by the program. Bell, an avid competitor in her own right, actively promoted athletic competition for women, but not to the extremes of varsity athletics.¹⁶ The men's model of varsity athletics was the basis for Bell's opposition to women's varsity athletics.

Bell's concept of competition in women's sports remained intact throughout her tenure, including her displeasure with the notion of women's varsity athletics. Through the departmental structure, Bell continuously supervised the evolution of women's extracurricular sports

¹⁴ Bell in NSWA Basketball Guide 1948-49, p. 39.

¹⁵ Michigan Daily, 27 November 1927.

¹⁶ According to Ocker, Bell performed for pay as a "high-diver" during her collegiate years at Sargent. A review of the local newspapers during Bell's tenure indicates that she was very active and successful in local golf competition. Conversations with Phyllis Ocker, Ann Arbor, MI, 1984-86.

at Michigan, and only allowed limited support to the intercollegiate endeavors.

Organizational Structures and Finances

Women's intercollegiate athletic activities continued to be sponsored by the WAA, a segment of the recreational arm of the DPEW, from 1923 to 1957. The close alliance of the sports organization with the women's physical education faculty also was sustained.

The WAA maintained its operations during this era unaffected by a number of structural changes experienced by the Department. These changes were administrative in nature rather than programmatic.¹⁷ The WAA's survival of the structural changes were aided by its low organizational status relative to other departmental functions and Bell's appreciation of the organization's purpose and work.

¹⁷ Prior to 1921 the DPEW was a service department of the University. In 1921 both men's and women's physical education and recreation functions were included in the Division of Hygiene and Public Health. The focus on health issues continued as Division Director John Sundwall, referred to the physical education programs as "Student Welfare" programs, and appointed a physician to head the women's department. Prompted by a University study of Athletics (resulting from a request for a new football stadium) the DPEW and the men's functions were withdrawn from the Division and placed under the jurisdiction of the Board in Control in 1926. This organizational structure existed until 1941-42 when a self-governing Department of Physical Education and Athletics was formed. Ruth M. Johnson, "A Brief History of Physical Education for Women at the University of Michigan" (M.A. thesis, UM, 1943), p. 87.

Within the DPEW, Bell appointed Assistant Director Louise Patterson VanSickle to advise the WAA from 1924 to 1928. Instructors Dorothy Colby Hall (1928-31) and Mary M. Stewart (1931-34) followed. Instructor Marie D. Hartwig assisted Stewart with the WAA responsibilities during 1932-34 and served as the WAA advisor from 1934 through 1970. Hartwig's long affiliation with the WAA, coupled with Bell's lengthy tenure and role as Hartwig's mentor, provided consistent leadership and direction of the WAA during this era.¹⁸

Bell established a close cooperative relationship between the DPEW and the WAA because she perceived early, and throughout her tenure, that the WAA organization gave "coeds the chance to develop leadership skills and qualities she believed essential to every woman's education."¹⁹ Student leadership was the impetus of the WAA activities during the Bell era. Nevertheless, Bell influenced the underlying direction of the WAA through mentoring and guidance activities, according to Hartwig. Bell took an active interest in the WAA activities in her early years, then gradually delegated most of this responsibility to Hartwig as she focused on health interests later in her career.

¹⁸ "DPEW" Annual Reports, 1924-1970.

¹⁹ Michigan Daily, 28 May 1957.

In addition, individual faculty implemented this subtle direction of the WAA in their organization of the sports activities they advised. However, the balancing of faculty input and student leadership in activities was difficult at times. One major incident occurred in 1932. In the 1931-32 WAA report the WAA president made the following recommendation:

Every effort should be made to cooperate with the Physical Education Department in carrying out their plans. At the same time, however, as long as WAA is sponsoring sports, I believe the coaches should allow the managers to express and carry out their ideas. This year our managers have been continually discouraged because the coach already planned and put into action her program without so much as consulting the plans of WAA. If this is to be true, where is the function of WAA? We might as well devote ourselves exclusively to the outdoor club.²⁰

This perceived imbalance was resolved at a joint luncheon meeting of the students of the WAA Board and the DPEW staff held early in the 1932 fall semester. The department report of the meeting indicated that "the relationships were excellently clarified."²¹ Similarly, other imbalances were quickly resolved, an indication of the overall cooperative relationship between the DPEW and the WAA.

The WAA did not depend on the DPEW for direct funding, although it did utilize departmental equipment, supplies, services and faculty members assigned as WAA sport advisors

²⁰ WAA President's Report, 1931-32, HPP.

²¹ "DPEW Annual Report," 1932-33, p. 126.

or coaches as part of their teaching load.²² However, all the WAA expenditures required Bell's approval. The WAA was dependent on the DPEW in many respects, although independent in terms of funding resources.

In 1925-26, Bell arranged for \$800 of annual funding for the WAA from the Palmer Field Fund. The Board in Control of Athletics, after absorbing the Palmer Field Fund in 1926, continued the \$800 funding through 1931-32. The proposed budget for 1932-33 indicated \$500 of funding from the Board in Control and an overall reduction in spending, probably the effect of the Depression. Scattered records show steadily decreasing levels of Board in Control funding: \$83 in 1934-35, \$43 in 1941-42, and \$15 for postcards,

²² According to Hartwig, Bell occasionally funded special requests from the WAA through a contingency fund.

The position of faculty advisor/coach of a particular sport was a low level priority in the assignment of teaching loads, according to Hartwig. Knowledge of the sport, and the ability to work with students as an advisor were required for these positions. However, faculty were not retained as advisors if they were needed to teach other academic classes, neither were they retained within the department if their performance did not meet Bell's expectations. Longevity as an advisor was more a result of coincidence than purposeful retention. The two exceptions were Hilda Burr (field hockey) and Violet Hanley (golf). Both women were hired specifically for their expertise and prestige relative to their given sports, and taught/coached in the WAA, and in the required, elective, and professional programs throughout their employment at Michigan.

stamps, and special items in 1945-46. There is no record of funding from the Board in Control between 1946 and 1957.²³

The \$800 funding from the Board in Control represented two-thirds of the WAA's annual proposed budgets of \$1200 during 1925-1932. In 1932-33, the \$500 funding represented 45% of the \$1100 proposed budget. Membership dues and the WAA's Penny Carnival proceeds (1926-36) comprised the balance of the proposed budgets. The Board in Control's funding provided a significant portion of the monetary resources for these eight years.

In terms of proposed expenditures during these same years, sports activities represented only 17 to 23 percent of the budgets. The remainder of the expenditures fell mainly under "executive", with publicity, "Lantern Night" (a women's activity at Michigan of that era), and "social" expenditures the major "executive" items. This apportionment of funding reflects the important social aspect of the WAA activities and the minimal funding used to execute the sports activities. Furthermore, the sports

²³ The Board in Control, composed of faculty, students and alumni was an all-male governing body during this era. The first, and only, challenge to the male constituency of the Board occurred in 1951-52 when the Student Legislature approved a motion to allow women students to vote for the student candidates and to be eligible to serve on the Board. The motion was based on the fact that women paid the same athletic fee as the men and were interested in men's athletics. There was no mention of women's athletic activities in the rationale. The Regents took no action on this motion. Michigan Daily, 7 March 1952.

funds often were used to underwrite individual sport tea socials, and publicity.²⁴

Another source of funding for the WAA was the Women's League, which served as an umbrella organization for all University women's activities. Motivated by a request by Bell, the League provided a \$160 budget for the WAA in 1941-42. This money was allocated to relieve some of the fund-raising pressures on the WAA, allowing it to concentrate on promoting sports activities for women.²⁵ The motivation for Bell's request is undocumented, yet probably reflected the move of the DPEW from under the Board in Control to the new Department of Physical Education and Athletics as well as the declining funds from the Board in Control alluded to earlier. The League budget continued through 1957, although it too decreased, typically funding only the WAA Board's picture in the Michiganensian (the Michigan yearbook), the Athletic Federation of College Women annual dues (AFCW, formerly ACACW), and publicity space in a League publication.²⁶

To supplement these financial resources and membership dues receipts, various fund-raising projects were undertaken by the WAA. These projects included the establishment of a

²⁴ Treasurer's Reports, 1925-32, WAA Papers, MHC.

²⁵ Ethel McCormick (Social Director, Michigan League) to Bell, 20 June 1941; Gwen Sperlich (1948-49 WAA President) to Bell, n.d., HPP.

²⁶ President's and Treasurer's Reports, 1942-57, WAA Papers, MHC.

tea room in Barbour Gymnasium, the Penny Carnival fundraiser and the selling of apples, blazers, and calendars. In addition to acquiring resources for operational expenses, the WAA worked to raise money for a new women's swimming pool beginning in 1937.²⁷ These efforts took the form of a variety of annual events such as the Varsity Swim Exhibition, Michigras, Michelodeon, Spring Weekend, and Tennis Ball which were co-sponsored by the WAA and other campus organizations. From 1937 through 1954-55, half of the total profits were allotted to the WAA, and in turn were designated for the Women's Pool fund. This included the WAA's portion of over \$9000 in net profits from the 1954 Michigras.

To defray its operational expenses, the WAA began to withhold 15 percent of its half of the proceeds from these joint projects in 1955-56. The balance was given to charitable causes, which reflected a concern that earmarking more of the WAA profits for the WAA budget could reduce the support of the fund-raising activities. While 15 percent of

²⁷ The WAA raised \$28,000 for the million dollar pool built by the Board in Control. This was the third facility expansion project provided by the Board. The first two were the Women's Athletic Building (WAB) and the Palmer Field improvements completed in 1928 at a cost of \$300,000. According to Fielding Yost, this earlier project was "the first time in the world that money which is part of athletic income of a school has been used to develop a permanent athletic plant for women." Michigan Daily, 8 January 1928. The Board constructed the WAB and men's Intramural Building in 1928 as part of Yost's "Athletics for All" plan, of which a new football stadium was a controversial issue. Committee on University Athletic, A Report on University Athletics, (Supplement to the Michigan Alumnus, 30 January 1926).

proceeds was a small dollar amount, it partially defrayed the WAA operational expenses and somewhat eased the pressures of fund-raising.²⁸

WAA sport opportunities developed under Bell's guidance, and in an atmosphere of financial constraint. Thus the WAA structure sustained Bell's control of competitive sports for women.

Competitive Formats

The sports opportunities offered by the WAA and DPEW continued to expand during the Bell era. Intramural programming replaced the inter-house format and encouraged more participation by women. The Indoor Meets, Exhibition/Demonstrations and Field Days, referred to earlier, were phased out during the 1920s. Interclass competition was also phased out by the mid-1930s.

Supplementing intramural competition, all WAA sports were organized in a club format by the mid-1930s. These clubs allowed for expanded sport opportunities relative to the needs and desires of their members. Membership was open to all women students and transgressed house or class affiliations. Club activities, which preceded and followed the intramural sport seasons, provided additional participation opportunities, typically at a more advanced

²⁸ Hartwig, "Finances of the WAA," March 1956, HPP.

skill level. Intercollegiate athletic activities were one of these participation opportunities.

During Bell's tenure intercollegiate athletic activities for women at Michigan fell into two categories: telegraphic and extramural competition. The telegraphic competition consisted of meets or matches in objectively measured sports (e.g. riflery and swimming) where actual participation of institutional representatives occurred on respective campuses, with the winners determined by the comparison of scores at a later time. In contrast, extramural competitions occurred between participants at a single location, such as a basketball game.

The DPEW annual reports clearly state that extramural activities were co-sponsored by the DPEW and the WAA clubs. No parallel statement of departmental sponsorship was made pertaining to telegraphic competition, despite faculty support. The imbalance in stated policy suggests the DPEW's definite concern and involvement with the extramural experience.

The situation reflects Bell's concern for the well-being of the women athletes and the direction of the program. The direct nature of the extramural experiences and the intense rivalry which could result in physical and emotional stress required DPEW attention. Sanctioning from the DPEW served to control the extramural form of competition, which approached the varsity athletic model.

In contrast, telegraphic competition would appear to be favored by Bell. According to Hartwig, the physical and emotional stress and the rivalry aspect of the extramural competition were lessened by the lack of direct interaction between opponents and the delay in establishing the winners. The indirect nature of the competition also reinforced the intrinsic value of the participation.

The following table summarizes the competitive program during the Bell era. Average frequencies by type of competitive date per period are shown in order to standardize the data for periods of different lengths. (Actual frequencies appear in parentheses.) The types and formats of competition are differentiated in the chart. Statistics of all sports alluded to earlier in this section are included in the chart, with the exception of riflery. The competitive dates in riflery were not recorded consistently, and therefore not included.

The table reveals that telegraphic competitions were limited in the 1920s, but had consistent participation in the 1930s and early 1940s. A decrease in frequency took place during World War II. However, after the War, utilization was at its highest from 1945-49 before suddenly stopping in 1949. This cessation was followed by an increased acceptability of extramural competition.

TABLE 1

AVERAGE PERIOD FREQUENCIES BY TYPE OF COMPETITIVE DATE

	1924-30	1930-40	1940-50	1950-57
INTERCOLLEGIATE				
Telegraphic	0.8 (5)	1.4 (14)	2.0 (20)	- -
Extramurals				
Mixed Team	1.2 (7)	- -	- -	- -
Dual Contests	- -	3.5 (35)	2.4 (24)	4.1 (29)
Sports Days				
One Sport	- -	0.2 (2)	- -	- -
Multi-Sport	0.2 (1)	0.4 (4)	0.3 (3)	0.6 (4)
National	- -	- -	0.1 (1)	- -
Subtotal	2.2 (13)	5.5 (55)	4.8 (48)	4.7 (33)
OUTSIDE COMPETITION				
With Clubs	- -	3.4 (34)	0.5 (5)	- -
With High Schools	- -	1.4 (14)	1.1 (11)	1.3 (9)
Subtotal	- -	4.8 (48)	1.6 (16)	1.3 (9)
AVG. TOTAL DATES	2.2 (13)	10.3 (103)	6.4 (64)	6.0 (42)

The mixed team format in extramural competition only occurred in the 1920s. Intercollegiate dual and triangular contests first occurred at Michigan in 1932-33, and increased through 1940-41. The decrease in average frequency in the 1940s was due primarily to government sanctions during the War, particularly gas rationing. A steady increase in dual contests took place after the War and through the 1950s. In 1956-57 nine meets occurred, the most in any year of this era.

Intercollegiate single sport sports days had limited usage, with Michigan participating in two in 1930-31. In contrast, Michigan participated in multi-sport sports days in each period. This format was popular in the mid-1930s and early 1940s, and then revived in the mid-1950s.

In 1949-50 Michigan women participated in their first and only direct national competition during the Bell era, the Women's Collegiate Golf Open. The Collegiate Open was first held in 1941, then again after the War years, from 1946 to 1952 at Ohio State University.²⁹

The use of outside competition to complement the intercollegiate events started in 1932-33. Competition against local clubs was popular from 1932 to 1938, with limited incidence thereafter. Similarly, competition against high school teams peaked from 1934 through 1937. However, this format continued on a limited basis through 1956.

Inspection by years indicated trends of the competitive program during the Bell era. The years from 1924 to 1930 show limited competitive dates of the telegraphic and mixed team formats. The 1930s were the prime period for competitive events. Dual contests, multi-sport sports days, outside competition against both club, and high school teams were in relative abundance. The period of the 1940s shows a decrease in dates, especially in the number of dual contests and both types of outside competitions. The decrease was partially offset by an increase in telegraphic dates. The 1950s show a shift in competitive format, with a lack of

²⁹ Mary A. Daniels, "The Historical Transition of Women's Sports at the Ohio State University, 1885-1975 and Its Impact on the National Women's Intercollegiate Setting During That Period" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1977), p. 156-57

telegraphic and outside club competition and a marked increase in dual contests. The losses were not balanced by the gains and resulted in a decrease in the average competitive dates for the final period.

Despite the competitive heydays of the 1930s, and the various fluctuations, the incidence of intercollegiate and outside competition for Michigan women was minimal. From 1930 to 1940 Michigan averaged 10.3 competitive dates per year, including only 5.5 intercollegiate dates. The highest incidence of competitive dates occurred in 1936-37 with a total of 21 recorded. (The 1984-85 women's varsity basketball team alone exceeded that figure.) Despite the small number of competitive dates, the Bell era was an important period in the development of women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan.

As stated earlier, the DPEW faculty influenced the direction and program of the WAA through their roles as advisors/coaches for the sports. During 1924 through 1957, nine sports recorded 120 seasons that included some form of intercollegiate competition.³⁰ Thirty advisor/coaches were identified for 111 of the seasons, representing 119 seasons coached. (Coaches for 9 seasons were unrecorded, and some sports used 2 coaches during 1 season.) One trend of note is that of the 119 seasons coached, 51 seasons (43%) were coached by 13 women who were educated in the East. One of

³⁰ "DPEW Annual Reports," 1924-57.

these "Eastern" women, Laurie Campbell, served as advisor to the major team sports for 14 years.³¹ In addition, all served under a dedicated "Easterner" Margaret Bell. The significance of this heritage lies in the fact that the Eastern institutions provided major leadership and direction in the women's physical education and athletic movements in the first half of the century. The Eastern viewpoint and influence were well-represented at Michigan by Bell and the roster of the WAA sports advisors and coaches.

During the Bell era, intercollegiate athletic competition for women was a means to an end rather than an end unto itself. None of the sport clubs were organized for the primary purpose of providing intercollegiate athletic opportunities. In the early years of this period, many intercollegiate activities served as culminating events of the sport seasons, a situation analogous to the culmination of the physical training work in the Open Days and Indoor Meets of the previous era. Later in the Bell era, as more attention was given to intercollegiate events by the sport clubs, the incidence of intercollegiate competition increased. However, intercollegiate contests did not replace intramural activities as the central foci of the clubs' programming. Bell's aversion to varsity athletics

³¹ Campbell, like Bell, held many leadership positions in AAHPER, WAS and NSWA during the 1930s through the mid-1950s. "DPEW Annual Reports," 1927-60.

was upheld, although the progression of competitive formats indicates some compromise.

Competition Policies and Practices

The evolution of sport competition for women during Bell's tenure was a progression of competitive formats and policies rather than a conscious move toward the varsity athletic model, according to Hartwig. Bell envisioned the proper sports program for women to stem from the physical education classes. Interest in selected sports learned in class activities would lead to elective class work, or participation in intramural or interclass contests. Bell believed that adequate competition could be found within the University's intramural program to satisfy the needs of all participants. If more extensive competition was needed, then it should be provided through expansion of the intramural program.³²

Bell expected women's participation in sports to be a part of their activities but not to monopolize their extracurricular time. The considerable time needed for proper preparation and participation in varsity athletics was contrary to her notion of a well-rounded educational experience. Specifically, a drawback to competition was the

³² This point of view coincided with the national perspective on women's competition. Hodgdon, p. 69.

amount of valuable time that was lost during travel.³³ This time could be spent studying, or participating in a sport or other extracurricular activities.

The travel to mixed team field hockey games held in conjunction with the football games probably was accepted by Bell because the social and athletic aspects took full advantage of the travel opportunity, according to Hartwig. Similarly, the telegraphic competition in riflery, that Bell found established at Michigan, was tolerated. The intercollegiate telegraphic competition required no travel, involved few women, and lacked intensity due to its indirect nature and the delayed announcement of winners.

The propriety of the women's sport activities was confirmed by a University committee in 1926.³⁴ The committee was formulated to study the entire sports spectrum at Michigan in response to Athletic Director Fielding Yost's request for a new football stadium. In "A Report on University Athletics," referred to as the Day Report, the committee concluded that relative to the women's program, only a new field house was needed:

The pursuit of elected activities is encouraged. There appears to be with the women a less definite separation

³³ Adherence to this concept is substantiated by the record. During the Bell era only 10 percent of the competitive dates (22 of 222) were noted as occurring outside of Ann Arbor.

³⁴ Clarence Cook Little, University President (1925-29) had stated in his inaugural address that intercollegiate athletics were "quite valuable for women as for men." Michigan Daily, 3 November 1925. This opinion was not presented again until late in 1926.

of physical education and intramural sports, probably because the two are under the same general direction. An encouraging number of the women-...voluntarily continue systematic exercise after having completed the two-year required course. In general, the work appears to be well organized and administered.

Like the work of the men, however, it suffers from lack of facilities....In general, the facilities for women are distinctly less satisfactory than those for men....Early action is clearly in order. The work of the women, as now conducted, suffers most unfortunately from the lack of satisfactory facilities.³⁵

While the women's facilities were found to be lacking, the women's sports program was not. The committee's views coincided with Bell's views and the skepticism towards varsity athletics at that time. Proselytizing, excessive publicity, and hero worship were noted in the Day Report as "evils" of men's intercollegiate athletics, and were the objects of Bell's criticism. Although no accusations were made, the Day Report found men's sports at Michigan to be unbalanced: "Intercollegiate athletics appear to have grown out of all proportion to the importance of the purposes which they serve."³⁶ Bell intended to protect the women students from these "evils," and a potential unbalanced program by prohibiting women's varsity athletics. In one of the rare incidents of University perusal of women's extracurricular sports of this era, the Day Committee, representing the views of the University faculty, concurred with Bell's views, and found the women's sports program to be proper.

³⁵ A Report on University Athletics, 1926.

³⁶ Ibid.

The WAA women also subscribed to Bell's concept of women's sports. A WAA student leader remarked in 1926, "After listening to Dr. Bell and her ideas concerning intercollegiate athletics it is impossible not to agree with her."³⁷ The following year, other statements indicating student support of Bell's views were noted:

Intercollegiate athletics cause the players to lose sight of this ideal ("Play for play's sake") for sport and to emphasize the idea that the game is contest which must be won for the honor of the college.... (Arlene Unsworth)

Intercollegiate athletics between universities seem impractical because the schools are too far apart. There is also a tendency to commercialize sports just as in men's intercollegiate activities.... (Betty Smithers)

When schools do have intercollegiate meets, they should be conducted with a view to increasing interests in the particular sport and raising the standard of efficiency, rather than for the purpose of bringing victory to one of the opponents and defeat to the other, thus making athletics too competitive, shifting the interest from the sport to the idea of having the school well represented in particular sports.... (Marie Hartwig, later Advisor to the WAA)³⁸

Comments by Gladys Appelt, the 1927-28 WAA President, probably provide the most practical assessment of women's sports, and also of her dreams:

Intercollegiate athletics for women have a place in athletic activities, but Michigan is not ready to undertake their introduction....I believe that the time when Michigan will be prepared for intercollegiate athletics is not so far removed....³⁹

³⁷ Michigan Daily, 16 December 1926.

³⁸ Ibid., 17, 27 November 1927;

³⁹ Ibid., 27 November 1927.

While Appelt's dream of varsity athletics never materialized during the Bell era, new concepts for women's sports emerged. Within a year after the release of the Day Report, President Little presented a plan for women's intercollegiate sports:

One of the great values of intercollegiate events is the broadening influence, and I believe this would be as true of a plan for athletic meets as it is true of intellectual contests. However, I do not advocate a system based on men's athletics, but I would like to see the development of class competition for women between colleges, rather than a Varsity team.⁴⁰

Little envisioned comprehensive field days involving numerous collegiate women in a variety of athletic, arts, and academic activities.⁴¹ According to the Michigan Daily a speech titled "Extramural Competition for Girls and Women" given at the 1928 Midwest convention of the American Physical Education Association in Detroit presented this plan, along with his conservative views on women and other topics:

'If women students would visit the campus of other universities, with a serious objective in mind more than they now do they would come back with a greater appreciation of the benefits which they have in their own institution, and new ideas as well. Besides this they would see what problems are common to all universities and what problems are those of their own institution and their own individual selves. A stimulating reaction is bound to be the result of a

⁴⁰ Ibid., 14 December 1926.

⁴¹ In 1928, Major John L. Griffith noted that the eligibility rules of the Western Conference (Big Ten) allowed women to compete in Conference events. Two women from Wisconsin and Northwestern were expected to take advantage of this opportunity. Michigan Daily, 4 April 1928.

group who are physically fit going to one place to play a game with other girls of their own age and training.

'...I should like very much to see an experiment tried in which one of the various co-educational institutions would send perhaps a hundred girls for a joint Field day. The delegation could include a field hockey team, a tennis team, the glee club, a group to act a one-act play in competition with the dramatic organization of the opposite school, and any number of different interests could be represented. The cost would be well repaid by the inspiration gained.

'...Men administrators will have to be guided and just back up the plans of the women who are in charge of the physical education program, for women...are in a position to know a great deal more about the formation problem than we are....

In regards to professionalism entering the field of women's athletics President Little expressed the opinion that there was little danger of women's sports ever becoming as professional as men's sports, 'because men will not go to see contests between women if they can see men's contests in the same sports. Then too there will never be as many women as men with afternoons to spend loafing at contests of this kind.'

Among President Little's other observations at the Detroit meeting was this one. 'It is remarkable that American girls and women have acquired the interest in physical education that they have when the attitude toward women which our civilization has developed is considered. The idea of a successful woman came to be, at one time, that it was she who could afford to avoid physical effort. Certainly in the Victorian period the clinging vine idea was prevalent.'

Would the tendency be toward more normality or less normality if women had their own inter-collegiate or inter-scholastic teams instead of devoting both their time and energy to following the men's athletic teams? 'More normality' would be the inevitable outcome, as President Little sees it.⁴²

Alice Lloyd, chair of the Women's Advisors, and later Dean of Women, disagreed with Little, believing that women lacked the strength for intercollegiate athletics. Furthermore, she refuted the field day concept: "I cannot see that intercollegiate athletics among men has brought

⁴² Michigan Daily, 23 May 1928.

about any such spirit of understanding, even though many hundreds follow the team on its trips. Just how this factor would be accomplished by the women in the same short time, I fail to see."⁴³

However, Little's field day ideas were compatible with Bell's views. The various types of field day activities, from the arts to sports, paralleled her notion of the well-rounded educational experience. Little's aversion to women's sports following the men's varsity athletic model, and his belief that women, rather than men, should provide the leadership for the field days were consistent with Bell's thinking. The use of competition between representative groups, rather than mixed groups, was the only controversial aspect of Little's plan.

Bell's recognition of Little's field day concept is evidenced by her efforts to have it publicized. She chaired the midwest physical education convention's Women's Athletic Section, and presided over the general session during which Little's speech occurred. She also orchestrated the newspaper presentation of the selected portions of the speech.⁴⁴ (However, the title of the newspaper article, "Women Are Advised By President To Engage In Inter-Collegiate Sports," may not have been to her liking.)

⁴³ Ibid., 20 November 1927.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 23 May 1928.

Bell's efforts may have been politically motivated. Nevertheless, the incident represents the only intervention by a president into the affairs of women's athletics during the Bell era. While Michigan did not sponsor or participate in a "Little field day," the notion of extramural competition between representative teams was acknowledged by Bell.

In the fall of 1929 Michigan participated in its first intercollegiate competition between representative teams.⁴⁵ The event was called a "play day," although mixed teams were not used. Women from Michigan State, Michigan State Normal, and Battle Creek Colleges travelled to Ann Arbor to compete in field hockey, tennis, golf and archery.

The spirit in which teams and individuals played was all that could be asked. Every game was played hard to the end, each girl putting the best of her ability into it. However, there was no undue emphasis on winning or losing. Players on both sides enjoyed it thoroughly and were in a happy, entirely "crab-free" mood throughout.⁴⁶

The social aspect of the event was well planned. The Friday night dinner at the WAB, prior to Saturday's competition, had a mixed seating plan for the women and also organized dancing after dinner with "each girl dancing with a representative of some other college." At lunch on Saturday "each player was asked to take in her opponent of

⁴⁵ Prior to this date competition occurred in the form of dual mixed team events. "The upperclass women of the two schools will compete against the underclass women, since intercollegiate contests are not allowed." Michigan Daily, 21 October 1927.

⁴⁶ "DPEW Annual Report", 1929-30, pp. 202-7.

the morning."⁴⁷ This organization alleviated any rivalry and promoted the introduction and exchange between women.

The play day was a new concept and format for competition which appeared in 1927. The concept of mixed team competition in a variety of sports to promote participation originated in California and moved eastward. The ACACW and the Women's Division of the National Amateur Athletic Federation (NAAF) adopted and actively promoted this form of competition.⁴⁸ According to Mrs. Herbert Hoover, chair of the Women's Division, the play day had many valuable qualities and surpassed varsity athletics in their provision of:

...relaxation and fun for all, instead of over-exertion for a few, bleacher seats for the many, and too strained intentness for all.

...In Play Days nothing is lost to those who are especially gifted with athletic ability. In fact, much is gained to them. A girl of athletic ability shows usually a marked capacity for excelling in some one specialty. If she is good on the track, she is encouraged to devote most of her time and energy to track work. She is exploited in that. This is what has happened in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. Meanwhile all her other athletic possibilities lie fallow. She will not have the immediate joy of a variety of sports nor the inspiration or preparation for the best in the future...

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ "WAA at the University of Michigan is a member of three national organizations: the Athletic Conference of American College Women, the United States Field Hockey Association and the National Amateur Athletic Federation. Membership in the USFHA and NAAF is more for the purpose of gaining a national viewpoint and aiding these organizations in their policies than for active participation....ACACW is an active college group in which WAA participates as an active member and whose policies are a part of the local WAA policies." President's Report, 1930-31, WAA Papers, MHC.

...The real point at issue is not just what special form of sport a girl might develop, but rather that she should not develop excessive ability for any one type at the sacrifice of the many. Under the Play Day plan she easily develops ability in many types; she becomes not a star but a first class all-around player.

...In Play Days we have the democracy of athletics, of sports, which offers full and equal opportunity to all, from the most timid and uncertain of its novices to the most brilliant of its long-time devotees.⁴⁹

While Bell supported the points made in this discourse, Michigan's events utilized representative team competition rather than the mixed team play. By definition, Michigan was sponsoring sports days, not play days. This deviation was made in order to permit, in the DPEW's view, a more satisfying form of competition than the mixed team play. While the 1929-30 "play day" proved to be socially acceptable, the outcomes of future events were questionable:

There has been a great deal of discussion of types of competition which are advisable at Play Days. The original idea of substituting mixed teams for those representing institutions has been very well accepted and apparently is very much enjoyed by the participants. It has been especially useful in those high school situations in which previous interscholastic competitions has brought about a feeling of tense and even bitter rivalry which makes sportsmanlike conduct of games difficult, if not impossible. In such cases when high school girls have played with girls from other institutions instead of against them the friendliness and relief from strain have made a much more spontaneous and enjoyable atmosphere than the uncontrolled interscholastic games.

Critics of this type of plan have held, however, that the mixed teams have no natural basis for competition and cannot produce a satisfactory standard of play. The natural desire of the sport-loving girl is to play her best on a team which is working together with all its powers against stiff competition. The resulting elan of mutual effort is a cause which

⁴⁹ NAAF, Women and Athletics, (New York: Barnes, 1930), p. 67-9.

commands deep loyalty, is a stimulus not lightly to be discarded. Only when this is commercialized or develops into narrow partisanship through an organized program of antagonism do we get into the dangerous by-products of competition. If all the desirable social values of sport can be developed in a situation which is frankly and naturally competitive, there will be few leaders in physical education who will not give it their support.

The Michigan Play Day is only one of the many experiments which need to be made before we have the answer to this question. That the social by-products of the first Play Day were desirable no one who was connected with it would dispute. Whether further Play Days of the same sort would eventually produce more organized competition, more emphasis on winning, and therefore less spontaneous good fellowship, is as yet an open question.⁵⁰

The following year a field hockey "play day" was sponsored by Michigan. Five colleges participated with each bringing two class teams as in the 1929-30 event.

Competition took place between representative teams. Mixed seating was arranged at the luncheon, and tea was served at the conclusion of the competition. Again the event was successful, and the format of representative team competition gained acceptance:

Types of competition for Play Days have been widely discussed and the substitution of mixed teams for those representing schools is a well accepted and popular form. The type of Play Day that the University of Michigan has had for the last two years is in the experimental stage and so far has been completely satisfactory in all respects.⁵¹

Michigan's deviation from the mixed team format of play days, while justified and successful, proved to be a

⁵⁰ "DPEW Annual Report," 1929-30, pp. 202-7.

⁵¹ Ibid., 1930-31, p. 144.

sensitive subject.⁵² This was due to Bell's, and the WAA's, abiding with the policies of the NAAF and ACACW which were promoting the play day concept. The following statement indicates this concern about conformity relative to a set of interclass-intercollegiate basketball games: "This was not intercollegiate competition, nor in any way contrary to the platform of the ACACW or NAAF."⁵³

One solution to this dilemma was suggested by a WAA president. "Play days, as they have been tried at the University of Michigan, have proven very successful. They should not only be carried on, but their success should also be reported to ACACW to form the basis for a possible change in the existing standard."⁵⁴

In 1931, WAA policies stated that intercollegiate sports days should be sponsored rather than varsity competitions. This reflects the incorporation of representative team competition into Bell's views on women's sports activities. This change opened a new realm of competition.

The introduction of representative team competition was limited to the interclass-intercollegiate format for the team sports. These contests were seen by students as being

⁵² Hult stated that Michigan's divergence from the play day concept was not unique among higher education institutions in the late 1920s. However the contingency was not large. Conversation with Joan Hult.

⁵³ President's Report, 1932-33, WAA Papers, MHC.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 1930-31.

different from varsity athletics. However, they were the "only way women can compete in inter-school competition since women's varsity teams are not allowed."⁵⁵ The following excerpt of an article titled "Demands For Competition In Women's Sports Are Answered" presents the DPEW's concept of women's sports in 1934:

The University steers a middle course as far as competition in women's athletics is concerned. Competition is never permitted to become so keen that participants suffer from nervous exhaustion. However, opportunity to engage in competitive sports is open to those women who desire further incentives than class and house practices.

Under this system of controlled competition, the training of the non-skilled athlete is not jeopardized. Additional time and instruction is given to women entering contests, but no emphasis is placed on their development during class periods.⁵⁶

In Bell's "controlled" environment of women's sport participation a new form of competition emerged, outside competition. First noted in 1932, outside competition against local non-collegiate sports organizations allowed diversity in competition without travel. While Bell adjusted her view that all the competition that was needed in women's sports could be found within the University, the expanded horizon of competition was a minor change because of its local nature. In addition, many DPEW faculty were affiliated with the local sports clubs and high schools, which tended to maintain the standards and controlled nature

⁵⁵ Michigan Daily, 13 October 1934.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 18 October 1934.

of the competition, according to Hartwig. The number of outside competitions were limited by the DPEW.⁵⁷

The inception of representative team competition, and outside competition appears to have motivated the promulgation of policies to give structure and standards to these opportunities. In 1936-37 the first DPEW policy statement on women's intercollegiate athletics was issued as recreation program recommendations. Bell's values are evident in the statements:

COMPETITION -

(1) That extra-mural competition be allowed the clubs or special interest groups for experimental purposes....

(2) That these extra-mural events be conducted in such a manner that the play spirit is fostered and sound social values realized.

(a) That the students involved in these extramural events consider themselves as hostesses and be responsible for their guests while they are on the premises.

(3) That extra-mural events be limited to that number which can be conducted without jeopardizing the campus program.

(4) That these extra-mural events, in which the University group travel, be confined to those organizations within easy traveling distances from Ann Arbor. (By this is meant distances which do not involve over-night accommodations.) Any change in this policy should be voted upon by the faculty.

(5) That, insofar as possible, the events be so arranged that all members of the club have the opportunity at some time to participate in them.⁵⁸

In the fourth item of this policy statement, Bell appears to have broadened her stringent views on travel to allow for short trips. Prior to January 1937 travel was limited. A memorandum titled "Extramural events effected by

⁵⁷ "DPEW Annual Reports," 1935-40.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 1936-37, p. 105.

lack of transportation" indicated that five Michigan sports clubs had been invited to nine away events, with only one event attended.⁵⁹ Later incidents do not verify any change in views. The record shows that only three away contests occurred in the seven years after the 1936-37 policy statement, as compared to seven in the prior seven years. Correspondence of 1939 indicates that the former policy was sustained. The response given to invitations to away contests was that Michigan had no provisions for travel and the extension of an invitation to a match in Ann Arbor.⁶⁰ The opposition to travel is reflected in the 1939-40 DPEW report on the WAA which stated that "The Women's Athletic Association did not sponsor any extra-mural meets this year. More stress was placed on skill development and activity within each group."⁶¹

While the 1936-37 policies approved a limited amount of extramural competition, a strongly worded policy statement of March 1938 discouraged students' participation in sports activities organized by agencies outside of the DPEW. Many of the recommendations for physical education major students parallel Bell's criticism of varsity athletics:

ACADEMIC STUDENTS:

It is recommended that:

1. The Department of Physical Education for Women assume

⁵⁹ Memorandum, 8 January 1937, Bell Papers, Box 6, MHC.

⁶⁰ Correspondence, 1939, HPP.

⁶¹ "DPEW Annual Report," 1939-40, p. 172.

no jurisdiction over the students in competitive activities conducted outside the department...

MAJOR STUDENTS:

1. It is recommended that the students majoring in physical education refrain from competition organized outside the department during the college year on the basis that it is likely to:

- a. Interfere with success in professional work because of time and energy demanded.
- b. Be detrimental to health because of excessive amount of physical activity.
- c. Limit the opportunity for the student to make other desirable campus contacts outside the field of physical activity.⁶²

This policy statement reinforces the notion of a system of controlled competition. If University women were going to compete in sports, then Bell wanted the competition to meet her standards. According to Hartwig, Bell was distrustful of students' participation in externally organized competition, although no specific basis for this skepticism is noted in her public remarks.

The following observation of a member of the DPEW faculty clarifies the administration of women's extramural competition prior to 1941:

The administration of problems of extra-mural competition has been one of expediency up to this point. Individual instances of extra-mural competition have been dealt with as individual events, each unique in itself. No general standards, except those tacitly agreed upon by a well-knit and similarly thinking staff have been formulated.⁶³

The lack of comprehensive policies and standards for extramural competition drew attention as a consequence of

⁶² "Recommendations of the DPEW in Regard to Students Competing in Outside Competition," March 1938, HPP.

⁶³ "Outline of Problem," 1941, HPP.

three communications received in 1940-41. One came in the form of a questionnaire from the Mid-West Association of College Teachers of Physical Education for College Women (MACTPECW) requesting information on the administration of intercollegiate athletics for women. The other two were in the form of invitations: 1) to the Mary K. Brown Tennis Tournament at Lake Erie College, and 2) to the Women's National Collegiate Golf Tournament at Ohio State.⁶⁴

The MACTPECW questionnaire was part of an on-going study of women's athletics by the organization. Specifically the investigation pertained to "the problems of meeting the interests and needs of college women who have a high degree of skill in sports."⁶⁵ The DPEW was unprepared to delineate the interests and needs of the women students, and the appropriate method to meet the needs according to Bell.⁶⁶ The lack of a standardized extramural policy was evident, and the focus of an internal study:

We are sorry to report that it would be impossible for us to answer this questionnaire without making a campus study. This we regret.

We discussed the questionnaire in staff meeting yesterday and it was suggested that we might be able to set up a study next year in line with a contemplated departmental study.

At this time we are making an effort to outline

⁶⁴ The competitive record shows that Michigan did not participate in either of these tournaments. According to Yost, Bell disagreed with the process used in the inauguration of the golf tournament. Daniels, p. 146.

⁶⁵ Rachel E. Bryant (MACTPECW) to UM [Bell], 25 April 1941, HPP.

⁶⁶ Bell to Bryant, 15 May 1941, HPP.

general policies in regard to participation that will be acceptable to our departmental faculties. This appears to be a job in itself.⁶⁷

Additional incentive for the study came from the invitations to the golf and tennis events. Upon examination these invitations 1) represented a different form of competition (national, in the case of the golf tournament) than had been considered before, 2) provoked disagreement on the results of the individual event review process or 3) pointed out that opportunities in women's competition were expanding, any of which would suggest a need to review the current practices. At that time, the DPEW lacked a comprehensive policy statement on which to base decisions.

The DPEW's Intercollegiate Study Committee would fill this void.⁶⁸ The stated purpose of the study was comprehensive, yet restrained to a local focus:

PURPOSE of the study - to formulate acceptable, workable policies to govern athletic extra-mural competition of women students of the University of Michigan.

LIMITATIONS. 1. To keep the policies practical and workable for our own local situation.

2. To set up these policies in accordance with administrative practices already conceived by the University.

3. To obtain a general staff acceptance of these policies so that administration of extra-mural activities may be uniform.

AMPLIFICATIONS. 1. It is possible that some of the policies involved in this study might hold for situations other than the University of Michigan.

2. These policies after formulation and an experimental period will probably be reconsidered.

3. It is hoped that out of this study some more concrete

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ DPEW faculty members Ruth Bloomer (chair), Marie Hartwig, Laurie Campbell, and Mabel Rugen comprised the Committee.

estimate might be found as to the demand and need of students for extra-mural participation than is now available.⁶⁹

These delineations of the study supported the maintenance of the status quo, with the administrative and organizational environment offering little flexibility as evidenced by their local focus. The study appeared to be more of a standardization of practices into a policy statement than a creative process.

The Committee collected information from a variety of sources, including a memorandum from Violet Hanley, the women's golf instructor. Hanley addressed the elements essential for participation in the Women's National Collegiate Golf Tournament. Her analysis reflects the state of affairs of women's athletics at Michigan:

Time--while in school to prepare for competition (at least three hours several time a week, the time required for 18 holes of golf).

Health--Players must be in good physical condition to stand up to the nervous strain of competition....

Interest--Not only must the player be really interested but she must have the backing of others equally interested, i.e., family, coach, friends. Few women will compete unless they have this backing, and a University is too disinterested to give the backing which will give the players the confidence they will need to perform at their best.

Personally, I approve of competition for women. It might offset all the coddling they receive through high school and college. I doubt if most girls would make a serious attempt to overcome:

1. The problem of fear and anxiety that is part of competition.
2. Social demands, blue books, etc., and give the

⁶⁹ "Outline of Problem," 1941, HPP.

time required to compete successfully. Our department is not set up to endorse competition in golf. Personally, I'd like to coach the skilled player.⁷⁰

Hanley's frustration with the disinterest of the University, the lack of endorsement by the DPEW, and social support of women's competitive golf is evident. Her views were in contrast with Bell's in many respects.

In the meantime the DPEW Annual Report for 1940-41 recommended that all extramural competition cease until governing policies were formulated. The promulgation of the policies was delayed by World War II. With the onset of the War the DPEW became wholly engaged in the national war fitness effort, allowing the athletic policy efforts to lapse.⁷¹

Women's athletics were affected by the War and the government sanctions. A Federal recreation tax forced the closing of the WAB bowling alleys while reduced production of sports equipment affected participation. The rationing of gasoline eliminated most of the women's travel to extramural events:

Prior to this year, WAA has always invited nearby schools, such as Michigan State College and Michigan State Normal College, to friendly competitions and get-togethers. However, with the advent of gas rationing, these meetings will be given up, and instead we shall

⁷⁰ Violet Hanley, Memorandum, [1941], HPP.

⁷¹ "DPEW Annual Reports," 1940-47.

content ourselves with activities and tournaments within the University.⁷²

This sanction reinforced Bell's views on women's sports and provided an additional obstacle to participation in extramural competition. Justification of non-participation based on Federal mandates replaced the traditional rationale of the potential physical and moral harm of intense competition, and the lack of funding.

Bell's subordination of intercollegiate athletics for women continued into the mid-1940s, as is evident in a 1944 article:

Women have no program that corresponds to the intercollegiate program for men. Michigan women have never felt the need for intercollegiate competition.... adequate competition is provided at home in the intramural play between the dormitories, league houses and sororities....occasionally we do have three-way meets or tournaments with Michigan State College and Michigan State Normal College. These occasions provide a social time with the competition....the Michigan woman is inclined to keep her routines within the environs of Ann Arbor.⁷³

Similarly Bell's views are reflected in the work of the Intercollegiate Committee. The "Recommended Policies For Extramural Activities" were established in 1947.⁷⁴ Notable changes were the recognition of the skilled athlete and the

⁷² Michigan Daily, 29 September 1942. This action coincides with the national trend in women's athletics. Hodgdon, pp. 80-81.

⁷³ Margaret Bell, "Michigan Women Enjoy Huge Sports Program," UM Football Program, 11 October 1944, Bell Papers, Box 4, MHC.

⁷⁴ The Committee submitting the final report consisted of Marie Hartwig, Laurie Campbell, and Corinne Crogan. Intercollegiate Committee Report, October 1947, HPP.

definition of DPEW budget item for the "limited promotion of extramural activities." While the policies are comprehensive in nature, they represent more of a standardization of practices than changes in policies:

The Committee assigned to study the problem of extramural participation...believes that such participation has a place in our program only in meeting the needs of the students with better than average skill. While a case might be made for opening up such participation for all members of a club or intramural group, it appears impractical from the standpoint of staff time and finances. It is believed that such extramural participation as is carried on should be conducted in accordance with the standards set up by the National Section on Athletics....

7. Expenses: It is the belief of the Committee that the Department should carry a budget for limited promotion of extramural activities when sponsored in accordance with the recommendations in this report. The Department budget should carry the major expense of such activities, but each individual or group should not be deprived the privilege of carrying a small share of the expenses. Until such a budget is available, it is recommended:...

9. Participation in State, Sectional, or National Tournaments: That the recommendation pertaining to travel hold for state, sectional and national tournaments. It is recommended that an individual entering a state, sectional or national tournament should not be sponsored by a club or the University.⁷⁵

This policy statement is significant because of its formal declaration and approval of certain practices. In general, extramural events were not to encroach on, only to enhance club or intramural programming. The DPEW would assume facility and equipment costs for home matches, with other extramural costs borne by the individuals or clubs.

⁷⁵ "Recommended Policies for Extramural Participation," November 1947, HPP. (See Appendix B)

Participants behavior was strictly defined. Good sportsmanship and courteous behavior were required, even at the expense of competitive play. The social aspects were strongly emphasized. Travel and sponsorship limitations restrained participation in state, sectional, and national tournaments.

Essentially the breadth of extramural programming was controlled by Bell. Her views appear to be effectively implemented by the limited allocation of resources of staff time and funding. There is no evidence that Bell sought additional funding to promote program expansion in this area. In addition, by leaving the event organization in the hands of the students, as suggested by AFCW policy, and allowing matches only to be arranged during the year of competition, the DPEW placed the leadership in a transient population.

The policies effected the extramural programming as reflected in the decline of invitations to compete in Chicago and at Purdue in the early 1950s. The following indicates the DPEW's continued emphasis on the social aspects of the extramural contests:

Most of the extramural program is in the form of social and get-acquainted functions rather than a competitive athletic program....

Games played in round-robin tournaments or for rating clinics give teams members a chance to develop their skill and to meet new women....

No awards are given in any of these tournaments, but

the participants have the opportunity to learn new games and to meet new friends in the spirit of competition.⁷⁶

In 1953-54 a DPEW committee reviewed several elective program issues pertaining to recreation and WAA participation.⁷⁷ A significant recommendation by the committee was made concerning the composition of extramural teams: "That selection be made from club membership for any group to play extramural teams."⁷⁸

The selection process would result in a homogeneous group which would require less time to improve skills, would improve attendance and allow for effective planning, and hopefully would result in a satisfactory experience in extramural competition. The only detriment was the definite emphasis on competition. In their study the Committee state some of the related problems of the program:

We are not meeting the desires of the students to play other schools. When we do play other schools it may be an unfavorable experience for us because we do not select the competitors but ask for volunteers....

Basketball and Hockey Clubs desire to play outside teams but are unwilling to spend time on improving individual skills and those that play are often poorly skilled which spoils the fun of those who have skill.⁷⁹

This recommendation reflected a shift in attitude of the DPEW faculty to the acceptance of a more competitive model than previously endorsed. The only indication of

⁷⁶ Michigan Daily, 23 May 1952.

⁷⁷ Hartwig chaired the committee of Joan Farrell, Ruth Harris, Betty Ludwig, Jean Stanicek, and Helen Stewart.

⁷⁸ "DPEW Annual Report," 1953-54, p. 76.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 78-79.

Bell's approval of this recommendation was that it was printed and included in the DPEW Annual Report. Physical education issues were of secondary interest to Bell after health issues following World War II.

In 1955 the policies governing extramural athletics were revised. Changes occurred relative to travel, funding, and tournament participation. The 75 mile travel limit was eased:

Travel to colleges in Michigan or adjacent states should be considered as to practicality regarding road conditions, day of the week, staff time and means of financing.⁸⁰

The assignment of funding responsibilities was expanded with the DPEW accepting more responsibility. It was recommended that the DPEW or WAA provide budgets for limited promotion of extramural activities, chaperone, and social event expenses. WAA clubs were encouraged to earn money to defray extramural expenses rather than requiring individual assessment. The strict policy of no sponsorship of participation in state, sectional, or national tournaments was revised to allow for individual reviews of this type of request.

The overall sense of the revised policies is an easing of old values coupled with a movement toward a new concept. While the majority of the points in the 1947 policy statement were retained, some of the rhetoric was omitted.

⁸⁰ "Recommended Policies for Extramural Activities," January 1955, HPP.

The revised policies reflected a more liberal viewpoint than previously stated. Again, evidence of Bell's approval is the fact that the policies were printed and distributed.

One view that remained intact was a distrust of external agencies organizing women's sports. The opening of the Women's Pool brought attention to the concurrent coaching of the women's speed swim club and the Ann Arbor AAU Swim Team by DPEW member Rose Mary Dawson, the daughter of the men's swim coach Matt Mann. Pointed recommendations were made to insure that extramural swim competitions hosted by Michigan were conducted exclusively under the National Section on Girls and Women's Sports (NSGWS) standards. However, a compromising attitude was reflected by the fact that the team could compete in AAU meets elsewhere as long as the NSGWS standards were met.⁸¹ (The AAU meets were attractive because they offered more competitive opportunities than those traditionally sponsored by Michigan.) Nevertheless the DPEW Swimming Committee stated: "It will be our policy not to train individuals specifically for AAU meets. If individuals wish to enter AAU meets, the individuals should not be sponsored by the University of Michigan."⁸²

⁸¹ This compromise on the AAU reflected the orientation of the national organizations governing women's athletics. Hodgdon, 121.

⁸² "Second Report from Competition Committee," 28 February 1955, HPP.

In 1956 the Swimming Committee made the following report which gives the DPEW faculty perspective on women's athletics:

The question of competition was brought up. The majority of committee members felt that swimming should not be stressed any more than any other activity. A few friendly swimming meets would be desirable but a regular schedule type of home and home meets etc. was not advocated.

Several members felt that the desire for competition should come from the students—we should not press the issue. It was suggested that we do not become involved with the AAU anymore than is necessary. If we do have a Swimming Team as such, however, they should be allowed to use the name of the University of Michigan and they should be allowed to schedule meets.⁸³

The concept of "friendly" extramural competition driven by student interest remained viable.

In Bell's final year the DPEW Annual Report recommended that "in all clubs opportunities for competition at the different levels of skill should be worked out."⁸⁴ The recognition and facilitation of competition for highly skilled women athletes was the antithesis of Bell's original views on women's sports. Her concept of women's intercollegiate athletics slowly broadened during her tenure. While competition approached the varsity athletics format, Bell's control of the emphasis and intensity of the participation differentiated Michigan's women's intercollegiate athletics from the varsity model.

⁸³ "DPEW Annual Report," 1955-56, pp. 95-96.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 1956-57, p. 178. This perspective coincided with the national trend in women's athletics. Hodgdon, p. 122.

CHAPTER IV

THE TRANSITION YEARS: 1957-1973

With the retirement of Margaret Bell, Esther French of Illinois State Normal University became Director of the Department of Physical Education for Women in Fall 1957.¹ French, an accomplished researcher, assigned Marie Hartwig as the principal administrator of the DPEW recreational program.

Change dominated the transition years. Changes in student attitudes, interests, and leadership occurred. Organizational changes accompanied by changes in funding sources affected the opportunities for women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan.

Hartwig's Concept of Competition

Hartwig, having provided leadership in the DPEW recreational program since the 1930s, continued to be the

¹ Two internal candidates for Bell's position were discounted. Dr. Laurie Campbell would retire in 1959, and Marie Hartwig held a Master's degree, not a Ph.D.

dominant force in women's athletics during the transition years.² She continued to endorse many of Bell's ideas about women's sports.

The continuance of Bell's concepts is substantiated by the review of introductory materials of an October 1957 meeting of the WAA Board and the faculty advisors to the WAA sports clubs.³ Over half of these materials were reprints of documents used in 1952 and 1956-57. Particular mention was made of the concept that limited staff, facilities, and funding would be available for the benefit of the majority of women students through intramural sports. That is, extramural competition would not be emphasized. In addition, sports clubs, the haven for skilled athletes, continued to be instructed by Hartwig to provide competitive opportunities for all skill levels. While this broad mandate diluted the possible focus on intercollegiate participation, this concept of balanced programming permitted skilled women athletes the opportunity to compete in limited extramural athletics.

Lacking among Hartwig's October 1957 materials was mention of Bell's concern for the physical stress that competitive athletics placed on women. Nor was Hartwig outspoken on the "evils" of the men's varsity athletic

² Hartwig held many leadership positions in AFCW, NSWA, and AAHPER in the 1940s through the 1950s. Her philosophy and concept of women's athletics strongly reflected these affiliations. "DPEW Annual Reports," 1930-70.

³ Packet of materials dated 24 October 1957, HPP.

model. However, Hartwig felt that the lack of funding and facilities, and the lack of students' commitment to extensive participation limited women's intercollegiate athletics to an extramural program.

WAA Student Leadership and the Campus Environment

Of particular importance to Hartwig was the environment which the WAA provided for the development of organizational and leadership skills in women students. She maintained a strong belief that the WAA activities were to be run by students with faculty guidance.⁴ The WAA's sports clubs were to be perpetuated through the interests and efforts of students, and not solely through the efforts of the DPEW faculty.

Hartwig's position on student leadership in the WAA is revealed in her memo of 31 October 1957 titled "Policy on Advising":

The development of student leadership has been one of the greatest 'byproducts' of WAA.

With this in mind the advisors stand ready to GUIDE AND ASSIST in every way....

It is a difficult situation for an advisor to stand by and watch an activity fail because of poor leadership, but this process must exist if WAA is to be a student run organization.

Instead of the advisor stepping in and running the activity, she should report to the president of WAA and/or the WAA advisor that there exists a lack of leadership in this area...

It would then follow that: 1. The WAA president...

⁴ Hartwig's belief was congruent with the philosophy of the ARFCW.

would attempt to help the situation or find a new leader OR 2. Drop the activity from the program until sufficient interest and leadership arises.⁵

Also reflected is the policy that faculty advisors were not to assume sports club leadership.

Unlike the Bell era when strong student leadership conducted the WAA activities, student leadership waned. This trend was intimated by Hartwig in 1959 relative to the sports club programs: "WAA is a student organization, therefore the students should lead or a revision should be made in terms of these activities where faculty assume the basic leadership."⁶ The following year the decline was seen as campus-wide, and was dubiously attributed to academic pressures:

The recreation program, along with the other elective extra-curricular activities, has been affected by a change in student attitude which has been developing on campus the last three years. With the pressure on academic subjects becoming seemingly greater, student and housing groups have been very selective in the amount of time they spend on extra-curricular activities.⁷

A significant event in 1959 for the women students was the Women's Week sponsored by the Women's League. This event focused on the conflict faced by women of marriage and career.⁸ The exploration of this topic would appear to have

⁵ "Policy on Advising," 31 October 1957, HPP.

⁶ "DPEW Annual Report", 1958-59, p. 101.

⁷ Ibid., 1959-60, p. 2.

⁸ Michigan Daily, 29 October-8 November 1959.

confronted Dean of Women Deborah Bacon's traditional and conservative views of women and marriage.⁹

A movement was started on campus in the early 1960s to relax University restrictions on women students and to oust Bacon for her "extreme paternalism, the stifling of individual expression, the restriction of open association."¹⁰ A documented student complaint against Bacon was received by the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA) in February 1961 and resulted in a recommendation that the Office of Student Affairs be reorganized with personnel reassigned. Bacon resigned in September 1961, and Elizabeth Davenport was named Acting Dean. By the end of 1961-62 Davenport had forecast the abolition of senior women's "hours," a sign of change.¹¹

The changing campus environment for women, and the students' independent attitude, are reflected in Hartwig's statement of 1962:

Many other 'recreation' interests are developing on campus in other than the sport and dance areas.... The continued pressure in the academic areas leave little free time as compared to ten years ago....

Adult advice [on Michigras] was not accepted despite the fact that it was based upon advising all the Michigras since 1936 with ever increasing budgets. This

⁹ Bacon served as Dean from the early 1950s, and was the last of a line of Deans of Women who "absolutely" ruled the lives of women students. Her interpretation of her role was characterized by an inflexible implementation of the University rules for women. Conversation with Elizabeth Davenport, Ann Arbor, MI, 14 October 1985.

¹⁰ Michigan Daily, 3 December 1961.

¹¹ Ibid., 31 May 1961; 29 May 1962.

event, too, will need serious scrutiny when the overall campus plan is finally set.¹²

During the mid-1960s the Office of Student Affairs underwent extensive changes including the merger of various men's and women's functions across the campus. By Fall 1962 the offices of the Deans of Men and Women were combined, although Davenport was named special advisor to Vice President of Student Affairs James Lewis on women's matters. This move was in reaction "to pressure from powerful alumni and alumnae demanding that the deanship of women be retained."¹³ Despite public pressure the University eased some of its "conservative" views relative to student affairs including women's hours and housing restrictions and coeducational dormitories.

During the change on campus, the concept of promoting student leadership through the WAA seemed threatened in 1964-65. The weakened student allegiance to WAA activities forced some compromise of Hartwig's and the ARFCW's student leadership principle:

Campus attitudes toward advisors has changed. An advisor is, as he should be, a resource person who does not initiate direction, but hints at it when asked. The young people today don't mind adults around in this capacity, but they revolt against what they call intervention. So the business of leadership training is a subtle one and can be best done through example. This calls for review of outmoded methods and a constant redesign....

The supply of student leaders diminishes yearly as the heavy academic schedules allow less and less time

¹² "DPEW Annual Report," 1961-62, pp. 98, 100.

¹³ Michigan Daily, 11 September 1962.

for the necessary planning meetings for organization. Faculty will have to assume more responsibility for planning but must be sure that students have an opportunity to make suggestions. With many students living in apartments the daily chores have eaten into the old 'free time.'

The WAA has found that sport managers are not interested in being part of a governing board when their sport is not in season.¹⁴

The status previously attached to membership on the WAA Board diminished.

By 1969 the predominant role the WAA played in student activities had diminished, as had the status of its student leadership opportunities. Other diversions on campus offered the potential of greater impact and dealt with more significant issues than those of the WAA. Student leadership efforts focused on causes ranging from the Vietnam war and civil rights (the Black Action Movement) to educational reform within the University. These movements coincided with a student alienation from the "establishment", which affected the sorority system, and the WAA.¹⁵

Hartwig reported in 1969 that "the WAA Board was small and very few students were involved with the planning and running of events. The strength of the student leadership was not what we have had in the past..."¹⁶ Some WAA sports clubs continued to function through individual student and

¹⁴ "DPEW Annual Report," 1964-65, pp. 73-74.

¹⁵ Michigan Daily, 27 September 1967.

¹⁶ "DPEW Annual Report," 1968-69, p. 76.

faculty leadership despite the weakness of the central WAA structure. Student leadership in the WAA organization had ceased to be effective.

The DPEW/WAA Concept of Extramural Opportunities

In contrast to the fading WAA Board student leadership, the DPEW faculty began to attend to the extramural needs of women athletes. While the 1947 policies, including the 1955 revisions on extramurals recognized the highly skilled athlete, 1957-1973 brought the development of supportive programming.

The extramural issue was raised immediately in 1957-58. A DPEW self-evaluation indicated that the skilled athlete remained neglected in the activities of the recreation program. On another front, the WAA Board challenged the legitimacy of the 75 mile travel limitation when a golf match was arranged in Ohio beyond the limit.¹⁷ Revisions of the WAA By-Laws brought opportunities for an unlimited number of trips, funded by the clubs, if sanctioned by the Board:

1. The WAA shall supply transportation for such activities encompassing two or more clubs, ...in a radius not more than seventy-five miles unless an appeal for special consideration is brought to the [WAA] Board and can be financially feasible.
2. A single club...may go beyond the 75 miles limitation pending approval of the Board....A single club...shall

¹⁷ Ibid., 1957-58, p. 170; and WAA Minutes, 4 March 1958, WAA Papers, MHC.

be unlimited in the number of trips (major or short) they take, per year, providing they take full financial responsibility. (However, every trip must be sanctioned by the Board.)¹⁸

As chair of the DPEW Recreation Area Committee, Hartwig presented a traditional statement of program priorities and acknowledged the faculty's pressure for the expansion of extramural opportunities in 1960-61: "Under present conditions, until we can answer the demand at the intramural level, we should continue serving the majority. The student leadership closely reflects the proportionate drive of the advisor of each activity pushing for more extramural competition."¹⁹

An indication of the faculty sentiment was revealed the following year by papers on women's competitive athletics given by two faculty members.²⁰ In December 1961, Katherine Ley reaffirmed that all forms of athletic competition were

¹⁸ 1958 WAA By-Laws, HPP.

¹⁹ "DPEW Annual Report," 1960-61, p. 110.

According to Hartwig, the line item budget for intramurals during 1957-1970 was approximately \$100 for student officials. Faculty were free to pursue extramural activities with the sports clubs, although funding was not available through DPEW sources. DPEW facilities and equipment utilized in intramurals were also available for extramurals without restriction.

²⁰ This sentiment partially reflected an influx of new DPEW faculty members in 1961-62 (Patricia Daugert, Katherine Ley, Phyllis Ocker, and Elizabeth Weil), who espoused more competitive and performance oriented attitudes and philosophies towards women's athletics than the existing faculty. Ley, Ocker, and Rotvig (appointed in 1956) held prominent leadership roles in AAHPER, DGWS, and on the Tripartite Golf Committee/NJCESCW. These affiliations were reflected in their philosophies of women's athletics. "DPEW Annual Reports," 1956-65.

approved by the national women's sports groups, and if they were organized and conducted in an appropriate manner, they would produce desirable outcomes. In February 1962, Barbara Rotvig, WAA golf advisor, warned that women physical educators were gradually losing control of the highly competitive aspect of women's sport participation because programs did not meet the needs of the highly skilled athletes, and the athletes were turning to competitive opportunities offered by outside agencies.²¹ The faculty advocacy was counterbalanced by the reality of student extramural participation from Hartwig's perception:

The pressure of academic work cause interested students to have to change their minds about participation in this type of [extramural] competition. They will try to meet the obligation with visitors coming to campus, but much time away from campus is just not available.²²

²¹ Katherine Ley, "The Philosophy Relative to Competitive Activities," speech to meeting of College Teachers of Physical Education Women, 2 December 1961, Ann Arbor, MI.; and Barbara J. Rotvig, "Competition: Conflict in Values-Implications for Sports," speech to Michigan Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 22 February 1962, Saginaw, MI.

A number of highly skilled Michigan women competed in Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) and other external events in efforts to fulfill their competitive needs which were not met by WAA programming. In addition, they sought and received coaching from men associated with the men's varsity athletic programs, during 1957-70. Included in this number were: Carolyn Osborne (gymnastics, Newt Loken), Karla Kamp and Cathy Hartwig (diving, Bruce Harlan), Francie Kraker (track, Ken Simmons), Micki King and Lani Loken (diving, Dick Kimball). The DPEW's Rosemary Dawson coached many accomplished speed swimmers in both WAA club events and the AAU Ann Arbor Swim Team competitions until 1963. Michigan Daily, November 1957-April 1970.

²² "DPEW Annual Reports," 1961-62, p.100.

Relative to participation, the 1962 WAA By-Laws revisions state that WAA sports clubs were limited to four extramural events per year, with a possibility of three occurring off-campus. This probably reflects both time and financial concerns. Concurrently the WAA recognized the skilled athlete for the first time in the Purpose of its 1962 Constitution: "Underlying this purpose is a philosophy that the highly skilled girl evolves from an organization which fosters opportunities for participation on all skill levels."²³ The reinforcement of the philosophy and integrity of the total program neutralized the significance of the recognition.

By 1964-65 extramurals events were identified as an appropriate mode of activity for all skill levels in the recreation program, although there was concern about their funding. In 1965-66 the intramural and extramural programs were linked by extramural participation opportunities given the intramural winners. This may have been an enticement to boost declining intramural participation.²⁴

The feeder linkage between intramurals and extramurals was further strengthened in 1966-67 by the WAA's stipulation that extramural athletes had to participate in the intramural program before representing Michigan in competition. In addition, the faculty were enthusiastically

²³ 1962 WAA Constitution, HPP. This statement reflected the DGWS position in 1962. Hodgdon, p. 124.

²⁴ "DPEW Annual Reports," 1964-65, p. 74; 1965-66, p. 73.

devoting increased time to the promotion of extramural competition.²⁵

Concomitant with the decline of the strength of the WAA Board, DPEW faculty leadership and support of extramural competition intensified. This is revealed in Table 2 on competitive dates for the transition years.

TABLE 2

AVERAGE PERIOD FREQUENCIES BY TYPE OF COMPETITIVE DATE*

	1957-61	1961-64	1964-67	1967-70	1970-73
Contests and Meets	3.8 (15)	9.3 (28)	8.0 (24)	14.0 (42)	26.3 (79)
Sports days					
Multi-sport	0.3 (1)	- -	0.3 (1)	- -	- -
Single sport	- -	- -	1.7 (5)	2.0 (6)	- -
Tournaments	0.5 (2)	2.7 (8)	2.0 (6)	2.7 (8)	4.0 (12)
AVG. TOTAL	4.5 (18)	12.0 (36)	12.0 (36)	18.7 (56)	30.3 (91)

Notes: Actual frequencies appear in parentheses.

*Field hockey, speed swimming, volleyball, tennis, basketball, gymnastics, synchronized swimming, golf, and badminton dates were used in this table. Riflery dates were not included.

Analysis of the competitive dates revealed an increase in the average number of extramural dates during the transition years, evidence of increased DPEW support. The average number of competitive dates per period grew over four fold from 4.5 dates in 1957-61 to 18.7 in 1967-70.

²⁵ Ibid., 1966-67, p.65.

Similar accretions occurred in tournament, dual contest, and multiple school meet participation over the same periods.

Prior to 1970 the DPEW and WAA clubs sponsored three large intercollegiate tournament and meets. The events were: at the national level, the 1961 Women's Collegiate Golf Tournament, and the 1963 Women's Swimming and Diving Meet; and the 1964 Midwest Intercollegiate Synchronized Swimming Meet. (The 1971 Midwest synchronized swim meet was also held at Michigan, sponsored by the Michifish club.) The Departmental affiliation with these events was in marked contrast to the attitudes and activities of the Bell era.

Note should also be taken of the growth in average number of competitive dates, including tournaments, contests and meets, which occurred between 1957-70 and 1970-73.²⁶ Competition in the last period, 1970-73, occurred after the dissolution of the WAA, when women's sports clubs functioned under the Michigan Sport Club Federation (MSCF). Much of the expansion reflects the release from WAA limitations. The sudden decline in the ARFMCW single sport sports days is a result of the evolution to events termed "state tournaments."

²⁶ Despite this growth, the women's sports clubs' competitive record did not compare favorably in 4 of 7 sports with the national average number of varsity contest per sport. Gary B. Smith, "Effect of Title IX on Women's Athletics in Selected NCAA Division I Colleges and Universities" (M.S. Thesis, Western Illinois University, 1980), p. 27.

Organizational Structures and Finances: 1957-1970

Women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan continued to be a function of the WAA and sponsored by the DPEW until 1970. The DPEW provided the WAA with facilities, equipment, faculty advisors, and financial assistance for special events.²⁷

WAA operating revenues were derived from the WAA's Michigras income, Cinema Guild movie income, and supplemented by apple, blazer, and calendar sales. Individual WAA sports clubs generated funds through dues, the sale of badminton shuttles, tennis balls, golf balls, and riflery ammunition to the physical education classes, and various fund raising projects. The lack of funding was a major deterrent to the expansion of extramural opportunities for women at Michigan in the 1960s.

In 1958, the WAA sought an alternative source of financial support. While Michigras and the various fund raising projects were moderately successful, the projects were limited in their ability to fund the programming desired by students:

The WAA has been investigating the possibility of financial aid from the University. Right now it is a self-supporting organization. 'If we could get it, we could spend more time on activities other than making money,' Miss Austin [WAA President] commented in a business tone.

'For instance, the clubs can not enter intercollegiate women's competition and be paid for

²⁷ Packet of materials dated 24 October 1957, HPP.

transportation unless it is within a 75 mile radius. This greatly limits our opportunities to get together with other colleges in the Big Ten, ...²⁸

Vice President Lewis' reply to WAA inquiries indicated that he believed that co-sponsorship of Michigras was a successful and appropriate manner for the WAA to generate operating funds.²⁹ Inferred in this response is the notion that the University felt that the WAA funding and programming were appropriate, including the limited intercollegiate athletic opportunities for women, and that the University saw no need for change or expansion.

With the reorganization of student activities came an opportunity for financial assistance for the WAA. A movement began in the early 1960s to merge the Michigan Union and Women's League functions, the umbrella organizations of men's and women's activities respectively, into a centralized University Activities Center (UAC). The WAA, a prominent constituent of the Women's League, held a significant financial factor in the proposed merger: the co-sponsorship of the lucrative Michigras with the Union. The League, probably desiring equal stature in the merger, negotiated with the WAA for the sponsorship of the Michigras and the Spring Weekend (a less successful financial event):

Concurrent Resolution

(1) ...the Women's Athletic Association shall transfer its co-sponsorship of Michigras and Spring Weekend to

²⁸ Michigan Daily, 1 April 1958.

²⁹ WAA Minutes, 11 March 1958, WAA Papers, MHC.

the Women's League. The League shall, with the Michigan Union, have total control of and responsibility for the two events.

(2) In exchange...the League shall guarantee financial support for the Women's Athletic Association. For the academic year 1964-1965 the League shall transfer \$.10 of its \$.50 per [women] student fee to the Women's Athletic Association. In the future years WAA shall receive a proportional amount: details of future financial arrangements shall be determined during the academic year 1964-1965....

PASSED: Unanimously by the Board of the Women's Athletic Association and the Women's League Council on April 14, 1964.³⁰

The future arrangements provided for a percentage of the League's student fee or a minimum of \$2000.

From the DPEW point of view, "WAA has been assured of a financial guarantee for funds which originally came from Michigras."³¹ However the following year the situation seemed more tentative to Hartwig:

The Union-League merger having been effected in activities only still leaves the League to honor its agreement of last spring...The Department and WAA are in agreement that their endeavors should be in the areas of sports and dance, and energy should not be diverted to money making events in order to provide recreational opportunities in these areas. A definite income of monies has never been assured and the program has had to be built each year accordingly.³²

The DPEW and WAA viewed the merger of the Union and League in terms of joint activities planning only, with the League remaining a distinct unit and therefore responsible for its guarantee to the WAA. If the League was dissolved in the

³⁰ WAA-Women's League Concurrent Resolution, 14 April 1964, HPP.

³¹ DPEW Staff Minutes, 17 April 1964, HPP.

³² "DPEW Annual Report," 1964-65, p. 74.

formation of UAC, then WAA would stand to lose its financial support.

The WAA received its funding from the League for two years, 1964-65 and 1965-66, with over \$1000 spent on extramurals in 1965-66. In August 1966 the Regents approved the formation of UAC. During 1966-67, UAC asked the WAA to sponsor jointly a jazz concert in order to earn its annual allocation. Poor WAA student leadership was noted in this effort. With this activity the WAA reverted back to a fund-raising mode which it had attempted to avoid by the League agreement. Hartwig sensed that the affiliation with UAC was not firm: "Let's have a hard look at the financial picture since UAC wonders how long they should subsidize WAA."³³

In June 1967, UAC notified Hartwig that their financial commitment with the WAA was terminated. This action was attributed to the fact that all of UAC's concert dates for the following year had not been granted, including one which the WAA would have been asked to sponsor.³⁴ Later that month, a motion by the Michigan League Board of Governors eased the effects of the termination:

In recognition of the Women's League long standing support of WAA, \$1000 be taken from the balance of the

³³ "DPEW Annual Reports," 1966-67, pp. 65-66; 1965-66, p. 73; Michigan Daily, 24 August 1966; and Intramural Programs for Women at UM, 1966-67, HPP.

³⁴ Hartwig, Memorandum to French on WAA Finances, 7 June 1967, HPP.

Women's League Funds and given to WAA as a final allotment.³⁵

Hartwig wrote letters of concern relative to this situation to the central administration, but received no reply, a fairly clear indication of the lack of concern for women's sports on the part of the central administration. The WAA had lost its guaranteed allocation from the League and its right to co-sponsor the Michigras. While the financial situation of the WAA was unstable, a reorganization of the physical education and athletic programs generated hope.

In March 1967, University President Harlan Hatcher appointed an Advisory Review Committee with a two-fold purpose: 1. To review the organization of, and make recommendations for, the intercollegiate athletic, physical education, intramural, and recreational sport programs; and 2. In anticipation of Director Herbert "Fritz" Crisler's retirement in June 1968, to assist in the nomination of his successor. The report on the first objective was made in July 1967, and on the second in February 1968.³⁶

The Committee report concluded in part that: 1. A need existed for an advisory board on intramurals, recreation,

³⁵ Braeman (Michigan League Board of Governors) to Davidson (WAA President), 30 June 1967, HPP.

³⁶ Advisory Review Committee, "Report on Organization Structure of Department of Physical Education and Athletics," July 1967, Szady Personal Papers, Ann Arbor, MI.

and club sports to consolidate interested factions, and provide a direct line of communication to the athletic director; 2. The Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics was financially limited, and would not be able to support expansion in terms of varsity athletic teams or facilities in the future, and 3. The physical education requirement needed re-evaluation.³⁷

The Committee recommended that either Donald Canham or Donald Lund succeed Crisler in the reorganized Department of Physical Education and Athletics. In the new structure two Associate Directors, one for athletics, the other for physical education, reported to the Director. Under the direction of the Associate Director for Physical Education were three units: 1) the men's program, 2) the women's program, and 3) the recreation program. The programmatic areas within the DPEW remained intact, including the WAA.³⁸

In March 1968 Canham was appointed Athletic Director by the Regents. By that Fall, Paul Hunsicker was approved as Associate Director for Physical Education, in addition to chairing the men's physical education program. Following Hunsicker's appointment, a joint physical education Committee on Structure was formed with two objectives: 1. To effect the facilitation of an elective program in light of the probable loss of the student physical education

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.; and Michigan Daily, 6 February 1968.

requirement; and 2. To negotiate the merger of the women's and men's programs.³⁹

The re-evaluation of the physical education requirement began in January 1968. Initiated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Allen Smith, the review was motivated in part by the Advisory Review Committee's report, and budget considerations. The Educational Policies Committee of SACUA reviewed the physical education requirement, and in May 1968 recommended its termination. While acknowledging the value of exercise, the committee felt that the compulsory aspect should not be a matter of University policy. This recommendation was well-received by those outside of Physical Education and coincided with other educational reforms taking place in the University community.⁴⁰

Smith reported the SACUA committee recommendation to Canham and Hunsicker in October 1968, stating that personnel and fiscal aspects needed review. Loss of the Required Program would have an impact, although different, on both the men's and women's physical education departments.⁴¹

³⁹ Michigan Daily, 16 March, 21 September 1968; and DPEW Staff Meeting Minutes, 27 September 1968, HPP.

⁴⁰ "Report on Organization Structure," 1967; Senate Educational Policy Advisory Committee, Memorandum to the Vice President of Academic Affairs on the University Physical Education Requirement, 14 May 1968, and Correspondence, 1968-69, Vice President of Academic Affairs Papers, Box 12, MHC.

⁴¹ Smith to Canham and Hunsicker, 21 October 1968, Vice President of Academic Affairs Papers, Box 12, MHC.

The men's department funded 21 teaching assistants who taught 70% of its physical education Required Program, with 13 regular staff members teaching the balance. The loss of the requirement would result in a loss of teaching assistants. Necessary reductions in the regular staff would be facilitated due to the number of joint appointments, and transfer opportunities into the Recreation and Athletic Programs.⁴²

Conversely, in the DPEW almost all of the 18 full-time and 2 half-time faculty taught in its Required Program, along with 6 teaching assistants. The loss of the requirement would impose widespread reductions in faculty loads and force a cut in the number of full-time staff. While most of the faculty had assignments in the women's recreation and WAA programs, these programs were integrated within the DPEW and offered no transfer opportunities for the staff.⁴³

With the potential of losing one of the four programs along with staffing in each department and a significant portion of credit hours generated, Hunsicker recommended an elective program of physical education courses in place of the Required Program in November 1968. The Regents

⁴² "Physical Education for Men Service Program, Fall 1967," Vice President of Academic Affairs Papers, Box 7, MHC; and Conversation with Stephen Galetti, Ann Arbor, MI, 27 October 1984.

⁴³ "DPEW Annual Report," 1968-69, pp. 31-46.

abolished the physical education requirement and approved the elective programs in April 1969.⁴⁴

Similar to the environment of educational reform in which the abolishment of the physical education requirement occurred, the merger of the women's and men's physical education programs followed the campus precedent of merging sex-differentiated functions. The expected loss of the Required Programs enhanced the potential merger, as the Departments attempted to minimize loss of faculty through combined efforts. In addition, the student demand for co-educational physical education classes and recreation activities was increasing.⁴⁵

The reconciliation of faculty loads was a major area of merger negotiations for the Committee on Structure. One discrepancy between the programs involved the faculty supervision of sports clubs under the WAA. The men's sports clubs, a function of the Recreation Program, drew their faculty supervisors from a variety of departments and were volunteer positions. The WAA sports club advisors were DPEW faculty and were granted credit toward their teaching loads for their supervision and/or coaching. This essentially had been the means of staffing the coaching positions for the women's extramural sports clubs. Ultimately, sports club

⁴⁴ Hunsicker, Memorandum to Smith on Physical Education Requirement, 20 November 1968, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Box 12, MHC; and Michigan Daily, 22 March 1969.

⁴⁵ Conversations with Elizabeth Davenport, Stephen Galetti, and Marie Hartwig.

supervision was not recognized as a part of the faculty load under the new structure.⁴⁶

The Committee on Structure negotiated the merger details, which were approved at a joint staff meeting in April 1970. The merger took effect 1970-71. The new structure under Hunsicker's direction consisted of three co-educational program areas: 1) the Professional, 2) the Elective, and 3) the Recreation. Physical Education faculty taught primarily in the Professional Program, teaching assistants staffed the majority of the Elective Program sections, and the Recreation Program had a separate staff.⁴⁷

The unique definition of each program area dissolved the integrated nature of the DPEW. The activities of the WAA, which once had involved the majority of the women faculty, functioned solely under the separate staff of the Recreation Program as a parallel to the men's sports clubs.⁴⁸ Eliminated by the merger were the DPEW benefits of assigned faculty advisors, equipment, administrative assistance, and priority in facility scheduling for the WAA. No longer were WAA functions or women's extramural athletics

⁴⁶ Conversations with Joyce Lindeman, 23 October 1984; Ruth Harris and Joan Farrell, 24 October 1984; and Phyllis Ocker, 23 October 1984, all in Ann Arbor, MI.

⁴⁷ Department of Physical Education Joint Staff Meeting Minutes, 27 April 1970, HPP.

⁴⁸ The Professional Program had evolved into an inhospitable environment for women's sports. Hartwig condoned the move of women's sports to the Recreation Program because continuation would be guaranteed.

the responsibility of the women faculty now in the Professional Program. The DPEW forum for the advocacy of women's intercollegiate athletics was lost.

Ironically, when students were demonstrating for and demanding more participation in the administrative affairs of University, there was no unified student movement demanding the strengthening of women's extramural opportunities, not even by dissatisfied participants. When opportunities arose to stimulate reform during the efforts of the Advisory Review Committee of 1967, two male representatives of men's sports clubs made presentations.⁴⁹ The women athletes failed to arrange to have their needs explained despite ties with French, a member of the Committee, and Hartwig, a presenter before the Committee.⁵⁰ Nor was pressure from the women students felt during the reorganization of the physical education structure. The apathy toward participation in university activities apparently outweighed the demand for student input in decision-making in this forum. Due to the lack of interest

⁴⁹ "Report on Organization Structure," 1967.

⁵⁰ Since the program was based on student leadership, it was appropriate that any reform movement stem from the women students, and not French or Hartwig. There is no indication that French solicited input from the DPEW faculty, other than Hartwig, for the Committee's review.

and organization on the part of the women athletes, these viable reform opportunities were lost.⁵¹

Hartwig, as Acting Chair of the DPEW, was a key member of the physical education merger negotiations. Her authority and longevity in managing the WAA left the other DPEW faculty members with little knowledge of the functioning of the WAA organization beyond their responsibilities as assigned advisors for the different clubs. Thus Hartwig supported the placement of the women's sports clubs under the new Recreation Program and alone served as advocate for the WAA interests during this period.⁵²

A new forum for Hartwig's advocacy was the Advisory Committee on Recreation, Intramurals, and Club Sports (ACRICS).⁵³ As recommended by the Advisory Review Committee in 1967, ACRICS was created by University President Robben Fleming in February 1968. In addition, the Regents authorized funding, in the amount of \$200,000 for each of

⁵¹ According to Hartwig and Parker. Conversation with Lucy Parker, Ypsilanti, MI, 20 September 1985. Nyikos also noted that athletics were not the focus of the student movements in the 1960s. Nyikos, p. 195.

⁵² Conversation with Ruth Harris and Joan Farrell.

⁵³ The constituents of ACRICS were the Athletic Director, the chairs of the DPEW, Men's Physical Education, and the Recreation Program, a representative of the Vice President of Student Services, four faculty, and four students.

three academic years (1968-71), to be utilized by ACRICS for recreational improvements.⁵⁴

Hartwig envisioned ACRICS as a source of funding for the WAA sports clubs, replacing revenues lost in the UAC merger and the Michigras agreement. An association of men's sports clubs also looked to ACRICS for funding. The Advisory Committee was sympathetic to the needs of both groups.⁵⁵

A Subcommittee on Sports Clubs was appointed in October 1968 with Hartwig as chair to consider the specific needs of the sports club program. The following Spring, the Subcommittee's first funding recommendation was to cover the deficits incurred by the men's sports clubs in 1968-69. The men's sports club association had been receiving an allocation of \$2000 from the Vice President of Student Affairs through the Office of Student Organizations (OSO) since 1965. Originally three clubs were supported by the funds. In 1968-69 fifteen men's sports clubs split the funding, and \$1081 in deficits occurred.⁵⁶

The allocation of the 1969-70 OSO funds was also problematic. The men's sports clubs distributed the funds without considering the women's needs or their entitlement to a share of the 1969-70 OSO funds based on the original

⁵⁴ Michigan Daily, 20 July 1968.

⁵⁵ "DPEW Annual Report," 1968-69, pp. 76-77.

⁵⁶ ACRICS Subcommittee on Sports Clubs Minutes, 1 October 1968; ACRICS Minutes, 18 March 1969, HPP.

funding concept.⁵⁷ The WAA had been subsisting on reserve funds and limited fund-raising projects from 1967 to 1969. With the imminent merger of the physical education departments, the WAA dissolved in 1969-70, and the women's sports clubs fell into the same funding predicament as the men's clubs.

When Hartwig discovered this situation, the men's and women's sports clubs were brought together through the efforts of the Subcommittee, resulting in the organization of the Michigan Sports Club Federation (MSCF) in April 1970. In May, ACRICS approved a \$10,000 allocation for 1970-71, the final year of ACRICS funding, to bolster the MSCF. The use of this one-time allocation was limited to the purchase of durable equipment or uniforms, with a maximum allocation of \$1000 per club. Six women's sports clubs were allotted \$2225 of the \$6225 initially distributed to 15 clubs. In addition, the OSO funds were assigned to the MSCF for allocation.⁵⁸

In May 1970 Hartwig drew the following conclusions about the status of women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan: 1. The development of women's intercollegiate athletics under the WAA had been limited to extramural

⁵⁷ Hartwig, Memorandum, 19 December 1969, HPP.

Funding was sought for the women's sports clubs, and not for the WAA as a total organization. There was no effort to perpetuate the WAA after the merger, according to Hartwig. Hartwig to ARFCW, 15 May 1970, HPP.

⁵⁸ ACRICS Minutes, 26 May 1970, Office of Student Affairs Papers, Box 12, MHC.

competitions partially due to the lack of funds; 2. The new MSCF structure would allow each sport club to evolve individually to its own potential; and 3. The changes in the organization of the Department of Physical Education and Athletics would preclude the incorporation of the national trends in women's athletics programs.⁵⁹

Advocacy of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics

As chair of the ACRICS sub-committee on sports clubs, Hartwig was immersed in the conceptual issues of sports clubs at Michigan. This position allowed her to work effectively in transferring the WAA sports clubs to the MSCF and gave her opportunities to raise issues concerning women's intercollegiate athletics.

In October 1969 Hartwig presented to the sub-committee a statement of standards and policies for intercollegiate athletics for women developed by the Michigan section of the Division of Girls' and Women's Sports (DGWS). The statement called for women's athletic programs to be accepted and approved officially by their institutions, to be administered by their women's physical education faculty, and to be included as a separate budgetary item by their institutions.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Hartwig, Memorandum on Women's Athletics, 18 May 1970, HPP.

⁶⁰ Hartwig to Hunsicker, 14 October 1969, HPP.

Due to the physical education merger, Michigan's women's sports clubs were moving in a direction opposite to the DGWS statement. After 64 years under the DPEW, the women's clubs were moving toward a more independent status under the MSCF and the OSO. In the new structure the women's clubs were to function under the Recreation Program with no contact with the women physical education faculty, except for limited volunteer coaching. Finally, no separate budget item would exist for the women's clubs. The prospects of women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan as sports clubs were vastly different from the move to varsity programs by the other institutions in the state.

Because of these differences the members of the ACRICS sub-committee instructed Hartwig to elicit Hunsicker's and Canham's opinion of the statement. Noting the implied financial and structural conditions of the statement, she pointed out to Canham and Hunsicker that ultimately Michigan would have to decide whether to provide the women's intercollegiate athletic prototype with appropriate support or sustain extramural competition through the sports club system. The women students were anxious to move to the newer program model that had been adopted by neighboring institutions.⁶¹

Canham's reply was positive, but noncommittal. Stating that he was very much in favor of varsity athletics for

⁶¹ Ibid.

women, his preference, at that time, was for funding through the Recreation Program. This, he concluded, would leave the committee to determine the extent of the participation. Hunsicker concurred that the DGWS statement should receive consideration.⁶²

Again, in answering a letter of a women's sport club manager who asked for more assistance, Hartwig asserted that if the intercollegiate model was undertaken, then administrative and financial support was necessary, otherwise the sports club level of programming would continue. Her opinion was evident: To attempt to upgrade the women's sports clubs without administrative and financial backing would be futile.⁶³ ACRICS was the one viable means to the needed support.

As the first step in this direction, Hartwig placed a request for a committee to develop guidelines for women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan on the ACRICS agenda in April 1970. This request was stalled for two years as the major efforts of ACRICS were directed toward the recreation improvements funded by the Regents' final allocation, and the request for a building to replace the Barbour/Waterman Gymnasium complex.

In December 1970 Hartwig addressed the Board in Control on the subject of women's sport clubs. Noting that

⁶² Canham to Hartwig, 13 November 1969, HPP.

⁶³ Hartwig to Boney (Tennis Manager), 6 November 1969, HPP.

competition was occurring through student leadership in extramural sport clubs at Michigan, she alerted the Board that the national trend rapidly was approaching varsity level programming for women's athletics. National championships for women had begun. Colleges and universities in the state had supported the DGWS statement and were organizing. That Michigan's women were being left behind was the implied message in Hartwig's presentation. No reaction by the Board was recorded, although there was some discussion about expanding the number of women's sport clubs in the MSCF.⁶⁴

In all, ACRICS, the OSO, and the Recreation Program assisted the women's clubs, although none could promote the varsity athletic status desired by the students. The Recreation Program was focusing efforts and resources on its expanded intramural service population with the inclusion of women's programming. The women's sport clubs received assistance equivalent to the men's, although no further growth could be supported. The OSO, and its provision of limited funds, was not an appropriate unit to house women's varsity athletics, nor was ACRICS. However, Canham had referred women's athletics to the Recreation Program; thus it fell to ACRICS to consider the issues.

During a series of comments in a May 1972 ACRICS meeting, Canham addressed the issue of varsity athletics for

⁶⁴ Hartwig, "Report to the Board in Control," 3 December 1970, HPP.

women. Citing women's athletic directors in general for lack of organization, he suggested that Michigan's women should present their needs to him. Possibly women's basketball, golf, and tennis teams could be assisted. Again, in early October 1972, in a memorandum to the Board, Canham alluded to an expanded intercollegiate athletic program for women relative to the need for expand facilities.⁶⁵

Hartwig prepared a presentation for the October 1972 meeting of ACRICS on the new developments in the national organizational efforts of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). Unfortunately, before she could start her report, strong opposition to the topic was verbalized from Recreation personnel. Support was given to the concept that women's varsity athletics was not an appropriate topic for ACRICS although the committee recognized the need. A recommendation was made that the Board in Control and the University President be made aware of these needs in women's athletics.⁶⁶

ACRICS would not address the issue of varsity athletics for women again. As a faculty member of the Physical Education Professional program, Hartwig had exhausted her last forum for advocating the furthering of women's

⁶⁵ ACRICS Minutes, 16 May 1972, Office of Student Affairs Papers, Box 12, MHC; and Canham, Memorandum to the Board in Control, 3 October 1972, Szady Personal Papers.

⁶⁶ Canham was not present at this meeting. ACRICS Minutes, 24 October 1972, Szady Personal Papers.

athletics. Because the issue of women's athletics had been referred to ACRICS by Canham, the Board in Control was not likely to address the issue.

Women's Sports Clubs in the MSCF

Seven WAA extramural sports clubs were members of the MSCF in 1970-71.⁶⁷ The women's clubs worked with the Recreation Program to arrange the pragmatic aspects of their participations. Through the MSCF, the women's sports clubs received funding from and representation to the OSO and ACRICS.⁶⁸ Generally, the women's sports clubs were able to schedule practice and game facilities similar to those secured under the DPEW.

⁶⁷ The seven women's sports clubs (basketball, field hockey, volleyball, tennis, gymnastics, synchronized swimming, and swimming and diving) continued through 1972-73. White's data indicate that the other Big Ten institutions supported an average of 7.2 women's varsity sports in 1972-73. Brooke's national survey showed that 69% of participating institutions sponsored 2 to 6 women's varsity sports in 1972-73. Kevin M. White, "An Appraisal of the Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Programs, and the Relationship to Men's Athletics, At Big Ten Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Institutions Before and After Title IX Implementation," (Ph.D. dissertation, 1983), p. 65; and William O. Brooke, Jr., "Assessing the Impact of Title IX and Other Factors on Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Programs, 1972-1977: A National Study of Four-Year AIAW Institutions," (Ed.D. dissertation, Arizona State Univ., 1979), p. 64.

⁶⁸ In contrast, in 1972-73 the following administrative units for women's athletics were cited most frequently in a national survey: 27% Combined Physical Education Departments, 26% Women's Physical Education Departments, and 26% Combined Athletic Departments. Brooke, p. 49.

Problems did arise for the women's sports clubs because of their separation from the DPEW. Practice and game equipment that had been provided routinely to the WAA clubs by the Department now required prior arrangements through the Recreation Program. The student manager (usually a leading participant) of each sports club suddenly was thrust into event management. Storage of club equipment and supplies was a similar problem, with the usual solution finding these items inconveniently stored in the manager's dormitory room or apartment.

One change that was crucial to the success of the women's sports clubs emanated from the loss of the physical education requirement. With the requirement, the student managers and the WAA had contact with virtually all first year women through their classes in Barbour Gymnasium and the Women's Athletic Building (WAB). This contact facilitated simple and effective communication and publicity about WAA club activities. After the requirement was dropped and this central contact lost, the sports clubs had to rely on flyers, posters, and word-of-mouth to find new participants and utilized telephone calls and written messages to relay club communications. Compounding this communication problem was the presentation of misleading information in the Fall of 1970. At a mass meeting on recreational sport opportunities available on campus, the speaker reported that intercollegiate athletic competition

for women did not exist at Michigan. This presented further problems in identifying potential women athletes.

The student managers also were faced with the loss of coaches from the DPEW, because coaching was no longer considered part of the teaching load. Phyllis Weikart and Joyce Lindeman continued to coach in the sport clubs despite the change. The other clubs found coaches outside the University, who agreed to serve on a volunteer basis or for a minimal salary. Four teams secured former participants as coaches, and another club used local school and club personnel. Only three of the coaches served the entire three year span of 1970-73.

This process of securing volunteer or near-volunteer coaches was reminiscent of the early years of men's collegiate athletics.⁶⁹ Similarly, the potential for problems of overemphasis and professionalism related to this intervention existed. Fortunately the women's coaches were unilaterally committed to the promotion of women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan, despite varied levels of ability and goals.

Most of the women's sports clubs held two to four practices a week, with a schedule of four to ten competitions per year. The level of participation depended on the motivation of the participants and the coaches. The speed swim and synchronized swim clubs trained more

⁶⁹ Savage, pp. 21-23.

frequently during both the competitive season and pre-season. This was reflected in their high achievements in national competitions.

Except for the national meets in which the tennis and the two swim clubs participated, competitions were scheduled with Michigan and Ohio colleges and universities of all sizes. The limiting factors were finances and time. Schedules typically were arranged in advance by the student manager in conjunction with the coach, if the coach was known prior to the beginning of the season. In most instances the student manager negotiated dates, times, and home/away considerations with a faculty member of another institution. This disadvantage was reflected in the schedules and reinforced the fact that Michigan women's sports clubs were usually competing against varsity teams from other institutions.

Financial support was one of the major dilemmas facing the women's sports clubs in their independent status.⁷⁰ In the first year under the MSCF, 1970-71, their burden had been eased considerably by the ACRICS funds for durable equipment and uniforms. In addition, six women's clubs

⁷⁰ The women's sports clubs received the balance of their individual WAA accounts. While the Recreation Program eyed the remaining WAA general account, Hartwig was successful in retaining control of the funds. Hartwig to Rinkle, 6 May 1970, HPP.

received a total of \$642 from the OSO funds.⁷¹ The MSCF had given priority to clubs sponsoring intercollegiate competitions, although funding was restricted to other than coaching and per diem expenses.

The Fall of 1971 brought unfortunate news for the MSCF. Jackie Boney, Vice President of MSCF, inquired at the September ACRICS meeting about the unexpended portion of the sports clubs equipment fund. The students learned that the balance was not carried forward from the previous year, and that the remaining money from the one-year allocation had been lost. This acutely effected those women's clubs which had not expended their total allocation, with the idea of supplementing it with additional money from fund-raising efforts in 1971-72. There was no relief from this error.⁷²

At the same meeting Boney announced that Canham planned to match the OSO funds. Grambeau elaborated on Boney's message in October, stating that Canham had agreed to provide \$2000 for the six women's sport clubs and also \$2000 for four men's clubs from Athletic Department funds. The

⁷¹ The synchronized swim club (Michifish) requested no OSO funding, although MSCF guaranteed aid if their swim shows failed. The Michifish shows had traditionally provided the club with ample revenues to cover their costs. "MSCF Financial Report," [1970-71], Grambeau Personal Papers, Ann Arbor, MI.

⁷² ACRICS Minutes, 28 September 1971, Office of Student Affairs Papers, Box 12, MHC.

funds would defray equipment, game, travel and insurance expenses.⁷³

Allocations to the women's sports clubs from OSO funds were decreased due to the funding from Athletic funds. A total of \$345 from OSO was recorded for five women's clubs. It was noted that the OSO funds for 1971-72 were not a budgetary item; rather they were the result of a post-budget transfer from the Vice President of Student Affairs' account to the Office of Student Services current account. The future of the OSO funds was precarious. Indeed the OSO begrudgingly gave the MSCF \$1750 in the Fall of 1972 "only on the basis that they had made a commitment and were forced to honor it."⁷⁴

In 1972-73 the women's sport clubs received funding from the Athletic Department and the OSO. This support was supplemented by fund-raising efforts and the payment of dues and some travel expenses by the participants.

The women's movement appeared on Michigan's campus in the early 1970s. Trailing the student unrest of the 1960s, the women's movement focused on similar issues of equality and access as had the civil rights movements. The women's cause received additional support from Congress when Title IX was attached to the Higher Education Act of 1972, and

⁷³ Ibid., and 27 October 1971.

⁷⁴ Notes, 1972-73, Szady Personal Papers; "MSCF Allocations, 1971-72," Box 33, and "Special Services and Programs, 1972-73 Budget Proposals and Priorities," 23 February 1972, Box 12, Office of Student Affairs Papers, MHC..

subsequently passed in June 1972. The development and focus of the Federal guidelines for implementing Title IX's ban on sex discrimination was cause for great consternation among athletic administrators nationally.⁷⁵

During the early 1970s, changes related to women's issues occurred within the University. Some changes were substantive in nature, while others were symbolic. The concept of women's hours in residence halls was discarded. Women were permitted to enter the men's Union through the front door. The Michigan Marching Band became coeducational. The Recreation Program began offering women's activities, and all recreational facilities were opened for coeducational use. The student positions on the Board in Control became open to women. Awareness of the plight of non-traditional women students developed, as evidenced by the support of day care centers and specific financial aid available through the Center for Continuing Education for Women. The University adjusted its hiring policies and wages for women in reaction to a Federal affirmative action investigation.

The participants of the women's sports clubs viewed themselves as the female counterparts to men's varsity athletes. While the women enjoyed the freedom from the WAA restrictions and philosophy, they soon realized that the sports club structure was not necessarily a step toward

⁷⁵ The controversy did not end after the guidelines went into effect in July 1975.

varsity status. Their frustrations in light of this predicament and inequity were justified by the concurrent social concern for women's equality rights.

In the women's attempts to improve their situation through the established system, they ultimately were directed to Hartwig because of her position as ACRICS Chair of the Sub-Committee on Sport Clubs, and her former role as administrator of the WAA. The communication from Hartwig was consistently that administrative support would be needed to conduct a varsity athletic program for women. However, the process, as perceived by the students, was at a standstill as no support was offered by the Board in Control, ACRICS had declined to consider the issue after October 1972, and the Athletic Department was not moving toward varsity status for the women.⁷⁶

Ironically, an obscure movement toward a women's intercollegiate athletic program had begun. In September 1972 Hartwig had the balance of the WAA general fund

⁷⁶ The students' direct attempt to convince Canham of their needs fell short. A meeting between the student managers of the women's sport clubs and Canham was arranged by Hartwig. Canham refused to consider varsity status for the sport clubs because their participation and competition was not indicative of successful varsity athletics, e.g. not competing against NCAA Division I opponents, and not winning. To aid their efforts in reaching this level of participation, he offered \$2000 to the women's sport clubs.

In the Fall of 1972 the Alumnae Council of the Alumni Association appointed a committee to study women's athletics at the University. This action was in response to an alumna's concerns about the poor transportation arrangements and lack of program support. Conversation with Elizabeth van den Bosch, Ann Arbor, MI, 21 October 1985, .

transferred to the Board in Control. This arrangement between Hartwig and the Athletic Department was probably motivated by the passage of Title IX in June 1972.

With the changing scene in the development of sports for women at a high skill level, we have been out of the picture. At this time we would like to develop a trial year to the best of our ability and make an evaluation at the end of this period. Therefore the amount of money, \$3015.24 should be transferred to The Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics (Women). We will use this in an administrative way to become a part of the intercollegiate picture for women.⁷⁷

Hartwig served as administrator for this fund although she had no formal affiliation with the Athletic Department, nor the women's sports clubs other than her interest based on her years as advisor of the WAA. From this unusual role Hartwig authorized expenditures from the fund for travel insurance, two entry fees, a forfeit fee, an ambulance bill, and membership fees for the State of Michigan Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, (SMIAIW) the Midwest Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, (MAIAW) and the AIAW, all totaling \$406.⁷⁸ The administrative nature of the majority of these expenditures did not benefit directly the 1972-73 operation of the women's sport clubs, except as an attempt to meet the SMIAIW

⁷⁷ Hartwig to Rinkle, 21 September 1972, HPP.

⁷⁸ Hartwig, Memorandum on Women's Athletics Finances, 30 May 1973, HPP.

In contrast, the other Big Ten schools averaged \$19,286 in expenditures for women's athletics in 1972-73. Nationally, 73% of the institutions in 1972-73 spent less than \$8,000 on women's athletics, with a mode at \$4,000 to \$5,000. White, p. 69; and Brooke, p. 44.

standards for membership and tournament eligibility. (The SMAIAW standards were similar to those of the DGWS.)

The women's sports club failed to recognize this minimal funding as a move toward intercollegiate athletics because it occurred independent of their prescribed operating organization (the Recreation Program and OSO), and because the funding was inaccessible for the operating needs of the clubs. While the women athletes perceived the funding of club operating expenses as the initial step to a viable athletic program, Hartwig attempted to develop an intercollegiate program from an administrative basis. Despite the similarity of goals, the difference in strategies led to student skepticism of Hartwig's efforts.

Hartwig, in addition to administering the women's fund, served as liaison to the SMAIAW and informed the Athletic Department of the status of women's intercollegiate athletics within the state. In March 1973, Hartwig communicated to Canham that she anticipated an SMAIAW ultimatum based on Michigan's non-compliance with the association's standards:

The conditions put forth,...are those we must have if the University of Michigan wishes to compete with other schools.

Do you have any suggestions as to how we should proceed? I believe it means we meet the standards or our women students will not have the opportunity to compete with other schools no matter what we call it-club sports-extramurals-or intercollegiates.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Hartwig, Memorandum to Canham, et al., on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, 29 March 1973, HPP.

The answer to Hartwig's question developed from an unanticipated source-the women students.

From the early years of MSCF, the women students' efforts to upgrade their athletic opportunities from sports clubs to varsity athletics received limited attention by the central administration. Stemming from MSCF concerns, Vice President of Student Affairs Robert Knauss wrote Canham in June 1971 relative to the increase in expressed interest in a formal women's intercollegiate athletic program. The feasibility of securing quality coaching for capable women athletes, he felt, deserved a review. The following Spring women students, faculty and administrators were invited to a tea, hosted by University President Robben Fleming, to discuss the role and future of intercollegiate athletics at Michigan. In October 1972, Sheryl Szady, Co-President of MSCF, related the inferior status and participation conditions of the women's sport clubs, and their desire for varsity athletic status in a speech before the Alumni Leadership Conference. The speech was well received by the alumni leaders and generated many unanticipated questions for Fleming at a pre-football game brunch the following morning. These efforts seemed, from the students' perspective, to have no effect on motivating the central

administration to prompt changes in women's intercollegiate athletics.⁸⁰

In an attempt to arrange for a secure source of funding for the women's sport clubs, Szady approached the University Development offices in March 1973. The women's clubs sought to be included in the contribution check-off categories on Development materials. The proposal was feasible, although the Development officers felt that the monetary benefits would be superficial compared to the broader support that was deserved. An appointment with Vice President of Student Affairs Henry Johnson was arranged for Szady.

Prior to the meeting with Johnson, the students' focus of concern changed. In attempting to schedule competitions for the 1973-74 seasons, Szady (field hockey student manager) and Linda Laird (women's basketball student manager) were turned down for the traditional home and away series by the Michigan State University teams. Furthermore, the managers were warned that other colleges and universities in the state would decline to schedule with Michigan. Reportedly, the members of the SMAIAW had decided to only compete with member institutions in compliance with their standards, which, in effect, blacklisted the Michigan

⁸⁰ Knauss, Memorandum to Canham on an Athletic Program for Women, 2 June 1971, Office of Student Affairs Papers, Box 33, MHC; Notes 1972-73, Szady Personal Papers, Conversation with Elizabeth Davenport.

teams.⁸¹ The action was taken to standardize the level of competition within the state, and to put pressure on institutions to upgrade their women's athletic programs. In reality, the potential lack of competition threatened the existence of the Michigan women's intercollegiate sports clubs.

The blacklisting of Michigan's women's sports clubs by the SMAIAW had transformed the students' original tangible need for financial assistance into a need for administrative recognition, similar to Hartwig's agenda. Because of this change in focus, Szady invited Laird and Maggie Stevens (women's speed swim team participant) to join the April meeting with Johnson. After the explanation of their tenuous position, Johnson concurred that assistance was needed. When an appointment with Fleming was impossible due to scheduling conflicts, Johnson arranged for the women to make a presentation at the Regents' meeting two weeks later. Prior to the meeting, Szady and Laird secured the endorsements of Regent Baker, Regent Huebner, and the Alumnae Council.

⁸¹ Conversation with Geraldine Barnes, Ypsilanti, MI, 25 September 1985. The majority of the schools with which Michigan competed were members of the SMAIAW. Within the sport club structure, Michigan did not meet the SMAIAW standards and policies for women's intercollegiate athletic programs. The intercollegiate sports clubs were not the responsibility of the Women's Physical Education faculty, did not have a separate budget item in the University budget, did not provide medical exams or insurance for the participants, did not utilize women faculty members as chaperones at all events and did not limit student participation to one sport per season.

Szady and Laird directed all their efforts toward the presentation before the Regents. No attempt was made to present their situation to Hartwig or Canham due to the time element and previous lack of action. Presentation materials were left at both of their offices the day before the Regents' meeting.

Unexpectedly, the women's presentation was enhanced by the preceding group of students. A group of four students had protested the academic calendar's orientation to Christian holidays. The loud, demanding, table pounding presentation alienated the Regents and Executive Officers, and the group was dismissed promptly at the end of their allotted time. In contrast, Szady and Laird approached their seats as Johnson distributed their materials. Their presentation began with a request for assistance to allow women athletes to continue to compete on an intercollegiate basis.⁸² After a brief explanation of the SMAIAW blacklisting situation, the Regents inquired as to the needs of the women athletes. An extended period of questions and answers followed as the Regents and Officers explored the

⁸² Due to the blacklisting, the continuance of competitive opportunities at any level was the central focus of the presentation. No request or suggestion of organizational support was made by the students. Nor was Title IX mentioned by the students, as it was not the basis for their presentation.

SMIAIW requirements.⁸³ As the conversation ended, Fleming asked for direction, at which time Regent Huebner pointed out Hartwig in the audience.

The Regents and Executive Officers were impressed with the presentation by Szady and Laird and felt the issue warranted study and policy decision. Fleming appointed the Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CSIAW) in June 1973 and stated his support of intercollegiate competition for women as well as men in July. Szady, Laird, and Hartwig were members of the Committee.⁸⁴

This prelude to women's varsity athletics was stimulated by the persistence of the women's sport clubs, which were sustained for three years by student leadership, and the historical athletic opportunities afforded women through the WAA.

⁸³ "Reports from the Regents' meeting indicated that the Regents appeared surprised to hear that the University lacked varsity sports for women and the the Regents were supportive of the students' requests." "Progress Report on Women's Athletics at UM," 26 October 1973, Alumni Association Papers.

⁸⁴ CSIAW Minutes, 12 July 1973, Szady Personal Papers.

Other members of the CSIAW were Eunice Burns, chair; Robert Blackburn, Phyllis Ocker, Robert Sauve, and student Janet Hooper.

CHAPTER V

VARSITY INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: 1973-1981

After years of affiliation with the DPEW through WAA, and later the Department of Physical Education and Athletics Recreation Program through sports clubs, women's intercollegiate athletics at the University of Michigan embarked on a new phase: varsity athletics. From Fall 1973 through Spring 1981 the women's varsity intercollegiate athletic program ascended from its sports club status to a varsity program competitive at the Big Ten conference level.

The First Year

In a preliminary report dated 6 August 1973 the Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CSIAW) recommended that a women's varsity athletic program commence immediately in Fall 1973. First the University had to join SMAIAW and officially recognize the program. To facilitate the women's varsity program and to meet SMAIAW standards, a program leader with at least a 50 percent

appointment was required, along with the designation of a separate program budget item, provisions for coaches for all sports, rated officials for competitions, and medical exams, first aid, medical and travel insurance for the participants.¹

Vice President for Academic Affairs Allen Smith immediately began to address these needs. This prompt attention reflected Fleming's intent of initiating a varsity athletic program for women in Fall 1973 without waiting for the CSIAW final report.² At about the same time, a class action complaint was filed by Marcia Federbush with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) charging the University with sexual discrimination in its athletic policies and practices.³

Smith sought program leadership from the Department of Physical Education (DPE), the previous source of WAA leadership and the departmental affiliation suggested by SMAIAW. Hunsicker recommended Hartwig as the leader to carry out the first year of varsity athletics for women during the formal establishment of the program. While Hartwig was released from 50 percent of her Physical

¹ Eunice Burns to Fleming, 6 August 1973, Szady Personal Papers.

² Smith to Hunsicker, 29 August 1973, Vice President of Academic Affairs Papers, Box 41, MHC.

³ The Federbush complaint was developed without direct support from the women students of the sports clubs or the women of the Physical Education faculty.

Education appointment to focus on women's athletics, no official athletic position was created for 1973-74.⁴

In a second preliminary report in late August the CSIAW recommended that six sports: 1) field hockey, 2) basketball, 3) volleyball, 4) swimming and diving, 5) synchronized swimming and 6) tennis; be supported in 1973-74 with varsity and junior varsity teams for the team sports. Furthermore the Committee recommended that competition should be limited to Michigan and bordering state schools in the establishment of moderate schedules.⁵ These two recommendations were identical to the previous women's sports clubs program. The scheduling limitation reflected a conservative and cautious orientation to women's athletics. The geographic limitations clearly differentiated women's athletics from the broader Big Ten type scheduling of men's athletics. These two preliminary reports of the CSIAW served as guidelines for the initiation of the new program.

The lack of formalization, and the vague nature of the program was a consequence of the University administration's and the CSIAW's desires to expedite the debut of women's intercollegiate athletics in 1973-74. Hartwig functioned through the Athletic Department. The fact that funding came

⁴ Smith to Hunsicker, 29 August, 14 September 1973; and Hunsicker to Smith, 11 September 1973, Vice President of Academic Affairs Papers, Box 47, MHC.

⁵ Burns to Fleming, 23 August 1973, Szady Personal Papers.

through both Academic Affairs and Athletics illustrates the nebulous state of affairs.

Despite the interim nature of the program in 1973-74, its varsity status provided positive elements for women's athletics. Women athletes neither had to pay dues, or sell apples or books to raise operating funds, nor did they have to secure and function under volunteer coaches. According to Hartwig, the expenditures for the first year totaled \$7,000 for operations, plus \$12,000 for the salaries of six part-time coaches. Provisions were made for equipment, supplies, warm-ups, meal allowances, transportation, per diem allowances during travel, medical examinations and costs, travel insurance, and limited publicity.

In addition, Hartwig provided centralization and balance to the interim operation. Owing to the newness of function and support of the program at Michigan, many facets of each sport demanded attention. Processes and procedures were defined for the women's operation and were coordinated with the Athletic Department through Hartwig. Her 50 percent appointment was an understatement of the time and effort she contributed to the development of the new program.

The use of facilities by women's sports teams improved during 1973-74. Field hockey moved to Michigan Stadium,⁶ volleyball used Barbour Gymnasium and the Intramural Sports Building, basketball competed in the Intramural Sports Building with limited use of Crisler Arena, and swimming and diving gained more access to Matt Mann Pool, while synchronized swimming and tennis retained their previous facilities priorities.

The competitive schedules for the first year approximated those of the sports club era and were based on the club schedules developed the previous spring.⁷ Most SMAIAW schools, including Michigan State University, recognized Michigan's move to women's varsity athletics and re-scheduled competitions. One notable exception was Eastern Michigan University, which chose not to alter its competitive schedules.

The existence and organization of the sports club program facilitated the rapid transition to varsity athletics in several areas. Women athletes previously involved with the clubs joined the new program en masse.⁸

⁶ The use of Michigan Stadium had been negotiated by the field hockey sports club the previous spring. Field hockey, similar to the other early Fall sports, began their programs on a sports club basis, and became varsity teams when administrative details were settled in late September.

⁷ More than 2/3 of the 1973-74 varsity competitions were repetitions of the 1972-73 sports club schedules.

⁸ Half of the varsity participants in 1973-74 had participated previously in sports club competition. These women were complemented by new participants and freshmen.

The majority of the volunteer coaches of the clubs became the varsity coaches and were assisted by their former student managers during the first years.⁹ The competitive schedules and team uniforms of the sports clubs were utilized to start the varsity program. Nevertheless, the program experienced an ample share of growing pains and unfilled dreams in its first year, despite its transition from the sports club program.

Program Formalization

While the first year of women's varsity athletics progressed, the formalization of the new program was negotiated. One factor in the process was the CSIAW report which was released in November 1973. The report reiterated the implemented recommendations of the August preliminary reports, and presented the following recommendations for women's varsity athletics:¹⁰

1. The Amateur Principle should not be compromised by the awarding of athletic scholarships and the

⁹ Hartwig sought coaches first through the Physical Education program, then through recommendations. Five of the six varsity coaches had previously coached during the sports club era. One sports club coach was replaced by a Physical Education staff member.

Student managers remained an important segment of the program because of the part-time coaching appointments, and the lack of assistant coaches. In addition, non-playing student managers began to fill the traditional roles of team managers, similar to men's varsity athletics.

¹⁰ Derived from the CSIAW Report, 1 November 1973, pp. 2-9, Szady Personal Papers.

recruitment of women athletes. (This concept coincided with the philosophy of the AIAW. In addition, one of Fleming's concerns communicated to the CSIAW was the avoidance of professionalism in women's athletics.)¹¹

2. A master coordinator of athletic facilities should be named. (This recommendation reflected a concern for women's access to the limited facilities based on difficulties experienced by recreational sports constituents.)

3. The women's program should function as part of the Athletic Department, and a new position entitled Associate Director of Athletics should be created. The Associate Director would administer the varsity women's athletic program, and report directly to the Athletic Director. A committee should be appointed for 3 years "to advise and assist the Associate Director in determining the appropriate procedures and direction for sound program development." (The first concept reflects the principle that women's varsity athletics should function at the same administrative level as the men's program within the Athletic structure. The advisory committee would provide continued external attention during the development phase of the program. The Department of Physical Education, while not having any direct responsibility for the women's program, would be a source for coaches and assistant coaches.)

4. "Appropriate organization and financial arrangements should be made to ensure continuity and permanence in the coaching staff" for both head and assistant coaches. Similarly "a sound financial base is essential and... continuing financial support is critical to the success of the intercollegiate program for women." (The Committee sought funding adequacy, rather than equality with the men's program.)

5. A budget of \$80,000 should be established for the women's program for 1974-75, with financial support shared between the Athletic Department and the General Fund. The Athletic Department would provide \$35,000 for the Associate Director's salary, secretarial assistance, office expenses, medical exams, and training facilities. The General Fund would support \$45,000 of program costs covering coaches salaries (6 head coaches at \$2500 each, 6 assistant coaches at \$1000 each), half-time trainer, uniforms, equipment, transportation, officiating expenses, entrance fees, membership, insurance, and miscellaneous operating expenses. (Those budget items

¹¹ CSIAW Minutes, 12 July 1973, Eunice Burns Papers, MHC.

that would increase with future program growth were apportioned to the General funds, thereby assigning the program support decisions outside the Athletic Department.)

6. The University should join the AIAW and the MAIAW.

7. The University should sponsor a conference on the Amateur Principle and women's intercollegiate athletics. (The notion reflected the Committee's staunch allegiance to the Amateur Principle, and their desire for Michigan to assume leadership in the field of women's athletics.)

The CSIAW report was reviewed and approved in principle by the Regents at their December 1973 meeting. An article in the Ann Arbor News analyzed the report as follows:

Riding..."a groundswell of support not only here, but throughout the country," the CSIAW went to the University of Michigan Regents last month and asked for a lot less money than it might have gotten.

The...committee opted for a "conservative budget, but a program structure that may have far reaching impact, not only on the development of women's athletics, but on the conduct of men's programs as well.

In so doing, the committee aligned itself with a developing position among many proponents of women's athletics that the traditional men's programs, for all their strengths, are not necessarily the most desirable model for women's programs - or possibly even for men's.¹²

With the Regents' support of women's athletics, Fleming developed a reorganization plan for the University's sports-related functions. The plan encompassed two factors: 1) the funding of women's athletics was "not really optional" in anticipation of a HEW investigation; and 2) a viable

¹² Adaline Huszczo, "An 'Idealistic Approach' to Sports," Ann Arbor News, 6 January 1974, p. 15.

Recreation Program would require additional support from the General Fund.¹³

Fleming's recommendations were presented at the February 1974 Regents' meeting and were approved in principle. The establishment of the women's varsity athletic program was a component of the reorganization plan for Athletics, Physical Education, and Recreation. The approved recommendations differed from the CSIAW recommendations in that the Athletic Department would provide the total \$80,000 budget for the women's athletic program. In turn, the Athletic Department would be relieved of \$80,000 in maintenance, utility, and other costs for facilities used primarily by the Recreation Program in order to provide the women's program budget. Physical Education would be relieved of the administrative responsibility for the Recreation Program and budget, which would be transferred to the new position of Associate Director of Athletics for Recreation. Recreation and Athletic priorities were set for the sports facilities with scheduling coordination assigned to the new Associate Director for Recreation and the Athletic Director.¹⁴

The Regents emphasized the designation of the new positions as Associate Directors rather than Assistant

¹³ Fleming, Memorandum to Canham, et al, "Funding and Administration of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreation, Intramurals, and Club Sports," 31 January 1974, Vice President of Academic Affairs Papers, Box 47, MHC.

¹⁴ University Record, 11 February 1974, p. 1.

Directors and mandated the effective date to be 1 July 1974. The Executive Officers were instructed to implement the recommendations with consideration given to the concerns of the affiliated groups.¹⁵

During the formalization process, Canham proffered concurrent views on the administrative structure of women's athletics. Prior to the establishment of the CSIAW, Fleming reported that Canham could provide reasonable facilities for the women's program, and that Athletics had made a \$2000 allocation for travel and equipment. In terms of structure, Canham perceived that the women students desired to have the women's athletic program within the women's physical education program, although no interest had been expressed by the Physical Education staff.¹⁶ However, despite the perceived departmental disinterest, Canham felt that Physical Education personnel were available to staff a women's athletic program due to the earlier abolition of the Physical Education requirement. The prospect of potential

¹⁵ The position of Associate Director for Recreation became effective 1 September 1975 with the opening of the new Central Campus and North Campus Recreation Buildings. Proceedings, February 1974, pp. 740-1.

¹⁶ Szady and Laird had made no suggestion for program placement in their presentation. The SMAIAW standards mandated program affiliation with the women's physical education faculty. The lack of interest by Physical Education probably reflected Hunsicker's desire for a purely academic focus for his program, as Hartwig, Lindeman, Ocker, and Weikart had been, and were, active and supportive in the promotion of women's athletics at the University.

resources within Physical Education was reiterated by Canham in October 1973.¹⁷

Canham was in basic agreement with Fleming's proposed reorganization of February 1974. With the funding of women's athletics through a budgetary trade-off, Canham concurred with the CSIAW's \$80,000 budget recommendation, although he preferred a different breakdown. In addition, Canham advocated that the Associate Director for women's athletics need not be full-time.¹⁸

One area of concern for Canham was the title of Associate Director for the director of women's athletics, although he was supportive of Hartwig in this position:

The director of women's athletics should not be an associate director....The duties of the women's athletic director and the two other associate directors are poles apart....I do not think I could be comfortable with a person who is handling one small area in this large department having equal authority with Paul Hunsicker and the Associate Director of Campus Recreation.... With Marie Hartwig here I don't view any problems, but I think in the future someone will face serious problems if we give the title of associate director to our director of women's intercollegiate athletics.¹⁹

¹⁷ Fleming, Memorandum to Smith, et al. "Intercollegiate Athletics for Women," 31 May 1973, Office of the President Papers, Box 40; and Fleming, Memorandum to Smith on the Physical Education Program, 11 October 1973, Vice President of Academic Affairs Papers, Box 41, MHC.

¹⁸ Richard Kennedy, Memorandum to Fleming, "Women's Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreation, Intramurals, and Club Sports," 7 February 1974, Office of the President Papers, Box 40, MHC.

¹⁹ Canham to Kennedy, 10 June 1974, Vice President of Academic Affairs Papers, Box 89, MHC.

Canham's comments provoked no change of action. This probably reflected the Regents' emphasis on the title of Associate Director, rather than Assistant, in February 1974.

The implementation plan was delineated in four sequences and procedures.²⁰ The first of these called for a three year Advisory Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics (ACWIA). Along with advising and assisting the Associate Director, the Committee would serve as a search committee for the next Associate Director of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics. The Director of Athletics would then make the appointment based on the Committee's recommendations. (This presumed that Hartwig would serve through 1974-75. Actually her tenure extended through 1975-76.) ACWIA was also charged with planning the integration of women's athletics under the Board in Control by 1 July 1977, and advising the Director on his budgetary recommendations for women's athletics to the Board in Control.

The second sequence called for the Vice-President of Academic Affairs to appoint a search committee for the Associate Director of Recreation, and upon their recommendation the Director would make the appointment. The Vice-Presidents of Academic Affairs, and Business and

²⁰ Kennedy, Memorandum to the Executive Officers, "Implementation Plan for Recommendations Dealing with Women's Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreation, Intramurals, and Club Sports," 19 April 1974, Szady Personal Papers.

Finance would establish a General Fund budget for Recreation including the \$80,000 trade-off for Women's Athletics. The Vice-President of Academic Affairs would also develop policies for joint appointments between Physical Education and Recreation.²¹

The last two sequences of the implementation plan provided the continuance of facility priorities for the Physical Education program. Changes in the assigned facility responsibilities would be considered by a committee of all of the Associate Directors and chaired by the Director, with recommendations sent to the Executive Officers. Finally, the reorganization changes would be appropriately reflected in the University's By-Laws.²²

Essentially the Athletic Department assumed responsibility for the women's varsity athletics program and was relieved of the budgetary responsibility for Recreation.²³ Hartwig was appointed as the first Associate Director for Women's Athletics (50 percent appointment), and the women's varsity athletic program formally commenced on 1 July 1974.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ The Associate Director of Recreation reported to the Director of Athletics, although his salary came from the General Fund. Recreation became an independent unit in most respects when Physical Education was streamlined with the removal of its Recreation and Dance Program responsibilities.

Varsity Athletics For Women

The women's intercollegiate athletic program continued with the original six sports. In addition to the six part-time head coaches, assistant coaches (Physical Education graduate assistants) were hired for the volleyball and basketball teams. As requested in the CSIAW report, a successful conference titled "National Conference on Women in Sports: Ethics & The Amateur Principle" was held in June 1975.

The ACWIA, another facet of the CSIAW report, was formed and began to advise and assist Hartwig in the Fall of 1974.²⁴ A number of programmatic topics were addressed primarily by the ACWIA during its tenure:²⁵

1. Increase in the level of competition for women: Continued efforts brought fewer competitions with junior and community colleges, and more with four year institutions. Initially most competition occurred within the state with few, if any, overnight trips. Later, regional competition increased as did the need for overnight trips.
2. The programmatic and funding differentiation of varsity team and sports club activities, and feeder-system relationships: The principle instance involved the synchronized swim team and the annual Michifish synchronized swim show. The separation was mandated

²⁴ The Committee members were Hartwig (chair), Robert Blackburn, Gwendolyn Cruzat, Louis Orlin, Phyllis Weikart, Eunice Burns (ex officio), and students Deborah Vander and Sheryl Szady. Orlin resigned in April 1975 and was replaced by Harvey Reed. Szady and Vander were replaced by Deborah Lewis and Janet Wilson in Fall 1975.

²⁵ The ACWIA had limited influence on budget formulation, and no formal relationship was developed with the Board in Control.

primarily on the basis that the Michifish show was a sport club activity and should not receive funding from the Athletic Department.²⁶

3. The need for publicity and media coverage of the women's program: Continued emphasis on these needs was reflected in increased attention and releases from the Sports Information office.

4. The philosophy statement for the women's intercollegiate program, and the finalization of details of the program's administration: The philosophy statement was approved by ACWIA with the final sentence reading: "The Advisory Committee should exist within the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics to implement the ideals and values of intercollegiate athletics presented here."²⁷ Discussions ensued with Fleming and Canham to clarify this and other organizational relationships. Fleming accepted the ACWIA decision to have the women's program budget under the administration of the Associate Director, and to

²⁶ The difficulty of this separation occurred in 3 areas: 1) The Michifish club had predated the varsity team and still served as a source of additional training and performance for participants. The coach continued to be involved in both team and show preparations; 2) The Michifish show for many years had provided substantial financial support and training for the club's participation in intercollegiate competition before varsity status was attained; and 3) The trend nationally was to permit these two type of activities to coexist. The action was taken on 30 October 1974. Lindeman to Hartwig, 6 April 1975, Szady Personal Papers.

²⁷ See Szady, Vander, and Lewis, "Philosophy of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, April 1975, HPP. Kennedy's implementation plan called for the women's program to function with the ACWIA until the committee's termination at which time the program would come under the Board in Control's jurisdiction. The statement in the philosophy proposed that the ACWIA continue its advisory function within the Board.

stay with the Board in Control jurisdiction plan.²⁸

5. Search committee function: This function of the ACWIA was temporarily tabled when the Regents delayed Hartwig's retirement furlough until 1976-77. A central issue in the search process was the split of the appointment between Physical Education and Athletics. A compromise of a 75 percent Athletics and 25 percent Physical Education split was reached with Fleming's assistance. The search committee gave Canham a slate of three external candidates, and the Board in Control approved Virginia Hunt as Hartwig's successor in June 1976.²⁹

The ACWIA remained involved with program policy, and maintained a positive relationship with Hartwig during her tenure. With Hartwig's retirement in 1976, and Hunt's succession, this relationship changed. Friction increased and communication diminished between the Committee and Hunt,

²⁸ Fleming, Memorandum to Intercollegiate Athletic Board et al, "Budget for Women's Intercollegiate Athletics and Relationship to the Intercollegiate Athletic Board," 10 November 1975, Athletic Department Papers.

Alternatives were discussed during the review of the relationships in the Fall of 1975, including a prominent proposal to remove the women's athletic program from the jurisdiction of the Athletic Department and place it under the Central Administration. The ACWIA's decision came as a surprise to Canham as he noted in his 13 November memorandum to Hartwig "I assume that...the women's intercollegiate athletic program is now irrevocably under the Board in Control...and I am not sure how that happened, but I guess that is what you want and I think it is in the best interest of the women's program." Canham to Hartwig, 13 November 1975, HPP. Fleming delayed his decision on the continuation of the Advisory Committee, which became a dead issue when the ACWIA chose to disband in March 1977.

²⁹ Canham and Physical Education favored the continuance of the 50/50 split, whereas the ACWIA maintained the need for a 100 percent Athletic appointment. The search committee, meeting without Hartwig, also named Katherine Ley and June Walker from a pool of 67 applicants.

due to her style of operation.³⁰ The ACWIA disbanded in March 1977, as the Women's Committee of the Board in Control began to function.

Hunt resigned as of July 1977. Ocker, a coach and Physical Education faculty member, was named Acting Associate Director in September 1977, and approved by the Board in Control the following September as Associate Director for Women's Athletics.

Title IX

A number of major issues relating to the women's intercollegiate athletic program arose between 1974 and 1981. While various groups were involved actively in these issues, the final resolutions were within the jurisdiction of the Board in Control. An underlying premise of the educational environment, and a common factor in these issues, was Title IX. The 1972 law influenced the issues to different extents, depending on its endorsement and its occurrence relative to the implementation of Title IX.

While Title IX was recognized after its passage in 1972, the extended debate over jurisdiction and the method of its implementation delayed any analyses of compliance until the guidelines were presented in 1975. Compliance efforts were given another reprieve as the guidelines

³⁰ Conversation with Phyllis Weikart, Ann Arbor, MI, 25 February 1986.

required a self-evaluation within one year, followed by plans to eliminate inconsistencies within the three year adjustment period ending 21 July 1978.³¹ Yet the exact nature of Title IX remained unsettled as debate over policy interpretations of the intercollegiate athletic provisions extended from December 1978 to December 1979. Court cases continued to re-focus the interpretation and jurisdiction of Title IX.³²

The major athletic issues, relative to the women's program, raised during the Title IX era were athletic awards, the addition of varsity sports, athletic scholarships, participant eligibility, and governance.

Athletic awards for women: The Board in Control reviewed and revamped the awards system in 1974-75, recognizing the participation of women. The "block M for women" issue was pioneered by Szady while serving on both the ACWIA and the Board in Control's Awards Committee. While there was little opposition within the Athletic Department to the granting of athletic awards to women, the granting of the "men's block M" to women was an emotional issue.

³¹ U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Nondiscrimination on Basis of Sex," Federal Register 104, no. 108, part II, 4 June 1975, 24128-45; and Elimination of Sex Discrimination in Athletic Programs, September 1975, p. 4.

³² For a further chronicle of the evolution of Title IX see Szady, "The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships for Women," 28 March 1983, Szady Personal Papers.

There is no law in this land that indicates that we must give identical awards. We plan to give an equal award, but we do not and should not be forced into giving an identical award. The block M has stood for excellence in men's athletics since the turn of the century, and I think to dilute it by giving it to synchronized swimming for women or softball for women would be a tragedy, ...³³

The ACWIA's position was clear: "ACWIA is upset by the reported discussion regarding the awarding of the block M only to the men. The inference of inferior performance by women is disturbing."³⁴

While Title IX was an active issue in the University environment, it was not defined during the debate of the award issue other than the global principle of non-discrimination on basis of sex. The exact nature of the compliance guidelines were merely conjecture. This nebulous status of Title IX may have worked in favor of the women's point of view as there was no firm knowledge as to whether or not identical awards, or equal expenditures for awards, would be required.

The awards question was presented from an ethical, rather than a legal standpoint by Szady and the ACWIA. The women's posture during this debate was reactive in nature, as they did not seek publicity on the issue. In contrast, individuals within the Athletic Department mounted an active

³³ Canham to Giles, Tompkins and Dobson, 2 May 1975, Plant Papers, MHC. The opposition to the block M for women emanated from the Athletic Department. There was Board in Control support for the block M for women.

³⁴ Hartwig to Canham, 23 May 1975, Athletic Department Papers.

campaign to gather support to deny the women the same block M award.³⁵

Three incidents may have influenced the final vote by the Board in Control: 1) During the evening prior to the actual vote, an embarrassing reprimand of the University for considering not giving the women the block M was aired by Detroit television sportscaster Al Ackerman; 2) Fleming's views became apparent. Anticipating a close vote by the

³⁵ "The block M has stood for excellence in men's athletics since the turn of the century, and I think to dilute it by giving it to synchronized swimming for women or softball for women [see note] would be a tragedy, and I know you three gentlemen feel the same way." (Canham to William Giles, Jack Tompkins, and John Dobson, 2 May 1975.) [Note: Softball was not a women's varsity sport in 1975, and was not presented for varsity status consideration until 1976. Varsity softball began in 1977-78.]

"I am sure you will realize how serious it would be for the Yellow 'M' to be awarded for synchronized swimming, softball and so forth. It would make the award worthless in my opinion and obviously in the opinion of the coaches whose letters are attached." (William M. Mazer, President of the UM M-Club, to "M" Man, 16 May 1975.)

"What we face is the possibility of the same football 'M' being earned by the women's synchronized swimming team for instance. If that comes to pass, it will minimize the value of the 'M' in the eyes of not only our players but the public who place such a high value on it....I believe that if this comes to pass we will very shortly petition to change the award for football, rather than give identical awards for football and women's sports." (Bo Schembechler to Canham, 1 May 1975.)

"The eligibility standards that a man has to meet to even qualify for this 'M' are not the same as those for a woman, and the level of performance that the man has to exhibit are far above those of the women. It would be bad for our basketball program if women's basketball, for instance, were to be awarded the same 'M' as the men. It would certainly minimize incentive, and I think we might even consider awarding another type of award for our basketball team if the 'M' loses its status." (John Orr to Canham, 1 May 1975.) (All letters from Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.)

Board in Control, Vice Presidents Johnson and Michael Raddock (Board members) were sent back to Ann Arbor from an Executive Officer retreat to cast the central administration's votes in support of the block M award for women, according to Johnson; and 3) The Title IX guidelines were released on 4 June 1975, six days prior to the vote. The guidelines contained the language "No person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be treated differently from another person or otherwise discriminated against in any... intercollegiate...athletics offered by recipient...."³⁶ which could be construed to support the women's viewpoint.

Informal exchange at the Board in Control meeting prior to the vote focused on the Ackerman reprimand. With minimal discussion the Board's vote was one vote short of unanimous in favor of the identical awards and awards program for women and men at the 10 June 1975 meeting.³⁷

The addition of varsity sports: The CSIAW had been given the task of determining the sports to be included in the new varsity athletic program, and their six recommended

³⁶ HEW, "Nondiscrimination on Basis of Sex."

³⁷ Unfortunately the color and proportions of the block M awarded to women athletes on their varsity jackets is not identical to the men's traditional block M.

sports were accepted by Fleming.³⁸ When the ACWIA was activated, it was directed to formulate evaluative criteria for the addition and retention of women's varsity sports. Initially there was some feeling, based on the success of the CSIAW's power of suggestion, that ACWIA decisions based on ACWIA criteria would receive similar recognition. However, this was not the case. While the ACWIA was independent from the Board in Control, all programmatic changes (including the addition of varsity sports) that had an impact on the Department budget and that fell within established Board policies needed Board approval.

In April 1975 the ACWIA approved the petitions of the women's gymnastics and the track and field sports clubs for addition to the roster of women's varsity sports. When Hartwig conveyed this action to Canham, he responded:

We cannot add women's sports on a different basis than men. The men's sports which become varsity sports must prove themselves in the club area, and I thought that was your feeling also. Until we see an active club in a sport and a schedule that is reasonable I don't see how you can justify spending the money to set up a team and hire a coach in track, for instance, [when] you only have 2 or 3 girls who wish to compete....

If we are going to have a viable program for women we cannot grab sports out of the air and make a varsity team until we find some interest on the part of the students who are here.³⁹

³⁸ Fleming looked to the women to indicate the need for program expansion. "It seems inescapable the the [Women's Athletic] program is going to have to expand here. Nevertheless I am reluctant to press them on it when the women don't seem to be doing so." Fleming, Memorandum to Johnson, 19 April 1975, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

³⁹ Canham, Memorandum to Hartwig, 17 June 1975, Athletic Department Papers.

Hartwig indicated her personal views and concern over the ACWIA's reaction in her reply:

I am in agreement with you on all of its [your letter] contents, and once again, I am proud of the fact that we are approaching this whole area at a slow pace. I think some of our friends in other schools are really finding it hard as they look back at the speed with which they jumped into this whole business of intercollegiates. Gymnastics is the only group which really followed my advice, and I believe yours, by being an active group for several years, ... I am anxious to see them become recognized....

I will want to talk with you fairly soon on the point of view and position I should take with the Advisory Committee. I expect we might have some fireworks, ...⁴⁰

And indeed there were. According to Fleming:

Our friends, the ladies and the [Board in Control], are at it again....

I am not entirely clear on the problem, but apparently it is who has authority over the funds that we allocate for women's athletics-the women's advisory group that we set up to phase in their operation for the next couple of years, or the [Board in Control]. The women's advisory group had approved two more sports for intercollegiate status and Don brought them to the [Board] for approval with a recommendation that they approve one and turn down the other. As usual, no information was supplied to the board on either!...

I'm not sure we can make it go if the women have to work through the [Board in Control]. They think, probably with good reason, that the alumni members are not at all sympathetic to them and that Don gets them organized before the meetings.⁴¹

The ACWIA met with Fleming in September 1975 to discuss the final authority on adding sports and other issues.

Resolution was achieved by finalizing the organizational relationship of the women's program under the Board in

⁴⁰ Hartwig, Memorandum to Canham, 22 August 1975, Athletic Department Papers.

⁴¹ Fleming to Kennedy, 15 September 1975, Office of the President Papers, MHC.

Control's jurisdiction. Therefore, the ACWIA's decisions on additional varsity sports would require Board approval.

The Board conditionally approved the addition of women's gymnastics in October 1975.⁴² This action followed the publication of the Title IX guidelines in July which stated:

(c) *Equal Opportunity*. A recipient which operates...intercollegiate...athletics shall provide equal athletic opportunity for members of both sexes. In determining whether equal opportunities are available the Director will consider, among other factors:

(i) Whether the selection of sports and levels of competition effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of members of both sexes;...⁴³

In addition, Fleming, in adherence to a September 1975 HEW memo, had directed the ACWIA to conduct a Title IX self-evaluation.⁴⁴ The product of this evaluation was presented to the Board in Control in May 1976 as part of Hartwig's report on women's athletics. The study results were abbreviated on a chart that was difficult to interpret and were accompanied by no written comments or analysis.⁴⁵ Problems with locker rooms and training facilities were highlighted as "corrected." However, complaints on salary,

⁴² The Board in Control tabled the Track and Field petition; however Greg Syphax, men's assistant track coach, was assigned to assist the women's club. Syphax, Memorandum, 14 October 1975, HPP.

⁴³ HEW, "Nondiscrimination on Basis of Sex."

⁴⁴ The self-evaluation was to be completed by 21 July 1976. HEW, Elimination of Sex Discrimination in Athletic Programs.

⁴⁵ Apparently only the existing program was evaluated. There was no assessment of the accommodation of interests and abilities relative to program expansion.

practice time and facilities, transportation, per diem funds, equipment, publicity and competitive seasons, along with additional inadequacies in training services and locker rooms, were not clearly indicated. The limited presentation of the findings reinforces the fact that little, if any, further action resulted from the study.

Three events coincided in the summer of 1976: 1) Hunt became the new Associate Director of Women's Athletics in June; 2) The July 1976 deadline for completion of the Title IX self-evaluation occurred; and 3) The Beckett Title IX complaint was filed with HEW in June. The last alleged discrimination on the basis of sex in denying athletic opportunities (specifically in golf) and athletic scholarships.

Influenced by these factors, another, more detailed, Title IX review was conducted in August 1976. Among the findings was the disproportionate distribution of athletic participation opportunities by sex. The report recommended the incorporation of track and field, golf, and softball into the women's athletic program by the end of the

adjustment period, 1 July 1978.⁴⁶ At their November 1976 meeting the Board in Control approved the three women's varsity sports to begin in September 1977. At the same meeting a two year moratorium was declared on any further addition of varsity sports in order to concentrate resources to provide equity in funding and competitive excellence in the men's and women's programs.⁴⁷

The second Title IX self-evaluation also defined other deficiencies in the women's athletic program and made recommendations for their elimination. In brief:

Deficiencies in equipment, supplies, and office services: Practice uniforms, shoes, socks, warm-ups, travel bags, and necessary laundry service would be provided beginning in 1976-77. Office supplies and services would be improved over a two year period.

Deficiencies in competitive schedules, practice and games facilities: The number of contests per sport were increased in 1976-77, and would be further expanded in 1977-78. The basketball team would practice and compete in Crisler Arena. Some women's games would be scheduled

⁴⁶ Two reports on the second Title IX self-evaluation are included in the minutes of the Board in Control meetings for September, and October 1976. The first is untitled, and provides more extensive data than, and is the basis for, the second report: D. Canham, V. Hunt, and C. Harris, "Title IX Evaluation and Recommendations," 5 October 1976, Athletic Department Papers.

Michigan sponsored 7 women's varsity sports in 1976-77. This compared favorably with Brooke's findings that nationally 70 percent of participating institutions sponsored 4 to 6 women's varsity sports in 1976-77. Brooke, p. 62.

⁴⁷ Board in Control: Long Range Planning Committee, "Board Policy Regarding The Creation of New Varsity Teams," 23 November 1976, Athletic Department Papers.

as preliminary games to the men's games.⁴⁸ The gymnastics team would have access to Crisler on the same basis as the men's team.

Deficiencies in travel, and per diem allowances: The number of overnight trips would increase as the program and schedules improved. Per diem allowances were increased to \$8.50 for meals, and \$10 for hotel per player.

Deficiencies in opportunities to receive coaching, and compensation: Coaching salaries were adjusted in 1976-77. Administrative positions may need to be increased in 1977-78. A full-time secretary was hired in 1976-77, with the possibility of further assistance in 1977-78.

Deficiencies in medical supplies and services: A full-time trainer was hired in 1976-77 who would recommend necessary equipment and supplies.

Deficiencies in publicity: A person should be assigned part-time in 1976-77.

Deficiencies in scholarships: Thirty-eight partial scholarships were available in 1976-77. An expansion plan through 1978 was noted. (See below)

(In addition, the Athletic Department took over the operation of the Physical Education Building which would provide offices for coaches and administration of the women's program in the Fall of 1976.)

While this second self-evaluation was more comprehensive in nature than the first, it did not assess the areas of practice time, academic tutoring, or housing and dining facilities and services.

A lull in program expansion occurred following this report and the subsequent approval of the three new women's

⁴⁸ This concept became controversial when a very close women's game threatened to delay the start of the men's game, and athletic officials ran time off the game clock to insure the men's 30 minute warm-up period before their game. The scheduling of women's games prior to men's was eliminated. Ocker to Hudson (Louisville), 12 December 1977, Athletic Department Papers.

varsity sports, because of the moratorium on further additions. While program growth was static, Title IX became an active concern for the Department of Athletics. A number of Title IX developments occurred after the end of the compliance adjustment period in July 1978:

August 1978 - The University was informed of HEW's investigation of the Federbush and Beckett complaints.

September 1978 - HEW conducted its on-site investigation of the Beckett complaint.

January 1979 - HEW conducted its on-site investigation of the Federbush complaint.

February 1979 - a Title IX Ad Hoc Committee of the Board in Control was formed to execute a comprehensive review of women's athletics since 1976 in order to stay in compliance.

Having experienced these investigations, and Federal concerns for Title IX compliance, the accusations of two women track participants in early 1979 received immediate attention.⁴⁹

Discontented with the practice time and facilities of the women's track and field program, Blaise Supler and Sheila Mayberry initially voiced their complaints to Ocker in December 1978. Unsatisfied, the women contacted the University's Affirmative Action Office in February 1979 about the practice situation and the lack of a women's cross-country team, among other complaints. In late March a formal Title IX grievance was filed by Supler and Mayberry.

⁴⁹ See Charles Allmand, Information Item: Memorandum to Regents on Women's Track Team, 10 May 1979, Office of the General Counsel Papers.

Meanwhile, at the February meeting of the Board in Control a petition for the addition of cross-country to the women's program by Ocker and Ken Simmons, women's track coach, was presented and referred to the Long Range Planning Committee. The Committee approved the petition in March, and the women's cross-country program was approved by the Board in Control in April 1979.

Thus the women's program had grown to eleven varsity sports, almost double the six initial sports of 1973-74.⁵⁰ None of these additions to the women's program were direct results of Federal intervention relative to Title IX. According to Canham, "We have 11 sports for women, 11 for men. We did it voluntarily. There was no gun to our head."⁵¹ However the proximity of internal program assessments with the Title IX developments reflects the legislation's strong influence on the program expansion.

Athletic scholarships: The CSIAW provided the initial stance on athletic scholarships for women: "We strongly recommend that there be no athletic scholarships or recruitment."⁵² This statement reflected the CSIAW's

⁵⁰ Junior varsity teams for all women's and men's sports programs were dropped in 1977-78.

⁵¹ Jeff Mortimer, "Title IX and Collegiate Resistance," Ann Arbor News, 22 January 1980, p. B1.

⁵² CSIAW Report, 1 November 1973, p. 2, Szady Personal Papers. The recruiting process was seen to be as equally problematic as the allocation of scholarships.

support of the traditional anti-scholarship philosophy of the AIAW.

The ACWIA continued the "no scholarship" stance during Hartwig's tenure, even though Title IX brought pressure on the AIAW to accept scholarships in 1973-74.⁵³ The following statements indicate some of the perceived detriments of a scholarship program:

- 1) Inconsistent with the amateur principle, and student-athlete concept;
- 2) Potential conflict with the academic standards of the University;
- 3) Potential inappropriate use of state tax dollars to fund out-of-state athletes;
- 4) Undue emphasis on athletics relative to the limited professional sport opportunities for participants after graduation;
- 5) Inconsistent with the philosophy of need-based scholarships;
- 6) Diversion of funds and efforts that would otherwise enhance the total women's athletic program;
- 7) Encroachment on the competitive opportunities of the non-scholarship women athletes.⁵⁴

⁵³ Litigation found that it was against the law to prohibit women athletes the same opportunities to receive athletic scholarships as those afforded men athletes under the NCAA standards. See Szady, "The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships for Women." Kellmeyer v. NEA was the first instance that indicated that the men's programs under the NCAA would be used as the norm to measure compliance of women's programs. However the women did not want to follow the men's model and its problems; rather the women desired to forego the accumulated men's problems and pursue a new direction.

⁵⁴ Based on Vander and Szady, Memorandum to Hartwig and ACWIA, 13 November 1974; and ACWIA Minutes, 12 December 1974, Athletic Department Papers.

This viewpoint partially explains the noticeable lack of attention given to the subject of scholarships in the ACWIA's Title IX self-evaluation findings.

In contrast to the no scholarship stance of Hartwig's administration, Hunt's tenure commenced with the implementation of 38 half-tuition scholarships (\$20,000 total) for returning women athletes for 1976-77. This action was a significant element of the second Title IX self-evaluation and a philosophical reversal of Hartwig's administration. In addition to the new scholarships, the following planned increases were defined: by July 1977, the AIAW maximum allowable number of scholarships (half-tuition) in all varsity sports (\$60,000 total); and by July 1978, 108 full-tuition and fees scholarships (\$120,000 total), demonstrating proportional opportunities for women and men athletes to receive scholarship aid.

Noteworthy were two underlying assumptions: 1) scholarships for men and women in non-revenue producing sports would be limited to full-tuition and fees; and 2) the men's program would move to the tuition and fees scholarship program. This assumptions were not nationally accepted, and the scholarship projections were revised.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ These assumptions anticipated the AIAW's adoption of a scholarship program limited to a maximum of tuition and fees, with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) following suit at their convention. The AIAW succeeded in January 1977, the NCAA did not approve the measure. See Szady, "The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships for Women."

Despite its introductory status, the women's scholarship program was not seen as adequate. In March 1977, HEW received a complaint from Raffel of the Washington D.C. based Women's Equity Action League (WEAL) alleging discrimination against athletes in the matter of athletic scholarships based on their sex, specifically the amount of scholarship aid received.

In 1977-78 women's scholarship funding increased to \$60,000 as planned. In April 1978 the Board in Control Long Range Planning Committee recommended and received Board approval for a revised scholarship program for women using an "equal opportunities ratio." This ratio determined the number of women's scholarships based on the ratio of the number of men's full scholarships to the number of men in non-revenue producing sports (60 to 300). Thus a goal of 40 full scholarships for 200 women athletes was predicated on the 1:5 men's ratio. The goal was completed on a 3 year incremental plan: 1978-79, 20 full scholarships; 1979-80, 30 full scholarships; and 1980-81, 40 full scholarships.⁵⁶

Prior to the completion of this plan the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) conducted a comprehensive on-site Title IX compliance investigation of the previous unresolved complaints (Federbush, Beckett, Raffel, and

⁵⁶ Board in Control: Long Range Planning Committee, "Financial Support for Women Athletics: A Policy for Michigan," 25 April 1978, Athletic Department Papers.

Supler-Mayberry) in October and November 1980.⁵⁷ In early December 1980 the University's intent to provide equitable treatment in athletics was defined:

President Shapiro and the Executive Officers are very anxious that you should move as expeditiously as possible to make changes in your program suggested by me [Virginia Nordby, Director of Affirmative Action], Dick [Daane], and Bill [Lemmer] in light of our analysis of the interviews and the data collected during the review. The Officers have decided to do this as quietly as possible, rather than make a public announcement of it.⁵⁸

In terms of women's scholarships, Nordby suggested that \$200,000 to \$250,000 needed to be added over a three year period to bring the University into compliance. The Board in Control, in January 1981, lifted the ceiling on women's scholarships to reach proportional limits with the men's non-revenue producing sports scholarship program.⁵⁹

In April 1981 the University received the DOE's findings of their Title IX investigation. They concluded that Michigan did not provide equal athletics opportunities for men and women in 11 of 12 areas, and "was not

⁵⁷ The Federal responsibility for Title IX investigations was moved from HEW to the newly formed DOE in 1980.

⁵⁸ Nordby to Canham, 3 December 1980, Athletic Department Papers.

⁵⁹ Board in Control Minutes, 29 January 1981, Athletic Department Papers.

implementing a plan which would remedy these disparities."⁶⁰ Specifically, in terms of scholarships, women athletes represented 27.3 percent of all athletes, received 12.2 percent of all scholarship funds, and averaged \$961.79 per scholarship compared to \$2,0609.20 per men's scholarship.

The other inequitable areas were:

- 1) Provision of equipment and supplies;
- 2) Scheduling of games and practice times;
- 3) Travel and per diem allowances;
- 4) Opportunity to receive coaching and the assignment of coaches;
- 5) Provision of locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities;
- 6) Provision of medical and training facilities and services;
- 7) Provision of housing and dining facilities;
- 8) Publicity;
- 9) Recruitment; and
- 10) Equal and effective accommodation of the interest and abilities of students of both sexes.

This report of the DOE's findings was later disputed by the University.

Title IX influenced the athletic scholarship program of women, although not by any direct mandate from HEW or DOE

⁶⁰ Kenneth Mines to Shapiro, 2 April 1981, Athletic Department Papers. Equitable benefits and opportunities were found in the area of tutoring and support services. The DOE investigation did not differentiate between revenue (specifically football) and non-revenue producing sports, which was the basis for Michigan's internal Title IX evaluations.

through 1981. Reporting on an interview with Canham, the Ann Arbor News stated: "He was asked if the dramatic increases in participation and funding for women's sports would have happened absent the legislation. His answer was simple: 'No way.'"⁶¹

Participant eligibility: After experiencing men participating in the women's varsity field hockey practices and volleyball try-outs, Hunt received ACWIA approval in September 1976 to issue a statement mandating that only women meeting AIAW eligibility standards would be permitted to participate in women's intercollegiate athletics.

This action predated the Stannard complaint of January 1977 which alleged discrimination based on sex in regard to participation in the University's varsity volleyball program. This alleged discrimination occurred when 1) the Board in Control denied a petition for a men's varsity volleyball team, and 2) it prevented men from participating in the existing women's program. The University was informed of the HEW investigation on the complaint in March 1977.

Stannard was the first Title IX complaint against Michigan Athletics to be investigated by HEW. The University did not contest the principles of Title IX, yet summarily argued that HEW had no jurisdiction to investigate or apply Title IX to the Athletic Department because the

⁶¹ Jeff Mortimer, "Title IX: Reversing the Tide of Male Domination," Ann Arbor News, 20 January 1980, p. F1.

Department was not in receipt of Federal funds, and affirmed the belief that the University could effectively manage its own community without Federal intervention.⁶² This argument was presented in response to all HEW and DOE investigations of complaints related to athletics. Despite this difference of opinion, the University cooperated with all HEW and DOE investigations.

Exclusive of the jurisdiction argument, a unique feature of the Stannard complaint was the substantially different strategy the University used in its defense than in the investigations that followed. The Athletic Department worked diligently to prove that the program was not in compliance with Title IX, whereas later they continually attempted to verify compliance or movement towards compliance.

The Athletic Department and Board in Control indicated that the men's volleyball petition was denied by the Board in Control on a budgetary basis due to the 1976-78 moratorium on the addition of varsity sports that had been deemed necessary in order to upgrade the women's program; the proportions of athletes, sports, and funding of the men's and women's programs were not equivalent; and the overall opportunities for women had been previously limited, which thus allowed the women's program to have single sex sports without providing parallel opportunities for men.

⁶² Lemmer to Charles Duffy, 20 June 1977, Office of the General Counsel Papers.

The University was found not in violation of Title IX in regards to the Stannard complaint in November 1977 without an on-site investigation.⁶³

Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference governance: The Big Ten Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Directors first met in December 1973 to share basic information on their programs, goals, and problems.⁶⁴ In the discussion of Big Ten competition for women, several points were made against expansion beyond the established "Big Ten championships" in Tennis and Swimming/Diving:⁶⁵

1. Big Ten conference schedules in all sports would drain financial resources, and curtail flexibility in scheduling and programming.
2. State competitions in volleyball and basketball were perceived as satisfactory by the women administrators, and precluded the need for Big Ten competitions.
3. Big Ten competition would cut across two AIAW regions and would conflict with the regional competition leading to the AIAW national championships.⁶⁶

⁶³ Hunt to Gwen Baker, 15 September 1976, Athletic Department Papers; and Mines to Fleming, 11 November 1977, Office of the General Counsel Papers.

⁶⁴ The organization of this group of administrators was based on the precedent of the successful meetings of the Big Ten Women's Intramural Directors, which had begun ten years earlier. In fact, this first athletic meeting was scheduled in conjunction with the intramural meetings.

⁶⁵ "Big Ten championships" refers to unofficial competition held between women participants of Conference institutions. Official Big Ten Championships began in Fall 1981 after the women's programs formally affiliated with the Conference.

⁶⁶ Derived from the First Big Ten Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Minutes, 6 December 1973, Athletic Department Papers.

The women directors strongly endorsed the AIAW programs, and gave little consideration to the notion of formalizing women's competition within the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference structure when non-compatibility with the AIAW was evident.

Michigan's women's intercollegiate athletic program endorsed this affiliation with the AIAW, the national organization which provided parallel governance for women's collegiate sports as the NCAA did for men's sports. The AIAW affiliation was supported by the CSIAW, and later the ACWIA, because 1) the AIAW arose from the traditions and philosophies of the DGWS and its predecessors; 2) the AIAW was a women's organization, guided by women, for women; and 3) the AIAW pursued an independent philosophy of athletics, while attempting to avoid the criticized portions of the men's model of athletics. For women in athletics, the NCAA symbolized a male dominated athletic network. NCAA affiliation would necessitate the surrendering of governance opportunities by women and the acquisition of undesired problems of recruiting and scholarships.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ In addition, affiliation was suspect because the NCAA had prohibited women athletes from participating in NCAA Championships in 1964, and rescinded the action in 1973 on the advice of legal counsel. Jack Falla, NCAA: The Voice of College Sports (Mission, KS: NCAA, 1981), p. 161.

Thus the Big Ten Women's Athletic Directors were concerned when the Joint Group of the Big Ten issued the following statement in October 1974:⁶⁸

Be it resolved that the Conference affirm that its Rules and Regulations are of such nature that they may be made to accommodate women's Intercollegiate athletics and that the Conference would welcome the inclusion of women if they desire to participate in women's intercollegiate Big Ten Conference competition and championships. If the spirit of Title IX is to be accomplished, it is important that the same institutional rules for Intercollegiate competition be applied to both men and women.⁶⁹

While the Title IX mandate of equal opportunity sanctioned the Joint Group's invitation, the potential loss of governance control and the inferred conformity to the established rules and regulations of the Conference troubled the Big Ten Women's Athletic Directors.

At Michigan, when the ACWIA considered the possibility of affiliating with the Big Ten Conference in 1974-75, a central concern was whether the Big Ten affiliation would pull the Michigan program away from the AIAW, and into the NCAA.⁷⁰

In reaction to the Joint Group's statement, the Big Ten Women's Athletic Directors, in December 1974, requested a

⁶⁸ Several athletic groups functioned within the Big Ten Conference: the Council of Ten (Presidents), the Faculty Representatives, the Directors of Athletics (men), the Joint Group (Faculty Representatives and Directors of Athletics), and later the Women's Athletic Directors (recognized 24 July 1975 by the Council of Ten).

⁶⁹ Charles D. Henry (Asst. Commissioner), Memorandum to Commissioner Duke, 6 December 1974, Plant Papers, MHC.

⁷⁰ The Big Ten Conference was, and is, a member of the NCAA.

three year transition period to consider the affiliation of their programs with the Big Ten. This statement reflected their belief that Conference affiliation would be required under Title IX:

Whereas we are mutually concerned about quality athletic programs for men and women students,

Whereas we believe an athletic program must exist on each campus that is in the best interest of the student athletes,

Whereas men and women need to become acquainted with the philosophy and concerns of each other's programs in order to coordinate their efforts,

Whereas the stages of competition for men and women are at different levels of development,

Whereas the men's and women's athletic programs are governed by separate national organizations (NCAA and AIAW),

Whereas the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives has concerned itself primarily with the governance of men's athletics,

The women athletic administrators request alliance with the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives on an experimental basis for a period of three years. At that time there shall be a review by all parties concerned to determine if the alliance is truly beneficial and agreeable to all concerned. This alliance would necessitate the following stipulations:

a) There shall be separate meetings of the Men's Athletic Directors, the Women's Athletic Directors, the Faculty Representatives and joint meetings of these University representatives to conduct the business of the Conference (four groups),

b) For a three year transition period there shall be two Faculty Representatives from each University, one each to represent the men's program and the women's program, in keeping with the spirit of Title IX,

c) There shall be a separate section of regulations within the governance of the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives for women's competition for the following reasons:

1) In order to comply with the existing differences in NCAA and AIAW regulations.

2) In order to permit the men to continue their complete Big Ten Conference schedule, but enable the women to schedule at a non-conference level during the season while conducting Big Ten Conference Championships only in selected sports. (The women are not ready to adopt a complete Big Ten Conference schedule.)

3) In order to permit the women to follow the

established state and regional route to national (AIAW) competition.

4) In order to allow flexibility in philosophical differences.

d) It has become the ultimate goal of this Conference to mutually agree upon and establish a single set of regulations that will best serve men and women students athletes in the Conference.⁷¹

The Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference's active interest in incorporating women's athletics into the organization preceded a similar action taken on the national level in January 1975 at the NCAA Convention. An NCAA resolution was adopted, again based on the principles of Title IX, which was interpreted by the AIAW as an attempt to undermine the AIAW's, and thus women's, governance of athletics:

Whereas, this Association has taken an active interest in the development of women's intercollegiate athletics since 1963; and

Whereas, developments in the field of equal rights--as to legal requirements and society's needs--now pose serious demands upon the NCAA as an organization; and

Whereas, the Association's legal counsel has consistently reminded the NCAA Council that

(1) the Association's rules and obligations of institutional membership relate to all varsity intercollegiate sports and do not differentiate between men and women; and

(2) the Association is facing legal obligation to offer services and programs to women student-athletes as it does for men; and

Whereas, each member institution has had these influences and requirements visited upon it at the institutional level and now the Association, itself, must move to adjust its concepts and programs to meet the demands of today's society and today's law;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the NCAA Council prepare a comprehensive report and plan on the several issues involved in the administration of women's intercollegiate athletics at the national level in light

⁷¹ "Resolution of Big Ten Women's Athletic Directors," 6 December 1974, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

of existing court decisions, anticipated regulations implementing Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 and present developments in women's intercollegiate athletics;...⁷²

The NCAA's plan to assume control of women's intercollegiate athletics and women's national championships was proposed in late April. American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (AAHPER), the parent organization of AIAW, denounced the plan and requested its withdrawal:

The manner being used by the NCAA to attempt to gain control of the...organization of women's collegiate sport is unacceptable in a democratic society. The Special Report of NCAA...announcing it is now ready to provide "services" for all women-student athletes is a mockery of democratic procedures. The "consent of the governed" is essential to any reorganization of collegiate sport. NCAA claims of alleged interest in "institutional control", sensitivity to the legal mandates regarding women, and alleged concern about opportunity for women athletes are meaningless when those to be governed are rendered powerless with vague promises of "contemplated" participation at some nebulous to-be-determined time.⁷³

This confrontation between the AIAW and the NCAA affected the potential affiliation of the women's program with the Big Ten. The Big Ten Women felt that joining the Conference could lead to an unwanted NCAA affiliation, or would be construed as being supportive of the NCAA's takeover of the women's championships because of the Conference's membership in the NCAA. As observed by a male Conference official "The ladies are reluctant to endorse a

⁷² "NCAA Resolution," 8 January 1975, Athletic Department Papers.

⁷³ Roger Wiley (AAHPER) to John Fuzak (NCAA), 12 May 1975, Athletic Department Papers.

system that eliminates the opportunity to live by their philosophy and chance for leadership."⁷⁴

In turn, participation and representation in the Big Ten governance structure was a major consideration for the women. In March 1975 the women met with the Joint Group and presented their proposed Conference structure of the Women's Athletic Directors, the men's Directors of Athletics, and two Faculty Representatives from each institution (a woman and a man), to comprise a new Joint Group of these forty members. Maximum representation in governance was the underlying principle and concern of the women directors. Taking no action on the proposal, the Joint Group appointed a Joint Committee of three women and three men to study the possibilities of incorporating women's athletics into the Conference.⁷⁵

In June 1975 six of the Big Ten Women's Athletic Directors met and formulated a position statement, which was later endorsed by nine of the women. The Joint Committee

⁷⁴ Henry to Duke, 6 December 1974, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

⁷⁵ "Report of the Conference Joint Group and Administrators of Women's Athletic Programs," 4 March 1975, Szady Personnel Papers.

In May 1975 the Council of Ten and the Faculty Representatives agreed that just as the Presidents had delegated the responsibility of governance of men's athletics to the Faculty Representative, a similar delegation would be necessary for the Conference to extend its jurisdiction over women's athletics. Thus ultimately the decision on the inclusion of women's athletics in the Big Ten would emanate from the Council of Ten. Fleming to Plant, 8 May 1975, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

reviewed the position statement, and a consensus was reached on all points of the proposal:

1. No recommendation to extend the formal Big Ten structure to include women's athletics at this time.
2. Retention of the Big Ten Women's Athletic Directors' organizational pattern to promote the exchange of ideas, and organization of the women's Big Ten championships under AIAW regulations and standards.
3. The Women should meet with the Joint Group once a year to review common problems and explore cooperative efforts.
4. Recommendation that the Conference extend assistance as requested.⁷⁶

The statement was forwarded to the Council of Ten for action. Hartwig communicated the ACWIA's view to Fleming prior to the meeting:

We are not anxious to get into conference scheduling in the Big Ten, but would prefer to continue as we have in the past with invitational gatherings if time and money permit....Regular conference scheduling is something to be considered in the future. We are not ready for this at the present time. We wish to continue to support AIAW's state, regional, and national plan.⁷⁷

The Council of Ten supported the Women's statement and deferred the decision of Big Ten jurisdiction over the

⁷⁶ Derived from the Minutes of the Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Programs, 7 July 1975, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

⁷⁷ Hartwig to Fleming, 7 July 1975, Athletic Department Papers.

women's athletics programs, with a request for a status report on the issue from the Faculty Representatives.⁷⁸

In February 1976 the Big Ten Women's Athletic Directors met and reviewed options for Conference affiliation.⁷⁹ The existing plan of informal affiliation was supported by a 9-1 vote, and in addition "a two year period of grace was warranted in order to permit NCAA and AIAW to attempt to resolve major national problems. At the end of the two year period, the women wish to reconsider the entire situation...." The rationale for their decision focused on four points: 1) formal affiliation could negatively affect the restructuring of the AIAW; 2) formal affiliation could encourage other women's programs to become aligned with their own men's conferences and thereby disrupt the AIAW championship process; 3) formal affiliation would appear to be a takeover by the men of the Big Ten, and a move towards

⁷⁸ Draft resolution of Council of Ten, 24 July 1975, Athletic Department Papers.

The Council of Ten's action recognized the women administrators as a formal group and mandated that "every courtesy be extended to the women's intercollegiate athletics programs without extension of the authority of the Conference over the control of these programs at member schools. In addition, the following services should be provided for a period of one year: A. Assignment of an individual within the office to handle matter pertaining to women's programs, such as: collecting and recording statistical data for Championship Meets and Tournaments; disseminating information relevant to both men's and women's groups; making arrangements for meetings; typing and duplicating minutes; etc."

⁷⁹ Prior to the February meeting the ACWIA expressed its desire for continuation of the three year informal affiliation plan presented the previous year. ACWIA Minutes, 28 January 1976, HPP.

uniting with the NCAA; and 4) the allegiance to AIAW was stronger than to the Conference.⁸⁰

The options developed by the Women were the central focus of the February 16th meeting of the Joint Committee. After studying the options, the Committee recommended that the Women's and Men's Athletic Directors meet to review the options, and formulate a recommendation for a change in the Conference structure to allow input by women at all levels that would support the Committee's concept of a single Conference structure for both men's and women's athletic programs.⁸¹

In meeting with the men Directors in March 1976 the women pointed out that 1) the needs of the women's programs were not being represented by the Faculty Representatives; and 2) conference governance decisions about the women's programs were to be made without the participation of the women, specifically the Faculty Representatives report on Women's Athletics to the Council of Ten. The Women's and Men's Athletic Directors' meeting approved the women's option with the two year grace period and also voted "that the women administrators be allowed to determine their own

⁸⁰ "Results of Meeting of Administrators of Women's Athletics at Big Ten Institutions," 1 February 1976; and "Report of the Joint Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics," May 1976, Athletic Department Papers.

⁸¹ "Report of the Joint Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics," May 1976.

future courses of action, and present their feelings and rationale to the Council of Ten."⁸²

The Joint Group met following the Directors' meeting, and recommended that the Faculty Representatives report to the Council of Ten include the women's views. However, Joint Group endorsed the Joint Committee's report recommending a single Conference governance structure.⁸³

The women presented their views to the Faculty Representatives at the same meeting, indicating their preference for continuation of the informal affiliation, and asked whether women had the right to be different in the organization and administration of their programs.⁸⁴

The Faculty Representatives report to the Council of Ten recommended an ultimate goal of single Conference governance structure with provisions for the participation of both men and women in its development and operation. After carefully disclosing the women's preference for more time to organize, the Faculty Representatives recommended the converse, specifying that the structure "be developed as quickly as possible."⁸⁵ The recommendation for rapid development seemed to be ignored by the Presidents, according to Fleming:

82 Ibid.

83 Ibid.

84 Ibid.

85 Ibid.

The view that the presidents will ultimately take is not very clear, but I suspect there is a majority in favor of letting the women remain independent a while longer, though with some device for working out a common set of rules. Upon reflection after the meeting, I wonder whether the way to do it isn't simply to set up a phased period of five years in which women's athletics can develop, but at the end of which time we would expect it all to be under one structure...⁸⁶

Nevertheless the Women's Athletic Directors asked the Council of Ten in July 1976 to reject the Faculty Representatives' recommendations, and allow the Women to continue in the current pattern until the Title IX policies on athletics were released.⁸⁷ In addition, the women submitted an AIAW-oriented philosophy statement, and a formal operational code for the women's group. The code called for an informal liaison with the Big Ten, the use of AIAW rules and regulations, and internal governance of the group.⁸⁸

In July the Council of Ten indicated support for the Faculty Representatives' views although not the "quick development" clause. The Council conceded that:

Over a period of time it is probable...that the rules for handling men's and women's sports will tend to come closer together rather than more divergent. If this is

⁸⁶ Fleming, Memorandum to Canham and Plant on Big Ten Presidents' Discussion of Athletics, 11 May 1976, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

⁸⁷ The NCAA was actively working to limit the jurisdiction of Title IX, while the AIAW was attempting to sustain the law. See Szady, "Evolution of Athletic Scholarships for Women."

⁸⁸ "Big Ten Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Directors' Organization Philosophical Position, Operational Code, and Recommendations," 29 July 1976, Athletic Department Papers.

so, we would all be better off if we were working towards a single organization for handling both groups rather than going separate ways.

In September, the Big Ten constituents were notified that the Council would explore the single structure concept via a committee chosen by the Council. An ad hoc committee was appointed in December 1976.⁸⁹

The Presidents' actions, along with the Faculty Representatives' disregard of the women's recommendation for continuance of the informal relationship with the Big Ten, precipitated a feeling among the Big Ten Women of being pushed into the Conference. This disregard of the women's views reinforced the necessity of equitable participation opportunities in Conference governance. At their November 1976 meeting, the Women reaffirmed their desire to function under the AIAW regulations, and, doubting that possibility within the Conference, wished to continue their informal Conference affiliation.⁹⁰

The preliminary report of the Ad Hoc Committee proved to be reactive to the views of the Big Ten Women. In studying the possibilities of a single Conference structure

⁸⁹ Council of Ten (Fleming), Memorandum to Duke et al on Administration of Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, 10 September 1976, Athletic Department Papers; and Council of Ten Minutes, 13 December 1976, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

⁹⁰ ACWIA Minutes, 7 February 1977, Athletic Department Papers.

In January 1977, the Board in Control supported continued membership in AIAW, and the Women's informal affiliation with the Big Ten. Board in Control Minutes, 25 January 1977, Athletic Department Papers.

for both men's and women's athletics, the Committee concluded that a single structure was not requisite. In lieu of the structure, the Committee recommended that the men's and women's athletic directors meet during the next two years to discuss the Women's Big Ten Championships and program cost-reduction efforts. At the end of two years if a more formal affiliation was desirable, then an ad hoc committee of the Council of Ten would develop the structure; if a more formal affiliation was not desired, then the Conference would sever its relationship with the Women's Programs.⁹¹

While the Women were satisfied with the Committee report, the Faculty Representatives were critical of its "course of inaction." They believed that:

...Failure to deal with the issues in a prompt and straightforward manner will result in a proliferation rather than reduction of costs; unnecessary litigation; unnecessary conflict and deterioration of morale within athletic departments and ultimately in a more difficult rather than less difficult situation to handle.⁹²

The Faculty Representatives presented two alternatives to the Council of Ten: 1) Provide separate funding and development for women's athletics at the institutional level, which would segregate the programs, alleviate the men's funding concerns, and relieve the Conference (and the

⁹¹ "Preliminary Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics to Council of Ten," 12 April 1977, Athletic Department Papers.

⁹² "Statement of Faculty Representatives" (to the Council of Ten), 18 May 1977, Athletic Department Papers.

men) of attempting to incorporate the Women in its structure; or 2) Delegate to the Faculty Representatives the jurisdiction to develop a single structure with adequate representation and development for men's and women's athletics, maintaining faculty control, and achieving necessary cost reductions.

Again in December the Faculty Representatives suggested to the Council of Ten that the incorporation of the Women's Programs might not be necessary, as HEW did not require equal governance structures for equitable opportunity. If AIAW and Big Ten differences could be facilitated on each campus, and if the NCAA and AIAW difference could be resolved on the national level, then the inclusion would be nonessential. The Council of Ten chose to maintain the status quo.⁹³ However, in April 1978 the Presidents of Purdue and Minnesota initiated some movement by proposing that a separate women's athletic conference be organized under the direct control of the Council of Ten⁹⁴

⁹³ "Statement of Faculty Representatives" (to the Council of Ten), 2 December 1977; and Joint Group Minutes, 29 December 1977, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

The Big Ten Presidents may have been waiting for the outcome of the NCAA's lawsuit to invalidate Title IX (NCAA v. Califano, 444 F.Supp. 425 (D.Kan. 1978), which was dismissed in January 1978) or the release of HEW's policy interpretations (proposed interpretations released in December 1978).

⁹⁴ Laurence Noble (Northwestern Univ.), Special note to Faculty Representatives and Athletic Directors, 4 April 1978, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

Michigan remained supportive of AIAW's efforts in 1978. However, the resolution of the NCAA/AIAW differences would be affected by Title IX. Fleming reported the following positions taken by the Big Ten and Pacific Athletic Conference (PAC 10) Presidents and Chancellors:

To encourage the NCAA and AIAW to work together with the ultimate goal of merger, but not to try and force a single organization at this point in time.

...The predominant feeling is that until HEW settles down on what the rules of the game are, it is extremely difficult to know how to put together the two major associations [NCAA and AIAW].⁹⁵

July 1978 marked the end of the three year adjustment period for Title IX compliance. However, most university athletic departments awaited HEW's policy interpretations of the intercollegiate athletic provisions of Title IX, specifically the treatment of revenue-producing sports.⁹⁶

In December 1978 the proposed policy interpretations were released, and while revenue-producing sports remained under Title IX, special deviations were allowed based on the nature of particular sports, such as football. An additional clarification stated that rules and regulations of athletic associations (e.g. NCAA and AIAW differences) did not relieve the institution of Title IX compliance

⁹⁵ Fleming, Memorandum to the Board in Control and Canham, 14 August 1978; and Fleming to Charlotte West (President, AIAW) 6 March 1978, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

⁹⁶ Various attempts were made to exclude revenue-producing sport from the jurisdiction of Title IX to no avail. See U.S., Dept. of H.E.W., "HEW News: Opinion of the HEW General Counsel Reaffirming the Applicability to Revenue-Producing Intercollegiate Athletics of Title IX," 27 April 1978.

obligations. The Faculty Representatives were immediately concerned with the Big Ten and AIAW differences in eligibility, transfer rules, and the men's five year eligibility period compared to the women's four years.⁹⁷

The movement away from incorporating the Women's Programs into the Big Ten Conference again surfaced in May 1979 when a recommendation was made to the Joint Group that a separate women's athletic conference be formed either within or outside of the existing Conference. This notion was supported by the Council of Ten's view that the Conference was for men's athletics only.⁹⁸

The new decade brought significant change in the AIAW and NCAA. In January 1980 the AIAW announced a three year television contract for coverage of its championship events. This signaled a financial commitment which, in addition to sustaining the organization, would also allow the AIAW to begin to defray participant expenses. Women's athletics could begin to function on a parallel with the NCAA. The NCAA, on the other hand, announced plans to sponsor women's championships for Division II and III schools, a direct

⁹⁷ "Statement of Faculty Representatives" (to the Council of Ten), 13 April 1979, Plant Papers, Box 2, MHC.

A significant difference between the AIAW and NCAA was the recruiting of athletes--AIAW did not allow the same type of recruiting as the NCAA did. Many women felt that the Title IX interpretation would use the NCAA model as the standard, thus requiring women's athletics to initiate a program phase that they had intentionally avoided since their inception.

⁹⁸ Joint Group Minutes, 14 May, and 3 December 1979, Athletic Department Papers.

challenge to the AIAW's authority. The AIAW again sought relief by proposing a five year moratorium on all NCAA championships for women.⁹⁹

The NCAA's plans for women's championships received more support than their 1975 attempt in part due to a change in leadership. Prior to 1972, 95 percent of the women's athletic programs had female leadership, whereas in 1980 female leadership had dropped to 36 percent.¹⁰⁰ This drop in leadership, and the accompanying support for the NCAA plan, weakened the viability of the AIAW.

Following the NCAA's lead, the Joint Group recommended to the Council of Ten that:

Universities which want to incorporate their women's intercollegiate athletic programs into the [Big Ten Conference] be permitted to join the Conference with the understanding that appropriate methods will be established to provide adequate women's representation.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ The Special NCAA Committee of Governance, Organization and Services had reported in December 1979 that "the committee concluded...that it is feasible, economically and administratively, to accommodate women within the NCAA structure." With this action the NCAA moved ahead with its plans for women's championships.

From a budgetary standpoint, the NCAA championship structure was superior to the AIAW's, as the NCAA proposed provisions for travel and per diem funds for participants. This lure, in addition to expanded recruiting allowed by the NCAA, was very attractive to the highly competitive women's programs. (Unfortunately the provisions lasted only a few years.)

¹⁰⁰ Fields, Cheryl M., "Small College Association May Offer Women's Championships in Nine Sports," Chronicle of Higher Education, 14 April 1980, p. 1.

¹⁰¹ "Faculty Representatives Report to the Council of Ten," 5 May 1980, Athletic Department Papers.

The Presidents reacted favorably to the recommendation and adopted the following resolution:

That the Faculty Representatives, augmented by a second faculty person from each institution (to ensure balanced perspectives), shall establish a task force to prepare a plan for incorporating women's intercollegiate athletics in the Big Ten Conference. To the extent feasible, a report shall be presented to the Council of Ten by December 15th, including a timetable for implementation of a new Conference structure which ensures adequate women's representation.¹⁰²

The Special Task Force on Conference Reorganization had initial consensus on two faculty representatives, one or two University boards to determine athletic policy, eight men's and eight women's sports for membership, and one Conference vote per University. The Women's Athletic Directors' asked the Task Force to consider: 1) enlarging the Joint Group to include the Women's Athletic Directors; 2) the continuation of use of the AIAW rules for competition; 3) 50 percent representation on all Conference committees; and 4) Co-Commissioners named for the Conference. The Directors of Athletics opposed enlarging the Joint Group because it threatened the one vote per institution principle, and would make the Joint Group unwieldy.¹⁰³

¹⁰² Council of Ten Minutes, 7 July 1980, Athletic Department Papers.

¹⁰³ Joint Group Minutes, 20 October 1980; and Director of Athletics Minutes, 10 November 1980, Athletic Department Papers.

In addition, the Joint Group gave no support to the AIAW's request to have the initiation of the NCAA women's championship postponed, and furthermore, they took no position on the anticipated NCAA legislation for expansion into Division I women's championships.

The interim report of the Task Force stated, among other points, that 1) each University should have the option to determine whether its women's program should join the Conference; 2) if the women's program joins, then the University should function under a single athletic board; 3) each University should have one vote; and 4) the duties of the Commissioner should be retained.¹⁰⁴

In January 1981 the NCAA moved to conduct women's championships in all divisions, allowing women's programs a four year transition period to affiliate with the NCAA. This action foreshadowed the demise of the AIAW. The Directors of Athletics agreed in February that the women's programs would remain with the AIAW for the year, and made recommendations for the reorganization of the Conference. While agreeing with most aspects of the Task Force's interim report, the Directors suggested a four year evaluation period with yearly institutional declarations of women's championship affiliation (a parallel to the NCAA action), one Faculty Representative, with an optional alternate Faculty Representative, and women's coaches to meet in the same pattern as the men's coaches.¹⁰⁵

The Council of Ten supported the Task Force's report with the Directors' recommendations in May 1981. The Task

¹⁰⁴ Joint Group Minutes, 1 December 1980, Athletic Department Papers.

¹⁰⁵ Director of Athletics Minutes, 15 February 1981, Athletic Department Papers.

Force plan would be implemented when the women's programs of six member institutions became affiliated with the Conference. Michigan's Board in Control approved affiliation in June 1981, and by August 1981 nine women's programs had agreed to affiliate with the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference. A Transition Committee was appointed by the Joint Group in August 1981.¹⁰⁶

Competition and Funding

Thus as the viability of the AIAW diminished, the Big Ten Conference became its logical successor. While Michigan participated in the AIAW championship format throughout this period (which emphasized more in-state opponents), competition with Conference schools increased as the Big Ten Women's Programs developed, and as funding became available. The shift coincided with the initial broadening to opponents on a national level rather than solely in-state competition. An analysis of Michigan's opponents is shown in Table 3. Between 1973 and 1977 in-state opponents dominated the schedules of the Michigan's women's teams, compared to the more equitable balance in 1977-81. Big Ten opponents

¹⁰⁶ "Report of the Transition Committee," 25 August 1981; and Board in Control Minutes, 30 June 1981, Athletic Department Papers.

increased from 20 to 28 percent prior to affiliating with the Conference.¹⁰⁷

TABLE 3

AVERAGE PERIOD PERCENTAGES BY TYPE OF OPPONENT*

Type of Opponents	1973-77	1977-81
In-State	81%	51%
Out of State	19%	49%
Big Ten	20%	28%

* Basketball, field hockey, swimming/diving, synchronized swimming, tennis, and volleyball were tracked for this analysis. (For all 11 sports in 1980-81 the breakdown was 46 percent in-state, 54 percent out of state, and 31 percent Conference opponents.)

The opportunities for competition increased as the locale of opponents broadened. Inspecting the schedules of the six original sports, growth is indicated in all categories of competition.¹⁰⁸ Table 4 reveals that total competitive opportunities jumped from 64.25 in 1973-77, to 117.25 in 1977-81. A 35 percent increase is seen in dual contests, and an 153 percent increase in tournaments and invitationals.

¹⁰⁷ All data in this section were derived from University of Michigan Athletic Department records.

¹⁰⁸ In comparison to Smith's findings, Michigan approximated the national data for average number of varsity contests per sport in the six women's sports in 1974-75, with the exception of basketball and tennis which were low. In 1978-79, Michigan gained pace and equaled or surpassed the national averages in nine of ten sports, the exception being golf. Smith, p. 27.

Table 4

AVERAGE PERIOD FREQUENCIES BY TYPE OF COMPETITION*

Type of Competition	1973-77	1977-81
Total Competitive Opportunities	64.25	117.25
Dual Contests	53.75	72.50
Tournaments and Invitationals	9.50	24.00

* For all 11 sports in 1980-81 there were 207 total competitive opportunities, including 108 dual contests, and 61 tournaments and invitationals.

Program growth can also be quantified in terms of financial outlay for the program. The total funding for the women's intercollegiate program for the initial formative year 1973-74 was approximately \$19,000 (including coaching salaries) according to Hartwig. In 1974-75, following the acceptance of the ACWIA report and the formalization of the varsity program, the funding was \$80,000 (including coaches and Hartwig's salary) for the six original sports. Salaries for the coaches and assistant coaches of the six sports in 1974-75 totaled \$20,000, compared to \$55,000 in 1980-81 for the same six sports. (For the 11 sports in 1980-81, the coaching staff total was over \$90,000.) The operating budgets (including transportation, meals, hotels, officials, equipment) for the six sports in 1974-75 was \$19,000, while the operating budget items for the same six sports in 1980-81 was \$63,000. (For the 11 sports in 1980-81 the total

annual budget was \$456,600, which reflects the inception of scholarships, recruiting, trainers, technical program aids, and other additions.)

After commencing as an enhanced sports club program in Fall 1973, women's intercollegiate athletics at the University of Michigan matured into a varsity program ready to take on the challenge of the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference schedule of competition in 1981-82. The growth and expansion of the women's varsity athletic program was enhanced by Title IX. In an action which paralleled the program's inception based on the needs of women athletes and not by a threat of legal action under Title IX, the Regents arose to support the concept of women's intercollegiate athletics at the University by issuing the following statement when the strengths and jurisdiction of Title IX were threatened locally and nationally:

Whereas, the Board of Regents recognize that the recent Federal District Court decision in *Othen v. Ann Arbor School Board* has held that Title IX...applies only to "...programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance..."; and

Whereas, proposed revisions of Title IX recently introduced in Congress would restrict the application of Title IX to programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance; and

Whereas, neither the Board in Control nor the Athletic Department is such a "...program or activity..."; nonetheless, the Regents wish to reaffirm the position expressed in Regents' By-Law 14.06 with particular respect to women's intercollegiate athletics;

It is resolved, that the Regents reaffirm their commitment to principles of non-discrimination in intercollegiate athletics programs, as well as in other activities, and direct the Board in Control of

Intercollegiate Athletics and the Athletic Department staff to continue their efforts to that end.¹⁰⁹

Thus the future of the women's varsity intercollegiate athletic program was assured a recognized and sustained position within the University of Michigan.

¹⁰⁹ Proceedings, September 1981, p. 87.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to compile the history of women's intercollegiate athletics at the University of Michigan. The history was limited to the period prior to the formal affiliation of Michigan's women's intercollegiate athletic program with the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference, 1922-1981. The organization and administration of the program as viewed through the policies, philosophies and practices is the focus of the study.

Findings

The following research questions were posed for this study:

- (1) What was the influence of Margaret Bell and her interest in the Women's Athletic Association on women's intercollegiate athletics for women at the University of Michigan?
- (2) To what extent have the programs, policies and philosophies of women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan been aligned with the national organizations governing women's athletics?

(3) How did organizational and administrative changes in Physical Education affect women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan?

(4) What was the role of the sports club era (1970-73) in the transition to varsity athletics?

(5) What was the effect of Title IX on women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan?

The first research question addressed Margaret Bell's influence on women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan. During her tenure (1923-1957) as director of the Department of Physical Education for Women (DPEW), Bell provided limited opportunities for participation in women's intercollegiate athletics. These opportunities, which conformed with the national guidelines for women's athletics, were sponsored by the Women's Athletic Association (WAA) under the control of the DPEW. Hartwig, a protege of Bell, served as the WAA advisor from the early 1930s through 1970, as Acting Director of the DPEW from 1967 through 1970, and as the first administrator of the women's varsity athletic program from 1973 through 1976. Bell's influence on the philosophy and administration of women's intercollegiate athletics were reflected in fifty of the fifty-nine year span of this study.

The second research question focused on the alignment of Michigan's women's intercollegiate athletic program with the national organizations governing women's athletics. The organizations central to question are the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW), the Division of

Girls and Women's Sports (DGWS), and their predecessors. Examination of the affiliation of Michigan's athletic programs and faculty to these organizations, and the congruence of Michigan's philosophy with those of the organizations, indicate the extent of the alignment.

Perhaps Phebe Scott best stated the strength of the relationship of the national women's athletic organizations and women physical educators: "For many years no professional woman in her right mind would ever oppose the pronouncement of DGWS and this has had some very positive results,..."¹ Many DPEW staff members were affiliated with American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (the parent organization of DGWS) and six staff members were prominent leaders in the national organizations (Bell, Campbell, Hartwig, Ley, Rotvig, and Ocker). In addition, the philosophy of Michigan's leaders of women's athletics--Bell, Hartwig, and Ocker--have exhibited a strong DGWS-AIAW orientation continuously.

The orientation of these leaders is reflected in the program affiliations during most of the history of Michigan women's athletics. However, the sports club era (1970-1973) stand in sharp contrast to the formal affiliations with the national organizations. The women's sports clubs did not join the AIAW for three reasons: (1) lack of funds for annual dues, (2) inability to meet AIAW standards, and (3)

¹ Hodgdon, p. 124.

ability to compete with other Michigan schools without affiliating with the AIAW or the State of Michigan Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (SMIAIW). The SMIAIW standards were the focus of the students' presentation to the Regents in 1973 when the opportunity to compete was threatened. Immediately with the inception of the women's varsity athletic program in 1973, Michigan joined the AIAW, SMIAIW, and the Midwest Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and remained affiliated with the AIAW through 1981.

Historically Michigan's policies governing women's athletics have reflected those of the national organizations. The 1923 National Amateur Athletic Federation (NAAF) platform that promoted sports programs for all women, conducted and controlled by qualified women, and that was against "highly intensive specialized competition" permeated women's athletic policy nationally from 1923 to 1957, and was reflected in Bell's comments during her tenure as well as the DPEW policies dated 1936 through 1955.² The 1957 and 1963 DGWS policy statements, while reaffirming the NAAF platform, recognized intercollegiate competition, and coincided with the DPEW and WAA's philosophies of the 1960s. The inconsistency of Michigan's affiliation with DGWS policy was due to the lack of funding rather than a difference in belief.

² Gerber, pp. 71-76.

In the sports club era, Hartwig and the sports club athletes and coaches respected the AIAW standards, yet had no avenue to facilitate their formal adoption. In 1973 the Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CSIAW) report incorporated the AIAW standards into their recommendations, particularly their statements regarding the Amateur Principle their stance against athletic scholarships. The women's varsity athletic program at Michigan functioned within the AIAW standards from 1973 to 1981.

Michigan conformed to the national trends in women's athletics from its initial program organization under the leadership of women physical educators (in contrast with men's athletics which originated as student-led activities), through the recognition of extramurals as an appropriate form of intercollegiate competition in the 1960s. Only the lack of financial support in the mid-1960s, as well as the withdrawal of Physical Education administrative support in the early 1970s, mitigated against the incorporation of the national trends. From 1973 through 1981, Michigan recovered, and once again conformed with the national trends in women's intercollegiate athletics.

The third research question examined the affect of organizational and administrative changes in Physical Education on women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan. Since the initiation of the physical training program for

women in 1896, the DPEW was part of three administrative restructurings. In all three changes the DPEW was organizationally relocated as a unit with no disturbance to the women's athletic portion of the program. From its designation as a service unit, the DPEW was incorporated into the Division of Hygiene and Public Health in 1921, moved under the Board in Control in 1926, and transferred to the Department of Physical Education and Athletics in 1941.

In 1967 an Advisory Review Committee on Athletics was appointed prior to the retirement of Fritz Crisler. While the report of this committee had no direct impact on women's athletics, it spurred a 1968 re-evaluation of the physical education requirement. The abolition of the requirement in 1969, and its concurrent effect on the DPEW and the men's physical education program staffs enhanced the possibility of a merger of the departments.

After two years of negotiations the women's and men's department were merged in 1970. As a result, the WAA function became a facet of the Recreation Program under the label of women's sports clubs. This had a significant impact on women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan. Essentially Michigan chose to house its women's athletic program in the Recreation Program as recreational sports clubs while the national trend was towards a women's varsity athletic program administered either by the physical education or athletic departments. The Recreation Program was hospitable to the women's clubs. However, due to their

recreational focus, they found it philosophically impossible to support and nurture a women's varsity program under the guise of sports clubs. This left the women's sports clubs at an organizational impasse: women's athletics were no longer recognized as a responsibility of the Department of Physical Education, the Recreation Program provided no avenue for recognition as an athletic program, and the Athletic Department considered women's athletics to be a responsibility of the Recreation Program.

The fourth research question focused on the sports club era's, and its role in the transition to varsity athletics. After the relegation of women's athletics to the Recreation Program, the desire of the women athletes continued the concept of a women's intercollegiate athletic program at Michigan, which eventually led to a varsity program. One could speculate that if the intercollegiate program had not been sustained (perhaps because the women's sports clubs had turned towards recreational pursuits), then the women athletes might have pursued independent athletic competition through organizations external to the University, leaving the Federbush Title IX complaint and ensuing Federal investigations or litigation to justify the creation of a varsity program. Instead the women athletes pursued intercollegiate opportunities through the sports club mode thereby establishing a continuity of competition with neighboring institutions, a core of women athletes in the

University, and coaches in the Ann Arbor area. Because these students persevered in their continuation of the tradition of women's intercollegiate athletic competition, the SMAIAW blacklisting of non-member schools had a serious impact on competitive opportunities which brought the deficiencies of women's athletics to the attention of the administration.

When the varsity program was initiated in the Fall of 1973, competitive scheduling and facility arrangements had been formulated by the sports club managers and basic equipment and uniforms were on hand which alleviated large initial expenditures. The returning women athletes were ready. The women's sports clubs had maintained a infrastructure for utilization in the development of as a varsity athletic program.

The final research question addressed the effects of Title IX on women's intercollegiate athletics at Michigan. Title IX had two major effects during the period 1973-1981: (1) The existence of Title IX indirectly influenced decisions relating to women's athletics because the educational environment was cognizant of its ramifications; and (2) The guidelines and interpretations of Title IX directly influenced athletic policy decisions. The decisions to appoint the CSIAW and to initiate the varsity program for women, and the symbolic decision to award the same block M athletic awards to both women and men were

enhanced by the University's awareness of the implications of Title IX, although not a direct result of the law.

In contrast the addition of women's varsity sports (after gymnastics), the expansion of the women's athletic scholarship program, and the restriction of participant eligibility standards were directly affected by Title IX reviews, investigations, or grievances at Michigan. Title IX also affected the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) decisions to promote women's athletics. This action weakened the AIAW, which led to Michigan's decision to affiliate its women's athletic program with the NCAA and the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference.

Implications

At the primary level of analysis, this study establishes Michigan's lengthy history of providing intercollegiate athletics opportunities for women. This history should rectify the perception that the inception of women's athletics at Michigan occurred in 1973. This belief disregards the multitude of women athletes who have represented the University of Michigan in various forms of intercollegiate competition since 1922.

Further analysis indicates that Michigan's program has been conservative relative to the national trends in women's athletics, while it was active in some periods, it was never on the cutting edge. The conservative characteristics

parallel the perception that the major influences on women's athletics have been external to the University, such as the policies and philosophies of the NAAF, DGWS, SMAIAW, AIAW, and Title IX.

There is little evidence that the University administration took an active interest in women's athletics prior to 1973. This indifference can be interpreted as either agreement or unfamiliarity with the function of the women's program. There have been few, if any, attempts by the University to upgrade women's athletics to a position of national leadership similar to those pursued or attained by other programs.

The longevity of the tenures of the three major leaders of Michigan's programs (Bell-34 years, Hartwig-45 years, and Ocker-25 years), along with the fact that Hartwig and Ocker were internal appointments (Hunt, an external appointment, served only one year) indicates that the University has been satisfied with maintaining the status quo in terms of leadership and direction of the program. Whether this point of view has been that of the Athletic Director or the central administration or both is unclear. Perhaps the lack of interest on the part of the central administration has been in part a by-product of the autonomous position the Athletic Department has held within the University.

Since the flurry of central administration activity surrounding the inception of the women's varsity program in 1973, most of the administration's interests stem from Title

IX and Affirmative Action affairs. The outward appearance of the women's athletic program has been that the Athletic Department has fulfilled all its obligations to provide an equitable program of athletics for women, but has not extended itself to fully embrace the women's program.³ The implication of this set of circumstances is that until the University asserts the need for more attention to women's athletics than what is now deemed adequate, or until there is a change in the top level administrators of the Athletic Department, little will change in the approach taken to the administration of women's athletics at Michigan.

The University, the Board in Control and the women's athletic program, needs to re-examine the goals and objectives of the program, along with strategies to achieve the objectives. This is especially important in view of the state of men's athletics today. Essentially the University needs to define success for women's athletics, the effects on the academic-athletic balance, its implications for the student-athlete, for funding and for facilities, and then implement a plan for its attainment.

³ Some of the men's programs also experience this lack of attention. See Janet Kittel, "A History of Intercollegiate Athletic Administration at the University of Michigan" (Ph.D. dissertation, UM, 1984), pp. 168-69.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations are made for further study:

(1) A history and organizational study of the Women's Athletic Association at Michigan, including its role in the history of women at the University: Intercollegiate competition was but one facet of the activities sponsored by the WAA. The WAA was the second most prominent women's organization on campus for many years.

(2) A history and organizational study of the Department of Physical Education for Women: The DPEW was the only gender specific department for women in the University. Its history would give evidence of the University's attitudes and actions relative to women on campus.

(3) An analysis of the coverage of women's sports in the Michigan Daily, Michigan Alumnus, and Michiganensian: Placement, frequency, size and content, as well as style of presentation has varied since 1895.

(4) Biographical studies of Margaret Bell, Laurie Campbell, and Marie Hartwig: This would provide an insight to the leadership these women gave to a variety of fields beyond women's athletics. These three women also represent some of the early women faculty members of the University.

(5) A compilation of the women's athletic records prior to 1973, including participants and event information: A comprehensive record would identify and recognize the

participants and their accomplishments, and would provide a basis for further research on participant demographics, competition parameters and specific sports.

(6) A study of Michigan's women's athletic program since its formal affiliation with the Big Ten Conference in 1981: The governance of women's athletics has changed under the Conference structure.

(7) A comparative study of the histories of women's intercollegiate athletics at other colleges and universities: The study would reveal the differences and similarities in the histories and the change agents, as compared to the Michigan model.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Ainsworth, Dorothy S. The History of Physical Education in Colleges for Women. New York: Barnes, 1930.
- Falla, Jack. NCAA: The Voice of College Sports, A Diamond Anniversary History, 1906-1981. Mission, KS: NCAA, 1981.
- Gerber, Ellen W.; Felshin, J.; Berlin, P.; and Wyrick, W. The American Woman in Sport. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1974.
- McGuigan, Dorothy G. A Dangerous Experiment: 100 Years of Women at the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: Continuing Education for Women, 1970.
- National Amateur Athletic Federation. Women and Athletics. New York: Barnes, 1930.
- Savage, Howard J.; Bentley, H. W.; McGovern, J. T.; and Smiley, D. F. American College Athletics. Bulletin 23. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1929.

Dissertations and Theses

- Brooke, William O., Jr. "Assessing the Impact of Title IX and Other Factors on Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Programs, 1972-1977: A National Study of Four-Year AIAW Institutions." Ed.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1979.
- Daniels, Mary A. "The Historical Transition of Women's Sports at the Ohio State University, 1885-1975 and Its Impact on the National Women's Intercollegiate Setting During That Period." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1977.
- Hodgdon, Paula Drake. "An Investigation of the Development of Interscholastic and Intercollegiate Athletics for Girls and Women from 1917-1970." D.Phys.Ed. dissertation, Springfield College, 1973.

- Johnson, Ruth Marjorie. "A Brief History of Physical Education for Women at the University of Michigan." M.A. thesis, University of Michigan, 1943.
- Kittell, Janet Ruth. "A History of Intercollegiate Athletic Administration at the University of Michigan." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1984.
- Nyikos, Michael Stephen. "A History of the Relationship Between Athletic Administration and Faculty Governance at the University of Michigan, 1945-1968." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.
- Smith, Gary B. "Effect of Title IX on Women's Athletics in Selected NCAA Division I Colleges and Universities." M.S. thesis, Western Illinois University, 1980.
- White, Kevin Michael. "An Appraisal of the Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Programs, and the Relationship to Men's Athletics, at Big Ten Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Institutions Before and After Title IX Implementation." Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1983.

Articles

- Bell, Margaret. "Michigan Women Enjoy Huge Sports Program." University of Michigan Football Program, 11 October 1944.
- _____. "The Doctor Discusses Basketball." In NSWA Basketball Guide, 1948-49, pp. 28-31. Edited by Marie D. Hartwig. New York: Barnes, 1948.
- Fields, Cheryl M. "Small Colleges Association May Offer Women's Championships in Nine Sports." Chronicle of Higher Education, 14 April 1980, p. 1.
- Huszczko, Adaline. "An 'Idealistic Approach' to Sports." Ann Arbor News, 6 January 1974, p. 15.
- Mortimer, Jeff. "Title IX: Reversing the Tide of Male Domination." Ann Arbor News, 20 January 1980, p. F1.
- _____. "Title IX and Collegiate Resistance." Ann Arbor News, 22 January 1980, p. B1.
- "Women's Athletics, IM Sports Funding Proposal Goes Before Regents This Week." University Record, 11 February 1974, p. 1.

Speeches

Ley, Katherine. "The Philosophy Relative to Competitive Activities." Speech at meeting of College Teachers of Physical Education for Women, Ann Arbor, MI, 2 December 1961.

Rotvig, Barbara. "Competition: Conflict in Values-- Implications for Sports." Speech at meeting of Michigan Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Saginaw, MI, 22 February 1962.

Public Documents

Michigan. Act of 1937.

_____. "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex." Federal Register 104, no. 108, 4 June 1975, Part II, 24128-45.

_____. Elimination of Sex Discrimination in Athletic Programs. September 1975.

_____. "HEW News: Opinion of HEW General Counsel Reaffirming the Applicability to Revenue-Producing Intercollegiate Athletics of Title IX." 27 April 1978.

University of Michigan (Ann Arbor) Sources

Athletic Department Papers.

Alumni Association Papers.

Bentley Historical Library. Michigan Historical Collection.

Margaret Bell Papers.

Eunice Burns Papers.

Department of Physical Education for Women Papers.

Marcus Plant Papers.

Michigan League Papers.

Office of Student Affairs Papers.

Office of the President Papers.

Vice President of Academic Affairs Papers.

Women's Athletic Association Papers.

Calendar of the University of Michigan, 1894-1898, 1902-1903.

Department of Physical Education for Women. "Annual Reports," 1924-1970.

Michigan Alumnus, 1898-1909, 1926.

Michigan Daily, 1896, 1898-1909, 1923-1928, 1934, 1942, 1952, 1957-1959, 1961-1962, 1966-1969.

Office of the General Counsel Papers.

Proceedings of the Regents' Meetings, 1895-1896, 1898, 1900, 1910, 1974, 1981.

Personal Papers

Ann Arbor, MI. Rodney Grambeau Papers.

_____. Marie Hartwig Papers.

_____. Sheryl Szady Papers.

Conversations

Barnes, Geraldine. Ypsilanti, MI. 25 September 1985.

Davenport, Elizabeth. Ann Arbor, MI. 14 October 1985.

Farrell, Joan. Ann Arbor, MI. 24 October 1984.

Galetti, Stephen. Ann Arbor, MI. 15 October 1984.

Harris, Ruth. Ann Arbor, MI. 24 October 1984.

Hartwig, Marie. Ann Arbor, MI. 1984-1986.

Hult, Joan. LaCrosse, WI. 26 May 1985.

Lindeman, Joyce. Ann Arbor, MI. 23 October 1984.

Ocker, Phyllis. Ann Arbor, MI. 1984-1986.

Parker, Lucy. Ypsilanti, MI. 20 September 1985.

Sutherland, Louise. Ann Arbor, MI. 11 May 1985.

van den Bosch, Elizabeth. Ann Arbor, MI. 21 October 1985.

Weikart, Phyllis. Ann Arbor, MI. 25 February 1986.

Cox, Thomas A. "Intercollegiate Athletics and Title IX." George Washington Law Review 46 (1977): 34-64.

Division for Girls and Women's Sports. "Statement of Policies and Procedures for Competition in Girls and Women's Sports." Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 28 (September 1957): 57-58.

_____. "Statement of Policies for Competition in Girls and Women's Sports." Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 34 (September 1963): 31-33.

_____. "Statement on Competition for Girls and Women." Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 36 (September 1965): 34-37.

_____. "National Intercollegiate Championships for Women." Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 39 (February 1968): 24-27.

Gerber, Ellen. "The Controlled Development of Collegiate Sport For Women, 1923-36." Journal of Sports History 2 (Spring 1975): 1-28.

Greenberg, Randi Jean. "AIAW vs. NCAA: The Takeover and Implications." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 47 (Winter 1984): 29-36.

Hult, Joan S. "The Governance of Athletics for Girls and Women: Leadership by Women Physical Educators, 1899-1949." Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport. Centennial Issue (April 1985): 64-77.

_____. "NAGWS: 1960-1985." Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance 56 (April 1985): 114-16.

Kadzielski, Mark A. "Post-Secondary Athletics in an Era of Equality: An Appraisal of the Effect of Title IX." Journal of College and University Law 5 (no. 2): 123-42.

Northrup, Ann. "A New Generation of Athletics: Winning with Title IX." Ms., September 1979, pp. 56-57.

"Sex Discrimination and Intercollegiate Athletics: Putting Some Muscle on Title IX." Yale Law Journal 88 (1979): 1254-79.

Uhlir, Ann. "Political Victim: The Dream That Was The AIAW." New York Times, 11 July 1982.

Walder, Barbara Jones. "Foremothers: Mrs. Hoover's Holy War on Athletics." Ms., n.d., pp. 23-24.

Weber, Ellen. "Revolution in Women's Sports." Ms., September 1974, pp. 33-59.

Periodicals

Chronicle of Higher Education, 1974-1981.

In the Running, Publication of the Women's Equity Action League, 1976-1981.

Project on the Status and Education of Women, Publication of the Association of American Colleges, 1974-1981.

Speeches

Hennis, Gail M. "ARECW--and the Past Makes the Future." Speech at the National Conference of the Athletic and Recreation Federation of College Women, Omaha, NB, 11-14 April 1965. In Assets for Leadership, pp. 9-14. n.p., 1965.

Public Documents

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "HEW Fact Sheet: Proposed Procedural Regulation for Civil Rights Enforcement." June 1975.

_____. "HEW Fact Sheet: Title IX--Civil Rights." June 1975.

_____. Final Title IX Regulations Implementing Education Amendments of 1972. 21 July 1975.

_____. "HEW News: Statement of David S. Tatel, Director, Office of Civil Rights." 27 April 1978.

_____. "A Policy Interpretation of Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics." Federal Register 44, no. 239, 11 December 1979, 71413-23.