

# Jeanne Dost: Women's Warrior at Oregon State University

By Cheyanne Simon

HST 407

Fall 2017

Mutschler

## INTRODUCTION

In the 1960s and 1970s, women in the workplace were often passed over for promotion, not given jobs, or assigned part-time work, because employers, often men, believed that a woman's role at home was more dominating than her potential as an employee. It was often assumed that working women were "housewives" supplying supplemental income, whereas men were the "breadwinners" and therefore were more deserving of employment. Employers were unaware of women's changing labor preferences, as it was no longer the universal goal for all women to be solely a mother and a wife. The same assumptions about women were made at Oregon State University. In 1968, Dr. Jeanne Dost was blatantly sexually discriminated against at Oregon State University. She applied for a tenure-track associate professor position at the Department of Economics in the realm of her academic specialty, Urban and Regional Economics. Rather than fully consider Jeanne Dost for the position, the school revoked the position entirely and instead hired a male instructor with a master's degree, who specialized in a subject already covered by multiple instructors in the department.<sup>1</sup>

After being fired from her post in 1971, Jeanne Dost refused to lose and lodged three separate complaints to receive her rightful position. First with Oregon State University's Faculty Review and Appeals Committee, then with the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and lastly with Oregon's Bureau of Labor Civil Rights Division. Meanwhile, Dost was unemployed, caring for her family and taking teaching posts where she could. Eventually, Jeanne Dost received her rightful position and much more, but she had to fight for it. Throughout Jeanne Dost's career at Oregon State, she witnessed countless injustices towards her gender and served as the first Director of the Women's Center and Women's Studies. As

head of a department that was constantly underfunded despite interest, she experienced the university's failures with affirmative action and a startling sexual harassment rate, which hindered the ability for female scholars to get jobs in academia and to even receive their education. Actions or lack of action by Oregon State University during the late 1960s and 1970s hindered scholarship and opportunity for women. This is exemplified and amplified through the experiences of Jeanne Dost. Her case serves as an example of a time where "friendships" often trumped merit in hiring situations, and women were still defined by their domestic roles.

In the world of academia, there are three levels of professorship, each of which come with their own pay tier, benefits and rank among other faculty members. Benefits can include but are not limited to research opportunities, research leave, sabbatical, travel funds and tenure. The lowest teaching tier is that of an assistant professor, during Dost's period of interest, these positions were often filled by graduate students in pursuit of their doctorate or master's degrees. Assistant professors were often appointed on temporary or a fixed-term basis, making job security almost impossible without increasing rank in the university system. Jeanne Dost worked at Oregon State University at the rank of assistant professor for almost ten years. The higher ranks are associate professor, which is a tenured position, meaning that it is yours unless you do not fulfill the position requirements, and full professorship. Full professorships often come with indefinite tenure, meaning that you will have a job until you retire, given that you fulfill all required duties.<sup>2</sup>

## THE OVERQUALIFIED ASSISTANT; JEANNE DOST'S BEGINNINGS AT OSU

Jeanne Dost began her academic career at Oregon State in 1962 after receiving her Doctorate in Economics from Harvard University in 1959, teaching briefly at Kansas State, and taking personal time off for her family.<sup>3</sup> It is unclear whether this was for child rearing or elderly care, both of which were gendered tasks that were typically done by women. She served as a part-time assistant instructor teaching various economic courses and inspiring undergraduates to pursue economic majors. Discrimination against Dr. Dost began from the beginning. When asked about departmental hiring policy by Dost, Economics Department chairman Dr. Harter responded that a male completing his doctorate thesis would be hired as an assistant professor and be considered for promotion to associate professor once their thesis was completed. Despite already having her Ph. D and teaching experience at Kansas State, Dost was immediately hired as an assistant professor and was not considered for promotion. Between her part-time hiring in 1962 and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's investigation launched in 1971, the Oregon State Department of Economics hired two men who at the time only held bachelor degrees, and one of them was not in the field of economics.<sup>4</sup>

Between 1962 and 1970, complaint reviewers concluded that Dost completed countless high-quality publications "at a rate above average for the department even though she ha[d] only been employed part-time<sup>5</sup>." She also served as Book Review Editor of *The Annals of Regional Science*, co-chairman of the NAACP committee at OSU, and as a member of both the Financial Aid Committee and Democratic Women's group on campus. At the same time, courses taught by Dost, including Regional and Urban Economics and Labor Economics, experienced steadily rising student interest. Moreover, Dost received admittance into conferences and

meetings, in which other department colleagues were turned down, specifically a meeting of the Western Economics Association in Vancouver, B.C. Dost's title was accepted while three departmental members were rejected. Many of her papers are interdisciplinary and explain connections between economics and sociological issues, more specifically connections between labor (or lack thereof) and gender. Her experiences and achievements showcase her qualifications and rank among others in the Department of Economics.<sup>6</sup> Most of the information about Dost's career and life came from her complaint investigations, and her obituary.

### **THE ECONOMIC DEPARTMENT'S ANTI-DOST AGENDA**

In 1968, the Oregon State University Department of Economics began its search for a professor of Economics specializing in Urban and Regional Economics. The department received interest from over 40 potential candidates and made offers to two males for the position, both rejected the offer for unrelated reasons.<sup>7</sup> Despite teaching the course on a part-time basis, specializing in the subject, and producing multiple papers on the subject, Jeanne Dost was never considered for the full-time teaching position in her specialty. At least seven people were fully considered for the position, meaning that they had potential to receive the job, Jeanne Dost was not one of them to be fully considered. Several department members supported the decision to reject Dost's application. The reasons given for not fully considering Dost was that she had been out of graduate school for too long, and as a result was "rusty" in the subject matter. In academia, this mentality makes it increasingly difficult for mothers, and other workers who take time-off, to find work because recent graduates would always be freshly

educated and desirable. Work completed at home was not deemed valuable, therefore motherhood led to a glaring gap on their resume and an attitude that as a candidate, they were less competitive.

Failing to find an adequate fit for the position, the department eventually abandoned their search for a full-time instructor and gave the Urban and Regional Economics courses to Dr. Dost to teach on a part-time basis.<sup>8</sup> Rather than promoting Dost to full-time status, the Department of Economics decided to promote Frank Miller to full-time status. At the time of full-time promotion, Frank Miller was a graduate student at Oregon State University and his specialty was International Trade and Latin American Economics, which was a specialty already covered by two professors in the department. There was no search involved, and no other candidates interviewed, Frank Miller essentially received his position by default. In consequence, the Department of Economics decided to expand course offerings that coincided with Miller's specialty, and reduced the course offering of Regional Economics to one term and completely dropped Urban Economics.

This curricular shift appeared odd to Dost, considering the interest in these courses "steadily rose" while she taught them. It is possible, had the other men accepted the position to teach Urban and Regional Economics, that these courses would not have been reduced. Dost believed that "there is evidence to suggest that course offerings have been amplified in some areas and/or restricted in others to justify hiring practices."<sup>9</sup> By giving Dost the courses, but not the full-time status, Oregon State University essentially endorsed the teaching ability of Dost but denied her the respect, status, and pay a man would receive in the same position. Because she was still teaching the courseload of a full-time teacher despite being employed exclusively

on a part-time basis, Dost complained to the Assistant Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Science. Her reasoning was simply that she should get equal pay for equal work. The response to this complaint was to reduce her workload, rather than promote her to a full-time slot.<sup>10</sup> “Wage justice” was a major component of labor feminism beginning in the 1950s, as women were often given a lesser wage than their male counterparts. By paying women less, employers were endorsing the single “breadwinner” model, where women stayed home domestically and men supported the family financially. Wage feminists argue that everyone doing the same job should be given a suitable pay that is able to support dependents. However, unequal pay was so frequent at the University, and in other institutions, that equal pay would involve a complete redistribution of wages.<sup>11</sup>

It became immediately clear to Dost and those deciding her complaints, that personal opinions of Dost affected the judgement of her teaching abilities. Many of her colleagues criticized her “pushy” behavior, and one went so far as to say that they would have supported her in the past, but withdrew their support because she started complaining about unequal treatment. “Pushy” is a word used to describe ambitious women whereas men were deemed “aggressive” and “charismatic.” Connotatively, both aggressive and charismatic can be seen as desirable qualities for an applicant, whereas “pushy” is entirely undesirable and embodies a dislikable person, often a woman. To push is to urge forward, to advance, especially when faced with resistance, which is exactly what Jeanne Dost was up against.<sup>12</sup>

For her part, Dost classified hiring in her department as “noncompetitive.” She noted that, Professor McFarland was hired as a “personal friend” of Dr. Wilkins, who is another department member. During her first year at Oregon State it was Wilkins who said that she

would be hired in the department “over his dead body.” It is also pertinent to point out that McFarland’s specialty is International Trade, the same as Frank Miller. Dost compared the Department of Economics to other departments on campus, where an assistant professor will often have had their doctorate and served as a postdoctoral fellow before achieving assistant professorship. As stated, Frank Miller was hired as an associate professor without even securing his doctorate. Dost argued that past “weaknesses in past procedures” relative to other departments should not have been used “when [she] was told [she] was not even considered as a candidate for the position.”<sup>13</sup>

At the end of the 1971 schoolyear, more than two years after applying for the full-time position, Jeanne Dost was not promoted to full-time, not promoted to associate professor and was informed that she would no longer have a job in the Department of Economics. Dost did not agree with the decision to fire her, and instead felt that she should have been promoted writing, “I should have been hired two years ago at the rank of Associate Professor if my qualifications and accomplishments had been evaluated in the same manner as males.”<sup>14</sup> Dost was held at a higher standard due to her gender, which was exemplified in her promotion pass over during 1968. In a letter addressed to three other graduate students In December of 1971, Jeanne Dost was offered part-time employment at graduate student pay, despite already having her Ph. D. and having been employed by the department for several years. She did not reply to this insulting offer.<sup>15</sup>



### **Unwilling to Lose: Dost's Professorship Perseverance**

Despite being fired from her post at Oregon State, Dost refused to be idle. Dost was a warrior and lined her artillery with what she could. Her first line of defense was to appeal the decision to Robert Newburgh, chairman of the University's Faculty Review and Appeals Committee, writing:

"I wish to request a review by your committee of the actions of the Department of Economics relative to my employment. Specifically, the Department has failed to appoint me on a full-time basis, has failed to appoint me to the rank of Associate Professor, and has informed me that I will not again be employed in the Department of Economics."<sup>16</sup>

After assessing and judging her sexual discrimination complaint against the Department of Economics, the Faculty and Appeals Committee instead thought that Dost was discriminated against personally, and therefore did not need immediate remedying. The Faculty Review and Appeals Committee noticed that since two women were previously offered jobs in the department, both refused, then there is no way that Jeanne Dost could have been discriminated against because of her gender. Regarding her personality, the committee found that "several members of the Department believe that Dr. Dost's 'pushy' behavior might have been disliked but tolerated in a man but was not in her case." The University Faculty Review and Appeals Committee concluded that Jeanne Dost was not discriminated against sexually saying:

"We doubt that there has been sex discrimination per se. The department has hired at least one woman in the past and has made job offers or offers of consideration to several women. However, there has been evidence of discrimination against Dr. Dost as an individual exclusive of her status as a woman. As a consequence we doubt that any future evaluations of Dr. Dost by the Department could be made in an unbiased way."

The committee ended their evaluation by recommending that *if* the department receives sufficient funding for a beginning economics instructor that Dost should be hired; and that *if* she was hired she should be considered for the rank of associate professor; and that *if* the Department should be seeking a Regional or Urban Economics instructor, qualifications from individuals outside of the university including Jeanne Dost should be considered. Despite these recommendations, no aspect of Jeanne Dost's unemployment was solved because no action was required.<sup>17</sup>

Dost heavily criticized the practices of the committee saying they spent an "inordinate amount of time evaluating [her] personality even though they found no one outside the department who had any particular difficulty associating with [her]." She pointed out the inequality of the whole procedure because no one else had to support their statements with evidence, where she had to provide proof for all of her statements. No one else was reviewed concurrently with her for an accurate evaluation of her abilities either, so there was not a realistic depiction of a full-time Economics professor for comparison. "Strengths and weaknesses of a candidate for promotion are relative to the strengths and weaknesses of the present members of the department," yet no one else's credentials were scrutinized for comparison. The Review and Appeal committee also said that there was no overwhelming evidence of her being qualified for her specialty, yet no one specializing in her field was interviewed for that judgement. She ended her statement with optimism pending that "an investigation might reveal that I should be considered for promotion to Professor."<sup>18</sup> Despite being told she is unqualified, she was confident in her credentials and wanted to challenge the lax, male-favoring ways of the Department of Economics.

Jeanne Dost had a few allies as well. She was apparently skeptical of the Faculty Review and Appeals Committee's effectiveness, as she had already launched a case with attorney and Director Marlaina Kiner from the federal Office of Civil Rights Health, Education and Welfare located in Seattle, Washington.<sup>19</sup> Additionally, upon hearing the news of her firing, 21 former students collaborated on a letter to Dr. Harter, who was head of the Department of Economics. In the letter, they pleaded for her reappointment and that "it would be a great loss to this university if someone of her capability and potential were not retained." The students were quick to point out Dost's compassionate and interactive behavior in the classroom and her impressive credentials as the book review editor of *The Annals of Regional Science*. They also demonstrated her commitment to Oregon State University students by donating her time to tutor the Honors Colloquia program, and her "concern for the needs and welfare of the students." This letter came as quite a surprise to Dost, as she had not told her classes that she was leaving the university. It was also received by University President Robert MacVicar, and Dean of Humanities Gordon Gilkey.<sup>20</sup>

Dost found another unexpected ally in former Oregon State University Professor of Landscape Architecture Richard Blakely. He retired from Oregon State in 1966, but that was enough time for him to gain admiration and respect for Jeanne Dost during their four years as colleagues. Blakely wrote letters to Dean of Students Stuart Knapp, Dean of Humanities Gordon Gilkey and famed Oregon State Senator Mark Hatfield regarding Jeanne Dost's situation at Oregon State. In his letter to Gordon Gilkey, Blakely reminisced about a time where him and Gilkey were together in his office discussing Jeanne Dost:

"If you remember when I was in your office the afternoon of June 17, 1971, I said to you that I had read through Jeanne's documents and that it was without doubt sex

discrimination. Your reply to me was, “I know it – I know it, and I’m going to help her.”<sup>21</sup>

Essentially, Blakely chastised Gordon Gilkey for not testifying on behalf of Jeanne Dost during the in-house evaluation for the Faculty Review and Appeals Committee, but appealed to him emotionally by saying that he sympathized “with the bind [he] [was] in between the Economics Department and the President [MacVicar].”<sup>22</sup> It is unclear what “bind” he is talking about, but it is reasonable to assume that Gilkey wanted to please both parties, and by remaining silent on Jeanne Dost’s behalf, he was not disrupting the regular activities of President MacVicar or the Department of Economics. This is an example of how many influential people recognized Dost’s oppression, yet few were willing to come to her aid.

### **Outside of the University: Others Decide Dost’s Fate at OSU**

On November 12, 1971, the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) reviewed Jeanne Dost’s sexual discrimination complaint against OSU. After completing the investigation, her complaint was deemed valid. Much of the evidence from their investigation relied on the hiring practices of the Department of Economics before and since the dismissal of Dost. The report demonizes Dr. Harter for his decision to hire Don Farness in 1970. Harter wrote “Don is a likeable person and a reasonably good economist, even though he was not our best candidate. Although on purely rational grounds we should not have rehired him, friendships won out.” Harter demonstrated that merit and qualifications were not the most important factors in choosing an employee. Above all, likeability decided who would be employed in the Department. To HEW, this was evidence of the loose attitude the Department of Economics had regarding their employees. In another statement, Harter said “instead of

hiring one of the applicants I had interviewed, the Department hired him. They did so even though it was obvious to me that one of his references warned us he would not be a good teacher.” It is not stated who testified about Harter’s confessions, but this quote further exemplifies how, despite hiring educators at a university, teaching ability was not a heavily considered aspect of employment decisions. The Department of Economics frequently valued friendly persons over competent teachers. It also exemplifies how once her complaint left the University, Dost’s colleagues were willing to anonymously testify on her behalf.

Because they consulted people outside of Oregon State University, HEW thought that she was more than qualified compared to the Department of Economics as a whole. Her teaching ability was fair, with many student evaluations indicating that she was an excellent instructor. Her papers were regarded as very good “scholastically and academically,” according to Professor of Economics Michael Mischailov of Western Washington State College. Mischailov and Dost became colleagues during her stint teaching at Western Washington State College while progressing her investigation. Since the failure to appoint Dost during the 1968-1969 school year, three full-time staffers have been hired, none of which had credentials drastically different than Dost’s.

Regarding sexual discrimination, it was evident to those presiding over Dost’s complaint that Jeanne Dost was held at a higher standard than her male colleagues, as her accomplishments in teaching, publications, education, service to the department and the university, and involvement in the community were favorable to theirs. HEW also noticed the lack of females in the department. Never in the history of the Department of Economics had a female held a full-time permanent appointment. An unnamed member of the department

admitted that people who receive part-time appointment are often discriminated against because they will continue to accept part-time work. He also stated that women are more likely to receive part-time work because it is likely that a man with a part-time appointment would have to seek a second job for income, whereas “housewives” would be suitable for part-time work. This assumption was frequent in the time period. People associated gender with financial responsibility when it was not always the case.

HEW’s investigation found that The Oregon State Department of Economics violated section 202 of Executive Order 11375 by sexually discriminating against Jeanne Dost in her quest for full-time employment during the 1968-1969 school year.

“The employer cannot require a female employee or applicant for employment to have better or different qualifications than those that are required of the least qualified male employees and applicants for employment. Inconsistencies in recruitment procedures cannot be considered as simply poor personal policy when those procedures consistently work in the favor of male applicants and to the disadvantage of female applicants. They are discriminatory and in violation of Executive Order 11246, as amended.”<sup>23</sup>

The law states that “the contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin...Such action shall include, but not be limited to the following: employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship.”<sup>24</sup> HEW found that Dost was discriminated against sexually by failure to promote. In order to correct these actions, Dost was to be paid for the 1968-1969 and 1970-1971 school years and be reinstated to associate professor with considerations for indefinite tenure. No offer, in contingency with HEW’s corrective action plan, was made to Jeanne Dost. She wrote, “although it is now almost

one year since the HEW investigation, Dr. MacVicar and Oregon State University have not complied and apparently do not intend to do so.” Rehiring Dost was the corrective action established, yet Oregon State University did nothing about it, since the Department of Health, Education and Welfare did not have direct authority over the University. Rather than sit idly in unemployment, Jeanne Dost was active. She was assembling materials for her own case, writing, teaching for Western Washington College, and she even ran for state treasurer in 1972.<sup>25</sup>

Therefore, Dost, with fewer options than before, filled out another complaint with Oregon’s Bureau of Labor Civil Rights Division. Their only objective was to resolve and remedy “the continued employment of a highly qualified women who can continue to give good service to the University at some useful level.”<sup>26</sup> The University had every opportunity to give Jeanne Dost her rightful employment, yet made the process even longer by not complying. President MacVicar’s response to the letter was that he had offered Dost a full-time position in December of 1971 at the rank of assistant professor (along with multiple graduate students.) She did not accept the position, but had she accepted, early consideration would have been made to promote her to associate professor, according to President MacVicar.<sup>27</sup> The full-time status was just a part of the justice Dost sought. She wanted a rise in rank to associate professor, because with that came job permanence, higher pay, and additional benefits.

And so, in December of 1972, utilizing the investigation prepared by HEW, the Bureau of Labor Civil Rights Division completed their own investigation of Jeanne Dost’s complaint against Oregon State University. The Bureau of Labor went a bit farther than HEW, by criticizing the lack of female full-time employees throughout the university, not just in the Department of

Economics. The bureau found that the lower the rate of full-time employment, the higher the proportion of instructors were women. Consequently, the higher the percentage of full-time employment, the higher the proportion of instructors were male. In the School of Humanities and Social Science, women were hired at a “significantly lower rate than that at which they are available.” Many departments had absolutely no full-time female faculty (see Figure 1).

Regarding Jeanne Dost, their investigation found that:

“Evidence indicates that no genuine offer of employment appropriate to complainant’s qualifications of training, experience and demonstrated job performance has been made by the university; that such jobs have been available; and that the university has not acted in good faith in the stated intention to take affirmative action in rehiring Dr. Dost.”<sup>28</sup>

The University was also heavily criticized for not having an effective grievance process for dealing with discrimination of any kind, as demonstrated with the Review and Appeal Committee’s mishandling of Jeanne Dost’s employment.<sup>29</sup> And so, the Bureau of Labor Civil Rights Division’s ruling was similar to HEW’s, as they suggested that Oregon State immediately rehire Jeanne Dost. However, their ruling had more weight to it, as it came with a heavy criticism of the entire University for lack of female representation.

December of 1972 was incredibly eventful for Jeanne Dost; The Bureau of Labor Civil Rights came to her unemployment aid, and she also lead a group of faculty women to form a Women’s study group. They refurbished the Benton Annex, scrubbed, painted and made it livable again, many departments and faculty members wanted the revitalized Benton Annex. However, the Women’s study group held their ground, and their “squatters’ rights” were recognized. More than six months after her Bureau of Labor Civil Rights conclusion, Jeanne Dost received a letter from Dr. MacVicar offering her full-time employment at the rank of associate



professor. She also received another title: as of the 1973-1974 school year she was the Director of Women's Studies. MacVicar also made sure that this offer "will serve as a complete settlement of all prior claims and demands [Dost has] made against Oregon State University, including the complaints presently pending with the State Bureau of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare."<sup>30</sup>

Estimates

REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN ON OSU FACULTY\*, 1971-72

Department/School	Percent Women
✓ Agricultural Economics	0
✓ Fisheries	0
✓ Agricultural Engineering	0
✓ Animal Science	0
✓ Soils	0
Veterinary Medicine	0
Engineering	0
✓ Anthropology	0
✓ Architecture & Landscape Arch.	0
✓ Economics	0
✓ Geography	0
✓ History	0
✓ Journalism	0
✓ Philosophy	0
PSYCH. ✓ Political Science	0
✓ Religion	0
Sociology	0
Entomology	0
Physics	0
Statistics	0
Geology	0
General Science	0
<u>Women Students at OSU</u>	<u>37 %</u>

\*Full time faculty with rank of Instructor or above.

\*Figure 1: Departments with 0% female full-time faculty; females were 37% of the student body, markings assumably made by Jeanne Dost.

Dost's situation was not uncommon in the American University system. Women were often passed over during hiring practices in many fields, not just academia. With her settlement, in exchange for back pay, Jeanne Dost also achieved an affirmative action compliance agreement with the University. Affirmative action was nationally recognized in 1972 to give women and men of color an equal opportunity, yet many institutions, including Oregon State University, were not held accountable in enforcing it.<sup>31</sup> This was brought up in the Bureau of Labor investigation by mentioning the lack of protocol and grievance process for combating sexism on campus. However, Oregon State University was not the only institution that deprioritized affirmative action. A study conducted between 1972-1980 found that there was a lot of skepticism between administration and male faculty regarding cost, mobility and feelings that there simply were not enough qualified females. Essentially, more females and men of color led to less promotions for white men. Lack of endorsement lead to ineffective affirmative action programs around the country, and stunted female faculty from succeeding in the sciences or at Universities.<sup>32</sup>

By not reinforcing the idea that all will be treated equal, the University essentially dismissed it. With Jeanne Dost, the University had multiple opportunities over a span of years to hire a qualified, student-loved, paper producing, committee overseeing, female faculty member, yet did not because members of her Department felt she was "pushy." Many agreed that this behavior would have been disliked but tolerated in a man, but that was not Jeanne Dost's case. After being blatantly sexually discriminated against she had to defend her life's work with evidence on three separate occasions just to be employed in a position she felt she would have gotten easily, if she were a man. Her experience changed her and the relationship

she would have with the University. With her post as Director of Women's Studies and her Associate Professor Rank, she dedicated her academic career to unveiling women issues in labor and society.<sup>33</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Jeanne Dost gave up \$33,000 in back pay in order to be reinstated at Oregon State as associate professor. Her trial received national attention because "it was the strongest compliance agreement" for affirmative action many civil rights attorneys had ever seen. Despite this, the situation was never monitored for effectiveness, so affirmative action was essentially rendered useless until it was reevaluated. There were a plethora of tactics utilized to essentially fool affirmative action, including the "revolving door." This involved, hiring a different woman every year to fill a fixed-term slot, therefore the University would still have strong numbers of females, without having to give them tenure, or permanency.<sup>34</sup>

The fighting was not over once she was hired full-time, either. When being evaluated for tenure in 1977, it came with a complete evaluation of the center, ordered by Stuart Knapp Dean of Undergraduate Students, despite them being two completely different entities.<sup>35</sup> Mary Hall, a faculty member and original women's study group member, hoped that this evaluation would be constructive and allow feedback that could help the center become better than it was before. "Such [was] not the case. The report reflects so many technical errors in the collection, use and presentation of data, that one can have no confidence in the findings and conclusions." Hall then gives examples of simple data collection techniques and interpretations that were rendered useless and aimed at evaluating the Director over the center. Hall eluded to the possibility of a vendetta against Dr. Dost, and using the Women's Studies Center evaluation as a

vehicle for disenfranchising her leadership ability, administrative skills and teaching techniques. She received indefinite tenure anyway.<sup>36</sup>

For much of its existence, the Center for Women's Studies "was the focus of much criticism and controversy over the years for all of the usual reasons that women and their activities are more closely scrutinized, less well funded, and more heavily suspected when perceived as outside the range of socially prescribed roles and activities."<sup>37</sup> Yet the Center was a hub where feminism was taught, academic discussions were had and sexual harassment was reported. In response to their work, the center was constantly underfunded, and had to appeal multiple times for budgetary shortcomings. The rate of female pupils rose every year between 1973 and 1981, which only benefitted the University. Everyone would benefit from a sexism free university, but during this period sexism ran so deep that it was hard to distinguish equality from oppression. This was apparent in the University's initial refusal to hire Jeanne Dost full-time from 1968 to 1973, and in order to receive her position she had to not only have her Ph.D., which was more than a lot of faculty members at the time, but she had to support three separate investigations with evidence.<sup>38</sup>

The Women's Center and the Women's Studies department serve as a symbol of female reckoning in the University environment. Both centers are fully functioning more than 40 years later, although Women's Studies was changed to Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies to encompass a greater range of topics and to include even more classically disenfranchised groups. An argument can be made that her refusal to compromise and relentless perseverance made Jeanne Dost the most admirable, and that impression was left on the Center for Women's Studies. She dedicated her academic career to proving and combating sexual

discrimination and harassment in labor situations. Sexual discrimination and sexual harassment were not viewed as serious matters, as they were regarded as funny, or no problem at all.

Despite mockery, Jeanne Dost and the Center understood and offered what support was available. Her perseverance toward sexual equality was an essential piece of Oregon State University's perpetual search for equity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ellen Carol Dubois and Lynn Dumenil, *Through Women's Eyes* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2009) 666-677.

<sup>2</sup> "Academic Freedom and Faculty Appointments," *Oregon State University Faculty Handbook*, updated 2013, <http://academicaffairs.oregonstate.edu/faculty-handbook/academic-freedom-and-faculty-appointments>

<sup>3</sup> "Jeanne E. Dost," *Corvallis Gazette-Times*, October 12, 2012.

<sup>4</sup> Department of Health, Education and Welfare, November 12, 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>5</sup> Department of Health, Education and Welfare, November 12, 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>6</sup> Faculty Review and Appeals Committee, ca 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>7</sup> Faculty Review and Appeals Committee, ca 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>8</sup> "More Thought on Departmental Policy," Summer 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>9</sup> "More Thought on Departmental Policy," Summer 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>10</sup> "Additional Comments," Summer 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>11</sup> Dorothy Sue Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004) 122-123.

<sup>12</sup> Nicci Gerard, "Women are Pushy, Men Ambitious" *New Statesman*, January 8, 1999.

<sup>13</sup> "General Remarks," ca 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>14</sup> "General Remarks," ca 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>15</sup> Department of Health, Education and Welfare, November 12, 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>16</sup> Jeanne Dost correspondence to Robert Newburgh, May 26, 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

---

<sup>17</sup> Faculty Review and Appeals Committee, ca 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>18</sup> "General Remarks," ca 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>19</sup> Jeanne Dost to Marlaina Kiner, April 19, 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>20</sup> Student correspondence to Dr. Harter, May 21, 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>21</sup> Richard R. Blakely to Gordon Gilkey, February 27, 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>22</sup> Richard R. Blakely to Gordon Gilkey, February 27, 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>23</sup> Department of Health, Education and Welfare, November 12, 1971, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>24</sup> "Executive Order 11375—Amending Executive Order No. 11246, Relating to Equal Employment Opportunity," The American Presidency Project, accessed December 6, 2017, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=60553>

<sup>25</sup> "Treasurer: Dost and Stathos" *Corvallis Gazette-Times*, May 17, 1972 and correspondence from Macvicar to Eleanor Meyers, November 9<sup>th</sup>, 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>26</sup> Jeanne Dost to Marlaina Kiner, September 15, 1972, and Eleanor Meyers to President MacVicar, October 25, 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>27</sup> Robert MacVicar to Eleanor Meyers, November 9, 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>28</sup> Bureau of Civil Rights Labor Division: Jeanne Dost vs. Oregon State University, ca December 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>29</sup> Bureau of Civil Rights Labor Division: Jeanne Dost vs. Oregon State University, ca December 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Personal Discrimination Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>30</sup> History of the Women's Center; ca 1980s, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 5, History of Oregon State's Women's Center Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence between President MacVicar and Jeanne

---

Dost, June 20, 1973, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, History of Oregon State University Letters and Memorandums Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>31</sup> Title IX of Educational Amendments, ca 1972, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2 Discrimination in Education Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>32</sup> Kul B. Rai and John Crizer, *Affirmative Action and the University* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000) 53.

<sup>33</sup> "Women Faculty Representation in the Academic Ranks," ca 1980s, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Dost Testimony folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>34</sup> "Testimony presented to the Affirmative Action Sub-Committee of the House Education Committee by Jeanne Dost on April 22, 1981." Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Dost Testimony folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>35</sup> Stuart Knapp to Peggy Adams, February 15, 1977, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2 History of Oregon State University Letters and Memorandums Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>36</sup> Robert MacVicar to Jeanne Dost, June 23, 1977, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2 History of Oregon State University Letters and Memorandums Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.

## Bibliography

The American Presidency Project. "Executive Order 11375—Amending Executive Order No. 11246, Relating to Equal Employment Opportunity." Accessed December 6, 2017.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=60553>

Cobble, Dorothy Sue. *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in*



- 
- Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Dubois, Ellen Carol and Lynn Dumenil. *Through Women's Eyes*. Boston: Bedford/ St. Martin's, 2009.
- Gerard, Nicci. "Women are Pushy, Men Ambitious." *New Statesman*, 128, no. 4418 (January 8, 1999): 12. Business Source Premier.
- "Jeanne E. Dost." *Corvallis Gazette-Times*, October 12, 2012.
- Jeanne Dost Papers. coll 366, Boxes 2 and 5. Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.
- Rai, Kul B. and John Crizer. *Affirmative Action and the University*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.
- "Treasurer: Dost and Stathos." *Corvallis Gazette-Times*, May 17, 1972.
- <sup>37</sup> Jeanne Dost, "What Students Have Taught Me About Sexual Harassment on Campus," ca 1980s, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Sexual Harassment Folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.
- <sup>38</sup> "Women Faculty Representation in the Academic Ranks," ca 1980s, Jeanne Dost Papers, coll 366, Box 2, Dost Testimony folder, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon Libraries, Eugene, Oregon.