

December 2, 1981

To: Ben Davis
From: Bob Atkins
Re: Waiver Committee Report

The committee met today, all members present, and makes the following recommendations.

1. Bill Talen requests the appointment of two adjuncts, both of whom appear not to have the PhD degree. No decision made on this. A letter has been sent to Bill requesting further information.

2. Edna Reed requests the removal of Marci Catanzaro as a peer member of her committee. The documents which are attached include two letters from Marci to Edna about her work, as well as Edna's lengthy justification for her request to remove Marci, Marci's response to this, and The core faculty member's opinion.

Edna's view is that the tone of Marci's critique of her work is offensive, and that communication between them is very difficult. In addition, she notes that Marci has indicated a lack of time for further participation. Marci answers that she is aware of differences between them, but is willing to stay on the committee as long as she does not have to "assume the entire responsibility of teaching her the basic rudiments of the research process." Penny agrees with Edna that the relationship with Marci as it now stands is counterproductive to her learning, and recommends that Edna's request be approved.

The committee had a lengthy discussion of this request, finding it to be rather difficult to resolve. It appeared that the content of Marci's critique was on point (this has since been confirmed by Penny in a subsequent telephone conversation.) But we could see how Edna would take offense at the tone of the letters. Marci's choice of words was consistently derogatory, challenging Edna's work in absolutist phrases, suggesting that she took someone else's annotated bibliography, etc. The style of her response is inappropriate in the UGS process and merits her removal from the committee.

However, given the validity of the content of her critique, the committee wanted to assure that those points not be lost in the continuation of Edna's process. The recommendation therefore is that Penny monitor the response Edna makes to the points raised by Marci. Penny has since notified me that she (Penny) included all of the points made by Marci into her own critique of Edna's work. This strikes the committee chairperson as sufficient guarantee that Marci's points will not be lost.

Finally, Penny had written in her support letter that Edna had three adjuncts, so that in her opinion it would be unnecessary to replace Marci with a new peer so late in the

process. However, a check of the records demonstrated that one of the presumed adjuncts, Ruth Berg, is a consultant (see attached appointment letter). Under this circumstance, the committee felt that a new peer would have to be chosen to round out the committee.

Penny has since indicated that Ruth Berg has in effect served as an adjunct from the time of her appointment and that her preference would be to have Ruth appointed as an adjunct now rather than appointing a second peer within two months of graduation. I think that this should be worked out between you and Penny and Edna.

In summary, the committee recommendation is that Marci be removed from the committee, that her substantive points be retained in the committee process and that a new committee member be chosen. Penny adds to this that she will carry Marci's concerns because they have already been expressed by her, and that Ruth Berg's appointment as a third adjunct is the best solution to rounding off the committee.

I also think that Marci should have a letter of explanation which shows appreciation for the amount of effort she put in - which was well beyond the norm for peers - but which also indicates to her that, intentional or not, the tone of her letter was understandably offensive to Edna.

3. Mary Kouri requests an extension of her time in the program beyond four years. She has had nine months of interim, and expects a final meeting in January - just after the four year mark. The committee approves of her request, and in case the meeting does not end in her graduation, offers her an extension until April 1, 1982.

4. Maria Ortiz requests appointment of an adjunct who holds the Doctor of Business Administration Degree from Harvard. He has a prestigious degree, and expertise in her field. The committee recommends approval.