

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 96-40830

---

HELENE BAKEWELL, Dr.; HEBE MACE, Dr.

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

VERSUS

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY, ET AL.,

Defendants,

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY;  
STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY BOARD OF REGENTS;  
DR. DAN ANGEL, in his official capacity and  
as successor to Dr. William Johnson,

Defendants-Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
For the Eastern District of Texas

(9:92-CV-179)

---

August 6, 1997

Before JONES, EMILIO M. GARZA and PARKER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

The Appellants, Helene Bakewell, Hebe Mace, and the Plaintiff class consisting of thirty-nine female faculty members, (hereafter

---

\*Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

"Bakewell *et al.*") appeal a "take nothing" judgment in the district court following an eight-day bench trial of the discrimination claims of Bakewell *et al.* against the Appellees Stephen F. Austin State University, *et al.* (the "University"), grounded primarily in Title VII and Title IX. Bakewell *et al.* claim that they suffered discrimination on the basis of their sex due to unequal pay, *i.e.*, female faculty members were paid less than male faculty members. Bakewell (individually) asserted additional discrimination claims for denial of tenure, failure to receive extended sick leave with pay, retaliation for opposing an unlawful employment practice, and violating her First Amendment free speech rights for speaking out on a matter of public concern.

The district court's findings of fact are reviewed for clear error and its conclusions of law under a de novo standard. North Alamo Water v. City of San Juan, Tex., 90 F.3d 910, 914-15 (5th Cir. 1996). The court has reviewed the briefs of the parties and has listened to the arguments of counsel, in addition to having reviewed the pertinent portions of the record. Our review leads us to the conclusion that the district court committed no reversible error of fact or law, and that this court could do nothing but replot the same ground and reach the same conclusion as that reached by the district court. Therefore, for essentially the reasons set forth in the opinion of the district court, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

AFFIRMED.