In Brief

Death in Beirut: Ph.D. candidate Janet L. Stevens was one of 46 killed in the April 16 explosion at the American Embassy. She was there to act as interpreter for the group awaiting U.S. Envoy Philip Habib.

Ms. Stevens, 32, joined the University graduate program in 1971 and completed her coursework by 1974. On a fellowship to the American University, she had gone to Cairo's Center for Arabic Studies abroad, then taught and did research in Cairo, Tunisia and Beirut. For several months before her death she had been in Beirut as a translator and journalist, surviving the siege of the summer of 1982 and continuing her research toward a dissertation on Folk Themes in Contemporary Egyptian Drama.

Her advisor, Dr. Roger Allen, said the Oriental studies faculty have approved a posthumous master's degree for Ms. Stevens, whom he described as a "tremendous help to other students" as well as an able scholar in her own work. She is survived by her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hazen Stevens of Venice, Fla., a sister and two brothers.

At Home: The annual University City House Tour stops at a new address this year: the newly-renovated Eisenlohr Hall where the Sheldon Hackneys live. The date is May 1, the time 1 to 5 p.m. rain or shine. Tickets for the whole Town and Gown Tour are $10 on the day or $7 to advance ($5 for students and senior citizens). Advance tickets are at the Off-Campus Living Office, 3732 Locust Walk; on May 1, they are at the chapel at 42nd and Spruce.

Injured: Senate Chair Murray Gerstenhaber is recovering from injuries he sustained Friday in interrupting an attempt to steal his car at Parking Lot 26 (the garage at 32nd and Walnut) around 5 p.m. Dr. Gerstenhaber, treated at HUP for a mouth injury and a severely battered eye, has tentatively identified his assailant from police photographs. Philadelphia and campus police are cooperating on fingerprint follow-through. Detective Barbara Cassel of Security asks any witnesses who were in or near the garage at the time of the incident to call her at Ext. 4485.

Senate: Another Tuition Vote ... Non-Tenure Track Actions

After heated debate on April 20, Senate passed two resolutions by Dr. Anthony Tomazinis to reopen the question of tuition benefits at "100% here, 50% away."

Taking the chair temporarily, next year's Senate Chair-Elect Jacob Abel recorded a two-thirds majority on a hand-raise vote, in a meeting which later proved to have over 300 in attendance. As the recorded vote was forwarded via Senate's Chair Murray Gerstenhaber and Economic Status Committee Chair Samuel Preston (page 2), the Administration's response (also page 2) was to maintain the earlier action of changing the package to 75%-40% on a phased schedule, but with a pledge to continue discussions on relief of hardship.

Non-Tenure Tracks: Six of the items on Senate's April 20 agenda dealt with variations on the non-tenure track. Their dispositions:

- A Clinician-Educator track for the School of Veterinary Medicine was adopted.
- A Clinician-Educator track, and
- a seven-year lecturer/clinical specialist category were adopted for Nursing.
- A motion of SEC to raise the cap on Clinician-Educator track appointments at the School of Medicine from 25% to 30% was amended to raise the cap to 40% (but with some clarification as to the base on which the percentage is figured). It passed as amended.
- A motion to cap Medical School C-E appointments departmentally at 50% was defeated. With respect to the proposals affecting Medicine, Dean Edward Steimmler, Medical Senate Chair Dr. Wallace Miller and others spoke for School needs.
- A proposal to create seven-year lectureships in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, urged by language faculty but opposed by others who argued that its breadth created problems of de facto tenure for non-language departments, had been reported out negatively by SEC. From the floor, a substitute was passed that recommends seven-year appointments in principle under safeguards to be framed in cooperation with the Provost.

Other Agenda Items: Dr. Seymour Mandelbaum's proposals on strengthening the role of the Senate in Academic Planning and Budget Committee activities (Almanac April 12) did not reach the floor. But Provost Thomas Ehrlich, in his opening statement, accepted the proposals. His report will be published next week. The Provost also used the Senate occasion to underscore commitment to end sexual harassment (see page 2).

The scheduled Report of the Grievance Commission was not taken up for lack of time. It will appear in Almanac next week.
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Rules Governing Final Examinations

1) No student may be required to take more than two final examinations on any one day during the period in which final examinations are scheduled.

2) No instructor may hold a final examination except during the period in which final examinations are scheduled and, when necessary, during the period of postponed examinations. No final examinations may be scheduled during the last week of classes or on reading days.

3) Postponed examinations may be held only during the official periods; the first week of the spring and fall semesters. Students must obtain permission from their dean's office to take a postponed exam. Instructors in all courses must be ready to offer a make-up examination to all students who were excused from the final examination.

4) No instructor may change the time or date of a final exam without permission from the appropriate dean or the vice-provost.

5) No instructor may increase the time allowed for a final exam beyond the scheduled two hours without permission from the appropriate dean or the vice-provost.

6) No classes (covering new material) may be held during the reading period. Review sessions may be held.

7) All students must be allowed to see their final examination. Access to graded finals should be ensured for a period of one semester after the exam has been given.

We encourage professors to be as flexible as possible in accommodating students with conflicting exam schedules.

— Thomas Ehrlich, Provost
A University of Parts

"In my department," said a colleague on hearing that students could foretell his final questions, "we don't change the questions but the answers." This whimsy holds a basic truth, for the profoundest questions stay the same.

In this Senate, we face recurring questions of medium depth, like Who are we? and Who governs us? alongside the constant but less clearly cosmic What's next year's raise? and Is the shortfall fairly shared? But only the fact and perceptions of fairness can prevent crippling polarization, and a budget in lean times may trade present fiscal pain for educational deficits later. Who administers must be fixed, but whether wisdom governs depends on information about all of our parts which, as I firmly believe, the administration has the obligation to provide and the faculty the duty to study.

Hardest of all, Who are we? asks about a concept of University in transition over the centuries from a community of colleagues seeking theological truth to a corporate body increasingly stratified and specialized in its parts. We debate today paths leading further in that direction which the administration permissively holds open, but how far to walk them we must judge in our own wisdom.

These are our perennial final questions.

Murray Bernstein

At Senate: Provost on Sexual Harassment

Let me add a word of special thanks for the excellent statements on sexual harassment last week at the University Council meeting by the past chair of the Senate, Phoebe Leboy, the new chair, June Axinn, and the chair-elect, Jacob Abel. In my time as Provost, I have heard more thoughtful or persuasive presentations on an issue, and I hope all have read them in the April 19 issue of Almanac.

I cannot underscore too forcefully my concerns about the issue or urge too strongly that all of us have special obligations to ensure that sexual harassment is erased from the campus.

I personally also believe that we need to make clear to all faculty members, teaching assistants, and others who instruct at Penn, that it is inappropriate for any teacher of any student to have intimate personal relations with that student. Whoever is the initiator, the credibility of academic relations between teacher and student is otherwise inevitably at risk. Along with the School Deans, with whom I have discussed the matter, I ask the help of everyone in ensuring that this message is well understood, particularly at the outset of the term next fall.

- Thomas Ehrlich

Tuition Benefits

From Senate Leaders:

In view of the two resolutions on faculty tuition benefits that were passed at the Faculty Senate meeting of April 20, and also in view of the massive support for a restructuring of these benefits as reflected in the outcome of the mail ballot, we would urge you to:

- continue implementing the restructured plan (AI) that was approved in the mail ballot;
- attempt to deal with the problems faced by those adversely affected by the new plan.

We hope that this attempt will include consideration of permitting individual faculty members to choose between the old plan and the new plan. This may be made possible by reallocating additional funds to faculty tuition benefits from other parts of the University; a willingness on the part of faculty to trade off salary increases or other benefits in return for extending such a choice (as expressed, for example, through a polling procedure); or relief from demographic pressures that might show up in application to Penn in a survey of the ages of faculty children.

No issue in recent years has clearly and dramatically divided the faculty and we believe that, despite the enormous effort already invested by you and others on this matter, continued discussion will increase the chances of finding the best possible outcome for all concerned.

- Murray Gertenskeher, Chair, Faculty Senate
- Samuel H. Preston, Chair, Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

President and Provost

As stated at the Faculty Senate meeting last Wednesday by the Provost, the University administration has been proceeding to implement the faculty tuition-benefit arrangements supported by the prior Senate and meeting the faculty mail ballot.

We recognize the concerns expressed at the meeting on April 20. The matter was, however, fully and fairly debated over many months, and an overwhelming majority of faculty expressing opinions clearly favored the arrangements we have approved. We are, therefore, implementing them beginning next year.

At the same time, we want to emphasize that we will continue discussions with the Faculty Senate leadership and interested groups to consider possible further steps to cushion the impact on those adversely affected by the new arrangements.

- Sheldon Hackney, President
- Thomas Ehrlich, Provost
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Women Among the Full-Time Faculty of the University (1973-82)

This is the first in a series of reports on the distribution of women and minorities in the faculty and nonacademic workforce of the University. This installment covers women's distribution in the faculty: subsequent reports will cover minorities in the faculty, and both women and minorities in nonacademic positions.

The figures here are taken from affirmative action data on file with the Management Information System as of December 15, 1982. School actions recorded after that date are not reflected. Therefore, the comparative data for noted years reflect what we call "snapshots in time."

Ten-Year Trends (by School)

During the ten-year period 1973-82, there was an overall increase in the numbers and percentage of women among the Standing Faculty* (all schools combined). In 1973, there were 208 women faculty (12.9%) and in 1982 their representation increased to 253 (14.8%).

This overall percentage increase reflects increases of women in every school except two, where the size of the Standing Faculty itself declined. In the School of Dental Medicine, where faculty size went down 5.9% in the ten-year period, the number of women declined from 17.6% to 16.3%.

In the School of Social Work, the size of the Standing Faculty decreased during this period by 42.9%, and the percentage of women declined from 39.3% to 37.5%.

In actual numbers, the most significant increases occurred in the School of Engineering, where the number of women increased from 1 to 5; in FAS where their numbers almost doubled from 40 to 73; in the School of Medicine, where women increased from 59 to 83; and in Wharton where women almost doubled in number from 5 to 11.

I. Women in the Standing Faculty by School 1973-82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMP (Total)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annenberg (T)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental (T)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (T)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAS (T)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS (T)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>+33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSFA (T)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (T)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (T)</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (T)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPUP (T)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW (T)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med (T)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton (T)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>+31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisc. (T)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>+92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>+45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing 1973 and 1982 figures, the total number of Standing Faculty increased by 92 (5.7%) compared to an increase of 45 (21.6%) in the number of women, as seen in Table I below left.

II. Women Among the Faculty by Tenure Status 1978-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>1978 (Nov)</th>
<th>1980 (Dec)</th>
<th>1981 (Dec)</th>
<th>1982 (Dec)</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>(8.6%)</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
<td>(9.1%)</td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>(23.0%)</td>
<td>(23.8%)</td>
<td>(23.4%)</td>
<td>(25.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-track</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>(27.9%)</td>
<td>(28.6%)</td>
<td>(28.7%)</td>
<td>(29.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinician</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. (T)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>(17.2%)</td>
<td>(17.3%)</td>
<td>(17.0%)</td>
<td>(17.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>(17.2%)</td>
<td>(17.3%)</td>
<td>(17.0%)</td>
<td>(17.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>2253</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Women)</td>
<td>(17.2%)</td>
<td>(17.3%)</td>
<td>(17.0%)</td>
<td>(17.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The representation of women among the full-time faculty steadily increased between 1978-82 relative to the changes in the total numbers of faculty in each tenure category. Referring to Table II above, the total number of tenured faculty remained the same while the number of tenured women increased by 12 (1.2%). In the tenure track category, total women increased by 21 (2.0%), while the total faculty increased by 9.6%. There was a 2.7% decline in the non-tenure accruing faculty with the total number of women remaining the same, although their percentage of this category increased slightly (by almost 1%).

These figures demonstrate that overall, the number and percentage of women among the Standing Faculty has modestly but steadily increased during the period 1973-82 despite decreases in the total numbers of faculty in a number of schools. There were 45, or 21.6%, more women in the Standing Faculty in 1982 than in 1973. Although these upward trends are encouraging, concerted efforts must continue for the appointment of even greater numbers of women to the Standing Faculty. It is especially important that affirmative efforts for appointments of women be made in the tenure track categories which serve as the pipeline (or primary source) from which appointments to tenure are made at the University of Pennsylvania.

—Davida Hopkins Ramsey,
Director, Office of Affirmative Action

*Standing Faculty are tenured; in ranks accruing tenure; or in Clinician-Educator status.
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1983 Penn Staff Survey: A Summary of Results

In the fall of 1982, the University of Pennsylvania contracted with SRI International to conduct a confidential opinion survey of Penn employees. SRI International—formerly Stanford Research Institute—is a large non-profit research organization located on the San Francisco Peninsula in California. Its staff have extensive experience conducting surveys and early in 1982 conducted a similar staff opinion survey for Stanford University.

In the words of Penn's new Vice President for Human Resources, the overall objective of the Penn Staff Survey was "to provide the basis for a long-range human resources plan that will address identified deficiencies at the University and at the same time listen to and learn from our staff." To meet this objective, SRI designed a questionnaire that measures staff members' attitudes toward various aspects of working at Penn. Almost 100 Penn employees, representing a wide variety of interests and backgrounds, provided input to the writing of the questionnaire through participation in discussion groups or through review or pretesting of the questionnaire. At the outset of this process, the University pledged to publish a summary of the results, both positive and negative.

The questionnaire was mailed to a scientifically random sample of fulltime Penn staff members (excluding faculty and hospital staff). Completed or largely completed questionnaires were returned by 75% of those who are currently Penn employees (947 out of 1,268). With this high level of response, the survey results can confidently be projected to the entire survey population of about 4,400 Penn employees who are neither faculty nor hospital staff.

Profile of Respondents

Survey respondents are very similar to the entire survey population of 4,400 employees in characteristics such as age, years of service, sex, race, salary, etc.

- Two-thirds (66%) of the respondents are women.
- About half (47%) are 40 or older.
- Slightly over half (57%) have worked at Penn for 6 or more years.
- Three-quarters (75%) are nonminorities.
- About one-fifth (18%) are union members (A-4s), with the remainder divided equally between A-3s (weekly-paid nonexempts) and A-1s (monthly-paid exempts).
- About one-fourth (26%) report that they are supervisors.
- Slightly over half (54%) have annual salaries of $15,000 or more.

Not surprisingly, these characteristics tend to be related to one another. For example, employees with high salaries are most likely to be A-1s, supervisors, older employees, men, nonminorities, and long-time Penn employees.

Of these characteristics, age, years of service, and employee type (A-1/A-3/A-4) are the most likely to be related to respondents' attitudes toward working at Penn. Thus, for instance, older respondents have different attitudes than do younger respondents on most of the issues included in the survey. In contrast, nonminorities and minorities seldom differ very much in their attitudes. Men and women also are relatively unlikely to have different attitudes, as are supervisors and nonsupervisors.

Areas of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in Working at Penn

The accompanying table lists areas that the survey found to be sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction among Penn employees. For all the items included in this table, respondents were asked to give their answers on 6-point scales that ranged either from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied" or from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." To help interpret the response, the mean (average) rating was calculated for each item, and these means are shown in parentheses in the table. The midpoint between positive and negative ratings is 3.5. A high mean rating always indicates a positive attitude, even on negatively worded items.

Overall, the staff tend to be very or moderately satisfied with the various aspects of their daily jobs, their supervision and training, their benefits, and the stimulation and prestige that derive from working at a university. For example, about three-quarters (78%) agree mostly or strongly that they like the kind of work they do, and the same proportion are mostly or very satisfied with their benefits. Seventy percent mostly or strongly agree that they would recommend Penn as a good place to work. And about three-fifths (62%) are mostly or very satisfied with the quality of the supervision they receive.

Staff are not very satisfied, however, with communication at Penn, general Penn management, job classification, promotion policies, handling of grievances, the treatment of minorities at Penn, salaries, advancement opportunities, the relationships among the major faculty and staff groups in the University, and staffing levels in their work group. (Interestingly, 52% of the respondents agree that understaffing is a serious problem in their work group, but only 18% are dissatisfied with their own work load.)

Respondents tend to have negative attitudes—that is, the mean rating is less than 3.5—on only six issues. They tend to agree that "People in my school/department often feel isolated from the rest of the University" and that "Too many people at Penn break the rules and get away with it," they are dissatisfied with safety on campus at night; and, among those to whom the services apply, they are very dissatisfied with the availability of child care facilities, parking availability, and, especially, parking fees.

Understandably, attitudes on some of these issues are related to the characteristics of the respondents. For example, women are quite a bit less satisfied than men with campus safety at night, and the higher-level, more "senior" staff are considerably more satisfied with the parking situation than are their more "junior" counterparts. (For the purposes of this summary, we are using "higher-level, more 'senior' staff" as a short phrase to represent A-1s, supervisors, the older staff, long-time Penn employees, and those with higher salaries.) Minorities and women also are less likely than nonminorities and men to be satisfied with the treatment of minorities and women at Penn.

Topics that are related to the greatest number of respondent characteristics are satisfaction with opportunities to meet interesting people, the kind of work done, salary, handling of grievances, and relations among A-1s, A-3s, and faculty. In general, the higher-level, more "senior" staff are more likely to be satisfied than are the more "junior" staff. However, often it is not those in the lowest group, but rather those in the second group—staff with 3 to 5 years service, those with salaries of $12,500 to $14,999, and those age 30 to 39—that are the least satisfied.

On some topics, there are few differences among groups. For example, most of the groups analyzed have very similar satisfaction ratings on benefits, work load, communication, and supervision. (This does not mean that everyone at Penn has the same attitude on these issues. It simply means that what attitude differences do exist cannot be explained by differences in the staff characteristics considered in the survey.)

Staff Development

The level of participation in staff development activities (for example, classes, workshops, conferences, special training, or university college courses) during the past 12 months varies from group to group. Groups with the lowest participation levels are A-4s (25%), staff with more than 13 years of service at Penn (29%), those over age 50 (30%), and men (36%). In contrast, between 50% and 60% of A-1s, supervisors, women, staff under age 30, and those with 3 to 5 years of service at Penn report having participated in staff development activities during the past year. Almost no one (2%) feels his or her supervisor discourages participation in staff development activities.

One means of staff development at Penn is enrollment in courses, and...
Advancement Opportunities

Staff are not very pleased with their ability to transfer or advance at Penn. Fewer than a third are mostly or very satisfied with their opportunity for advancement or their opportunity to transfer to other jobs at Penn. Supervisors, A-Is, and women are the most likely to feel they receive adequate information, whereas A-4s feel they receive adequate information.

Respondents believe strongly that Penn staff development activities should include overall personal development, job skills, and supervisory skills. Almost 75% of the respondents mostly or strongly agree that these areas should be included. Some of the higher-level, more "senior" staff groups are less likely than the more "junior" groups, to want these topics covered, but the differences are not large.

Problem-Solving and Grievance Mechanisms

Respondents who indicated they are not union members (A-4s) were asked how familiar they are with Penn's staff grievance procedure, the Personnel Relations Office, the Personnel Relations Office, the Ombudsman's Office, and the Penn Women's Center. About half (46%) say they are not at all familiar with the Personnel Relations Office, and 40% to 65% say they are not at all familiar with each of the other resources. No more than 5% say they are "very familiar" with any of the resources. The higher-level, more "senior" staff are consistently more familiar with these resources than are their more "junior" counterparts, but nonminorities and minorities do not differ in their familiarity ratings. Men and women differ on only two of these resources: Men are more likely to be familiar with the Ombudsman's Office, and women are more likely (though not by very much) to be familiar with the Women's Center.

As expected, the University's job classification system is not very popular among the staff. Less than half—39%—feel their job is properly classified, and only 28% are mostly or very satisfied with the job classification system in general. Only about 20% mostly or strongly agree that the job reclassification process is applied fairly "as far as I know" and that they receive adequate information about Penn's pay and classification system.

Minorities and nonminorities do not differ in their ratings of the job classification system, nor do supervisors and nonsupervisors, but other groups do. Those that are the least likely to have negative attitudes about the system are men, A-4s, staff age 50 or over, and those with more than 13 years of service.

Job Classification

As expected, the University's job classification system is not very popular among the staff. Less than half—39%—feel their job is properly classified, and only 28% are mostly or very satisfied with the job classification system in general. Only about 20% mostly or strongly agree that the job reclassification process is applied fairly "as far as I know" and that they receive adequate information about Penn's pay and classification system.

Minorities and nonminorities do not differ in their ratings of the job classification system, nor do supervisors and nonsupervisors, but other groups do. Those that are the least likely to have negative attitudes about the system are men, A-4s, staff age 50 or over, and those with more than 13 years of service.

Problem-Solving and Grievance Mechanisms

Respondents who indicated they are not union members (A-4s) were asked how familiar they are with Penn's staff grievance procedure, the Personnel Relations Office, the Personnel Relations Office, the Ombudsman's Office, and the Penn Women's Center. About half (46%) say they are not at all familiar with the Personnel Relations Office, and 40% to 65% say they are not at all familiar with each of the other resources. No more than 5% say they are "very familiar" with any of the resources. The higher-level, more "senior" staff are consistently more familiar with these resources than are their more "junior" counterparts, but nonminorities and minorities do not differ in their familiarity ratings. Men and women differ on only two of these resources: Men are more likely to be familiar with the Ombudsman's Office, and women are more likely (though not by very much) to be familiar with the Women's Center.

A third of the respondents (that is, of the A-Is and A-3s) say they have used the Personnel Relations Office. Of these, half found it moderately or very useful. Only about 10% of the A-1 and A-3 respondents have used each of the other resources. About half of these rate the Ombudsman's Office and the Women's Center as moderately or very useful, and about a third rate the staff grievance procedure and the Affirmative Action Office as moderately or very useful. Most of the higher-level, more "senior" groups tend to rate the Personnel Relations Office as more

Penn staff are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied With:</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfied With:</th>
<th>Not Very Satisfied With:</th>
<th>Quite Dissatisfied With:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence on the job (5.2)**</td>
<td>Work load (4.6)</td>
<td>Communication at Penn (3.5)</td>
<td>Parking fees (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor's performance expectations (5.2)</td>
<td>Competence and productivity of coworkers (4.8)</td>
<td>Promotion policies (3.5)</td>
<td>Parking availability (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kind of work they do (5.1)</td>
<td>Orientation and training (4.5)</td>
<td>Staffing levels in work groups (3.5)</td>
<td>Availability of child care facilities (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (5.0)</td>
<td>Supervisor's supervisory skills (4.4)</td>
<td>Relations between A-1s, A-3s, A-4s, faculty, etc. (3.5)</td>
<td>Too many people at Penn break the rules and get away with it (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and recreational opportunities at Penn (5.0)</td>
<td>Performance feedback and evaluation (4.3)</td>
<td>General Personnel management (3.5)</td>
<td>Safety on campus at night (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn as a good place to work (4.9)</td>
<td>Participation in decisions that affect their job (4.2)</td>
<td>Job classification (3.5)</td>
<td>Sense of isolation from the rest of the University (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of equipment and facilities (4.9)</td>
<td>Supervisor's supportiveness (4.2)</td>
<td>Handling of grievances (3.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security (4.8)</td>
<td>Adequacy of working facilities (4.2)</td>
<td>Salary (3.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to meet and interact with interesting people (4.8)</td>
<td>Work group morale (4.1)</td>
<td>Advancement opportunities (3.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being part of a highly regarded academic institution (4.8)</td>
<td>Treatment of women at Penn (4.1)</td>
<td>Treatment of minorities at Penn (3.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in parentheses are mean (average) ratings of all respondents, using a scale of 1 to 6, on which 1 indicates a very negative attitude and 6 indicates a very positive attitude.
** Two or more related questionnaire items averaged.
- Two-thirds of the respondents indicate that child care does not apply to them, and a third indicate that parking does not apply to them.

Sources: SRI International 1983 Penn Staff Survey: Areas of Satisfac
tion and Dissatisfaction

The following was sent to Vice President for Human Resources Gary J. Posner April 18, 1983, with the text that appears on these pages, including the table at right.

Enclosed is SRI's summary of the Penn Staff Survey results. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank everyone at Penn who participated in the study—the focus-group participants, questionnaire reviewers, pretest participants, survey respondents, and you and your staff—for helping to make the survey a success that it was. It was a pleasure to work with everyone involved.

There is a wealth of information in SRI's report. I am sure you will find there is much that is useful in developing Penn's long-range human resources strategy.

—Susan Higley Russell, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Research Program
SRI International
useful than do the more "junior" groups, but there are few differences among the groups on the other resources.

**Personnel Services**

Survey respondents were asked to rate as "poor," "fair," "good," or "excellent" each of seven services provided over the past 12 months by the Personnel Office. In addition, supervisors were asked to rate the help they have received from Personnel in hiring A-Is and A-3s. For the most part, the ratings of these services are not related to respondent characteristics. The highest ratings are for assistance in hiring A-3s. Among those who have received such assistance in the past 12 months, 64% feel that what they received was good or excellent.

Other services that receive "good" or "excellent" ratings from half or more of those who could provide a rating are: providing answers to general questions (62%), providing information about staff benefits (61%), courses provided by the Training Division (57%), providing information about or enrollment in training courses (53%), and new employee orientation (52%). Assistance in hiring A-3s is rated as "good" or "excellent" by 49% of the supervisors who received this assistance.

Two services receive "poor" ratings from a third or more of the respondents: providing service regarding job classification or reclassification (rated "poor" by 38%) and assisting staff members in transferring to another position (rated "poor" by 41%). Each of these services is rated "good" or "excellent" by about a third of the respondents.

**Salary Issues**

As noted above, staff members—especially the more "junior" groups—tend not to be very satisfied with their salaries. Only a third of the respondents are mostly or very satisfied with their salary, and only about a third agree mostly or strongly that their salary increases are determined fairly. Even fewer (25%) agree mostly or strongly that they are paid about the same as others they know at Penn who have similar responsibilities and experience. (A third have no idea whether they are paid the same as others.)

These attitudes are related to all respondent characteristics except supervisory status. Staff age 50 and over, those with more than 13 years of service, A-4s, and those with salaries of $20,000 or more all tend to be moderately satisfied with salaries. In contrast, staff under age 30, those with 3 to 5 years of service, A-3s, and those earning less than $12,500 tend to be quite dissatisfied.

By and large, these same differences occur in attitudes about how respondents' salaries compare with those paid for similar work by other Philadelphia area employers and about whether salaries at Penn have gotten worse, better, or stayed the same over the past few years, compared with other Philadelphia area salaries. Of all respondents, 58% think their salary is lower than what other employers are paying, 11% think it is about the same, 6% think it is higher, and 25% have no idea. Twenty percent think salaries at Penn have gotten worse over the past few years, compared with other Philadelphia area salaries, while 28% think they have stayed in the same relative position, 9% think they have gotten better, and 42% have no idea.

Similarly, half of the supervisors feel that Penn's starting salaries are inadequate for recruiting most A-1 staff for their department, and 61% feel they are inadequate for recruiting most A-3 staff.

Two questions in the salary section asked about how respondents believe Penn should determine annual pay increases, one for A-Is and one for A-3s. The response choices were:

1. All A-1 [A-3] employees should receive the same percentage increase, regardless of performance.
2. Each A-1 [A-3] employee's increase should be based solely on his/her performance, so that the better the performance the greater the increase. Poor performers should receive no increase.
4. Same as choice 3 except that poor performers should receive a small increase (less than the across-the-board).
5. Have no idea.

The distribution of responses is essentially the same for the two questions, except that a larger percentage of respondents circled "have no idea" on the A-1 question (17%) than on the A-3 question (7%). The most popular choices are #3 (across-the-board plus merit, with no increase for poor performers and #4 (across-the-board plus merit, with a small increase for poor performers). Each of these was selected by about 33% of the respondents. Choice 2 (merit alone) was selected by about 20% of the respondents for both A-Is and A-3s, and choice 1 (flat percentage) was selected by 3% for A-Is and 6% for A-3s.

Supervisors, too, want flexibility in determining pay increases. Sixty-three percent indicate they would like "quite a bit" or "a great deal" of flexibility to reward superior A-1 performers through pay increases; 57% "very little" flexibility to reward A-1s, and only 2% would like "none" or "very little" flexibility for A-3s.

**Benefits**

As expected, the survey shows that Penn's benefits are highly regarded. Overall, about 80% of the respondents are mostly or very satisfied with their benefits, and half agree mostly or strongly that "The University benefits were important in my decision to work at Penn." Half also feel that Penn's benefits are better than those of other employers; only 11% rate Penn's benefits as worse. (Almost a third say they have no idea how Penn's benefits compare with other employers' benefits.) These attitudes tend not to be related to respondent characteristics.

Of the individual benefits, vacation and sick leave are especially highly regarded, and holidays follow closely. Ninety percent of the respondents rate vacation and sick leave as mostly or very adequate to their personal needs, and 85% give holidays a mostly or very adequate rating. Between about 70% and 75% feel that dental, health, and life insurance and tuition assistance to staff members are mostly or very adequate. About 60% feel that tuition assistance to dependent children is mostly or very adequate. (However, only about half of the respondents feel that this benefit applies to them, and 12% of these have no idea about its adequacy.)

The remainder of the benefits are seen as mostly or very adequate by fewer than half the respondents. These are long-term disability, tuition assistance for spouses, the retirement plan, and the tax-deferred savings plans (SRA and Equivest). However, sizeable percentages of the staff—from 20% to 50%—have no idea of their adequacy, so the lower ratings reflect unfamiliarity at least as much as negative opinions. For example, 31% have no idea about the adequacy of Penn's long-term disability benefit; but among those who rated it, 63% feel that it is mostly or very adequate.

The adequacy ratings of holidays and of dental, life, and health insurance tend not to be related to respondents' characteristics, but the rating of the other benefits are related to most of the characteristics. Once again, it is generally the higher level, more "senior" staff who have the higher ratings; also, women and nonminorities tend to find the benefits more adequate than men or minorities, and A-Is tend to find them more adequate than do A-4s or A-3s. The largest differences are in the ratings of tuition assistance for staff, spouses, and dependent children.

**Concluding Remarks**

The results of the Penn Staff Survey suggest that the staff feel that while there is room for improvement in the University, working at Penn has a number of very positive aspects. Staff tend not to be very satisfied with such things as their advancement opportunities, the job classification system, their salaries, faculty/A-1/A-3 relationships, and general Penn management. The University's problem-solving and grievance mechanisms receive lukewarm ratings, as do some of the services performed by Personnel. Parking and safety on campus at night are problematic.

On the other hand, staff tend to be very well satisfied with the kind of work they do, the independence they have, their benefits, and their job security. They derive both pleasure and pride from being part of a highly regarded academic institution—its cultural and recreational opportunities, its interesting and varied people, and its goals. The University may have many shortcomings, but only 6% of the respondents disagree that they would recommend Penn as a good place to work.

*ALMANAC, April 26, 1983*
Academic Calendar
April 29 Spring term classes end
May 2-3 Reading days
May 5-13 Final examinations

Children’s Activities
April 27 After-School Program: Arbor Day. Story Hour, ages 5-7; hear stories, have a tree snack and take home a tree seedling. 3:30 p.m., Morris Arboretum, $7 per child. $5.25 for Arboretum members. Reservations: 247-5777.
May 7 Architecture for Children: The Gingerbread Age. 2 workshops: a walk around a quarter mile tour for children ages 5-12, 9 a.m.-noon, $20 for one adult and one child, $5 for each additional family member (CGS).

Conferences
April 28-May 1 Literature and History: Theological Problems and Russian Case Studies, keynote address April 28, 7:30 p.m.; Members' Lounge, University House (Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures). Free admission. Information: Ext. 8704.
May 7 Health, Survival and Progress of Black Women. Second National Conference of Health Promotion (School of Nursing). Information: Ext. 8281 or 4522.

Coursework and Training
College of General Studies
April 30 A Workshop in the Novel, 9:30 a.m.
May 2 Programming in Basic, 5:45 p.m.
April 3 Writing: The Art of Effective Essays, 5:45 p.m.
May 7 Springtime in Cape May, a walking tour, 9 a.m.
May 8 Graduate Studies: The Living Art of Africa. 2 p.m.

These are non-credit courses sponsored by CGS. Dates shown are starting dates of courses. Information and registration: Ext. 6479 or 4693.

Morris Arboretum
April 28 Water Gardens, 7 p.m.
April 30 Spring Migration Bird Walk. 8 a.m.
May 1 Trees of the City. 2 p.m.

These courses are sponsored by the Morris Arboretum. Pre-registration is required. Information: 247-5777.

Exhibits
April 29 Ancient Mesopotamia: The Royal Tombs of Ur. Mesopotamian Gallery reopens, University Museum. On display in the refurbished gallery are the gold and lapis bull-headed lyre, the Ram in the Thicket, the golden headdress of Queen Pu-abi, the treasures of the Royal Cemetery at Ur. The new display includes the Royal Tombs at Ur, the Ur. The new display groups the artifacts chronologically from the earliest to the latest, allowing visitors to see the changes in art and technology over time.
May 7 College Galleries: Concert featuring Joan Kimball, recital pianist; Telemann, van Eyck and others; Karen Meyers, theorbo, and Langdon Carson, violin; 2 p.m., Lower Egyptian Gallery, University Museum.

Guided Gallery Tours
April 30, May 1 Mesopotamia
May 7 Highlights of the Collections
May 8 Mesopotamia

These Saturday and Sunday tours are free and begin at 1 p.m. at the main entrance of the University Museum. Information and to arrange for group tours: Ext. 4015.

Films
April 28 Lenin, 10 p.m.
May 1 Hair, 8:30 and 11 p.m.
May 7 The Return of the Seance of Seven, 8 and 10 p.m., midnight.

Music
April 29 William Parbery conducts the University Choral Society and the University Symphony Orchestra in Schubert’s Mass in Ab. 8:30 p.m., Tabernacle Church.
April 30 Penn Relay Concert, 8 p.m., Irvine Auditorium (Groove Phi Groove Social Fellowship—Year 102 Events).
May 7 Collegium Musicum presents a program featuring Joan Kimball, recital pianist; Telemann, van Eyck and others; Karen Meyers, theorbo, and Langdon Carson, violin; 2 p.m., Lower Egyptian Gallery, University Museum.

Meetings
Trustees: May 9 Executive Committee Stated Meeting. University Council: May 4 Meeting. 4-6 p.m. in Room 2, University School.

Tours of the City
As part of its effort to inform the public on the importance of trees in an urban landscape, the Morris Arboretum is offering a city walk May 1, 2-4 p.m. The walk begins and ends at the Liberty Bell Pavilion, Independence Mall. This is an opportunity to discover which trees and shrubs are best adapted to the city environment and what can be done to help them. Cost is $4 per registration is requested. Call 247-5777.

On Stage
Through May 7 Philadelphia Festival Theater for New Plays presents Groveland, an evening of four short comedies: Fast Women by Willie Reale; Two Hot Dogs with Everything by James Bitzer; God's Day Off by Ellen Byron; No Tricks for Harris by John Heller; Harold Prince Theatre, Annenberg Center. Information: 222-5000.

Special Events
April 28 Twenty-Five Year Club Annual Dinner. 5 p.m., University Museum. Information: Maroon Pond, Ext. 6811.
April 28, 29 Heptathlon/Decathlon.
April 27-28 Massage Marathon. A Health and Wellness event of the CA; noon-8 p.m., Christian Association Building. $4-10. Information: 222-9411.
April 28-29 Pennsylvania Festival of the Arts.
April 29 Class of 1904 Hey Day (Student Life).
April 30 Spring on Spruce Street. Parent-Infant Center flea market and carnival. 10 a.m.-4 p.m. Raindate May 1.
May 5 Alice Paul Awards Reception to honor women students for outstanding contributions to the University; 4:30 p.m., Room 121, Van Pelt Library (Women’s Faculty Club).
May 6 Wine and Cheese Open House sponsored by CGS, featuring special discounts, door prizes, entertainment by Don Kavash, and registration information for summer special programs; $3-7 p.m., West Lounge, Houston Hall. Information/registration: Ext. 6479 or 6463.
May 8 Mother’s Day Brunch, featuring Club members’ recipes, 11 a.m.-3 p.m., Faculty Club.

Citiweek: Arts and Architecture
University Citiweek, an annual showcase of diversions and attractions available year-round in University City, is April 29- May 8. This year’s focus is arts and architecture, Penn is sponsoring several events highlighting the area’s cultural and architectural richness. See the entries with the symbol. For a complete schedule of dozens of Citiweek events call 472-7609. Ext. 2299.

Sports (Home Schedules)
April 28 Baseball vs. LaSalle, 3 p.m.
April 28-30 Men’s and Women’s Outdoor Track.
April 28, 29 Softball vs. Trenton, 4 p.m.
April 29 Men’s Tennis vs. Cornell, 2:30
April 30 Women’s Crew vs. Princeton, Dartmouth
May 7 Baseball vs. Rider, 1 p.m.
Locations: Bower Field: Baseball; Franklin Field: Men’s and Women’s Track; Lott Courts: Women’s Tennis; River Field: Softball; Schuylkill River: Women’s Crew.

Tales
April 25 The West German Elections and the Nuclear Disarmament Movement: Werner Kallfelz, University of Göttingen, former director of the Social Science Research Institute of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation; 2:30 p.m., University House, Suite I, Holiday Inn. (Foreign Policy Research Institute). Information: 452-9514.
A Model for Lipid Peroxidation in Red Cells: Dr. Arnold Bell, University of Pennsylvania, Department of Biochemistry.
April 27 Patterns in Classical Music: Robert Gjerdingen, doctoral student; 12:15 p.m., Room 223, Graduate Lounge, Houston Hall (GSAC Lunchbag Seminars).
Aging in the Female Reproductive System: Dr. Luis Blasco, associate professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology. University Museum, University Museum.
Job descriptions and qualifications are listed only for those positions which have not previously appeared in Almanac. Positions which have appeared in the current issue of Almanac may have strong internal candidates. If you would like to know more about a particular position, please ask at the personnel office.

Where qualifications include formal education or training, equipment, college level coursework in communications, approved dental assisting program, certification preferred, experience in art and graphics, submission of a portfolio of work, and a strong internal candidate or hiring department representative. Openings listed without salaries are within which salary is to be determined. Resumes are requested for administrative/professional positions.

Support Staff

Administrative Assistant I (D0106) performs budget, bookkeeping and purchasing duties for project budget; assists in the preparation of budgets, grant proposals and proposals. Experience in budget preparation, word processing, typing, and ability to lift mail is required. Salary: $9,000-$11,000.

Administrative Assistant II (D0107) assists in budget preparation and word processing. Experience in budget preparation, word processing, typing, and ability to lift mail is required. Salary: $11,000-$13,000.

Administrative Assistant III (D0108) performs budget, bookkeeping and purchasing duties for project budget; assists in the preparation of budgets, grant proposals and proposals. Experience in budget preparation, word processing, typing, and ability to lift mail is required. Salary: $13,000-$15,000.
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Administrative Assistant II (D0107) assists in budget preparation and word processing. Experience in budget preparation, word processing, typing, and ability to lift mail is required. Salary: $11,000-$13,000.

Administrative Assistant III (D0108) performs budget, bookkeeping and purchasing duties for project budget; assists in the preparation of budgets, grant proposals and proposals. Experience in budget preparation, word processing, typing, and ability to lift mail is required. Salary: $13,000-$15,000.