Selection of University Professors
April 26, 1983
This letter is written to inform the University community of the procedures to be in use this year and thereafter for appointing University Professors. These procedures, which have been reviewed with both the Faculty Senate leadership and the University Professors, are as follows:

The Provost shall annually appoint a Faculty Review Panel, consisting of five tenured faculty members, to advise him on the qualifications of nominees for University Professorships. Not more than three of these panelists shall be University Professors or holders of Benjamin Franklin, named, or endowed professorships.

Nominations to University Professorships may originate from the Provost or may be sent to the Provost by any qualified source within or external to the University. The Faculty Review Panel shall independently review the merits of any nominee forwarded by the Provost, normally including external assessments, and report its recommendations to the Provost. Appointments shall be made by the Trustees on the recommendation of the President and the Provost after receiving the advice of the relevant faculty. Appointees to University Professorships will be considered by the regular procedures appropriate for external tenured appointments (including affirmative action).

—Thomas Ehrlich, Provost

Staff Survey: Talks Toward Follow-through
In a series of meetings last week, the administration presented detailed findings of the SRI Survey of staff attitudes that was summarized in last week's issue and will be mailed in full (some 280 pages) to deans and others for the start of follow-through.

Parking—an issue that stood out on the staff survey but cuts across all population lines on campus and some in the community—is now scheduled for tomorrow's Council agenda as a joint issue of the Facilities and Community Relations Committees.

Other topics moving up on the agenda are discussed in the page 6 summary of President Sheldon Hackney's talk at the joint meeting of the Administrative Assembly and A-3 Assembly last week.

Throughout the week SRI's Dr. Susan Russell appeared before invited groups to answer questions about the survey and its results. The survey's 75% return—and the fact that the distribution of the return by various characteristics matches the basic profile of University staff—is considered a high one. There were "few surprises" in the results, compared with pretests and interviews with sample groups before the mailing, she said. But among the key ones was that while satisfaction ran higher with older and better paid staff, the lowest satisfaction was not among newest and lowest paid but among those in the midrange. Another unpredicted result: a very high preference at all levels for a merit component in salary raises.

Dr. Russell said in response to queries that it was not possible to compare staff attitudes here with those in other institutions her firm has surveyed—including Stanford University—because the studies were on different bases.

Administrative Assembly: New Officers
The new officers of the Administrative Assembly for 1983-84 were announced at the conclusion of the joint A-1/A-3 meeting on April 22. Anthony Merritt, director of Research Administration, was chosen as chairperson-elect. Kristyn Nicholaas, assistant dean for admissions, College of Arts and Sciences, will be secretary-elect. Three new executive committee members were also elected: Ed Carre, assistant to the treasurer; Catherine Marshall, director of educational projects/assistant managing director, Annenberg Center for Communication Arts and Sciences; and Kevin Vaughan, assistant to the executive director, Student Financial and Administrative Services.

Council's Last Meeting
The Wednesday, May 4, meeting of Council will have both outgoing and incoming members present for an agenda that includes the election of the 1983-84 Steering Committee; continuation of the discussion on faculty-student issues in sexual harassment; a discussion of parking; and a status report on admission of the Class of 1987.

'Staff Survey: Talks Toward Follow-through'

A special performance by the Chinese Magic Circus of Taiwan is the entertainment at the Annenberg Center's fundraising gala May 12. An Evening of Chinese Opulence is a formal affair at the Center, with a 9 p.m. performance by the 18-member circus performing acrobatics and daring feats of balance that represent 2000 years of Chinese culture and tradition. After the show there will be desserts, cocktails, and dancing to the music of the Mark Davis Orchestra and Harriet Fay and Friends. An authentic Chinese dragon will also make an appearance. The cost is $50 per person, with $30 tax deductible as a contribution to the Annenberg Center. Cocktails and a formal Chinese banquet prepared by the Frog/Commissary will begin at 6:30 p.m. for a total cost of $125 per person, $65 tax deductible including the show and party. For more information on the gala evening, call Ext. 6706. There are also daytime performances of the Chinese Magic Circus of Taiwan, part of The Annenberg Center's Theatre for Children Series. See Children's Activities.
Annual Report of the Faculty Grievance Commission

Published in lieu of delivery at the Spring Meeting of the Faculty Senate April 20, 1983

I. Grievances: Seven cases were reviewed: two were accepted for hearing, two were not accepted for hearing, two are pending, and one has been withdrawn.

A. There were four formal requests for a hearing before the Commission. Of these four, two cases have been accepted for hearing. In both, the grievants are tenured members of the Faculty. The issues in question are 1) term of appointment and 2) relation of possession of research grants to salary level. One case is in the process of hearing and the other will be heard after the discovery process requested by the grievant has been completed.

Two cases were not accepted for hearing because the claims were deemed not to be a grievance according to the Faculty Grievance Procedure or because the grievants had not sufficiently pursued the procedures set forth in that Procedure.

B. Two cases are awaiting formal requests for a hearing. One case is a complaint by a tenured faculty member concerning terms and conditions of employment. The second case involves a decision to deny tenure.

C. One case involved a tenured faculty member who alleged arbitrary and capricious standards used by the department concerned in regard to establishment of a salary scale. After lengthy negotiations, the grievant withdrew the complaint.

D. Five other members of the Faculty consulted with the Chair of the Commission to discuss the possibility of filing a grievance with the Commission. In three of these cases, questions of tenure were involved. A fourth involved salary policy, and the Chair resolved questions raised by the faculty member after several telephone conversations. No further action was necessary.

The fifth consultation involved general University policy and was not pursued through the Faculty Grievance Commission.

II. Hearings: In the year October 1981-October 1982, there were hearings on two cases. As reported last year, in both cases the panel found for the grievants. However, only after extensive negotiations were the recommendations of the panels fully implemented and the cases successfully concluded. A third case which arose last year was not brought to a hearing, since negotiations had begun. These negotiations are continuing, under the guidance of the Past Chair of the Commission.

III. Selection of a Legal Officer: Peter Marvin, Esq., resigned this post as of February 16, 1983. A Search Committee was constituted consisting of Dr. Peggy Gelber, Executive Assistant to the Deputy Provost, Chair; Shelley Green, General Counsel of the University; Paul Bender, Professor of Law; and Adelaide Delleruva, Chair of the Faculty Grievance Commission. This committee reviewed fifty resumes, interviewed eight candidates, and recommended the appointment of Elliot B. Platt, who has accepted.

IV. Matters of Policy: The Commission, along with other Faculty who had been involved for some time with grievance matters, met with a sub-committee formed to review faculty judicial procedures—Chair: Paul Bender. (This subcommittee is part of a University Commission established to review campus-wide judicial procedures and is chaired by Professor John Keene, Ombudsman.) The Faculty Grievance Commission reported on matters of concern and made recommendations for further consideration.

V. Finally: The Faculty Grievance Commission wishes to express its appreciation to those members of the administration, faculty and staff who have aided it in its work, and to Almanac for being an important source of documentation of University policies and procedures.

The Faculty Grievance Commission:
Adelaide M. Delleruva, Chair
Lucienne Frappier-Mazur, Past Chair
Alfred Rieber, Chair-elect
Elliot B. Platt, Legal Officer

Computing Survey For Faculty

In the fall of 1982 the Provost appointed an Academic Computing Committee chaired by James Emery and co-chaired by Gerald Porter. The members of the main committee and its five subcommittees have met frequently over the last months and have made real progress toward the goal of defining the University's current and anticipated needs in computing and word processing. Further progress will require more direct input from the faculty as a whole. A short survey designed to determine current and planned needs will be mailed to all faculty members this week. It is important that the questionnaire be returned to my office by May 15, 1983, if it is to be useful in guiding the Committee's initial recommendations to the Provost concerning those needs which should be addressed on a priority basis. I therefore urge the faculty to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible.

The final report of the Academic Computing Committee and the results of the questionnaire will be published in Almanac.

—Barry S. Cooperman
Vice Provost for Research

Annuity Plan Changes: By May 13

Participants in tax-deferred annuity plans (TIAA/CREF or Pennsylvania Annuity Plan) are permitted, under Federal tax rules, to make or change tax-deferred annuity arrangements only once during each tax year. Now is the time to elect a tax-deferred arrangement for 1983.

Please note that all permanent, non-student, members of the University faculty and staff are eligible to participate in these annuity plans. Election forms are being mailed to faculty and staff who are currently making voluntary extra contributions to TIAA/CREF or are participating in TIAA/CREF Supplemental Retirement Annuities or the Pennsylvania Annuity Plan. Faculty and staff who would like to begin participating in such voluntary programs at this time may obtain election forms from the Benefits Office, 116 Franklin Building.

It is most important that completed election forms for the 1983 tax year be returned to the Benefits Office by Friday, May 13, 1983.

—James J. Keller
Manager, Benefits

Winding Down Almanac

Almanac will publish on May 10 and May 17, then stop for this fiscal year unless special needs arise. Those contributing to On Campus are urged to send for the May 17 issue (deadline noon Tuesday, May 10) all events through the first part of July, allowing for the possibility that the traditional summer issue will be mid-July. Staff are on duty despite the publication gap, to assist contributors with planning of future insertions.—Ed
Women at the Top?

Fourteen top policy-making positions in the administration have been filled during the past two years and not one has gone to a woman, despite the applications of highly qualified female candidates who received strong endorsements from search committees. Perhaps the most shocking example is the questionable search process that resulted in the recent appointment of a white male as Director of Public Safety, a position for which she was better qualified. Ms. Wells, with 28 years of experience in the criminal-justice system (21 in the Philadelphia Police Department and 7 on our own campus) has an outstanding record here, widespread and enthusiastic support for the position and first-rate academic credentials; is recognized as an expert on safety and security even beyond the confines of our campus, having been appointed by the Mayor of Philadelphia to serve on the Transit Crime Commission, the Mayor’s Commission on Women, and as a consultant to the Mayor’s Blue Ribbon Panel on Minority Hiring in the Philadelphia Police Department. Here at the University she has developed and administered the most successful victim-support program on any campus in the nation. We could go on, but by now it should be clear that Ms. Wells was a candidate of outstanding qualifications for the position she sought. The search process that failed to choose her, like so many others in recent years, passed over an outstanding woman candidate to choose a man.

The implications are clear. We call upon the administration to take the lead in reversing this reactionary course. We call upon them, in short, to fulfill their responsibilities to the women administrators who are deprived of professional opportunities, to the students, male and female, who are deprived of those women’s expertise and example, and to the good name of the University itself which has already been damaged by this and other reactionary courses. We call upon them, in short, to the administration to take the lead in reversing this and other reactionary courses.

On Being Appointed...

I am very pleased to have been chosen faculty master of Stouffer College House for the next three years and, with unbridled enthusiasm—and, perhaps, naiveté—look forward to assuming the responsibilities of engaging the Stouffer students, faculty, and graduate students collectively in what the Provost aptly called "a superb substitute for more expensive forms of self-indulgence"—learning. At Penn, this learning takes place in a unique liberal/professional environment rich with tradition and a history of outstanding faculty and high quality students. The two dimensions, excellent faculty and students, are what make Penn a great institution capable of achieving the ideal goal of education: the cultivation of persons, not merely the transmission of skills. The College House is another dimension.

The College House is the embodiment of the belief that the chief justification for housing students on campus is educational, i.e., the fostering of a community that defines itself in terms of shared educational purposes among students and faculty. Stouffer is an idealization of such a community and offers students and faculty a splendid opportunity for personal growth, intellectual stimulation, expansion of cultural horizons, and the shared excitement of simply expanding our experiences beyond the spheres within which we are comfortable. My family and I accept our role in this adventure with great expectations. We look forward to its challenge and to its joys.

—Marion L. Oliver
Associate Provost

The following was sent to Provost Thomas Ehrlich and to Almanac for publication.

A Question of Consistency

Since my original letter (Almanac 3/22) was misinterpreted by at least one colleague (Prof. Nathanson’s letter in the 4/19 Almanac) and since I was (mis)quoted out of context in the 4/21 Almanac, I’d like to reiterate my objection to the “new” tuition benefit plan as approved by the campus-wide mail ballot.

I feel strongly that any reduction in compensation for any segment of the existing faculty, without their expressed individual concurrence, has the potential danger of sending the wrong signals to people we’re recruiting to join us. This concern is entirely distinct from questions of expressed or implied contracts and from problems relating to newly-realized financial burdens placed on some of the existing faculty.

It is also independent of the universal sentiment that the current 900 direct grant is woefully inadequate. I am disturbed that the proposed change in tuition benefit policy has apparently not been examined, by either the administration or the SEC, for its potential impact on our ability to recruit, maintain and strengthen an outstanding faculty.

The importance of compensation to a prospective faculty member is twofold: first, that it meet some quantitative threshold below which the quality of life would have to be intolerably compromised; second, that one be able to count on it for the long haul. We are reasonably well in the former, one even hears of lucrative packages magically appearing at the eleventh hour when a superstar is being wooed for an endowed chair. So the magnitude of the salary/benefit package is not in general an impediment to attracting the best people. Consistency is the problem: having performed the calculus and deciding to forego the stock options, partnership profits or whatever, the new professor signs on and plans his financial future consistent with the benefits then in place. What is embodied in the “new” tuition plan is a substantial reduction in compensation for eventually 400 professors at any given moment (assuming 100 faculty children admit per year times four year matriculation per child). The prospective faculty member must now do another calculation: what are the odds that I will be one of the x people affected by the next reduction in compensation? What form is that reduction likely to take? Could I stand it?

I am very pleased to have been chosen faculty master.

So the magnitude of the salary/benefit package is not in general an impediment to attracting the best people. Consistency is the problem: having performed the calculus and deciding to forego the stock options, partnership profits or whatever, the new professor signs on and plans his financial future consistent with the benefits then in place. What is embodied in the “new” tuition plan is a substantial reduction in compensation for eventually 400 professors at any given moment (assuming 100 faculty children admit per year times four year matriculation per child). The prospective faculty member must now do another calculation: what are the odds that I will be one of the x people affected by the next reduction in compensation? What form is that reduction likely to take? Could I stand it?

I am very pleased to have been chosen faculty master.

I am very pleased to have been chosen faculty master.

I am very pleased to have been chosen faculty master.
The Work of the Ombudsman: An Overview

by John C. Keene

The preparation of a Biennial Report provides an opportunity to step back from the press of everyday concerns and reflect on the fundamental objectives, current trends and prognoses for the Office of the Ombudsman. This year we have decided to address some of the questions that are most frequently asked about the office. Even though the University has had an Ombudsman since 1971, there are many people on campus who are still not really familiar with it, perhaps because of the relative novelty of the institution of ombudsman in the United States.

What Does the Ombudsman Do?

University Ombudsman's responsibilities are usually patterned after those of governmental Ombudsmen, the first of which was selected in Sweden in 1809. "Ombudsman" (rhymes with "woodsman," with the accent on the first syllable) is a Swedish word meaning a public official who investigates citizen complaints that government officials have in one way or another violated individual rights. At Penn, the Ombudsman's office was created to provide students and employees with an independent, objective forum where they could complain of injustice and, if appropriate, initiate a process designed to remedy the wrong. The Ombudsman is an advocate, not for one class of university citizen or another, but for fairness, adherence to University regulations, due process, individual responsibility, and, from time to time, the softening of the effects of legitimate bureaucratic regulation in the service of broader considerations of equity.

The first task is to find out what happened, by talking to both sides, and assessing credibility. The second task is to secure equitable resolution of the matter if it appears that the complainant has a justifiable claim. The Ombudsman has no authority to decide an issue one way or the other: the office can act only in an advisory, mediatory capacity seeking either to persuade the person against whom the complaint has been made that something must be done to right a wrong, or to convince the complainant that he or she does not have a well-founded grievance.

How Does the Ombudsman's Office Operate?

What happens when a member of the University community calls or comes into the Ombudsman's office? After explaining the function of the office and assuring the individual that whatever is said will be kept confidential, we explore the various aspects of the problem with the complainant. We then discuss what steps, if any, the individual should take personally to seek redress. For instance, if the problem involves the procedures that a professor followed in grading a student's work the student should, in most cases, discuss it with the professor directly, and if still not satisfied, with the department chairman, before asking us to intervene.

It may be that the person who stops in simply wants to explore his or her problem with someone with experience in such matters who can serve as a disinterested adviser. Often the individual will want to find out what avenues exist for redressing the perceived wrong. Sometimes, after evaluating the probable risks and benefits of making a formal complaint, the individual may decide to take no action, to seek transfer to another position, or in some other way to deal with the problem indirectly.

If the individual decides to pursue the complaint and enlists the help of the Ombudsman, we must first explore the problem with the person against whom the complaint is being made. Once we have heard both sides of the controversy, and, where appropriate, discussed the matter with others who may possess relevant information, we decide whether or not the complaint is justified. If so, we then seek to secure corrective action that is reasonable from both the complainant's and the University's point of view.

What Kinds of Complaints Do You Get?

This question is answered in the statistical section that accompanies this report. By way of summary of the data for the last two years, 61% of the complainants are students, 32% employees and 7% alumni and persons with no direct affiliation with the University. Three categories embrace 54% of the complaints: academic matters, 24%; job issues, 20%; and procedures generally, 10%. No other category constituted more than 9% of the total. The academic complaints ranged from unfairness in grading and a professor's scheduling an exam before the end of classes to a professor's failure to avert an anticipated incident of cheating. Job complaints ranged from questions concerning office operation to termination procedures, and to sex, race and age discrimination.

What Changes Have There Been in Types of Complaints?

The general structure of the case load has been surprisingly stable over the last few years. The total number has averaged around 400 cases per year, meaning that somewhere between one and two percent of the potential client population (faculty, students and nonunion staff) comes in to see us in any particular year. The number of students has declined steadily from a peak of 308 in 1978-79 to 232 in 1981-82 (a 25% decrease) with an especially marked drop in the number of graduate students. The number of employee complaints has risen from 81 to 140 during the same period (a 72% increase). Within the employee category, faculty matters have doubled over the four years, from 21 to 43. Within the student category, residence complaints dropped 50% last year from the level of the prior three years. Otherwise, there have been no significant changes in the statistical profile.

Buried within the overall statistics, however, is a development that is profoundly disturbing. The office has been involved in several cases where the principal allegation was that a member of the faculty or nonacademic staff had engaged in some form of sexual harassment. Such activity is part of a large family of wrongs arising out of the oppressive use of a position of power to coerce, humiliate, or intimidate. Because of the reluctance of subordinates to make charges of power abuse, it is difficult to estimate the depth and breadth of the problem on campus. Suffice it to say that too many students and employees—usually women—must either endure degrading comments, suggestive innuendoes, offensive touching (or more) or alter their educational and employment objectives because a person who can significantly influence their progress toward these goals has taken or benefited from some form of harassment that the subordinate decides must be avoided. It is not clear whether the individuals who engage in this type of abusive conduct are so trapped in a set of social mores that condone and in fact support it that they do not realize its impacts, or whether they not only understand but also intend these impacts. In any event, it is certain that this type of activity is morally and legally wrong, and has no place on the campus. As we indicated earlier, it is deeply disturbing to hear more and more complaints of this type, because it reveals the extent of the problem. At the same time, because more and more complainants are
coming forward, it is possible to take concrete action concerning specific individuals and impose sanctions on them when appropriate. One can expect that with vigorous leadership from senior faculty and administrators in the implementation and enforcement of anti-harassment policies, the phenomenon will subside and subordinates will be released to pursue their educational and employment objectives without fear of intimidation and humiliation.

How Effective is the Ombudsman's Office?

This, of course, is the central question. It is also one that should be answered by others. Still, it is worth exploring the criteria that should be used. In the broadest sense, the effectiveness of the Ombudsman's Office should be measured by the extent to which it has made the University a more humane institution, a fairer place in which to live, study and work, and a community where there is a respect for oneself and one's colleagues that finds expression in a vigorous civility and an intelligent observance of enlightened institutional norms. It is, of course, quite difficult to measure these elusive but important qualities. It is more difficult to determine whether they have evolved in some marginal way over a short period of time. It is most difficult of all to trace the linkage between a particular cause of factor and any such change. With respect to the work of the Ombudsman's Office, it has been effective to the extent that:

First, 400 or so potential grievances whom we see every year have a better understanding of how the University works and what they can do to take a hand in resolving their problems;

Second, the 400 or so faculty members and administrators with whom we talk who are the other part of the problem learn how better to handle the disputes, mistakes and misunderstandings that arise in institutions; and

Third, instances of injustice are actually remedied.

To measure the last-mentioned factor—the rate at which instances of injustice are remedied—requires determining the percentage of the grievances with a meritorious claim that achieve an acceptable resolution of it. This criterion is difficult to apply. Claims come with a wide range of merits, from weak to strong. The proposed resolutions of the dispute may range, in the view of the grievant, from totally unacceptable to highly desirable. Thus, a case may rest on a claim that, on balance, is marginally valid and may involve a resolution that has little attraction for the complainant. Or, it may rest on a claim that is compelling and clear and may result in a proposed resolution that is more generous than the complainant had ever hoped for. Most cases fall somewhere between these two extremes. Accepting the subjective nature of the process of classifying these resolutions, we believe that a large proportion of meritorious claims that our office handles are resolved in a way that is acceptable to the grievant, much to the credit of the faculty members and administrators involved. The ones that are not, so that the grievant must move on to more formal procedures for redress, are both saddening and sobering.

Does the Ombudsman Do Anything Besides Handle Cases?

Part of the Ombudsman's responsibility is to identify recurrent problems or complaints and to suggest institutional changes that will remove the factors that cause them. The most important initiative of this type was the proposal in the Ombudsman's 1980 report that a study be made of the various elements of the University's judicial system to see whether any changes should be made. The President appointed a Commission on Judicial Proceedings for that purpose a little less than a year ago. The Commission's committees on students, faculty and nonacademic staff procedures are nearing completion of their work and the Commission as a whole expects to complete its work by the end of the academic year.

A Final Word

I cannot end this report on the activities of the Ombudsman's Office without recognizing the continuing contributions that Val Gossmann, Assistant Ombudsman, has made to its functioning. She brings a keen intelligence, an astuteness at judging character, a passionate, yet tempered, commitment to fairness, and ten years' experience to the job. Her work has been a significant factor in whatever accomplishments the office has achieved during her service.
A Presidential Session with the Nonacademic Staff

President Sheldon Hackney's overview of the year for Administrative and A-3 Assembly members in their first joint meeting started with optimism, and spelled out some reasons:

- A balanced budget for the seventh year in a row—"not that we are in business just to balance the budget; but we are preserving for our successors the ability to function in the future."
- Development accelerating—running about 20% ahead of last year, both in gifts/pledges and cash receipts for the second best year in Penn history. The President called it "remarkable" for a non-campaign year's proceeds to be second only to the finale of the Program for the Eighties.
- Applications up, both undergraduate and graduate, despite pool declines that are now becoming real—and scores that show Penn "outperforming the market" in attractiveness to the outstanding students we want.
- High evaluations of Ph.D. programs in the newest set of ratings. With five in the top five nationally, another five in the second five, and 11 more in the second ten, only 7 programs among those rated failed to crack the top twenty. "If you put that with our very strong reputations of the professional schools Penn is well up in the top ten overall."
- Achievements such as the seven Guggenheim, two McCarthy "genius" awards, and research breakthroughs such as the "super-rat" and plant gene experiments foretelling a Penn-research breakthroughs such as the "super-rat" and plant gene experiments foretelling a Penn-future. The title change for Gary Posner's position—from executive director of personnel relations to Vice President for Human Resources—reflects, he said, a commitment to the human side of the University, as does the commitment of more resources to aid in such programs as internal mobility, staff development and information.

Staff Survey

In a rundown of "what we really think of ourselves" as shown by the SRI Survey (Almanac April 26), Dr. Hackney hit the highlights without pulling any punches on the items that came in below 3.5—including the administration itself, communications, and personnel services. For the low item on the statistical totem pole—parking—he borrowed Clark Kerr's quip about the easy way to run a University (sex for the undergraduates, football for the alumni and parking for the faculty) but added "We only asked about parking." (Discussion on parking is now on the Council agenda; see page 1.)

Heartened that the survey showed such a high proportion of people who would recommend Penn to friends as a good place to work, he pledged to follow through on those that tempered that impression. He then opened the floor to questions. Among these:

Q. and A.

What about representation, such as that of assemblies, for long-term permanent part-time employees? (See last paragraph in box below for A-3 Assembly's reply.)

How does the improvement in entry-level pay square with reward for those who have been here and proved themselves? (A certain amount of catch-up is involved from two years ago when entry-level figures did not rise to meet inflation and thus fell behind the marketplace, the President and Mr. Posner responded.

In performance reviews, an audience member said qualifications of the reviewer matter—and some who head units have academic but not supervisory backgrounds. The President responded that guidelines are being given out now, and a booklet "A User's Guide to Performance Appraisal" is being distributed. He also said there is some responsibility for the employee to see that he/she gets reviewed.

How is the University progressing on internal grievance procedure revisions? The President said that the Staff Survey results moves up on the University's agenda the effort to install revisions. (In response to another query he said what is being moved up in priority is the George Budd Committee report on non-academic grievance processes vis a vis the Ombudsman John Keene's all-campus one.) Asked if there was a deadline, he quipped, "Not until today."

A new inquiry on any steps to prevent community backlash to University scientific programs drew perplexed responses. The President was aware of issue-oriented community reactions—that are dealt with as they arise, but none seem to have emerged on the nonrational 'science scare' side. He assured that the University has radiation safety and other measures in place.

What about emergency services at HUP for University personnel injured or ill on the job? An unexpected unanimity on the need for such services, affecting faculty as well as staff, cut across A-1/A-3 lines as speakers chimed in with actual experiences, leading Roosevelt Dicks to report that the A-3 Assembly has already scheduled a meeting on the topic.

How about affordable day care? At present, no new plans are in the works to expand campus day care, but about a third of the respondents to the Staff Survey say they are affected, the President said; "Maybe it ought to be on the agenda to look at."

As co-chair of the first joint session, Administrative Assembly Chair Stuart Carroll said he and Mr. Dicks hope to see the joint meeting become a tradition.

The Assemblies

Last week The Daily Pennsylvanian identified the Administrative Assembly as an organization of low-level administrators, and referred to its leadership and that of the A-3 Assembly and Librarians Assembly as "labor leaders." In an article on responses to the Penn Staff Survey.

The Administrative Assembly encompasses all A-1 personnel of the University—both administrative and professional—and the only restriction on rank is that the President of the University may not hold office.

The three Assemblies are generally referred to as staff organizations or nonacademic assemblies. All three are represented on the University Council and on the Almanac Advisory Board, two entry points for the views of nonacademic staff on University issues.

The A-3 Assembly often extends its interests to that portion of the A-4 workforce that is made up of "permanent part-time" personnel who perform in positions that would be A-3 if full time. A-4's interested in the work of the A-3 Assembly may reach its Spokesman Roosevelt Dicks at Ext. 4241.
Academic Calendar

Through May 4 Reading days
May 5-13 Final examinations

Children's Activities

May 7 Architecture for Children: The Gingerbread Age, workshop and walking tour for children ages 5-12, 9 a.m.-noon, $20 for one adult and one child, $5 for each additional child.

Exhibits

Through May 8: Sculpture by Sergio Castillo, distinguished Mexican artist, recent works in stainless steel, bronze and brass; Faculty Club.

Conference

May 7 Black Women: Facing the Realities, Houston Hall (Penn Women's Center). Information: Ext. 8281 or 4522.

Meeting

May 7 The Return of the Secaucus Seven, 8 p.m. in the Tea Room, Faculty Club.

Credit Union

May 4 Meeting

The Annual Meeting of the University of Pennsylvania Credit Union will be held on May 4, in Room 245, Houston Hall, at 5 p.m. Credit Union officers will speak on services available to members, such as checking accounts, recently added to the list which already included savings accounts, Christmas and Vacation Clubs and loans.

On Stage

May 7 King Kong at Morriss. Men will perform ritual 15th century English fertility dances to celebrate the arrival of spring, noon. 

On Campus

May 3-15

Un iterator, red oak laminate, 12" x 12" x 3/4", by Janet Veiner, a third year graduate student exhibiting in the MFA show opening May 7. See Exhibits.
Special Events
May 3-13 Horticultural Herst, tickets for drawing to benefit the Morris Arboretum on sale now and at the annual plant sale, 10 a.m.-5 p.m. daily, donation of $1 each or $5 for tickets. Drawings will be at 11:30 a.m., 2 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. on May 12, at 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 Kew, and registration information for summer special programs. 4 p.m., west lounge, Houston Hall. Information/registration: Ext. 6479 or 6493.
May 13 Spring Plant Festival, 10 a.m.-5 p.m. daily, Morris Arboretum.
May 8 Mother's Day Brunch, featuring club members' recipes, 11 a.m.-3 p.m., Faculty Club.

Sports (Home Schedules)
May 7 Baseball vs. Rider, 1 p.m.
May 21, 22 Women's Lacrosse NCAA Finals

Sports (Other Schedules)
May 3-5 Women's Hockey National Competition.
May 21, 22 Women's Lacrosse NCAA Finals

Talks
May 3 Godessess and Sacrifice, Kees W. Bolle, professor of history, University of California/Los Angeles, 3:20 p.m., 2nd floor lounge, Christian Association Building (Women's Study Center). May 4, 5, 6, 7 Religious Studies, Department of South Asia Regional Studies, Department of Religious Studies, Student Christian Movement of the CA). May 7 Future Trends in Automotive Materials: Julius J. Harwood, director, materials science laboratory, Ford Motor Company, 3 p.m., Auditorium, LRSM (Materials Science and Engineering, Engineering).

D.P. Graphics can also arrange for the outside printing of artwork, magazines, typesetting, do real work, does résumés, stationery, brochures, reductions & enlargements of artwork, magazines, typesetting, newspapers, advertisements, and other design work. The D.P. also publishes The Daily Pennsylvania, a campus newspaper, which is distributed at more than 50 locations on and near campus. Mailed subscriptions are available, as well.

The D.P. also publishes 4 Street magazine every Thursday. The magazine covers Philadelphia, arts and entertainment, and provides reviews and listings of events throughout the city.

The Daily Pennsylvania publishes paid advertising in both the daily newspaper and 4 Street. The paper's advertising and production departments will help design and completely produce all advertising material, usually without any extra charge. Additional typesetting and design work is performed by the newspaper's D.P. Graphics division (see D.P. Graphics).

For more information call Mary Lou Schaffer, office manager, or Cathy Bradley, assistant office manager, Ext. 6581.


For more information and prices call Kathy Leudtke, Wendy Cumiskey, or Diana Iannucci, managers, Ext. 6581.
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