

A Report on

The University of Pennsylvania

Affirmative Action Program

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN AN ACADEMIC SETTING

The University of Pennsylvania, like so many educational, governmental, and corporate institutions, has long maintained a policy against discrimination in the recruitment, appointment, promotion, and compensation of staff on grounds of race, color, sex, age, religion, or national origin. Such a policy is not only a moral and legal but also an educational imperative, fundamental to the effective functioning of an institution of teaching, scholarship, and public service.

At the same time, we are learning that nondiscrimination may no longer be a sufficient response. Underrepresentation of women or minorities in a particular role or profession, for example, may reflect far more the cumulative traditions and habits of a broad range of institutions than any conscious policies of exclusion or prejudice. The task before us is not to seek or assign blame, but to act positively – affirmatively – toward the elimination of all patterns of unequal treatment of women or minority groups. Our affirmative action policies are based on, but not limited to, Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 (including Revised Order #4), the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, and the Philadelphia Fair Employment Practice Act. They are dedicated to the full realization of equal opportunity for all and to the achievement of a university community which truly reflects the rich heterogeneity of our society.

This report is in two parts. The remainder of Part I summarizes some of the basic principles upon which the University's Affirmative Action Program, under the general direction of the Provost and the Vice President for Management, has been developed. Part II summarizes the major components of the Affirmative Action Program which have been implemented to date. This report is based upon earlier drafts which have been shared with the University community, its deliberative bodies, and certain external agencies. It is hoped that this Report, too, will elicit suggestions for further refinement and development.

A Comprehensive Strategy for Affirmative Action

A comprehensive strategy for affirmative action must operate on at least five levels: (1) the candidate pool, (2) hiring, (3) promotion and retention, (4) compensation, and (5) personnel policies. Each of these levels, or components, of the affirmative action strategy is directed toward a different manifestation of discrimination or underrepresentation.

The Candidate Pool. One reason for the persistent underrepresentation of women and minorities in many of our institutions – even those most committed to principles of nondiscrimination in hiring – is that the underrepresentation is already in evidence in the pool of candidates under consideration. For consideration of academic appointments, candidates are drawn either from graduate schools or other colleges and universities. For administrative appointments, candidates similarly tend to be drawn from university communities or from professions in which women and minority group persons may not be strongly represented. The potential candidate pool may be nationwide – indeed, often worldwide – and occupancy of certain professorships and endowed chairs may be of such consequence to the faculty that a position goes unfilled for months or even years. Yet the serious candidate pools may be limited largely to suggestions received by members of the relevant academic or administrative departments or search committees from colleagues at a relatively small number of institutions.

Such a process of co-optation may, of course, perpetuate the backgrounds of those doing the searching. It is not a system likely to give substantial attention to promising candidates from lesser known institutions or from nonacademic professions, to women scholars who

have left academe, or to members of minority groups who have not yet entered the mainstream of mobile professors and administrators. *Equal opportunity, then, – particularly for academic and administrative appointments – must begin with greater representation of women and minorities within the candidate pools.* This principle suggests the need to:

1. *Advertise appointments:* Notice of appointments should be posted or made otherwise conspicuous to both insiders and outsiders, with particular attention to hitherto untapped pools of minorities and women such as may be found in lower-level administrative positions, social service organizations, wives of faculty and staff, etc.; and

2. *Recruit for the candidate pool:* A history of underrepresentation of women and minorities does not mean that there is a large untapped reservoir of qualified women and minorities eagerly awaiting notice of the new job opportunities. For some positions, qualified women and members of minority groups may be hard to locate. Women in general are less mobile than men, and may not even be aware of career opportunities open to them. This is simply to suggest that a heterogeneous candidate pool may take some effort to compile, and that an effective affirmative action strategy must expect to actively search for women and minority candidates.

Hiring. It goes without saying that hiring must be based on merit without regard to race, sex, color, age, religion, or national origin. In fact, there can be no compromise with the principle of hiring by merit, especially in the case of faculty, if the standards of the University are to be maintained. At the same time, the criteria which define "merit" are often difficult to define – much less to quantify, sum, and compare among individuals. Our challenge is to maintain our allegiance to "merit" while critically examining the expressed or implied criteria by which individuals have been judged and the degree to which such criteria have made the maximum use of the skills and talents of women and members of minority groups. We can expect cases to arise when candidates may be judged of virtually equal merit on all but the most trivial criteria. *In such cases we believe it compatible with a fundamental allegiance to nondiscrimination and merit, yet responsive to the need to achieve full equality of opportunity, to avowedly favor women, minorities, or any other perversely underrepresented segment of the population.*

At times, especially with respect to clerical, secretarial, and some administrative and professional positions, criteria for the determination of "merit" can be unintentionally discriminatory. Qualifications for such jobs have occasionally called for verbal skills, educational background, or job experience which have been excessive for the demands of the position. "Merit" in such instances can become a screening device, effective in weeding out applicants – usually the less educated – on the basis of attributes and values some of which may be quite irrelevant to the skills needed in performance of the task. *The criteria of merit, then, must be free from unintended biases which might select unfairly against women, minorities, or older persons.*

Allegations of "reverse discrimination" are often raised in the context of *numerical goals* for women and minority hiring. Those opposed to numerical goals often identify them as "quotas" and maintain that quotas will either: (a) force institutions into clear cases of reverse discrimination (i.e., hiring a woman or member of a minority group over a clearly more qualified Caucasian male), or (b) encourage institutions to set unrealistically low goals which can be easily met without generating any truly affirmative actions. Others, however – including the H.E.W. Office of Civil Rights and most recent legislative, executive, and judicial directives – maintain that numerical goals should be thought of only as a constant challenge and reminder to the institution and as a yardstick against which to measure progress.

The absence of targets, or goals, requires considerable faith on the part of women, minorities, and public and private "watchdog" agencies that a college or university will continue to strive to markedly increase its employment of women and minority group persons. The willingness of institutions to set goals, on the other hand, requires faith on their part that the failure to reach these targets will not be abused or considered in isolation from the special circumstances of a given case. *We believe that colleges and universities should set realistic but challenging goals, with the clear understanding – in accord with Revised Order #4 – that these goals will frequently prove unattainable but that performance will be evaluated on the basis of procedure and effort rather than simple proximity to target.*

Promotion. Affirmative action at the level of new hiring means very little if the same considerations are not applied to promotions. An aggregate staff census may at times show substantial representation of women and minority group persons, but fail to show those which may be concentrated at entry or near-entry level positions. *Policies and programs to move women and minority group persons up career ladders must be accorded at least as high a priority as those directed toward new hiring.*

Generally the policies and programs applicable to new hiring apply as well to promotions – e.g., advertising openings, recruiting from the ranks, and seeking a more heterogeneous candidate pool. Of particular importance, especially for support staff, are training programs to move women and minority group persons into middle and upper levels of management responsibility.

A significant new element affecting the promotion of assistant professors to the rank of associate professor with tenure is the virtual cessation of the growth in the overall size of the faculty, coupled with a reduction in retirements and resignations of senior faculty. As a result, promotions to tenure must be limited if the overall ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty is to remain roughly constant (at about 2:1). Given these constraints, promotions to tenure will increasingly have to be based not simply upon the individual's competence as a scholar and teacher, however demonstrated, but with consideration to the future growth and the present ratio of senior to junior faculty in the department and school. *Thus, although we believe the promotion and even the direct appointment of women and members of minority groups into the senior faculty ranks to be of utmost importance to our affirmative action program, we must recognize that the number of promotions to tenure has declined sharply in recent years and may continue to decline or at best remain at a level considerably below the levels prevailing throughout most of the past decade.*

Compensation. At still another level, an affirmative action program must seek to avoid wage disparities based on sex or race. Systematic patterns of discrimination in compensation are most likely to occur in academic and higher level administrative positions in which positions are truly comparable but in which salaries are, to a greater or lesser degree, essentially "negotiated" between the incumbent and his or her superior. Higher salaries, in such a system, will be a reflection of the recognized qualifications of the individual and the supply-and-demand conditions of the market for his or her particular field. While the "test of the market" cannot be viewed as the sole criterion for the determination of salary (or promotion), the constraints of supply and demand cannot be ignored, and the institution must remain free to negotiate salaries. We reject the imposition of a fixed schedule of salaries through which all professional staff would move in strict accord with seniority and rank.

At the same time, market influences are truly efficient and equitable only where there exists a highly mobile and well informed labor force aggressively seeking greater compensation and fully prepared to relocate if a better package can be obtained elsewhere. The individual who is relatively immobile (and without a serious alternative job prospect in mind), often uninformed of the salaries of his or her colleagues, and generally not as aggressive in seeking "top dollar" wage will be at a distinct disadvantage in negotiations for salary and promotion. Unfortunately, these characteristics of market uncertainty are almost certainly more prevalent among women than among men. *Thus, while salaries should legitimately reflect the current supply and demand of individuals in a particular field and with a particular set of capabilities, salaries should generally not reflect differential negotiating strengths of individuals which stem primarily from sex- or race-related differentials in their job mobility.* Salaries, then, should generally be the same for individuals with the same qualifications carrying out the same task and bringing the same value to the institution to the extent that these comparabilities can be demonstrated.

Personnel Policies. Finally, there are a number of personnel policies which bear directly or indirectly upon hiring, promotion, retention, and compensation, particularly of women. Since these are best discussed in the context of the University's own plan, we will simply cite below a number of these policies and the way in which they relate to affirmative action. For example, maternity leave is essential to encourage women to return to work soon after having a child if she wishes. The elimination or relaxation of most nepotism restrictions can remove a potential barrier to women who may most want, and be most qualified, to work at the same institution as their husbands – or vice versa. More flexible provisions for part-time work could similarly assist women with families.

Contracts with Suppliers. The components listed above are the ingredients of a strategy for increasing the representation and equal treatment of women and minorities on the academic and support staffs. Another component of a comprehensive strategy is to bring pressure to bear upon other institutions or firms to meet standards of equal employment opportunity. Because a university is a large purchaser of all manner of goods and services, many from smaller local firms, it can apply considerable leverage upon those firms to adopt their own affirmative action plans.

Academic and Supporting Staff

A conceptual framework of an affirmative action program by the components above is particularly important when devising strategy to meet the needs peculiar to the various categories of college or university employees. Most institutions identify employees as "academic," "administrative," and "support," with the support staff often divided between secretarial/clerical and operative/laborer. For the purpose of formulating an affirmative action strategy, the following observations might be useful:

Academic staff. The academic staff is generally distinguished by:

1. small, non-local candidate pools, traditionally containing relatively few women or minorities;
2. a powerful tradition of collegial decision-making on all matters affecting hiring and promotions;
3. the institution of tenure and the "up and out" policy which may lead the college or university to avoid even beginning a faculty member on the tenure track without a long-term budgetary commitment;
4. criteria for promotion and compensation based on scholarship and teaching ability, with the former generally predominating.

Administrative and Professional Staff. These staff are characterized by:

1. more typically bureaucratic structures and processes for hiring and promotion;
2. considerable mobility between top level administrative positions and the academic staff; and
3. considerable growth in recent years, together with an increasing "professionalization" of academic administration.

Mid- and top-level administrative positions may well represent the most fruitful area in the expansion of women and minority group persons. The candidate pools are generally more representative than are those for faculty positions. Particularly important is the need to look *inward* for minority persons and women who may simply have been left in mid- and lower-level positions. While new hiring is important, of course an equal or greater challenge at this level for most institutions probably lies in effecting more equitable policies of promotion and compensation.

Secretarial and Clerical Staff. The secretarial and clerical staffs of most institutions are generally characterized by:

1. predominance of females;
2. a proportion of minority group members usually at least equal to the proportion within the surrounding communities;
3. in some institutions, the presence of many students and wives of students; and
4. little organization as an employee group.

Hiring procedures may at times unconsciously discriminate against men and minority group persons through job descriptions and formal qualifications. The major problem, however, is probably at the level of promotion. Affirmative action strategies for clerical and secretarial staff should focus on training and promotional policies and on drawing from the pool of top level secretarial (e.g., office manager) staff to fill vacancies in administrative positions.

Craftsmen, Operatives, Laborers, etc. This employee category may be differentiated by:

1. unionization;
2. prescribed rules regarding compensation, seniority, and promotions; and
3. presence of large numbers of minorities and women in certain of the fields (e.g., dining services).

Unionization, where established, may be the most significant of these characteristics, requiring the affirmative action plan to work through established collective bargaining machinery. The problem, again, lies principally in promotions and the tendency of minority group persons to remain concentrated in entry level positions.

Grievance Machinery

Effective grievance machinery is an important component of an effective program of affirmative action. The basic assumption behind affirmative action is that past procedures for hiring, promotion, and compensation may not in themselves be sufficient to realize the ultimate goal of equal opportunity for all. Therefore, grievances should be thought of not necessarily as a breakdown of the plan or as an irritation to be minimized or discouraged, but as one legitimate means by which institutional change for greater opportunity is to be brought about. In general, we believe that the best interests of an aggrieved individual as well as the institution will be better served if the grievances can be resolved internally rather than externally, and individually or collegially rather than judicially or quasi-judicially.

Grievances, however, are fundamentally conflicts which carry within them the potential for both constructive and destructive change. The purpose of grievance *machinery* is to control and direct the conflict so that individual redress and institutional change may take place without damage to the essential educational functioning of the institution. Grievance machinery requires, then, a delicate balancing of several potentially conflicting needs. One of these is to respect and preserve the prerogatives of the faculty in matters pertaining to the hiring and promotion of academic staff, but to recognize, at the same time, that certain procedures designed to assure compliance with affirmative action policies will have to be followed and monitored. A second need is to respect the tradition of collegial and decentralized decision-making while at the same time holding the president and the chief administrative officers of the University ultimately responsible for effecting significant institutional change. Finally, a grievance procedure must assure prompt due process for each grievance without swamping the institution in a sea of quasi-judicial, time-consuming litigation with enormous potential costs which simply cannot be borne today by most colleges and universities.

These considerations suggest a number of working principles for the grievance process:

1. Separate grievance mechanisms should be set up to deal with the academic staff and the support staff who are not covered under collective bargaining agreements.

2. Legitimate grievances are principally a reflection of imperfections in managerial and administrative policies and/or procedures. Therefore, the grievance mechanisms should be viewed as a device not simply to redress individual complaints, but to sensitize, educate, and ultimately to change these policies and procedures. For this reason the grievance mechanisms must, to the extent possible, work *through* normal supervisory and administrative channels. Department chairmen, supervisors, managers, and other administrative personnel must be challenged to redress grievances of individuals under their responsibility, and must, in turn, be held accountable to their administrative supervisors (e.g., directors, deans, vice-presidents) for persisting difficulties. Grievance mechanisms, in other words, must attempt to change, not simply to bypass or supersede, imperfections in the system.

3. Quasi-judicial proceedings such as formal grievance panels or hearings should be held to a minimum and only then used as a last resort when established procedures have proven incapable of resolving a dispute. Such proceedings may draw upon analogies to courts of law, but they remain essentially collegial procedures for resolving disputes rather than legal procedures for the determination of guilt or damages and must be designed and evaluated accordingly.

4. In all cases, the chief executive officer of the University or his designee must have final authority. Although recommendations of grievance panels, affirmative action officers, and others will be the major bases for final arbitration and will not be lightly

countervened, the final authority on such matters as hiring, promotions, tenure, etc. cannot be left to a grievance panel or officer.

Responsibility

The final ingredient of affirmative action is the assignment of responsibility. It is important in this respect to distinguish between responsibility for policy and responsibility for the effective functioning of a plan. Policy affecting academic staff or program must reside with the president and the chief academic officer in conjunction with the duly established faculty consultative bodies. Policy affecting support staff must reside with the president and the major nonacademic officer.

However, the effective functioning of an affirmative action program is most dependent upon a different kind of responsibility – the responsibility not to make policy, but to assure the proper workings of the compliance and grievance machinery; to monitor the regulations and directives established by those responsible for policy; and to make certain that the requisite policy decisions are being made by the appropriate individuals or bodies. It is vital to the success of an affirmative action program that one person, in a staff relationship to the president or a chief administrative officer, be held accountable for the effective functioning of the affirmative action program. This individual should generally hold an office and a title such as equal opportunity officer or administrator of an office of equal opportunity.

II. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The principles set forth in the preceding section constitute an effective Affirmative Action Program only to the degree that they are promulgated in official policies and procedures. The Affirmative Action Program of the University of Pennsylvania, then, is best evidenced by the various documents of official University policy and procedure included as attachments to this report. This section will summarize the components of the University's Program already promulgated, and report on the progress of those still in their formative stages. The "Program," itself, will continue to undergo review, modification, and expansion in the months and years ahead – an evaluation which will be reflected in subsequent reports to the University community; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and other interested agencies and individuals.

Responsibility

Responsibility for the development, implementation, and monitoring of the University's Affirmative Action Program rests with the Provost (the senior academic officer) and the Vice President for Management (the senior nonacademic officer). The Administrator and Associate Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity are responsible for maintaining liaison with external agencies, disseminating information about the Affirmative Action Program to all concerned parties, monitoring compliance with various components of the Program; servicing the grievance procedures; and providing technical assistance to the various offices and individuals responsible for implementing components of the Program. The Executive Director of Personnel Relations is responsible for the development and implementation of all University personnel policies and procedures, including those directed wholly or partially toward the goal of equal opportunity.

Drafts of these components have been presented to the University community and have been reviewed by organizations representing the various employee categories or interests (e.g., Administrative Assembly, A-3 [secretarial and clerical] Assembly, the Faculty Senate, and Women for Equal Opportunity at the University of Pennsylvania [WEOP]). The Council of Academic Deans and the newly-formed Academic Committee on Equal Opportunity along with the University Senate provide ongoing advice and review on affirmative action policies and procedures and will have a major role in the formation of the components dealing with the faculty. Major policy changes would be expected to be reviewed by the University Council, the principal deliberative body of the University of Pennsylvania.

Data Analysis, Goals and Timetables

Accompanying this Report* is the output of our first comprehensive affirmative action survey of University employees. The principal analyses are:

1. The distribution of full-time and permanent part-time employees by group (Black, American Indian, Oriental, Spanish surnamed, and other) and sex in the academic ranks and job families within the twenty-three reporting units (plus departments, for faculty only) of the University.

2. Persons by group and sex and by years in service and years in grade within reporting units according to recent promotions.

3. The distribution of persons by group and sex and by academic ranks and job families within salary and seniority classes.

Data and instructions are contained in the [forwarded] volumes of printout. Responsibility for generating data for affirmative action analysis rests with the Assistant Vice President for Management Information Systems. The input is derived from existing personnel records, which do not carry racial identification, plus a separate, confidential tape of employees by employee identification number and group (Black, American Indian, Oriental, Spanish-surnamed, and other). As the affirmative action reporting system is modified and perfected, analyses will be undertaken at least once a year by the Office of Equal Opportunity and the Offices of the Provost and the Vice President for Management.

Programming and printing the [forwarded] affirmative action data were completed on April 16, 1973 — giving insufficient time for an exhaustive analysis within this report or for the generation of goals and timetables on the basis of such an analysis. The fourteen academic deans and the vice presidents and directors of the ten administrative reporting units, however, have been requested to supply three-year estimates of new hires by administrative divisions, schools, departments and aggregates of departments. This information will be combined with estimates of women and minority group availability to construct goals and timetables for the various schools and other reporting units by June 1, 1973. (See page VIII.)

Affirmative Action for Nonacademic Personnel

Supporting the faculty of the University are over 4,000 "non-academic" personnel. These are classified for payroll purposes as:

A-1: Administrators, supervisors, and professional staff performing highly skilled or specialized work;

A-3: Salaried staff performing secretarial, clerical, technical, or service work; and

A-4: Hourly employees, including craftsmen, operators, technicians, laborers, and maintenance personnel — most of whom belong to one of the thirteen collective bargaining units.

These personnel classifications have been further subdivided for the purpose of affirmative action analysis into seventeen job categories. The sex and minority-group composition of these job categories across the entire University is shown in Table 1. Even a cursory review of the raw data [forwarded with] this report identifies the senior A-1 administrative positions as the job categories in which the greatest effort must be made to increase the number of women and minority group persons. Although minority group individuals must generally be recruited from outside the University, it is possible that women can be added to the senior administrative ranks in significant degree by internal recruitment and promotions.

The greatest need in the eleven A-3 secretarial/clerical job categories is to increase the mobility of minority group women into the senior classifications and the more advanced job categories. Examination is also being made of job opportunities for males within these traditionally female job categories.

The A-4 technician/tradesman/service worker job categories are mostly unionized, and affirmative action programs have been pursued in conjunction with union contracts and the requirements of federal and state agencies overseeing apprenticeship programs, contracts, etc. [See Attachment A†, Affirmative Action Plan for the Department of Buildings and Grounds, submitted to the Pennsylvania Apprenticeship and Training Council of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Depart-

Table 1

FULL TIME NON-ACADEMIC STAFF BY JOB CATEGORY
AND MINORITY GROUP STATUS
AS OF DECEMBER, 1972

	Minority Group										
	Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		
	Total	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A-1 Senior Admin.	108	104	96.2	4	2.7	4	2.7	4	2.7	0	.0
	297	178	59.9	119	40.0	20	6.7	11	3.7	9	3.0
	365	227	62.2	138	37.8	32	8.7	17	4.6	15	4.1
A-3 Professional	221	52	23.5	169	76.4	20	9.1	5	2.3	15	6.8
	542	199	36.7	343	63.3	149	27.5	45	8.3	104	19.2
	42	29	69.0	13	30.1	6	14.3	4	9.5	2	4.8
	32	1	3.1	31	96.9	13	40.6	0	.0	13	40.6
	421	1	.2	420	99.8	87	20.6	1	.2	86	20.4
	473	10	2.1	463	97.0	54	11.4	1	.2	53	11.2
	167	40	23.9	127	76.0	42	25.2	14	8.4	28	16.8
	76	6	7.9	70	92.0	12	15.8	1	1.3	11	14.5
	47	7	14.9	40	85.1	19	40.4	1	2.1	18	38.2
	61	61	100.0	0	0	7	11.5	7	11.5	0	.0
	93	71	76.3	22	23.7	31	33.3	21	22.6	10	.0
	173	80	46.2	93	53.8	50	28.9	28	16.1	22	12.7
A-4 Technician	30	28	93.3	2	6.6	21	70.0	19	63.3	2	6.6
	172	168	97.6	4	2.3	35	20.3	35	20.3	0	.0
	657	332	50.5	325	49.5	449	68.3	227	34.5	222	33.8
Total	3977	1594	40.1	2383	59.8	1051	26.4	441	11.2	610	15.3

ment of Labor and Industry.] The principal thrust of affirmative action efforts to date in the skilled trades has been upon increasing the number of minority-group persons. We recognize however, that women have also been excluded from many trades and that they may require a quite different strategy for affirmative action.

Recruiting and Hiring. The process of recruiting and hiring a new nonacademic (A-1, A-3, or A-4) person begins with the supervisor, senior administrator, or other hiring officer submitting a "Request for Employee Services" form to the Personnel Office. Requests for new positions are reviewed by the Senior Classification Review Committee so that proper classification and salary range is determined. Criteria for positions are determined by the hiring officer in consultation with the Personnel Department. For every position an attempt is made to ensure that each criterion is realistically related to the requirements of the position, and that they do not eliminate from consideration members of minority groups or women. Salary levels or ranges are guided by practices prevailing in similar institutions as revealed in comparison studies such as the bi-annual report of Booz, Allen, Hamilton and Associates. Job classifications and salary ranges have been set up for all but statutory officers and the senior administrative officers.

Positions within the A-3 and A-4 job categories listed in Table 1 are relatively standardized and draw primarily upon local candidate pools. For this reason, most of the recruiting and screening of candidates is done by the Personnel Office of the University, although the actual hiring is done by the head of the operating unit which initiated the "Request for Employee Services." All A-3 and A-4 positions are listed for at least 3 days in the Personnel Announcements, on the official job posting boards located throughout the campus, and generally in the *Almanac*, the official journal of record of the University [See Attachments B†; Personnel Department Announcement of Position Vacancies, and C†; Job Listings in the *Almanac*.] Positions in the A-3 and A-4 job categories are also advertised off campus in newspapers and trade journals [Attachment D†; Sample Advertising]. In an effort to

*As forwarded to the HEW. Raw data not available for inspection, but see Tables I and II herewith for compilation.

†Available for inspection, Office of Equal Opportunity.

reach the broadest possible candidate pools and especially to seek out minority candidates, the Personnel Office also uses employment agencies, the State Employment Service, and agencies such as the Veterans Administration, the Urban League, the Opportunities Industrialization Center, and the NAACP. The Personnel Office has also made general recruiting trips to local high schools and trade schools – many predominantly black. In addition, each job counselor within the personnel department maintains files on females and minority group applicants who either applied when no positions were open or who were not hired for a specific opening. These files are continually consulted and the applicants notified if an appropriate opening develops.

The use of tests for screening candidates for A-3 and A-4 positions has been carefully and critically examined, and a number of tests have been dropped because of questionable predictive success and possible discriminatory impact. Currently, only a typing test (the same test as utilized by the federal government) for secretarial candidates and a vocabulary test for library employees are used. There are no failing or passing scores on these tests, and the results are used by job counselors only in combination with other criteria in advising hiring officers in the selection of employees.

Recruiting and hiring for administrative and professional (A-1) positions is considerably more decentralized, with advertising, preliminary screening, and final selection often done by the hiring unit rather than the Personnel Office, although women and minority group candidate files are maintained by the Personnel Office and called to the attention of the hiring units when positions become open. Because such administrative and professional recruiting and hiring is so critical to the Affirmative Action Program, a special compliance procedure has been instituted [Attachment E†, Affirmative Action: A-1 Hiring]. Promulgated by the Provost and the Vice President for Management, this procedure declares that:

...it shall be the policy of the University in filling administrative and professional positions to give special consideration to women and minority persons when all other relevant considerations fail to provide a clear choice among the top candidates.

Besides the requirements of 7 days' posting and clearance of new positions by the Senior Classification Review Committee, this procedure requires submission to the Executive Director of Personnel Relations an accounting of the steps used in the search process; a summary of the numbers of candidates examined, including numbers of women and known members of minority groups; and the vitae of the best woman and best candidate known to be a minority group member, together with a short rationale why neither of these were chosen. The Executive Director of Personnel Relations with assistance from the Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity is charged with monitoring and enforcing this procedure. Official policy declares that: *No personnel action is complete and no commitment is to be made to a candidate until notification by the Personnel Office that the Personnel Action Form and the Statement of Compliance have been approved* [Attachment E].

Promotions and Transfers. Integral to an affirmative action program are successful promotion and transfer procedures. We believe that there are strong candidates – including women and minority group members – within the University for most positions sought. University policy, then, is to officially encourage employees to seek promotions and hiring officers to seek candidates, when appropriate, from within [Attachment F†, Policy on Promotions]. Employees may investigate opportunities in confidence with Job Counselors in the Personnel Department, and, of course, have access to positions available through the job posting procedure.

In many cases, special training is a requisite for promotion or lateral transfer. The University Training Center, headed by a Training Director, operates classes during working hours for staff who wish to upgrade their skills, primarily secretarial and clerical. The Training Center also participates in the JOBS '70 federally-funded program to provide training in clerical and secretarial skills for 50 disadvantaged persons. So far 33 people have graduated from the program and 24 are still employed on campus [Attachment G†, JOBS '70 Training Program]. In addition, the staff of the Training Center is developing classes on

University accounting and budgetary procedures, management techniques and a variety of other topics useful for any employee who wishes to advance.

Buildings and Grounds conducts an apprenticeship program to train both current employees and outside applicants in the skilled trades. [See Attachment A†].

Personnel Policies. A number of personnel policies have been revised as part of the University's Affirmative Action Program. The *nepotism* policy was revised in March, 1971, to allow employment of two or more members of the same family even in the same department. The only limitations presently are the obvious ones: no member of the same family shall participate in the decision to employ, promote, reappoint or terminate the employment of a member of his or her family; and no individual should be in a position to pass on any vital matter, including salary determination, affecting a member of his or her family.

The *maternity leave* policy has also been greatly strengthened in order to allow and encourage women to continue at the University of Pennsylvania after having children. The revised policy [Attachment H†, Maternity Leave] generally treats pregnancy and childbirth like any other temporary medical leave, with full eligibility to draw on current and accrued sick leave and vacation time. In addition, women who have completed six months of service before a medical leave on account of pregnancy and childbirth may take a personal leave for up to five additional months for child care.

Termination. To ensure that equitable procedures are followed in the case of employee terminations, a termination policy has been developed that protects both employee and employer [Attachment I†, Termination Policy].

Grievance Procedure. A grievance procedure was instituted in the spring of 1973 for all non-faculty staff who are not members of a collective bargaining unit. This procedure [Attachment J†, Grievance Procedure for all Nonacademic Staff Not Covered by Collective Bargaining Agreements] was adopted after substantial input on earlier drafts from many members and bodies of the University Community, including Women for Equal Opportunity at the University of Pennsylvania and various employee organizations. The grievance procedure conforms to the principles set forth in Part I of this Report, including emphasis on working through the normal management channels. The procedure calls for a Complaint Appeals Panel as a final arbiter which shall recommend disposition of the complaint to the Provost (when complaints arise within academic units) or the Vice President for Management (for cases within nonacademic units). The grievance procedure is to be evaluated by the end of the 1973-74 academic year.

Affirmative Action Through University Contracts and Purchasing

Construction. The Executive Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania passed a resolution at its November 13, 1970 meeting which states the University will adhere to the Federal Philadelphia Plan in construction contracts for all work over \$500,000. [See Attachment K†, Construction.]

Vendors and Suppliers. On the reverse side of all University purchase orders is a general statement regarding the seller's responsibility for compliance with the non discrimination clause of Executive Order 11246 as amended by 11375. [See Attachment L†, Purchase Order Form.]

The Purchasing Department, with the assistance of the Office of Equal Opportunity, will make an intensive effort to identify minority businesses capable of supplying some of the University's needs.

The University has taken a further step regarding vendors and suppliers and is cooperating with the city of Philadelphia in requiring an affirmative action plan of service units with 25 or more employees. This program is known as the city's Philadelphia Plan. The responsibility for monitoring this program belongs to the city. [See Attachment M†, Letter to Mr. Clarence Farmer, Chairman, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, from Paul Gaddis, Vice President for Management.]

[†]Available for inspection, Office of Equal Opportunity. (E) published Almanac December 12, 1972; (F) October 9, 1973; (G) October 19, 1971.

[†]Available for inspection, Office of Equal Opportunity. (H) published Almanac September 25, 1973; (I) October 9, 1973; (J) December 12, 1972.

**Affirmative Action for
Academic Personnel**

The University of Pennsylvania as of November 30, 1972, had 1676 full-time and 3648 part-time faculty, categorized for the purpose of affirmative action reporting as: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, other generally tenure-accruing ranks, (e.g., associates, instructors), non-tenure-accruing ranks (e.g., lecturers, investigators), and students with part-time academic appointments. A gross breakdown of full-time faculty by rank, sex and minority group status is shown in Table 2. The distributions by School and by department are included within the printouts [forwarded to the HEW]. As discussed above, goals for women and minority group hiring are currently being formulated for the various schools.

Academic Policy for Affirmative Action. Affirmative action policies for the academic staff are promulgated by the Provost. The Provost is assisted by an *Academic Committee on Equal Opportunity*, chosen by the Provost and the President from a list submitted by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee. The Committee is currently composed of eight faculty members, and has been meeting since February, 1973. Its mission is to advise the Provost on policies and procedures and to monitor and report upon their success. [See Attachment N†, Letter from Provost Stellar to Chairman Anna-Marie Chirico, for elaboration on the mission of this committee.]

Also serving the Provost in both an advisory and an executive capacity is the *Council of Academic Deans*. University policies and procedures must recognize that Schools differ in type of faculty, organization of faculty, and in general progress toward meeting the goals of affirmative action. Furthermore, policies and procedures must recognize that nearly all hiring and promotion decisions are made at the levels of schools and departments. It follows, then, that there can be no truly effective affirmative action for faculty without the commitment of the deans and their department chairmen. In recognition of this, a number of sessions have been spent with the deans on the topic of affirmative action, including a recent off-campus session on the meaning of affirmative action, the responsibilities of deans, and various procedures for helping deans and their school personnel committees to meet affirmative action policies and goals.

The University's principal deliberative body is the University Council, which takes cognizance of all matters of fundamental University policy. On June 22, 1971, the Council passed a resolution which has since formed the basis for an academic affirmative action program. The resolution reads:

...That the Council reaffirm existing University policy that in all appointments, reappointments and promotion decisions in the best candidate should be chosen or promoted and that the same scholarly and professional standards shall be applied to men and women. Because of the present inequitable ratios of men to women on the faculty, particularly at the higher ranks, it is further resolved that when it is not possible to make a clear choice between a man and a woman on the basis of qualifications, special consideration shall, at this juncture, be given in favor of the woman. This policy is to be reviewed annually.

The resolution was passed at the session of Council devoted to receiving the Cohn Committee Report on the Status of Women at the University of Pennsylvania. In accord with the spirit of that resolution, the principle was broadened by the Provost [Attachment O†, Provost's Memorandum of February 2, 1972] to include favoring minority persons as well as women where the top candidates are equally qualified. The basic policy and its extension to members of minority groups as well as women was reaffirmed by the Council by formal resolution on March 21, 1973: *That the present policies [i.e., with respect to hiring as summarized above], which are based on the spirit of the Cohn Report as extended to cover minority groups as well as women, be endorsed by the Council.*

Women and Minority Recruiting Officers. The Provost has named a Minority Recruiting Officer to assist departments, personnel committees, search committees, and deans seeking minority candidates for

†Available for inspection, Office of Equal Opportunity.

Table 2

FULL-TIME FACULTY BY ACADEMIC RANK,
BY SEX AND MINORITY GROUP STATUS
AS OF DECEMBER, 1972

	Minority Group										
	Male			Female			Total			Minority Group	
	Total	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.	%	No.	No.	%
Professor	558	538	96.4	20	3.6	23	4.1	23	4.1	0	.0
Associate Professor	367	335	91.3	32	8.7	19	5.1	17	4.6	2	.54
Assistant Professor	455	389	85.5	66	14.5	29	6.3	23	.5	6	1.3
Other Tenure Accruing	200	122	61.0	79	39.0	14	7.0	9	4.5	5	2.5
Non-Tenure Accruing	96	73	76.0	22	22.9	10	10.4	5	5.2	5	5.2
Total	1676	1457	86.9	219	13.1	95	5.7	77	4.6	18	1.2

academic positions. A special Committee will be named to assist the Minority Recruiting Officer and the Provost in evaluating minority group candidates for special "Redevelopment Fund" support, described below. Efforts continue to name a woman Recruiting Officer, whose duties will be similar.

Recruiting and Hiring. Directives have been sent by the Provost to deans and department chairmen regarding the recruitment and hiring of faculty [Attachment P†, Provost's memorandum of March 16, 1971; and Attachment O]. Key provisions of the February 2, 1972 directive on recruitment and hiring are:

...each proposal coming to the Provost's Staff Conference [the final review body for all appointments and promotions to tenure or tenure-accruing positions] has carried a departmental certification that the nominee was selected after full consideration of all candidates including women and members of minority groups...

Each Department should be instructed to retain written records of data obtained concerning candidates considered, and of all applications and supplementary material received from applicants, whether successful or unsuccessful, for five years after a position has been filled.

Some deans regularly submit the vitae of the best women and minority group candidates along with the vita of the candidate presented for review by the Provost Staff Conference. Other deans and their school committees maintain ongoing lists of personnel being sought – with women and members of minority groups identified – on the premise that faculty in their schools are hired not on account of "openings," but when one or more of these top candidates can be found. The Academic Committee on Equal Opportunity and the Council of Academic Deans are currently considering a number of draft procedures for strengthening and regularizing procedures for reviewing recruiting and hiring at the school and departmental levels. Subsequent reports will review progress in this direction.

Ultimately, affirmative action will succeed not because of "directives" or "procedures," but because of an acceptance by the entire faculty of the need to make extraordinary efforts to increase the presence of women, blacks, and other minority group persons on the faculty. Although our Affirmative Action Program is still in its early stages, we believe that there is evidence already of considerable sensitizing – as evidenced, for example, by the number of women added to the professorial ranks in the past two years. Of the 272 faculty added to tenured or tenure-accruing ranks in the 1970-71 and 1971-72 academic years, 51 or 18.8%, were women; of the 147 promoted or appointed to tenure, 21 or 14.3% were women.*

*Available for inspection, Office of Equal Opportunity. (P) published Almanac April 6, 1971.

Although these numbers have been checked for accuracy with all of the deans complications of interpretation have arisen in a few cases of individuals apparently appointed to, or promoted from, joint appointments or non-traditional academic ranks.

Redevelopment Funds for Minority Recruitment. The University Development Commission, an eighteen-member task force charged with recommending directions for the University of Pennsylvania in the next decade, placed considerable emphasis on establishing a viable "black presence" at the University. The Report of the Development Commission indicated a number of assumptions, shared by the Provost, the President, and other members of the Administration:

1. Of paramount importance to a black presence at the University is a major increase in the number of black faculty.
2. New appointments of black faculty should be made in the regular fashion by departments and schools (albeit expedited at times by the Minority Recruiting Officer and a shared sense of urgency).
3. The need for additional black faculty is so critical that special resources should be devoted to the task – and can be so devoted without jeopardy to our principles of "merit" and "academic excellence."

The Development Commission recommended a fund:

...established under the Office of the Provost to whom the academic officer in charge of recruiting will report. Candidates may be identified by the department or may be brought to the attention of the department by the officer in charge of recruiting. In the event that a department wishes to hire a black candidate but is unable to pay for the position, the fund will provide up to one-half of the cost of the faculty salary for a maximum period of six years. The department will follow normal procedures in deciding whether it wishes to make an offer to the candidate. If special recruiting funds are used to cover part of the salary, the department should assume full fiscal responsibility for the position as soon as funds become available through faculty retirements, departures, or normal increments in departmental budgets.

In accord with recommendations from the University Council, *This procedure, with a high priority claim on University Redevelopment Funds, will be operative for the 1973-74 academic year.*

Promotions. The academic deans have been directed [Attachment O, Provost's memorandum of February 2, 1972] to implement the following proposals relating to promotions, emanating from the Cohn Committee Report on the Status of Women:

Each Department should make generally available in written form its own specific criteria for promotion if such exist. Such criteria would supplement but not supersede University standards. Copies should be filed with the offices of the Deans and Provost.

Each Department should re-examine promptly the status of women already in the Department to determine whether or not deserved promotion has been overlooked.

Procedures to strengthen and regularize promotion policies are being studied along with new appointment procedures by the Office of the Provost, The Academic Committee on Equal Opportunity, and the Council of Academic Deans. Such procedures must be considered against the backdrop of the caveat mentioned in the preceding section: namely, that promotions to tenure are going to become increasingly scarce and may at times be based as much or more on the capacity of a particular department to increase its proportion of tenured faculty as on the merits of the individuals currently on the tenure track and having to be considered for either promotion and tenure or for a terminal contract.

Other Personnel Policies. Many of the policies described above in the section on nonacademic staff apply as well to the faculty. Revisions in the Nepotism and in the Maternity Leave policies [Attachment H] should open up additional opportunities for faculty women at the University of Pennsylvania. The Provost has also proposed revisions in the academic personnel policies which would decrease the isolation of part-time faculty and provide more opportunities for promotion and a chance for tenure for part-time faculty. Deans and departments have also been directed by the Provost [Attachment O†, Provost's memorandum of February 2, 1972] ...not [to] give consideration to the family situation of a qualified woman candidate. It should not be assumed that she will fail to come to Pennsylvania because of her husband's occupation. Decisions of this order should be left to the family unit itself.

†Available for inspection, Office of Equal Opportunity.

Grievance Procedures for Academic Staff. Faculty, of course, already have well established procedures for dealing with certain kinds of grievances through the School and University Committees on Academic Freedom. However, there is a need for a mechanism which is faster, more flexible, and more sensitive to allegations of discrimination or unfairness on account of race or sex. This year, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Council and the Committee on the Faculty of the University Senate were charged with studying and making recommendations for a grievance procedure that would be responsive to the requirements of the University's Affirmative Action Program. The recommendations of the Faculty Affairs Committee are presented in [Attachment Q†, Faculty Grievance Procedure: For Comment]. Current plans of the Council are to wait until the Committee on the Faculty of the Senate† has responded to the recommendations before bringing them before the full Council for approval. The completion of this deliberative process and the implementation of a grievance procedure for academic staff represents one of the few incomplete components of the Affirmative Action Program and will be pursued in the months ahead with the greatest urgency. We have every reason to believe that a plan will be implemented next academic year along the general principles outlined in the first section of this report.

Dissemination of Affirmative Action Policy and Program

The University will disseminate information on the Affirmative Action Program within and outside of the University.

Internal

1. Affirmative Action Progress Reports will be maintained by the Office of Equal Opportunity and the Academic Committee on Equal Opportunity.
2. A regularly released Affirmative Action report will be brought to the attention of the University community through the *Almanac* and other University publications.
3. Periodic briefing sessions will be held with persons involved in supervisory capacities for the purpose of reviewing current employment problems affecting minority groups and women.
4. A University personnel policy and procedure manual will be developed and maintained for the use of supervisors.
5. Equal Employment Opportunity posters and other pertinent government-sponsored posters will be placed in areas of the University where employees and applicants are likely to see them.
6. The University's Equal Employment Opportunity statement will also be posted on permanent bulletin boards throughout the University.

External

1. All recruitment sources and advertising sources will be informed of the University's nondiscrimination policy.
2. Included in all advertisements and personnel manuals will be the wording "The University of Pennsylvania is an Equal Opportunity Employer."
3. The University's commitment to its Affirmative Plan will be conveyed to organizations, community agencies, community leaders, secondary schools, junior colleges, churches and social groups in the Philadelphia area and to all persons, groups and organizations using University facilities.
4. Meetings will be held with unions representing University employees for the purpose of stating the University's policy of affirmative action in employment.

†Available for inspection, Office of Equal Opportunity. Faculty Affairs Committee report published *Almanac* February 20, 1973; Senate Committee on Faculty report October 2, 1973; due for action October 31, 1973.

This report was forwarded by President Martin Meyerson in the spring of 1973 to the U.S. Office of Health, Education and Welfare, with the goals and timetables on the following page. It was prepared through the offices of the Provost, Dr. Eliot Stellar, and the Vice President for Management, Paul Gaddis, with the help of D. Bruce Johnstone, Executive Assistant to the President; Scott Lederman, Assistant to the Vice President for Management; Verity Powell, then Associate Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity; Gerald Robinson, Executive Director of Personnel Relations; and James Robinson, Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GOALS AND TIMETABLES

EXPECTED WOMEN AND MINORITY GROUP APPOINTMENTS TO FULL-TIME TENURED OR TENURE-ACCruing ACADEMIC RANKS 1973-74 TO 1975-76

School	Total number 12/1/72	Number women 12/1/72	Number minorities 12/1/72*	Est. appt. next 3 yrs.	Est. women next 3 yrs.	Est. minorities next 3 yrs.
College**	341	27	4	68	10-13	1-4
Phys. Sci.	(107)	(2)	(1)	(16)	(1)	(0-1)
Soc. & Life Sci.	(64)	(5)	(0)	(8)	(1-2)	(0-1)
Humanities	(170)	(20)	(3)	(44)	(8-10)	(1-2)
G.S.A.S.	53	3	0	15	3	1
Wharton	215	11	1	31	3	2
Mgt. & Fin.	(115)	(5)	(1)	(18)	(1)	(1)
Soc. Science	(100)	(6)	(0)	(13)	(2)	(1)
Engineering	41	1	0	10	1	1
G.S.E.	40	8	0	3	1	1
G.S.F.A.	35	5	5	12	1	1
Social Work	30	12	6	8	2	3
Law	30	1	0	11	1	1
Annenberg	10	0	0	6	1	1
Medicine	493	53	21	113	18	6
Basic Sci.	(144)	(14)	(7)	(26)	(5)	(1)
Clinical Flds.	(349)	(39)	(14)	(87)	(13)	(5)
Dental Med.	71	9	1	10	3	1
Basic Sci.	(22)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(0)
Clinical Flds.	(49)	(7)	(0)	(8)	(2)	(1)
Veterinary Med.	104	8	1	26	3	1
Basic Science	(44)	(4)	(0)	(13)	(2)	(1)
Clinical Flds.	(60)	(4)	(1)	(13)	(1)	(0)
S.A.M.P.	13	9	0	4	2	1
Nursing	48	44	1	10	8	2

EXPECTED WOMEN AND MINORITY GROUP APPOINTMENTS TO NONACADEMIC POSITIONS, 1973-74 TO 1975-76***

Job Category	Total number 12/1/72	Number women 12/1/72	Number minorities 12/1/72*	Est. new hires next 3 yrs.†	Est. new women next 3 yrs.	Est. new minorities next 3 yrs.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION						
Sr. Administrator	10	—	—	4	1	1
Administrator	16	13	1	12	—	2
A1 Professional	6	—	—	2	1	1
Secretary	3	3	2	4	—	—
Sec./Admin.	11	11	3	13	—	—
Clerk	1	—	—	—	—	—
A3 Svce. Worker	1	—	1	1	—	—
Other	4	4	—	—	—	—

CENTRAL SERVICES						
Sr. Administrator	14	—	1	7	2	—
Administrator	40	15	3	35	—	—
A1 Professional	9	4	2	5	—	—
A3 Professional	2	2	—	1	—	—
Misc. Technician	15	8	1	8	—	—
Typist	3	3	1	2	—	—
Secretary	25	25	4	32	—	—
Secretary/Admin.	33	32	7	40	—	—
Clerk	11	8	2	13	—	—
Bookkeeper	5	4	—	6	—	—
Office Equip. Oper.	5	5	2	3	—	—
A3 Service Worker	4	—	—	2	—	—
A4 Skilled Trade	3	1	1	—	—	—
A4 Service Worker	21	5	11	14	—	—
Other	11	10	4	—	—	—

V/P FOR BUSINESS & FINANCIAL AFFAIRS						
Sr. Administrator	16	—	2	4	2	—
Administrator	16	8	3	8	—	—
A1 Professional	16	5	2	14	—	1
Typist	1	1	1	6	—	—
Secretary	3	3	1	8	—	—
Sec./Admin.	19	18	1	9	—	2
Clerk	9	9	5	12	—	—
Bookkeeper	28	26	8	35	—	—
Office Equip. Oper.	1	1	1	1	—	—
A3 Svce. Worker	2	2	—	3	—	—
A4 Svce. Worker	23	16	17	17	—	—
Other	10	9	2	—	—	—

VICE PRESIDENT FOR DEVELOPMENT & PUBLIC RELATIONS

Sr. Administrator	13	—	—	3	1	1
Administrator	27	7	—	20	—	1
A1 Professional	16	10	1	14	—	—
A3 Technician	2	2	1	—	—	—
Typist	4	4	1	—	—	—
Secretary	27	27	5	34	—	—
Sec./Admin.	20	19	1	14	—	2
Clerk	8	7	2	8	—	—
Bookkeeper	3	3	—	4	—	—
Office Equip. Oper.	6	4	2	4	—	—
Other	7	7	1	—	—	—

V/P FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

Sr. Administrator	6	—	—	2	1	1
Administrator	21	—	—	5	2	1
A1 Professional	13	1	—	7	1	1
A3 Professional	1	—	—	1	—	—
A3 Technician	11	—	2	3	1	—
Misc. Technician	7	1	—	2	—	—
Secretary	4	4	—	1	—	—
Sec./Admin.	8	8	—	8	—	2
Clerk	2	—	—	3	—	—
Bookkeeper	1	—	—	1	—	—
A3 Skilled Trade	10	—	1	1	—	—
A3 Svce. Worker	29	12	13	2	—	—
A4 Technician	4	—	—	2	—	—
A4 Skilled Trade	167	3	32	61	—	—
A4 Svce. Worker	388	176	242	132	—	—
Other	23	—	1	—	—	—

AUXILIARY SERVICES

Sr. Administrator	5	1	—	5	—	1
Administrator	13	3	2	5	—	—
A1 Professional	4	—	—	6	1	1
A3 Technician	1	—	—	—	—	—
Typist	4	4	1	9	—	1
Secretary	5	5	—	11	—	—
Sec./Admin.	3	2	—	1	—	1
Clerk	25	18	3	9	—	2
Bookkeeper	7	7	—	3	—	1
A3 Skilled Trade	1	—	—	—	—	—
A3 Svce. Worker	10	4	4	4	—	—
A4 Technician	2	—	—	—	—	—
A4 Skilled Trade	1	—	1	—	—	—
A4 Svce. Worker	206	116	163	100	—	—
Other	33	22	5	—	—	—

LIBRARIES

Sr. Administrator	5	1	—	2	—	1
Administrator	5	3	—	3	—	1
A1 Professional	83	63	6	31	—	—
Library Staff	170	90	45	136	—	—
Sec./Admin.	5	5	—	2	—	1
Other	2	1	—	—	—	—

STUDENT AFFAIRS

Sr. Administrator	2	1	—	—	—	—
Administrator	26	9	2	—	—	—
A1 Professional	4	3	—	—	—	—
Typist	1	1	—	—	—	—
Secretary	11	11	3	—	—	—
Sec./Admin.	14	14	—	—	—	2
Clerk	35	27	11	—	—	—
Bookkeeper	2	1	—	—	—	—
Office Equip. Oper.	1	—	—	—	—	—
A4 Service Worker	1	1	—	—	—	—
Other	3	1	—	—	—	—

ASSISTANT V/P—MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

Sr. Administrator	5	—	—	2	1	1
Administrator	5	—	—	3	1	1
A1 Professional	15	5	—	15	—	2
A3 Technician	21	8	2	25	1	1
Typist	1	1	1	—	—	—
Secretary	1	1	—	2	—	—
Sec./Admin.	4	3	1	—	—	—
Clerk	10	10	2	1	—	—
Office Equip. Oper.	17	16	8	14	—	—
Other	5	5	1	—	—	—

* includes Negro, American Indian, and Spanish-surnamed American only, as reported on census.

** A range is presented for the College of Arts and Sciences corresponding to, at the lower boundary, *expectations* based on non-discrimination and candidate pool available, and, at the upper end, *aspirations* which we can hope even to exceed, but which appear less probable.

*** Goals have been projected for job categories to which special attention is to be concentrated over the next 3 years.

† Estimation based on turnover for the past 3 years.