

Almanac

Vol. 20 No. 9

October 23, 1973

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

IN THIS ISSUE

- SENATE: *Principles and Policies (Taubman)*
- *Grievance Procedures: Issues Facing Senate (Lesnick)*
- *Faculty Affairs Committee: Subcommittee Report on Faculty Grievance Procedures*
- HONORS • DEATHS • *Personnel Bulletins*
- OPENINGS • NEWS IN BRIEF • THINGS TO DO

BLUE CROSS: PENN PEOPLE COVERED

In the wake of announcements that Blue Cross has canceled agreements with 58 hospitals in Pennsylvania, the University's Personnel Administrative Services Director James J. Keller has issued a memorandum (page 7) indicating that campus Blue Cross group plan subscribers entering approved hospitals are "still covered for the Blue Cross benefits in accordance with usual procedures as in the past, through August 1, 1974, the date of expiration of the University's current contract." The memo defines "approved hospitals" in terms of their professional accreditation.

The University will advise subscribers at a later date if there is to be any change in these provisions which will be made effective after August 1.

Mr. Keller also announced this week a rise in Blue Cross (but not Blue Shield) coverage, effective November 1 for those who pay their own subscriptions. Details next week.



First Comes Krapp's Last Tape . . . Page 8

MUSCLE INSTITUTE: A FEDERAL \$4.3 MILLION GRANT

A new research agency called Pennsylvania Muscle Institute has been established in Philadelphia, funded by a \$4.3 million 5-year grant from the National Heart and Lung Institute. It is the first such Institute in the nation to be supported by the NHLI.

Announcement of the project was made by Dr. Robert D. Dripps, Vice President for Health Affairs at the University, whose office is administratively responsible for the Institute's operations.

The presence of many internationally-known muscle researchers made it possible to form the Institute here, Dr. Dripps said, emphasizing the opportunity for collaborative work and the sharing of new equipment that is provided by the Institute.

The Pennsylvania Muscle Institute has 19 member-investigators and six associate members at the University of Pennsylvania, Presbyterian-University of Pennsylvania Medical Center, Thomas Jefferson University, Medical College of Pennsylvania, Wistar Institute and Temple University. Institute director is Dr. Andrew P. Somlyo, Professor of Physiology and Pathology here and senior research pathologist at Presbyterian.

Health Sciences Task Force

The recently activated Task Force for Nursing, SAMP and Related Health Sciences will hold an all-day conference October 31 at which it will seek the wisdom of extramural consultants as it begins to examine possible directions for the University in these areas. The consultants include: Father Edward J. Drummond, Executive Vice President, St. Louis University; Dr. J. Warren Perry, Director, Study of Allied Health Education, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; Dr. Robert J. Atwell, Director, School of Allied Medical Professions, Ohio State University; Dr. Hans O. Mauksch, Professor of Sociology, University of Missouri; Dr. Rozella M. Schlotfeldt, Professor of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University; and Ella W. Allison, Vice President for Nursing Education, Albert Einstein Medical Center.

In addition to these consultants the Task Force will draw on the expertise of Dr. Dorothy Mereness, Dean of the School of Nursing; Dr. Sidney Rodenberg, Dean of SAMP; Mrs. Iris Gross, Director of the HUP Nursing School; Dr. Humphrey Tonkin, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies; and other knowledgeable persons within the University. They will also make use of the existing substantial base of information in reports and plans which have been developed by the schools or various committees in recent years, and will seek advice from all interested persons in the University community. At its first meeting October 12, the Task Force decided on the following:

1) Since it was not deemed possible to obtain full student representation for all groups involved by having one or two students as Task Force members, representatives of the *Daily Pennsylvanian* and *Almanac* have been invited to participate and fully report activities. Additionally, for the assistance of all interested persons, copies of background material will be placed on reserve in the following locations: Van Pelt, Medical, SAMP, and Tri-Institutional Libraries and Morgan Building.

2) Following the October 31 meeting, a "Green Paper" will be prepared to provide a base for further discussion.

3) Written statements will be invited from interested groups or individuals. Representatives of viewpoints expressed will be invited to discuss their views with the Task Force, at one of its November meetings. These meetings will be opened to interested observers and are scheduled as follows:

Nov. 7, 9 a.m.-12, Conference Rm. 285. McNeil Bldg.

Nov. 17, 9 a.m.-12, Franklin Rm., Houston Hall.

Nov. 20, 9 a.m.-12, Franklin Rm., Houston Hall.

Statements may be submitted by addressing them in care of Mrs. Frances Hardy, 110 College Hall, who is Administrative Liaison to the Task Force.

Dr. Alfred P. Fishman, Chairman

Prof. Howard Arnold

Prof. Alexander M. Capron

Mrs. Jane Farahmand

Mrs. JoAnn S. Jamann

Dr. Charles A. Malone

Eugene Michels

Mrs. Sue Moyerman

Dr. Daniel J. O'Kane

Dr. Henry W. Riecken

Dr. Samuel P. Martin

Principles and Policies

The agenda for the Senate meeting on October 31 includes reports on Grievance Procedures, Tenure, Early Retirement and the methodology of measuring departmental quality and related concepts. Some of the proposals contained in these reports, as well as certain proposed amendments, will profoundly affect the workings of the University. At the risk of over-simplification and of displaying my personal biases, let me indicate to you what I consider to be the major issues raised in these reports and amendments.

The Proposed Grievance Procedures are based on the proposition that in cases in which a person feels he/she has been aggrieved by his/her department or other administrative group, the person has the right to present the case to an impartial group of peers, denoted an inquiry panel. This panel can hear the complaint and acting under a somewhat informal set of rules can determine if there are grounds for the complaint and can propose solutions. (In cases of denial of promotion or tenure, the panel would not overturn a decision but indicate that the department, etc. should reconsider the decision using proper grounds.) Several alternative modes of operation have been suggested. The Committee on the Faculty's Report, for example, calls for the establishment of a commission of 16 persons, from which each inquiry panel (of 3) is drawn alphabetically. One proposed change allows the grievant to choose one member from the commission. A second area of controversy concerns what documents will be made available to a panel and who will have access to the documents. A third controversy concerns how formal the hearing procedures should be. Yet another area of debate is the extent to which another body can and should review the inquiry panel's decision.

Perhaps because the Tenure Report has not had as long a circulation, no amendments have yet been proposed. But the report is important. For example, if passed it will no longer be possible to obtain tenure solely by the passage of time. Without an affirmative vote of tenure, a person will only have a claim to severance pay. The report also alters the requirements for and use of certain titles such as lecturer and assistant professor.

The Optional Early Retirement Report proposes several plans under which people whose mandatory retirement age is currently 68 or 70 may voluntarily retire at 65 or 67.

The University has an announced policy of selective excellence. The Academic Planning Committee has labored during the past several years to measure excellence and related concepts. Its proposed methodology is being offered to the University. I am sure the Committee would welcome constructive criticism before the plan is finalized.

The resolution of the important and sensitive issues to which these reports are addressed will determine the future functioning of the University. I urge you in the strongest terms to read the documents carefully and to come to the Senate meeting in order that the decisions reached reflect the considered opinion of the Faculty as a whole.

Paul Taubman

Grievance Procedures:

The Senate Meeting on October 31 will give the Faculty an opportunity to express its collective judgment as the shaping of a grievance procedure reaches a critical stage: a year of work by several committees has produced specific proposals, and a final committee product is soon to be presented by the Faculty Affairs Committee to the University Council. The question, however, is as complex as it is controversial; regardless of the view one takes on the merits, an attempt must be made, if the Senate is to have any realistic input, to articulate a small number of relatively basic policy questions, on which faculty reaction may give guidance. Anything more, such as a series of Senate votes on specific language, will inevitably produce no useful Senate input at all. In what follows, I have attempted to sketch out what seem to me the crucial issues facing us in the shaping of a grievance procedure, and then to give my own views regarding a just resolution of each. I have tried to identify the issues in such a way that, whether one agrees or disagrees with my reaction to them, one would regard them as fairly and accurately stated.

It is important to begin with what is common ground. There is apparently widespread agreement that the University should establish a grievance procedure which would enable faculty members having a claim of arbitrary or discriminatory action, or of violation of existing regulations, to present it to a faculty body independent of the administration, which would consider whether the claim has merit and would (where such is found to be the case) make a recommendation to the administration for redress. The recommendation would not be binding, but the administration would be expected to accept it in the absence of unusually compelling circumstances. Grievances could involve instances of denial of tenure or promotion, where arbitrary or discriminatory action is alleged, but would not be limited to such cases, and would cover questions such as compensation, assignments, etc.

On three issues which seem to me central, there is divergence of opinion. These are: (a) the function and mode of proceeding of the group or person which is to carry out the review function (referred to in both the Senate Committee and Faculty Affairs Subcommittee versions* as the Inquiry Panel); (b) the composition of such a body; (c) further appeal to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom. I would like to examine each of these in turn.

First: In approaching the issue of function and procedure, I hope that we can resist the appeal of decision-making by shibboleth, although much talk I have heard in recent days gives me pause. To resort readily to such appealing catch-words as "informal" rather than "formal" or "judicialized" or "legalistic" proceedings seems to me to seek refuge in what a colleague once referred to as an anodyne for the pain of reasoning. I hope that the traditions of our respective academic disciplines will prove sufficient to enable us to substitute sober, concrete, factual inquiry for emotion-laden symbols and epithets.

Essentially, what the Senate Committee has proposed (Section IV, *Inquiry Procedures*) is an *investigatory* role for the Inquiry Panel. The panel would hear the grievant and departmental or administrative representatives, and would be permitted to examine relevant documents. However, the grievant would normally not be present during any committee

* See *Almanac* October 2 and pp. 4-5 of this issue.

Issues Facing the Senate

by Howard Lesnick

meetings when adverse material was being received, and would not be guaranteed the right to attempt, by questioning adverse witnesses or rebutting adverse documents, to show that he or she has made out a case after all. The amendments proposed by the Faculty Affairs Subcommittee to Section IV, and by my first proposed amendment, would convert this investigation into a *hearing*. One can argue whether the hearing would be formal or informal, whatever that means. In my judgment a substantial degree of informality is easily possible, but the important point is that it would be a hearing rather than an investigation. Under these amendments the grievant would not be limited to trying to prove a claim on the basis of whatever information may be available to him or her, but could take a more active role in attempting to establish the credibility and cogency of the allegations of discrimination or other improper acts. The particular safeguards involved—the right to hear and reply to adverse evidence and to have the meaningful assistance of an adviser—are simply the minimum requisites of procedural fairness long recognized as essential if factual issues are to be fairly resolved.

I favor the hearing rather than the investigation model for this reason. It is essential to realize that most grievances will not involve action which on its face appears discriminatory, arbitrary or in violation of some regulation. To determine whether a claim is in fact groundless or meritorious will require more than passively perusing or listening to conflicting claims. An investigative model would require that the Inquiry Panel play an active role in developing the facts, and act in a sufficiently grievant-oriented way during this phase that it can be assured that a grievance is in fact lacking in merit before it so decides. But it seems plain that an Inquiry Panel constituted as recommended by the Senate Committee is not and could not be expected to play this role. Structuring the proceedings so as to provide a genuine hearing permits the necessary input to be supplied by the grievant rather than the Panel. Without it, and without some substitute for it (as to which see the next point), the procedure is little more than an expensive charade.

Second: The proper composition of the Inquiry Panel is obviously closely related to its function and mode of proceeding. I personally favor the model developed by the Senate Committee: a panel selected at random from a list chosen by the Senate Advisory Committee. But I can favor this only if the grievant is given minimally adequate opportunity to supply an input to the deliberations of that body. If it is thought essential to have only an investigation, and not a hearing, for reasons having to do with fears of law-related procedures, then one must build greater grievant-oriented input into the investigation. One way to do this might be to provide for a standing Inquiry Officer (much as has recently been done in the revision of the University Judicial System). This person, who would be a faculty member taking on the job much as in the case of the Ombudsman, would interview the grievant and other concerned parties, and discuss the case with the grievant and his or her advisor, prior to a disposition. The person selected would need to be able to provide a sufficiently sympathetic orientation that one could be assured of a full and fair investigation. Such an officer could be given authority either to refuse to proceed or to "prosecute" a claim on the grievant's behalf before the Inquiry Panel.

The Faculty Affairs Subcommittee has proposed a variant mode of building such input into the investigation, by abandoning random selection and permitting the grievant to choose one member of the Inquiry Panel. If this were done so that that member would be regarded as particularly appointed to assure full exploration of the grievant's case, the system could work. I would wonder, however, whether it would be wise in such a case to limit the choice, as the subcommittee would, to one on the list named by the Senate Advisory Committee. The volume of cases will probably be sufficiently large, and the number of panel members likely to be chosen by grievants for this task sufficiently small, that the case-load would probably get out of hand. My preference, as I have stated, is to use neither of these modes, but to have an adequate hearing procedure in the first place, which would permit resort to the Senate Committee's method of Panel selection.

Third: Finally, the question of a further appeal is likewise inextricably tied up with the first issue. The Faculty Affairs Subcommittee has proposed a right of appeal in all cases, but no right of hearing on appeal; the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom would be authorized, after examining the appeal papers and the record of the Inquiry Panel, to deny the appeal without a hearing or to schedule a hearing if it thought there was likely merit in the appeal. The Senate Committee proposal, as most recently revised, would permit no appeal at all where tenure or promotion is not involved, and would permit appeal, with full right of "formal" hearing, in all cases which do involve tenure or promotion. Both of these approaches seem to me extremely unwise, for they would bring the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom deeply into the grievance process and enormously burden its members' time and energy. At the same time, they seem to me basically misguided in their approach. The answer to an inadequate first-step appeal is not to provide an inappropriate second step, but rather to make the first step adequate. The Inquiry Panel process is itself an appeal, and in the ordinary case once it is structured in a minimally fair way, I do not perceive a need for providing yet another review mechanism. It benefits neither the institution, the faculty members serving, nor—because of the delay involved—even the grievant.

However, I do see a valuable function to be played by the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom. Where the grievant has prevailed before the Inquiry Panel, its report is to go to the Provost, who is encouraged to implement it, but obviously need not. Hopefully, he or she will normally do so, and the School or Department will accept it. However, the occasion may arise when that will not be the case. In such a case, is it not appropriate to lay the question before the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, which would hold a full—"formal," if you will—hearing, and, knowing the high stakes that have been declared to be involved, lay the matter with its recommendation before the President? My third proposal would so say. Apart from that rare, yet crucial, situation, I would leave the Senate Committee out of this matter.

There are a number of issues which, although not as central in my judgment as the three I have discussed, can nonetheless hardly be called unimportant. It is critical that following the Senate meeting the Faculty Affairs and Steering Committees pay full attention to these matters in drafting a final proposal to lay before Council. But if the Senate is to play any role at all, it must hoard its time and energy. I believe that an expression of Senate sentiment on the three issues addressed here would be feasible and helpful.

Howard Lesnick is Professor of Law and a member of the University Council.

On October 2 in these pages the Senate Committee on the Faculty presented its proposals on faculty grievance procedures to be discussed at Senate on October 31. Below, an ad hoc subcommittee of the Council Committee on Faculty Affairs offers an amended version. (Proposed deletions are in brackets; additions italicized.) In the meantime, the Senate Committee itself has made a number of changes—many of them resembling those of the Council subcommittee; these are footnoted below.

Proposed Faculty Grievance Procedures

Response from an ad hoc subcommittee of the Council Committee on Faculty Affairs

I. APPLICABILITY

a. This grievance procedure shall be available to any member of the University faculty *whether tenured or untenured, fully or partially affiliated.**

b. A grievance is a claim that action has been taken which affects the faculty member's personnel status or the terms or conditions of his/her employment and which is: (1) *unjust*, arbitrary and capricious; (2) discriminatory with regard to race, sex, creed, age or national origin; or (3) not in compliance with University procedures or regulations [(other than those relating to academic freedom)].

II. GRIEVANCE COMMISSION: INQUIRY PANELS

a. There shall be selected by the Senate Advisory Committee sixteen persons from the [full-time] University faculty to constitute a Grievance Commission. The Commission shall be broadly representative (including women, [and] members of minority groups *and partially affiliated faculty*), but shall not include department [chairmen] *chairpersons*; deans and directors; associate, assistant or vice deans; or members of the central administration. In accepting appointment to the Commission each member shall [be asked to bind] *commit** himself/herself to maintain confidentiality with respect to oral and documentary evidence presented during the investigation of individual cases. Members shall serve three-year terms expiring June 30 which shall be so arranged that the terms of no more than six members shall expire simultaneously. Replacements shall be selected by the Senate Advisory Committee at least once a year as needed. Each year members of the Grievance Commission shall select from among themselves one person to chair the Commission.

b. The Grievance Commission shall have power to receive and to process grievances in accordance with the procedure set forth below. [In so doing,] The Grievance Commission shall act in each individual case through a three-member Inquiry Panel, [the composition of which shall be determined by alphabetical rotation]. *The first member will be chosen by the Commission; the second member will be chosen by the grievant; the third member will be selected by the first two members of the Inquiry Panel and will serve as its chairperson. If the Commission does not include a member who in the grievant's opinion can adequately appraise his/her case, the Commission chairperson, taking the grievant's interest into account, will name to the Commission, for this case only, a single set of three additional faculty members, from which the grievant may choose one as a member of the Inquiry Panel.* The Panel shall not include persons belonging to the grievant's department nor, in a case involving termination at the end of the probationary period, an untenured person from the grievant's School. [The grievant shall be permitted a peremptory challenge of one Panel member. Either the grievant or the parties who made

the decision which is the subject of the grievance may challenge panel members for cause, such challenges to be ruled upon by the remaining members of the Grievance Commission.]

III. PRELIMINARY PROCEDURES

a. Before filing a grievance with the Grievance Commission, the affected faculty member shall first (1) request *in writing** from his/her Dean a written statement of the reasons for the decision which is the subject of the faculty member's grievance, and (2) make an effort to confer in person with the Dean to attempt to reach an equitable settlement of the grievance. The Dean shall promptly cooperate with the grievant in this preliminary procedure. The Dean's written statement should either be approved by the department [chairman] *chairperson* and the [chairmen] *chairpersons* of any departmental or school personnel panels which have reviewed the case or be accompanied by separate statements from those persons.**

b. Failing a settlement within four weeks after the request to the Dean for a written statement, the grievant may submit to the Grievance Commission through its Chairperson a written notice of grievance and request for a hearing. *The notice shall be submitted within 6 months of the grievant receiving notice of the event which resulted in the complaint. In any case, the grievant does not lose standing to pursue the grievance if he/she leaves the University so long as these procedures have been followed.* In such a case, the grievant shall at the same time notify the Provost in writing that such notice and request have been filed. In the event it should appear to the Chairperson of the Grievance Commission that the grievance implicates questions of academic freedom *or whether the grievant actually has tenure**, he/she shall refer the notice of grievance to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, Faculty Rights and Faculty Responsibility (Senate Committee)†, which shall promptly determine whether the grievance is in fact within the jurisdiction of the appropriate School Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

c. Upon receipt of notice of the grievance, the Grievance Commission shall appoint an Inquiry Panel to process the grievance. The Panel shall undertake a full examination of relevant evidence, to commence between two and four weeks from the date of filing of the grievance, unless the Senate Committee earlier determines that the grievance is in fact within the jurisdiction of the appropriate School Committee under Section IIIb. The Panel is encouraged, as its inquiry progresses, to effect an equitable settlement of the grievance through mediation.

** Senate Committee on the Faculty's alteration here adds:
In cases involving reappointment, promotion or tenure the affected faculty member must initiate the grievance procedure by requesting the written statement from the Dean within five months after formal notification of the unfavorable personnel action which is the subject of the grievance.

† The change in title and broadening of the functions of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility which is implicit in this proposal would require a change in the Senate Bylaws. [A motion to that effect is on the October 31 agenda.—Ed.]

*Change is identical to, or closely parallels, revisions also made by the Senate Committee on the Faculty.

IV. INQUIRY PROCEDURES

a. Both the grievant and the parties who made the decision which is the subject of the grievance shall be permitted to provide to the Panel oral and documentary evidence in support of their respective positions, to question adverse witnesses on any oral evidence given, and to examine and reply to any adverse documentary evidence. Whenever feasible, evidence should be offered in person, by individuals having personal knowledge of the events in question, with any documentary evidence provided as a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, oral evidence.

b. [In cases involving reappointment, promotion, or tenure,] The Panel shall have access to all documentary evidence [concerning] relevant to the [grievant] grievance that was available to the parties who made the decision.* Such "parties who made the decision" might include any or all of the following: department [chairmen] chairpersons, department personnel committees, department members who decide on departmental recommendations for personnel action, the deans of the schools, the school personnel committees, the Provost, the Provost's Staff Conference. The Panel shall also be authorized to [solicit] obtain additional documentary evidence on its own initiative such as the dossiers of other members of the same department who recently or currently are alleged to have received more favorable treatment and to hear oral testimony. Examination of, and reply to, such evidence by or on behalf of the grievant shall be subject to the following: (a) The Panel shall first consider (following consultation with one or more of the parties who made the decision) whether any concrete reason exists which strongly counsels against permitting the grievant to examine the said evidence. Should the Panel determine that no sufficient reason exists, it shall permit the grievant to examine and reply to the said evidence; should the Panel determine the contrary, it shall proceed as in the next clause. (b) If the grievant has chosen or intends to choose to be accompanied by a University colleague (as provided for in the following sub-section) and such colleague agrees to be bound to maintain complete confidentiality with respect to all information contained therein, the Panel shall (except as provided for in the next clause) permit such colleague to examine such evidence, and reply to it at a meeting or portion of a meeting not attended by the grievant. (c) If extraordinary circumstances leave the Panel strongly persuaded that even such limited disclosure would be substantially harmful, it shall so state to the grievant, with a statement of its reason, and shall provide to the grievant, to the greatest extent feasible, an indication of the tenor of the evidence received, so that he or she may make such response as is possible under the circumstances.

c. The grievant may be accompanied by a University colleague when appearing at Panel meetings who may speak on behalf of the grievant. [(This colleague may not address the Panel unless invited to do so by the Panel.)]

d. The Panel shall keep detailed records of its meetings.

e. Findings shall be based on evidence provided according to the foregoing procedures.

V. FINDINGS

a. Except in extraordinary circumstances findings shall be reported within ten weeks of the filing of the complaint.

b. If after examining the evidence the Panel determines that there are no substantial grounds for complaint, it may dismiss the grievance. This decision shall be final within the University.*

c. In cases in which the tenure status of the grievant is at issue between the grievant and his school, the grievance panel may at any time refer the case to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, Faculty Rights and Faculty Responsibilities.*

b. [d.]* In all cases [not disposed of pursuant to (b) and (c),] the Panel shall promptly prepare a written report and recommendations, setting forth, in detail appropriate to the case, the factual findings of the Panel, its conclusions regarding the merit of the grievance and its recommended disposition of the case. In cases involving reappointment, promotion, or tenure, where the Panel

* Change is identical to or closely parallels revisions also made by the Senate Committee on the Faculty.

has found persuasive evidence of arbitrariness, discrimination, or non-compliance with University procedures or regulations, it shall recommend further evaluation [re-evaluation] of the decision on proper grounds, either by the parties who made the decision initially or, should it seem fair and appropriate, by a special group recommended to be constituted ad hoc by the Provost in order to carry out a valid re-evaluation. Neither the Inquiry Panel nor the Grievance Commission shall have the responsibility or authority to make such a re-evaluation of professional competence on its own, but may invoke the aid of its own outside experts in making its decision.

c. [e.]* The Grievance Commission shall promptly* communicate the report and recommendations both to the grievant and to the Provost.

d. [f.]* While these recommendations are to be accorded great weight, they are advisory to the Provost and not binding upon him. In the event the Provost declines to implement the recommendations, he/she shall communicate that decision to the Commission in writing, accompanied by compelling reasons stated in detail. The Provost's decision shall be rendered within six weeks.

VI. HEARING BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM, FACULTY RIGHTS AND FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY

a. In cases [not dismissed by the Inquiry Panel, which involve reappointment, promotion, or tenure,] where the grievant, [if] is not satisfied with the disposition of [his/her] the case, he/she is entitled to appeal for a [formal hearing] review by [before] the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, Faculty Rights and Faculty Responsibility (Senate Committee) on the grounds asserted in the grievance. Such a [hearing] review may also be requested following an affirmative vote by the faculty members of the grievant's department or school. The records, reports and recommendations of the Grievance Commission shall then be made available to the Committee. If, after examining the evidence the Committee determines that there are no substantial grounds for complaint, it may dismiss the appeal. Otherwise it shall hold formal hearings.*

b. In accepting appointment to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, Faculty Rights and Faculty Responsibility each member shall commit himself/herself to maintain confidentiality with respect to oral and documentary evidence presented during the investigation of individual cases.

c. [b.] The Senate Committee shall adopt procedures for the expeditious conduct of the hearing. Such procedures shall be similar to those stipulated in cases involving suspension or removal of a tenured faculty member for just cause, except that in the present case the burden of proof shall be upon the grievant. In particular, the grievant shall have access to all documentary evidence relevant to the grievance, the right to make certain peremptory challenges of members of the Committee and to challenge them for cause, to question adverse witnesses and to call witnesses on his/her own behalf, and shall have the assistance of the administration in securing the attendance of witnesses on his/her behalf; both the grievant and the administrative officers whose decision is the subject of the complaint may have the assistance of counsel. [and] In the event that the grievance is successful, this shall be at University expense. A verbatim record of the hearing shall be taken.

d. [c.] The Senate Committee shall promptly report its findings and recommendations to the President, Provost and grievant.*

VII. THE ISSUE OF TENURE AND CONTINUED APPOINTMENT

a. No one shall acquire indefinite tenure by default during grievance procedures.

b. In extraordinary circumstances when it has not been possible to complete grievance procedures prior to the termination of the appointment of the grievant, the Senate Committee may recommend to the Administration that the appointment be continued until the matter is resolved within the University.

Ad Hoc Subcommittee (on the Grievance Proposals)
of the Committee on Faculty Affairs:

Robert E. Davies
Bernard R. Gerber
Victoria E. Kirkham

HONORS

FESTSCHRIFT IN STOCKHOLM: BRITTON CHANCE

For Dr. Britton Chance's sixtieth birthday, over 200 scientists gathered for a symposium following the IXth International Congress of Biochemistry, then held a formal dinner at the Operakällaren of the City of Stockholm. The scientific contributions of the symposium on Energy Transducing Membrane will be published as a volume in his honor.

FULBRIGHT-HAYS LECTURESHIPS

Drs. Hennig Cohen, John Shover and Anthony Tomazinis have been awarded senior Fulbright-Hays lectureships; two graduate students also received grants. Dr. Cohen is at the University of London as the first holder of the Fulbright Chair in American Studies. This spring, Dr. Shover will be the first Fulbright lecturer in the USSR since the program began in 1946; he will teach courses in American history at the University of Leningrad. Dr. Tomazinis has been appointed visiting professor at the University of Paris (Vincennes) and will lecture on transportation and city planning at the Institut d'Urbanisme there as well as conduct studies on transportation problems of metropolitan Paris for the Transportation Research Institute of France.

PUBLICATIONS AWARDS

Academic Transformation: Seventeen Institutions Under Pressure has been selected as the recipient of the 1973 Book Award of the American Council on Education. Provost Emeritus David R. Goddard and Assistant Ombudsman Linda C. Koons wrote the University of Pennsylvania chapter in the book edited by David Riesman and Verne A. Stadtman for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Professor Jerre Mangione received the Athenaeum of Philadelphia Literary Award this year for his history of the Federal Writers' Project, *The Dream and the Deal*.

The Pennsylvania Gazette was again placed among the top-ten alumni magazines at American Alumni Council meetings. Associate Editor Patricia McLaughlin received an award for excellence in writing from *Atlantic* magazine and special citations for alumni profiles and an article on term-paper mongering.

HUP's public relations office received an honorable mention for its in-house publications from the Academy of Hospital Public Relations in August; its "Medical Staff News" and "Round HUP" were edited by Jo DeMarco and Julie Wang under the direction of Marilyn Castaldi.

HONORS IN BRIEF

Dr. Renee C. Fox is one of ten Phi Beta Kappa Visiting Scholars in the country this year; she will present lectures and hold informal discussions during two-day stays at eight universities during the year.

The American Association of Endodontics has named a new award for Dr. Louis I. Grossman and presented the first one to him for "superlative and meritorious contributions . . . and for exemplary dedication, service and leadership to dentistry and this association."

Emeritus Professor Dr. Frank Kral received the first Achievement Award ever presented by the American Academy of Veterinary Dermatology, given in July at the Academy's 110th annual meeting.

Dr. Robert M. Lumiansky, Avalon Foundation Professor in the Humanities, has been named to succeed Dr. Frederick Burkhardt as president of the American Council of Learned

HONORARY DEGREE NOMINATIONS

The Committee on Honorary Degrees invites nominations of candidates for consideration of awards of honorary degrees in May 1974. The committee is concerned with awards for outstanding scholarly and scientific achievement.

Each nomination should be accompanied by a supporting statement and a curriculum vitae. Letters seconding the sponsor's nomination should also be sent to the committee.

All nominations and other correspondence should be sent to Professor Ward H. Goodenough, University Museum (F1). Nominations and supporting materials should be submitted not later than November 16 in order to receive consideration before the committee's final report in December.

—Ward H. Goodenough, Chairman

Societies, a 39-member federation whose programs fund humanistic scholarship. Dr. Lumiansky was chairman of the English Department here from 1965 until this year and has chaired the Council's board of directors since 1959.

Dr. Charles C. Price has been given the Charles Lathrop Parsons Award of the American Chemical Society for outstanding public service. He is a former president of the Society and in 1946 won the ACS award for pure chemistry.

DEATHS

JESSIE J. BROWN (October 8 at 55), janitor at the Dental School and the Richards Building since 1957.

LEE N. GULICK (October 9 at 80), Emeritus Professor of Mechanical Engineering. During his 44-year career at the University, Professor Gulick served as director of the School of Mechanical and Metallurgical Engineering, as acting dean of the Towne School, and as assistant vice president for undergraduate engineering affairs. He received his B.A. from Penn in 1916 and his M.A. in 1930 and the Alumni Award of Merit in 1968.

MARGARET C. HOELZLE (September 22 at 62), for 16 years a secretary at SAMP until her retirement in March.

PROFESSOR JERZY KONORSKI (September at 69), Director of the Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology in Warsaw, Poland, which conducts research with Penn's Institute of Neurological Sciences; visiting professor and honorary degree recipient here in 1970.

CAROL LOWENSTEIN (September 13 at 21), CW sophomore.

BRENDA OVERTON (September 4 at 20), junior in urban studies who first came to Penn as an exchange student from Morgan State College. Until her illness in May she worked with Justine Rector, Director of the Penn-Morgan Cooperative Project.

SHERWOOD SHRIEVES (September 15 at 37, in an automobile accident). Mr. Shrieves had been a food service worker since 1964 at Houston Hall and Stouffer Dining Commons.

ZELDA BERNSTEIN WOLFMAN (October 16 at 45) wife of Bernard Wolfman, Dean of the Law School and mother of Jonathan, Brian and Dina. Memorial services were held Wednesday. In lieu of flowers the family asked contributions to the Zelda Wolfman Fund for Prisoners' Rights at the Law School.

MEMORIAL TO DR. ALTMAN

The Engineering faculty has established a MANFRED ALTMAN Memorial Award to be given annually to a freshman in honor of the late director of the Institute for Direct Energy Conversion. Colleagues and friends may send contributions to Dean Arthur Humphrey's office, 107 Towne Building.

BULLETINS

BLUE CROSS HOSPITAL SERVICE BENEFITS

Under the University's Blue Cross group plan, service benefits in approved hospitals are guaranteed to subscribers. An approved hospital is defined as a hospital approved by the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals or by Blue Cross or by the American Osteopathic Hospital Association.

If such approved hospital does not have a contract in effect with Blue Cross at the time services are charged to a Blue Cross subscriber, the subscriber will nevertheless still be covered for the Blue Cross benefits in accordance with usual procedures as in the past, through August 1, 1974, the date of expiration of the University's current contract with Blue Cross. This provision applies to new Blue Cross subscribers who join from now until August 1, 1974, as well as to those who have been subscribers for some time.

The University will advise at a later date if there is to be any change in these provisions which will be made effective after August 1, 1974.

—James J. Keller

NOTE: The University Personnel Benefits Office will be closed for business Wednesday, October 24.

TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND STAFF PERSONNEL

The University is considering the possibility of changing our office hours from the present 9 a.m.—5 p.m. to a new schedule of 8:30 a.m.—4:30 p.m.

There is a variety of reasons why this change is being considered, which include:

1. a request from the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce.
2. the possibility of relieving some traffic congestion, and
3. requests from many women on campus for earlier work hours during the winter.

We are fully aware of the fact that the needs of some departments may dictate some departure from the proposed schedule. However, we anticipate a policy that will be sufficiently flexible to meet such needs.

We welcome comments regarding this proposal by Nov. 1, 1973.

—James J. Keller

TO: Miss Jacqueline Pollard
Executive Assistant, Personnel Administrative
Services, 130 Franklin Bldg. 16

- ☐ I favor the proposed change.
☐ I do not favor the proposed change.

I have the following comments:

ENCORE '73: FOR THE RETIRING

Encore '73, postgraduate course designed for retired or soon-to-retire alumni, will be held in Vance Hall on four Fridays, October 26-November 16. Members of the Wharton faculty will lecture on health, housing and financial planning. Open to faculty and staff as enrollment permits. Registration is \$25. Information: Ext. 7927.

OPENINGS

ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL (A-1)

ADMISSIONS OFFICER, LAW SCHOOL (10/16/73).

ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT (10/9/73).

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, personnel admin. servs. (9/25/73).

DIRECTOR OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID (9/25/73).

ELECTRICAL ENGINEER II (9/18/73).

FACULTY CLUB MANAGER responsible for full operation of the Club, which includes dining, banquets, receptions, bar service, game room. *Qualifications:* graduation from a school of hotel administration or similar degree plus at least five years' similar experience. Additional five years' experience may be substituted for degree. Salary to be determined.

RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR, Environmental Med. (10/2/73).

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR IV under administrative direction and with varying degrees of latitude for judgment. Business administrators are responsible for delegated business, administrative and service functions of a school, department or research project. *Qualifications:* College graduate, preferably with advanced degree in business administration. At least 10 years of progressively responsible experience in business, industrial or institutional administration, including three years in an appropriate management capacity or comparable institutional assignment. \$13,550-\$16,875 (midpoint).

SUPPORT STAFF (A-3)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I, administrative office. Executes policy, responsible for advanced secretarial duties, making special studies, supervising part-time staff, preparing budget, maintaining office records, editing and preparing monthly newsletter, dealing with people. *Qualifications:* At least three years' responsible secretarial experience, preferably at a college. B.A. preferred, or some college. Willingness to work with people. \$6,250-\$7,350-\$8,450.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II for business office (9/18/73).

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II, medical research department. Must be able to work independently on bookkeeping, budgets, ordering supplies, maintaining office, proofreading, drafting routine correspondence and typing letters and research papers. *Qualifications:* Excellent typing and shorthand, dictaphone and use of the adding machine. B.A. preferred. At least two years' secretarial experience. \$6,725-\$7,950-\$9,150.

DATA CONTROL COORDINATOR for Dental area. (10/9/73).

ELECTRON MICROSCOPE TECHNICIAN II (9/18/73).

PHOTOGRAPHER II, research area on campus. *Qualifications:* ability to draw in ink, charts and graphs from experimental data. Perform upkeep of drafting equipment. Ability to take motion pictures and stills and make micro-copies on 35mm film. Experience with Leroy equipment. \$6,675-\$7,775-\$8,875.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (9/4/73).

SECRETARY II (4) (10/16/73).

SECRETARY III (4) (10/16/73).

SECRETARY IV, Dean of Students office (10/16/73).

Dates in parentheses refer to publication of full job description in ALMANAC. Those interested should contact Personnel Services at Ext. 7285 for an interview appointment. Inquiries by present employees concerning job openings are treated confidentially by Personnel staff.

SCUE DATA: OPEN TO VIEW

Faculty members and students can view the computerized printout results and students' comments gathered by SCUE for courses given in the Fall 1972 and Spring 1973 semesters. Forms and printouts are filed in the office of the SCUE Course Guide, 328 Sergeant Hall, 34th and Chestnut Sts., and will be available until November 2. Office hours are Monday, 9-1 and 2-5; Tuesday 10-12 and 1-5; Wednesday 3-5; Thursday 11-5; and Friday 10-12; Ext. 5507.

NEWS IN BRIEF

STATUS OF FELLOWS: DEAN O'KANE

On questions raised by teaching fellows and research fellows concerning their status, Provost Eliot Stellar has named GSAS Acting Dean Dan O'Kane to "consult with faculty and students and to recommend measures to resolve any inequities that may exist," according to an October 10 memorandum from the Provost's Office. Assisted by deans and others from the schools primarily involved, Dr. O'Kane will seek wide expression of views from the University community, he said.

FACULTY CLUB: GLEIM, CLIFFORD

With the retirement of Manager Fred Gleim, Mrs. Catherine Clifford becomes acting manager of the University's Faculty Club November 1. Mr. Gleim has managed the Club since 1967, and Mrs. Clifford has been its Assistant Manager. The Club's House Committee will shortly begin the search for a new manager, Chairman Gerald L. Robinson said.

COMMITTEE W: OPEN MEETING OCTOBER 25

AAUP Committee W will hold an open meeting Thursday to discuss the Senate's proposed Faculty Grievance Procedures.

The meeting, at 4 p.m. in the Ivy Room, second floor Houston Hall, is open to tenured and nontenured women faculty, both fully and partially affiliated.

Participants will include Dr. Anna-Marie Chirico, chairman of the University's Equal Opportunity Committee; Dr. Henry Hiz of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility; Ombudsman James O. Freedman; Law Professor Howard Lesnick; and WEOUP President Carol Tracy.

Dr. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, (History and Psychiatry) chairs Committee W this year. Members are Dr. Philip H. DeLacy (Classics), Dr. Lucienne Frappier-Mazur (Romance Languages), Stephen Goldstein (Law), Dr. Madeleine Joullie (Chemistry), and Dr. Peggy Sanday (Anthropology).

A-3 ASSEMBLY: OCTOBER 25

The Assembly will hold an open house for members and their guests Thursday, Houston Hall auditorium, noon-2 p.m.

WOMEN'S FACULTY CLUB: OCTOBER 25

The Women's Faculty Club will hold a wine and cheese party at 4:30 p.m. Thursday for members and prospective members, with Mrs. Jacqueline Wexler, president of Hunter College and a Trustee of the University, as its invited guest. Prospective members are women faculty, graduate students, administrative and professional personnel including librarians. Thursday's reception is in the Faculty Club Tea Room.

THINGS TO DO

THEATRE

Krapp's Last Tape and *Not I* are the TWO BY BECKETT that Jessica Tandy and Hume Cronyn bring to Annenberg Center's Zellerbach Theatre this week: 8 p.m. October 25, 26 and 27, with matinee 2:30, October 28. Alan Schneider directs the famous pair, who act not together this time but in separate-but-equal *tours de force*.

A single performance brings British lieder-to-jazz singer Cleo Laine in her Philadelphia debut: October 31, 8 p.m., Zellerbach Theatre. Composer/conductor/husband John Dankworth and a pianist, a drummer and a bassist-guitarist accompany.

The Threepenny Opera is Penn Player's production November 1-4 and 7-10 in Harold Prince Theatre at Annenberg Center, 8 p.m. each night.

Ticket prices, reservations for all of the above: Ext. 6791.

FILM

Two documentaries at Annenberg Center's Studio Theatre October 24 are Walter Ruttmann's 1927 *Berlin: The Symphony of a Great City* and the 1939 Van Dyke-Steiner *The City*. Each shown twice: 4 p.m. and 8 p.m.; free.

The University Museum shows *The Brothers Karamazov* in color free October 28, 2:30 p.m.

LECTURES

Vice Provost Humphrey Tonkin speaks on undergraduate education at today's meeting of the Faculty Tea Club; Faculty Club, 1:30 p.m.

Sir Misha Black, Senior Partner in the Design Research Unit and professor of industrial design at the Royal Academy of Art, will give the fourth Tiffany Lecture on "The Designer and the Manager Syndrome" October 24, Fine Arts auditorium, 4:30 p.m. "Good Design Is Good Business" follows next week; *Thomas J. Watson Jr.*, chairman of the executive committee of IBM, will speak. October 31, same time and place. Free tickets must be obtained in advance from the dean's office, E-111 Dietrich Hall; undergraduate office, E-116; or Wharton Grad office, Vance Hall.

Buckminster Fuller will give the annual A.V.B. Geoghegan Lecture on "Humans in the Universe" at the Annenberg Colloquium, October 29, Colloquium Room, Annenberg School, 4 p.m.

Dr. Trevor O. Jones, director of advance product engineering of General Motors' technical center, will talk about current and future electronic developments in autos and how they will affect us. Second of the Moore School 50th anniversary lecture series, October 30, Fine Arts auditorium, 8 p.m.

Dr. R. M. E. Parkhouse of London's National Institute for Medical Research will lead a COHR seminar on "Biosynthesis and Secretion of Polymeric Immunoglobulins; Control by J-Chain"; October 30, Room S-1, Dental School, noon.

Women in Communication. Panel moderated by Lenore Hershey, editor-in-chief, *Ladies Home Journal*; panelists: Jacqueline Brandwynne, president of her own advertising agency; Marion Lockett, advertising media manager, Scott Paper Company; Carol Pillion, associate fashion editor, *Journal*; Ruth Seltzer, society editor, *Philadelphia Inquirer*. October 30, Rooftop Lounge, Harrison House, 4 p.m. Open free to faculty and staff; sponsored by Mortar Board.

EXHIBITS

Ferdinand Roten Galleries of Maryland exhibit and sell graphic art October 24, Houston Hall, 10 a.m.-6 p.m.

Sixty Photographs by Philadelphia photographers are in the Bowl Room, Houston Hall, through November 2. Sponsored by Penn Union Council, free.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (I6) Ext. 5274

Editor Karen C. Gaines

Assistant Editor Margaret M. McIlmoyl