

# Almanac

Tuesday, December 20, 1983

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 30, Number 16

## IN BRIEF

**North Toward Cambridge:** Dr. Robert F. Maddin, University Professor of Materials Science and Engineering, is taking early retirement to become visiting professor of anthropology at Harvard University, where he will also direct the Center for Archaeological Research and Development at the Peabody Museum. Dr. Maddin, who made numerous broad-based contributions to metallurgy and materials science during his "first" career here, began focusing on ancient metals and archaeology after he was named University Professor in 1973. In 1978, he also became associate director of the University Museum Applied Science Center for Archaeology. Dr. Charles D. Graham, Jr., current chair of materials science, credits Dr. Maddin with building the Penn program from a three-member metallurgy department in the early 'fifties to a materials science unit of 12 faculty members with some 50 graduate students. As Dr. Maddin prepared to leave for Cambridge, Provost Tom Ehrlich added, "We shall miss his special form of alchemy."

## New Staff Grievance Procedure: January 1

Effective January 1, the University's non-academic staff will have a new grievance process, to be operated on an interim basis over the next two years.

On page 7 of this issue, President Sheldon Hackney has released his December 9 letter to Ombudsman John Keene, head of the Commission that reported in *Almanac* December 6. The full procedure will be published in *Almanac* and incorporated into the *Personnel Policy Manual*.

Dr. Hackney organized a broad-based committee two years ago under George Budd of Labor Relations to study revisions of the nonacademic process. After extensive consul-

tations with staff Assemblies and organizations such as the Association of Business Administrators, and with the Affirmative Action Council, the President incorporated numerous suggestions from various sources.

"With the conscientious effort that many knowledgeable people have given to the Staff Grievance Procedures, the timing appears appropriate to provide our nonacademic staff with a procedure on whose integrity they can depend and which they can utilize when required," the President said in his letter. "While it is not a perfect document, I am convinced it is a major improvement over our existing procedures."

### President to Staff: January 12

The new grievance procedure and other topics are on the agenda as President Sheldon Hackney speaks January 12 to an all-staff assembly sponsored by the Administrative and A-3 Assemblies. The meeting begins at 1 p.m. in 351 Steinberg-Dietrich and is open to part-time as well as full-time personnel, the Assemblies' leaders Bud Ledwell and Russell Muth said.

## INSIDE

- Senate Chair: Civilized Environment, p. 2
- Speaking Out on SEC/ATO, p. 3
- New Wistar Agreement, pp. 2-3
- January On Campus, pp. 4-5 (unnumbered)
- Recommendation-Writers' Guide, p. 6
- Interim Grievance Process for Staff, p. 7

Center: Judge Forer's ATO Opinion

## Rehearing ATO Withdrawal: Leo Levin of Law

Professor A. Leon Levin of the Law School, who served as vice provost for student affairs (now University life) when that office was first created in the 'sixties, is the Hearing Officer for the court-ordered rehearing of the Alpha Tau Omega case now in progress.

The rehearing—which is on withdrawal-of-recognition of the fraternity only, not on individual members' cases settled earlier this year—is being conducted under guidelines laid down in the Hon. Lois Forer's order of November 17 (*Almanac* November 29), and in terms of clarifications later received in response to a University request. In the center of this issue, pages I-IV, is the full text of Judge Forer's written opinion issued December 13. Judge Forer retains jurisdiction in the case.

Professor Levin, a noted scholar of judicial administration who is currently director of the Federal Judicial Center in Washington, teaches courses and seminars at the Law School in civil procedure, injunctions and judicial administration. His books include *Dispatch and Delay: A Field Study of Judicial Administration in Pennsylvania* (1961, with Woolley); *Cases on Civil Procedure* (1974 with Chadbourn and Schuchman); *Commentary on Pennsylvania Execution Rules* (1967, with Gorman and Schuchman) and others on the American judiciary, its systems and its future.

By appointment of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, he headed state reapportionment following the 1970 census, and later served as executive director of the Commission on Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System. After his term as vice provost here, 1965-68, he served as vice president for academic affairs at Yeshiva University, 1969-70, and was national president of the Order of the Coif, 1967-70.



## Toward a Civilized Learning Environment

It is now more than ten months since Alpha Tau Omega had a party after which one of our students, a junior in FAS, reported that she had been raped successively by a considerable number of Penn fraternity members. The event left in its wake a young woman who has suffered severe physical and psychological damage, and a campus filled with anger and conflict. Students have been given conflicting messages about moral standards and acceptable behavior in this or any institution of civilized life. Hardly an atmosphere conducive to learning.

It was clear that measures had to be taken to improve the moral climate. The first step appropriate to an institution of learning was to learn the facts. On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, I appointed a committee to do four things: to review the administration's actions; to evaluate the adequacy and appropriateness of the sanctions applied to the accused individuals in the fraternity; to evaluate the support given to the young woman; and to offer recommendations for the future. We now have the report of that committee and it deserves careful consideration.

The committee did a detailed and thorough review of the administration's response to the ATO incident from the moment when the young woman first reported the matter until the date of their report. They found actions based on many confusions and misunderstandings. The role of the Special Faculty Committee, convened by President Hackney and chaired by Professor Spritzer, is a case in point: Professor Spritzer thought his committee was charged with recommending procedures. The Consultation Committee had advised the administration, however, that the Special Committee actually hear the case. A panel had been carefully proposed with a broad range of expertise including a representative from the human services area, and an expert on adolescence, as well as law. A committee to advise on procedures might well have had a different makeup. Professor Gerstenhaber, the chair of the Consultation Committee at that time, expressed to the president his surprise and dismay at the different charge to a committee formed for another purpose.

There were other procedural problems occurring along the way which were raised by the committee: decisions based on erroneous information, appropriate information sources not consulted, lines of authority vague, no one clearly in charge. The president and the provost, while not agreeing fully with the report, have acknowledged their difficulties and their responsibilities.

Initially, the faculty had two concerns about the sanctions to individuals: (1) they appeared to be trivial in respect to the gravity of the offense, and (2) they were rumored to be educative, but were not being supervised by academic faculty in the schools granting the degrees to the individuals involved. The Review Committee Report bears out these concerns, and also raises for campus discussion the serious issues involved in confidentiality in student judicial procedures. Upcoming campus discussion on judicial procedures will surely be shaped by this experience.

In response to its third charge, the Review Committee found that the "complainant was not accorded the dignity and compassion she deserved and the financial assistance she required" and recommended "the University promptly consider its financial responsibility to the complainant." The Senate Executive Committee agreed and voted, overwhelmingly, that "... the University promptly fulfill its moral responsibility to the victim by meeting the medical, legal and educational expenses incurred by her as a consequence of this incident." The president and provost have assured us that such help is forthcoming.

The Review Committee offered four guidelines in case of future problems:

"First, the investigation of the incident should be complete and accurate. Second, there should be a hearing before a tribunal capable of rendering a decision fair to all parties concerned. Third, the resolution of the incident should transmit a clear message as to what conduct is and is not acceptable on this campus. Fourth, the entire process should show great sensitivity to the stake that the complainant has in the outcome."

I think we would all agree to the importance of each one of these guidelines. We are all eager to help heal the damage to the University and to the young woman. Setting and enforcing proper standards of conduct is the responsibility of both faculty and University officers. The president and provost have stressed in their statement the need to develop a more humane University community and to formulate better procedures when serious breaches in expected conduct occur. I have invited the president and provost to join with the faculty in discussion of this at the next meeting of the Senate Executive Committee. I hope we can move together toward creating a civilized learning environment.



## Death of Dean Kennedy

Dr. William B. Kennedy, former associate dean at Penn's School of Medicine who was director and president of the American Cancer Society for 30 years, died on December 4 at the age of 69 following coronary bypass surgery. Dr. Kennedy earned his medical degree at Penn. and after an internship and residency at Geisinger Memorial Hospital, he returned to the University in 1942 as a professor in the Department of Medicine. He served as an assistant to the Dean, as Vice Dean and Associate Dean until 1967 when he accepted a full-time position with the National Board of Medical Examiners as director for NBME examinations.

Retaining his affiliation with Penn until retirement in 1982, Dr. Kennedy also worked with the Federation of State Medical Boards and was active in professional organizations.

Dr. Kennedy is survived by his wife, Edna; three children, Dorothy Coil, Kathryn Kennedy, and Philip Kennedy; a brother, Philip A. Kennedy; a sister, Emily Ernst; and four grandchildren. Contributions may be made in his memory to the American Cancer Society or the American Heart Association.

---

## New Wistar Agreement

A basic Agreement of Cooperation between the Board of Managers of the Wistar Institute and the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania has been signed by John W. Eckman, President of Wistar's Board of Managers, and by Sheldon Hackney, President of the University. This constitutes a revision of the previous agreements signed in 1960 and in 1970.

Basic points covered in the new document are as follows:

- Appropriate members of the Institute's scientific staff may be appointed to the Associated Faculty of the University when proposed through the customary personnel procedures relevant to such appointments and subject to approval of the Provost's Staff Conference and the University's Board of Trustees.

- Those members of the Institute's scientific staff who have been duly appointed to the University's Associated Faculty are thereby eligible for membership in graduate groups and may participate in graduate education including the direction of doctoral dissertations if selected for graduate group membership and appointed to graduate group membership by the cognizant dean.

- The University and the Institute from time to time may agree to share educational and scientific endeavors, including but not restricted to agreements concerning tuition scholarship and graduate training.

- The University and the Institute from time to time may agree to share or supply operational services including but not limited to utilities, chilled water, and radiation safety.

(continued)

## SPEAKING OUT

### Question: Consultation Committee

Can we hear from the Committee on Consultation concerning its exchanges with the President and the Provost over the problem of choosing a procedure to review evidence in the ATO episode?

With a report from a special Senate Executive Committee now published, and a reaction from SEC that is quite critical of the administration, some people are evidently on the verge of proclaiming a rupture between the faculty and the administration over this matter. Yet the situation does not, at least on the face of it, appear to justify any such conclusion.

When the ATO emergency caused the President and the Provost to consult with the Committee on Consultation, the major problem the administration sought to solve was how to proceed against the alleged wrongdoers. The choice was between following the procedures in the student judiciary system or creating a special tribunal to hear the evidence.

The Committee on Consultation apparently advised the latter course, and nominated four people to constitute a committee to carry out this role, under the chairmanship of Professor Ralph Spritzer. The administration, upon composing the group, then asked if it agreed that a special tribunal should be employed, or whether it thought that the student judiciary procedures should be used.

This, we now are told, is where the administration made its mistake. Despite the fact that the Spritzer Committee replied unanimously by rejecting the idea of a special tribunal, and unanimously insisted that the established judicial procedures be employed, reaction from the Senate Executive Committee has been to condemn the administration's decision both to seek and then to accept the Spritzer Committee's advice.

To attack the administration in this way seems to me not so much to espouse a reasonable alternate analysis of the facts as to reveal a quite possibly fatal *idée fixe* on the subject of consultative protocol. Attacking the President and Provost for consulting a committee that the Committee on Consultation had itself created reveals a misunderstanding of the fundamental purpose of consultation in the operation of University governance. The purpose of consultation is not to pay the best kind of courtesies to officers assigned to the formal role of consultants.

The purpose of consultation is to discover the best way to solve the governance problem; which in this case was how to choose between alternate methods of judicial procedure.

Grant this, and the administration's consultation with the Spritzer Committee would seem to have been not only justified but obligatory. The decision then to follow that committee's advice may have been wrong (as the SEC report suggests) but at least it was a decision, an act of governance that undertook to get on with a job that needed to be done.

Those who attack the decision and who argue that the whole matter should have gone back to the consultation system for another round of deliberation may have a certain point. But in making it they provide the community as a whole with an opportunity seriously to consider whether or not such a consultative system, so interpreted, really serves the best interests of the University.

It would be most helpful to know the views of the Committee on Consultation concerning this issue.

—Robert F. Lucid,  
Professor and Chairman, English

### Disapproval of SEC

This note is to register my disapproval of the Senate Executive Committee's apparent conclusion that the University did not comport itself well in dealing with the ATO rape case. Although I speak only for myself, none of my colleagues has yet indicated agreement with the SEC in this matter.

Most striking to me is the parallel between what the police and the courts all too often do to rape victims, and what the SEC has done to the Administration—treat the victim as they should the perpetrator. President Hackney certainly did not ask for the terribly unfortunate incident; it was thrust upon him. He and other administrators consulted with the faculty, attempted to find the facts, and dealt with the situation in as decisive and considered a fashion as possible. The action against the fraternity did not please everyone, I know, but it was action and it was appropriate. The fraternity defended itself in a court that denied the University's position, for the time being. I am confident that eventually the courts will agree with Hackney that the fraternity must be punished and that the University acted well and within its jurisdiction.

There is one thing about the SEC opinion that heartens me. During my two years on the

SEC, it discussed issues relevant only to faculty remuneration. Questions concerning intellectual atmosphere and achievement, scholarly criteria, and graduate student quality were avoided in favor of tenure protection, salary levels relative to inflation, consulting guidelines, and faculty tuition benefits. At the very least, the ATO rape case is a departure from this trend.

—Stephen Roth,  
Professor and Chairman, Biology

### Faculty to the Center

As a strong proponent of the faculty involvement in the jurisdiction of the University I can only see the handling of the ATO affair by the present administration as a convincing argument for my position: students and administrators have failed miserably; students and administrators alike were overwhelmed by the lawyer of the fraternity members, and such secrecy was imposed as to suggest that those in charge were inept or had tried to cover up. Why did the "Special Faculty Committee" appointed by the President not act more independently or resign after being told of the limitations of its duty? Did the members of this committee fully understand what was at stake?

Only panels appointed by the Faculty Senate such as the Review Committee (enlarged by one student and the Judicial Officer of the University) seem to me the right forum to deal with serious cases such as the ATO affair. Luckily, there are sufficient trustworthy colleagues among us who can deal with cases which affect the whole University community and will show more tact and responsibility than those who produced the mess of the ATO affair. Moreover, there is a great amount of trust and collegiality among the faculty which for some reason seem to understand and act well on the specific question of what can be shared without breach of confidentiality.

Therefore, the time seems to be right for an attempt to bring faculty back into the center of the jurisdiction of the University. I hope during their next meetings a sufficient number of members of the Senate Executive Committee will ask for the necessary changes in the new proposals for a new judiciary system for the University and give faculty the absolute majority in judicial panels dealing with the most serious cases of misconduct and crime.

—Peter Gaeffke, Professor of  
Modern Indian Literature

*SPEAKING OUT* welcomes the contributions of readers. Almanac's normal Tuesday deadlines for unsolicited material is extended to THURSDAY noon for short, timely letters on University issues. Advance notice of intent to submit is always appreciated.—Ed.

### New Wistar Agreement

Founded in 1892, The Wistar Institute is the nation's oldest independent institution devoted entirely to biomedical research. It is located on campus at 36th and Spruce Streets. As part of a long-term relationship, the University and Wistar share joint staff appointments, collaborative research programs and some services. A number of pre- and post-doctoral fellows from the University conduct research under the supervision of Wistar scientists in their laboratories.



Dr. Hackney, left, with Wistar Board president John Eckman.

# January on Campus

# January on Campus

## A Recommendation-Writers' Guide

*At Council in October, discussion on students' feelings about the approachability of their teachers focused at times on a test question asked initially by Provost Tom Ehrlich at a Hill House meeting: "Do you know a faculty member well enough to ask for a recommendation as you approach graduation?" Patricia Rose, present as director of the Career Planning and Placement Service, said her office's experience echoed the students' belief that too few could answer "yes." In response to individuals' private requests for advice on writing recommendations, Ms. Rose furnishes the following document, which her office prepared for the guidance of "Teaching Fellows and Others New to the Recommendation Process." In many departments, senior faculty and departmental secretaries help circulate such information; Ms. Rose welcomes dialog from all concerned on improving Penn students' chances at jobs, graduate fellowships and major awards in the U.S. and abroad.*

Writing letters of recommendation for students is a time-consuming and sometimes perplexing task. The Career Planning and Placement Service makes the task of referees easier, and the mailing of recommendations speedier, by maintaining files of recommendations for students. On students' request, these files can be quickly reproduced and sent to graduate schools or employers. This way, when you take the time to write a thoughtful letter for a student, you know that the student can use the recommendation several times without asking you to rewrite it. (If you yourself are a graduate student at the University, CPPS will also maintain a file of recommendations on your behalf. The file will save you a great deal of time and anxiety in getting letters out on time when you apply for fellowships, grants, or jobs. See us about setting one up.)

We hope that these suggestions will also be helpful to you in the more difficult issue of deciding how to write the recommendation for a particular student.

1. When a student asks you to write a letter of recommendation, know that you are not under any obligation to do so and decide whether you wish to write enthusiastically enough about the candidate that your recommendation will be helpful to him or her. On the sheet we give to students who request recommendations, we encourage students to ask for a recommendation tactfully enough that it will be easy for an unenthusiastic referee to decline. Even if this is not the case, however, please decline unless you feel your recommendation will be helpful.

Since the vast majority of letters of recommendation are written enthusiastically, recommendations which are neutral are interpreted as negative, and often those which are even slightly negative can seriously impair a student's chances of admission to a graduate school or an offer from a selective employer. Naturally referees wish to be honest. However, your honest negative evaluation of a student in his or her file can handicap him or her far beyond what you may have wished or intended. So, if you are uncomfortable writing positively, please decline!

Referees from Asia or Europe may be interested to know that references from these areas are usually far more understated than are those written in the States. "Mr. Jones' mastery of the material was entirely adequate," for example, might be high praise in many countries. In the U.S., it translates to "Mr. Jones is an average student."

2. If you decide to write the recommendation, find out what the student is most likely to use it for, so that you can stress, where possible, the factors of most interest to that type of graduate program or employer. Ask the student whether or not he or she wants a general recommendation or one which mentions a particular goal. A student may ask for more than one letter from you to be put on file, perhaps one tailored to a particular career goal and a more general one. CPPS distinguishes them by their dates. For example, you could tell a student that the law school reference was dated 10/15 and the more general one 11/1.

3. In writing the recommendation, be as specific as possible. General encomiums serve the student less well than specific examples. "His performance was brilliant" is less convincing than "His critique of the experimental basis of the theory of learned helplessness was so closely reasoned that I encouraged him to send his paper to a professional journal for publication." You can include references to conversations with the student or to his or her behavior towards others. For example, "I have frequently spoken with Lauren outside of class and find that her interest in literature is genuine and that her classwork is supplemented by reading according to her own wide-ranging interests, which include French novels in the original and Russian ones in translation." Or, "Discussions were heated. Sandra frequently carried her point, but never denigrated others' contributions. In fact, she was usually one of the first to recognize someone else's clear argument." You may also include favorable comments that you have heard

others make about the student or your knowledge of a difficult circumstance that the student has handled well. For example, "I know he has been unusually willing to help other students who are having difficulty with the work," or "Her performance is especially impressive in view of the fact that she had to work twenty hours a week and lost three weeks this semester as the result of an auto accident from which she has since completely recovered."

Try to compare the student to others, choosing a comparison which serves the student well. Perhaps the student was not the best you ever had, but was the best in his or her discussion section. Perhaps, although his grasp of the subject matter was only good, he wrote better than anyone else in the section. Perhaps he can be described as "one of the five best in the section."

4. In the world of employment and admissions, omissions of factors tend to be construed as negative. Therefore, in a reference for anything, always make at least brief mention of students' academic and intellectual abilities, of their motivation and commitment and of their interpersonal skills. If you say nothing about what the student seems to be like as a person, a professional school admissions committee may easily conclude that he or she is brilliant academically but has difficulty talking to others.

Statements which are explicitly negative or which introduce problems, no matter how many disclaimers are attached, can seriously jeopardize a student's candidacy: "I have no reason to think that he is neurotic." "Although I do not know of any specific examples of dishonesty, I have some question about his integrity." "While his manner is abrasive, I personally do not find it offensive." "She is not well-liked, but this is perhaps merely a further testament to her creativity." Statements such as these can be disastrous for a candidate. If you have such concerns it may be better not to write at all. If you wish to give a thoughtful evaluation of a student's weaknesses as well as strengths, couple them with an explanation of how they do not interfere with performance. For example, "He has told me that he does not write quickly or easily. However, his revision of drafts is painstaking and the final product is always concise and polished."

5. Omit references to appearance, which trivialize a recommendation and make the candidate appear less serious than he or she otherwise would. If you want to refer to personal charm, which frequently is a tremendous and relevant asset, describe its effect on others. For example, "His warmth and sense of humor readily draw others toward him and he is a welcome participant in groups of students, faculty, or administrators."

6. As you know, federal law stipulates that students can see letters of recommendation unless they waive their rights of access to them in advance. The students' choice will have been designated on the form which they give you. Most students choose to waive their rights, since they are told that graduate and professional schools usually find confidential references more compelling. However, if you, as the author of a confidential reference, wish to show a copy to the student whom it concerns, you certainly may.

7. When CPPS receives a confidential recommendation for a student, we maintain that confidentiality and will not show the recommendation to the student. On request from the student, we will review a recommendation in order to ascertain whether or not it is suitable for a specific purpose. For instance, if you conclude a letter, "J.B. will make an outstanding physician," we will tell a student that that letter is inappropriate for law school, but we will not divulge specific contents of the recommendation or your overall impression of the student to him or her. On occasion a CPPS counselor who notices a very negative recommendation in a student's file may call its author to ask whether the impression given is the one that was intended.

8. Please type your recommendation. Handwriting is more difficult to read and the ink often reproduces less well than type does.

9. The time that you spend writing thoughtful letters for students is of great assistance to them. If there is anything the Career Planning and Placement Service can do to help, please get in touch with us.

If you have further questions, feel free to contact any one of our counseling staff.

Director: Patricia L. Rose, Ext. 3208.

Annenberg, Graduate Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Graduate School of Fine Arts: Mary Morris Heiberger, Associate Director, Ext. 7530.

The College: Aminta G. Hawkins, Ext. 3012; Jean M. Papalia, Ext. 7529.

Field Experience/Summer Jobs: Liza Jane Bernard, Ext. 4827; Rita Goldman, Ext. 3198.

Graduate and Professional School Advising: Carol Baffi Dugan, Assistant Director, Ext. 7324; Michael Hindery, Ext. 7324; Becky Weir, Ext. 5261.

Graduate School of Education, School of Nursing, School of Social Work: Peggy L. Curchack, Ext. 4381.

School of Engineering and Applied Science: Rita M. Wittmer, Ext. 7590.

Wharton: Beverly Hamilton-Chandler, Associate Director, Ext. 7533; Barbara Church, Ext. 3530.

# From the President

President Sheldon Hackney's recent letter to Ombudsman John Keene is published here to advise all members of the University community of an interim policy for staff grievance procedures.

## Effective January 1: Interim Grievance Procedures for Staff

I have had an opportunity to peruse the Final Report of the President's Commission on Judicial Procedures. The document reflects conscientious thought and effort. For purposes of this communication, however, I wish to limit my remarks to Section III of the report relating to the Non-Academic Staff Procedures.

As you are aware, it has been over two years since I initiated a broadly based Committee representative of A-1 and A-3 employees and staff to make recommendations on the Non-Academic Staff Grievance Procedure. During this lengthy period of time the Budd Committee (as it has come to be called) submitted to me and then resubmitted to the Vice President for Human Resources on November 3, 1983, its recommended Staff Grievance Procedure. The President's Commission of Judicial Procedures, of which you were Chairman, has only had the opportunity to review the December 22, 1982, submission of the Budd Committee. My comments, therefore, are directed to Section III of the Commission's Report and subsequent changes that have been made as a result.

The Staff Grievance Procedure (amended and modified since its original submission to the Commission) attempts to address the concerns of many constituency groups and those recommendations in the Commission Report that can be immediately implemented. Since a grievance procedure is viable only if employees believe it will be effective, fair and equitable, the Staff Grievance Procedure has been commented on and reviewed by many groups and individuals including the A-1 and A-3 Assemblies, the Human Resources Council, the Affirmative Action Council, the Association of Business Administrators and individuals representing specific interests.

At my request the Affirmative Action Council was asked to review the full procedure very recently and made suggestions which have now been incorporated. The A-3 and A-1 Assemblies have had representatives on the original Budd Committee, the Commission and the Affirmative Action Council.

I have reviewed the specific recommendations of the Commission in light of our desire to have a Staff Grievance Procedure operational as soon as possible. I believe the Staff Grievance Procedure addresses most of the concerns in the Commission report to the extent they could be inserted into the procedure without additional delays.

Specifically, the Commission made nine specific recommendations. Let me address each in turn:

1. The Commission has recommended the creation of an 'Office of Judicial and Grievance Administration.' This recommendation deserves further exploration though I should indicate that I believe the responsibility for administration of the Staff Grievance Procedure properly rests with the Office of Human Resources. On the other hand, the Judicial and Grievance Administration Office may prove viable should the Staff Grievance Procedure be deficient after experience in its utilization has occurred. I therefore am directing that upon implementation, the Staff Grievance Procedure be considered as a two-year pilot program.

2. The Commission did not believe that the 'dual track' handling of discrimination/sexual harassment complaints and other grievances was appropriate. The Staff Grievance Procedure now reflects one central processing mechanism by having the Office of Affirmative Action assist the Office of Staff Relations in matters involving allegations of sexual harassment or discrimination. The parallel procedure has been eliminated.

3. The Commission recommended that the grievant and the responding supervisor be permitted to have advisors during the informal and/or formal procedure and that these advisors may be selected from the full-time faculty or non-academic staff. We concur and the changes have been incorporated.

4. The Commission was concerned that the time periods in the formal procedure appear to be too short. The time limits are to be recognized as not being absolute and may be extended for legitimate reasons. The time frame for the informal procedure has been expanded to twenty working days and for matters involving allegations of sexual harassment or discrimination may be extended further. The time period that your recommendation set forth for Steps 1, 2, 3, and 4 have, at my request, been incorporated into the Staff Grievance Procedure.

5. The Commission recommendations concerning the "activities of the panel" and my response are incorporated in the Staff Grievance Procedure, and it shall also contain the more detailed instructions pertaining to my response.

6. The Commission recommends clarification of the policies and procedures covering high ranking administrators. This has now occurred.

7. The procedures "when the (grievance) clock starts running" as recommended by the Commission have been clarified to the extent possible.

8. We concur with the Commission that the grievant's employment status is to be protected. The procedure requires that action may be taken only after all applicable University policies and procedures have been followed. In addition, the procedure protects the grievant from any retaliatory action, and the University will not condone nor tolerate any such retaliatory action.

9. The Commission recommended that no changes be adopted until reviewed by those affected. We believe the two-year review process coupled with our latest communication, discussion and review with constituency groups fulfills the Commission's desire and indeed has provided over two years of review and careful thought to the Staff Grievance Procedure.

Coupled with the effort to review the specific grievance procedure by the Budd Committee and the Commission we also included questions on our problem-solving and grievance mechanisms on the Penn Staff Survey conducted among a representative sample of all non-academic employees this year. The results of that survey again reinforce that we need to update our grievance mechanisms and address the concerns identified by employees in the Staff Survey as soon as possible. I had indicated at a joint spring A-1/A-3 Assembly meeting that a new grievance procedure was a top priority for us.

With the conscientious effort that many knowledgeable people have given to the Staff Grievance Procedure, the timing appears appropriate to provide our non-academic staff with a procedure on whose integrity they can depend and which they can utilize when required. While it is not a perfect document, I am convinced it is a major improvement over our existing procedures.

As a result, I am directing the Vice President for Human Resources to implement a revised Staff Grievance Procedure effective January 1, 1984, subject to the following:

1. That the procedure be reviewed, in conjunction with the A-1 and A-3 Assemblies, two years after implementation.

2. That each employee receive a summary of the grievance procedure with additional publicity in *The Penn Paper*.

3. That the complete text of the full grievance procedure be published in *Almanac* "Of Record" and be placed in the Personnel Policy Manual.

4. That, as part of our supervisory development programs, training occur on the Staff Grievance Procedure.

Since the summary of the Commission Report has been reported in *Almanac*, I believe it appropriate that this letter be published for the campus community in anticipation of the implementation of the procedure on January 1, 1984.

I urge all supervisors and employees to read the staff grievance procedure when published and utilize it when required. Our ability to treat one another with dignity and respect is enhanced when a procedure exists to have concerns heard fairly and expeditiously. I commend highly you and your Commission on this section of their Report and thank the Budd Committee, the A-1 and A-3 Assemblies and the Affirmative Action Council for their invaluable insight, comments and support. The new Staff Grievance Procedure is an example of the Penn community working together toward a common goal.



cc: Thomas Ehrlich      Russell Muth      Davida Ramey  
Elizabeth Flower      Helen O'Bannon      *Almanac*  
Bud Ledwell      Gary Posner      *Penn Paper*

# United Way Donor Option Campaign

Final Report, November 21, 1983

## Over the Top

As Penn's United Way/Donor Option campaign drew to a close last month the total was more than \$28,000 above the goal of \$135,000. President Sheldon Hackney presented James H. Robinson, director of community relations, with the following certificate at the United Way victory party.

Behind every successful effort to achieve a worthwhile goal is one individual who possesses the necessary understanding, energy and ability to motivate others. This combination of attributes, in concert with the experience gained in past campaigns, has enabled you to bring about recognition of the University as a *Pacesetter* in the 1984 United Way/Donor Option campaign.

All those who served on the University's United Way team applaud your sincere efforts, and they say "thank you" for a job well done.

School/Department	Total Employees	Percentage Contributing	Total Contributions
Annenberg	41	66%	\$ 2,136
Dental Medicine	360	16	2,518
Faculty of Arts & Sciences	917	21	20,477
Engineering	203	24	6,217
Education	72	40	1,597
Fine Arts	56	15	1,110
Auxiliary Enterprise	317	43	2,757
Finance	277	42	6,139
Human Resources	49	96	2,691
Operations & Maintenance	598	30	2,197
President	58	66	5,662
Provost	73	90	4,451
Libraries	251	36	5,918
University Life	208	46	3,065
Development	122	55	4,173
Operational Services	76	53	1,682
Intercollegiate Athletics	65	86	2,058
Law	71	15	3,765
Medicine	1,800	24	45,448
Museum	95	37	1,004
Nursing	80	36	1,641
Provost-Interdisciplinary	97	43	5,044
Social Work	31	65	1,657
Veterinary Medicine	495	12	4,481
Wharton	434	34	16,451
Other			8,765
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,846</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>\$163,098</b>

## Collegium Musicum on WHYY FM

*Nowells and Lullabies of Early England*, featuring the Collegium Musicum directed by Mary Anne Ballard, will be aired by WHYY 91 FM at 7:30 p.m. for music lovers in the Philadelphia listening area. The show, recorded at the Church of Saint Martin-in-the-Fields in Chestnut Hill December 12, 1982, will be distributed to more than 240 public radio stations across the United States via the American Public Radio Network.

**Corrections:** To *Almanac* 11/29: On page one, Dean Stemmler spoke to the principle of information-sharing, but not "for the motion" on the floor as indicated ... and the date of death for the late Maurice English (page 4) was *November 18*, not the 25th as reported. The 12/6: On page 2, point 5 in the VPUL's comments on reenrollment and attrition should be to "Increase efforts to interview all *existing* students ..." rather than "existing students."

*Almanac* 3601 Locust Walk/C8  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104  
(215) 898-5274 or 5275.

The University of Pennsylvania's journal of record and opinion is published Tuesdays during the academic year and as needed during summer and holiday breaks. Guidelines for readers and contributors are available on request.

EDITOR  
ASSISTANT EDITOR  
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT  
WORK STUDY STUDENTS

Karen C. Gaines  
Marguerite F. Miller  
Linda M. Fischer  
Kevin M. Dougherty  
Amy L. MacMullan  
Michael S. Markowitz  
John Neumann  
Matthew H. Stone

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD Eliot Stellar, chair; Jacob Abel, June Axinn, Jean Crockett, Carolyn Marvin and Ralph Spritzer for the Faculty Senate; ... Denise McGregor for the Administration ... Jane Bryan for the Librarians Assembly ... Edwin Ledwell for the Administrative Assembly ... Joseph Kane for the A-3 Assembly.



*Theatre Beyond Words, Canada's most popular visual comedy troupe, brings more than Five Good Reasons to Laugh as they present a collection of comedy situations combining sound, music, vocalization, masks and gestures. The five performers look like a living comic strip and move like an animated cartoon while providing family entertainment December 22 and 23 at Annenberg Center. Performances are at 8 p.m.; tickets: \$8, \$6.*