Three Sets of Goals

College of Engineering and Applied Science:

At the first Engineering Faculty meeting this fall, Dean Arthur E. Humphrey listed three related sets of goals for improving undergraduate education, graduate programs and the state of the College in general.

He outlined nine projects in undergraduate areas:

1. To make Engineering a strong element in the University's emerging undergraduate system through independent majors, thematic studies and the proposed technology major in the College.

2. To develop programs and courses for the recently-proposed Bachelor of Applied Science degree, a nonprofessional degree in the Engineering College.

3. To develop programs and courses for recently-approved Bachelor of Science in Engineering degrees in Bioengineering and Systems Engineering.

4. To create "technology literacy" courses in cooperation with the Department of History and Sociology of Science, including such topics as The History of Science and Technology; Innovation and Invention; Materials in Modern and Ancient Societies; Pollution; Systems Dynamics in Society; and Computers and Automation.

5. To complete a New Directions for Engineering Education report to aid in obtaining up to $2 million needed for the B.A.S., technology literacy series and other new programs.

6. To modify the undergraduate engineering course work to create a basis for preprofessional education in law, medicine and business.

7. To evolve a Junior Year Abroad with perhaps four institutions: Tel Aviv University (Dr. Beran), Technical...

Continued on page 8
On the Role of Faculty Review Committees
by Charles H. Kahn

As a member of the College Personnel Committee over the last four years, I have given much thought to the function of a faculty review committee in our University, and I would like to share these thoughts with other members of the faculty. It seems appropriate to have some public discussion of this question just at this moment, since the imminent creation of a Faculty of Arts and Science will presumably require the setting up of one or more new committees designed to review appointments and promotions in the new faculty.

The proposals which follow are aimed at eliminating certain institutional ambiguities in the review procedures as I am familiar with them. The basic issue concerns the proper division of responsibility between the faculty review body and the officers of the University administration. My remarks are in no sense intended as a criticism of any Dean or any other member of the Administration. The problem is not one of persons but of institutional structure.

I have suggested to Professor Paul Taubman, Chairman of the Senate, that the Senate might well seek to clarify the principles that underlie the Steering Committee resolution adopted by the University Council on May 9, 1973. I refer particularly to the following sentence: "It is recognized that only in extraordinary circumstances does the Provost act favorably on an appointment, reappointment or promotion contrary to the advice of the faculty concerned." Although I am in full sympathy with the intent of this resolution, I do not believe that it resolves the crucial issues. In the first place, circumstances can always be judged "extraordinary." In effect, this phrasing leaves the Provost free to overrule a negative faculty decision on appointments and promotion whenever he wishes, and for whatever reason, as long as he does not do it too often. And in the second place, by acting before a definite recommendation has been received, the Provost and his Staff Conference can avoid acting "contrary" to such advice. (Some of us know of a case in which this happened.) Above all, the resolution does not make clear who is responsible for formulating "the advice of the faculty concerned." Of course, it is the Dean who communicates this advice. But is it his judgment which constitutes "the advice of the faculty"? Or is he merely the spokesman for a faculty body?

The Statutes of the Corporation specify that "Each faculty shall determine the qualifications for membership in that faculty" (Article VII). I take it that this means that the qualifications are determined by the faculty as a whole, or by a representative body, and that this judgment cannot be overruled. Presumably the Administration may refuse to appoint someone who is academically qualified, if it acts on nonacademic grounds, e.g. on the grounds that the University cannot afford the cost. But I do not see how the Administration can properly decide to appoint (reappoint, promote) someone that the faculty or its representatives have found unqualified.

In order to clarify the resolution of last May, and to spell out the implications of Article VII as quoted, I propose the following three principles:

1. Each faculty (or sub-faculty, if it is desirable to subdivide a future Faculty of Arts and Sciences) will be represented by a Personnel Review Committee, or by some comparable body as established by the individual faculties. In order to make clear that these bodies represent the faculty, they might be directly elected. It may be more convenient, however, to keep the present system of nominations by the Dean. In that case, there should be a formal vote by the faculty, confirming (or, as the case may be, altering) the composition of the committee. In any event, the members of this committee should no longer be thought of as consultative to the Dean-serving, as it were, at the Dean's pleasure. They should instead be officially regarded as the appropriate representatives of the faculty, authorized by the faculty to judge the academic qualifications of a candidate who is proposed for membership in that faculty.

2. No appointments or promotions shall be made before they are considered by such a review body. If there are exceptions to this rule, as in the case of an appointment as Benjamin Franklin Professor, these exceptions should be explicitly defined. In general, endowed chairs should not be an exception.

3. No appointments or promotions shall be made in the case of a clear negative judgment by the appropriate faculty review body.

Principle (2) is probably uncontroversial. Principle (1) may make little practical difference in the short run, but is of considerable theoretic importance. It is intended to express the idea of a kind of division of powers, or a division of rights and responsibilities. Who but the faculty (or its representatives) should have the responsibility for judging academic qualifications? And this responsibility is explicitly recognized in the Statutes of the University.

Principle (3) is the most radical, and it may be regarded as imposing a cumbersome restraint on the Provost's responsibility and authority. Although I agree that the University needs a strong Provost, I do not believe that a strong executive need be one whose powers are unrestrained. A system of checks and balances seems a good thing to institutionalize in the University as in the national government.

I would argue for principle (3) as follows. The function of a faculty review committee is to establish and maintain certain minimum standards for membership in the corresponding faculty. (The committee has no way to determine, and it is not its function to determine, whether a proposed appointment represents the best available person among those who may be reasonably qualified.) Now suppose that a faculty review committee has judged that a proposed appointment does not satisfy the desired standards of academic excellency. On what grounds would a Provost overrule their recommendation? Either he must substitute his judgment for theirs, or he will be accepting a lower level of academic
I do not see any third possibility. But if there is any area of University governance where the faculty should be the supreme authority, it is in judging the academic qualifications for membership in that faculty. And whatever other reasons there may be for making a given appointment—to develop a new field, for example, or to take affirmative action on the appointment of women or minority representatives—it cannot be good policy to do so by lowering academic standards. Just as the administration must retain a veto power on grounds of financial solvency, the faculty must possess similar powers on grounds of scholarly and academic accountability.

In the case of a weak faculty, an administration that aims to raise the level of academic excellence might well choose to take such decisions into its own hands. But the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania today is strong enough to set its own standards. It can best do so by means of a watchdog committee, which is constituted to review proposals from a wide variety of departments, and many of whose members serve in this capacity for several years at a time. Although they are certainly fallible, they are as well-placed as anyone can be to set uniform or comparable standards for different departments, and thus to help gradually to raise the level of weak departments up to that of the best.

This is a time-consuming activity, and such a committee will not be motivated to do its work conscientiously if it does not feel that it has a task of genuine responsibility. It is demoralizing for a review committee to find that a negative decision (which is always made after considerable heart-searching, and is of course the exception rather than the rule) can be ignored or overruled by the Dean or the Provost. To ask a review committee to reconsider its decision is always in order. To overrule it is to deny its essential function. I submit that a committee cannot perform properly its task of judging qualifications for membership in the faculty unless the responsibility for this judgment is put squarely in its hands.

Dr. Kahn is Professor of Philosophy.

FULBRIGHT-HAYS JUNIOR LECTURESHIPS

Applications will be accepted until November 1, 1973 for junior lectureships in American studies in Belgium, France, Italy and Spain for the academic year 1974-75. Applicants should be advanced graduate students or scholars who have recently completed the Ph.D., preferably in American literature, American history or government, but also in economics, geography, psychology, or sociology. Good knowledge of French or Spanish is required for appointments in France or Spain.

One award is also to be offered to a junior scholar for research in Belgium in some aspect of Atlantic studies.

Additional information and application forms are available from the Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20418.

DUMBARTON OAKS JUNIOR FELLOWSHIPS

The Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies promotes the study of Byzantine Civilization in all its aspects, offering each year a limited number of Junior Fellowships to qualified students in history, archaeology, history of art, philology, theology and other disciplines who wish to write the doctoral dissertation on a subject of interest to the Center (Late Roman, Early Christian period, Middle Ages generally, but with emphasis on contribution and achievements of the Eastern Roman Empire; studies of Byzantine cultural influence in the Latin West, and in Slavic and Near Eastern countries encouraged).

Fellowships are for one academic year, for full-time resident work at the Dumbarton Oaks Center, Washington. Stipends are $4000 single, $4500 married, with board subtracted for net stipend of $2500. Arrangements for children vary.

Applications are due before January 1, 1973, for 1974-75 awards. For forms and details, write the Director of Studies, Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1703 Thirty-second Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20007.

THE PROVOST'S GUIDE TO TASK FORCES

To implement the Report of the University Development Commission, a number of task forces were proposed during the spring term and set up in the spring and summer. Provost Eliot Stellar reported their progress at the September 19 Council meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK FORCE</th>
<th>CHAIRMAN</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE LIASON</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Professional Education &amp; Services</td>
<td>Alfred Fishman</td>
<td>Bruce Johnstone</td>
<td>Work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-health Professional</td>
<td>— — — —</td>
<td>— — — — — — — — — — —</td>
<td>— — — — — — — — — — —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Philip G. Mechanick</td>
<td>Humphrey Tonkin</td>
<td>Newly formed, starting to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Almarin Phillips</td>
<td>Bruce Johnstone</td>
<td>Completing report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>Werner Gandersheimer</td>
<td>Michael Neiditch</td>
<td>Work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Faculty Recruiting</td>
<td>Robert Engs</td>
<td>Bruce Johnstone</td>
<td>Newly formed, starting to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Presence Proposals</td>
<td>Steering Committee, Eliot Stellar convening</td>
<td>William Adams</td>
<td>Meeting regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar</td>
<td>Jean Brownlee</td>
<td>Michael Neiditch</td>
<td>Work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Resources</td>
<td>Jerome Rauch</td>
<td>John Hobstetter</td>
<td>Completing report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad Renovation &amp; College Houses</td>
<td>Margo Marshall</td>
<td>Michael Neiditch</td>
<td>Newly formed, starting to meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Community Relations

Throughout the past academic year, the Committee on Community Relations focused on the changing role of the Office of External Affairs of the President's Office. The Office of External Affairs found itself to be in a period of transition, both in terms of the definition of its mission, and in terms of personnel changes. For these reasons, it sought consultation and advice from the Committee. As the Office serves as the primary interface between the University and its neighboring community, the Committee felt the Office request to be appropriate. Frank Betts and Andy Sullivan met regularly with the Committee, and consultation was sought both with Paul Gaddis and Bruce Johnstone.

The discussion continued for a period of several months. During this time, the responsibility for the University Year for Action Program was transferred from the Office of External Affairs to the Office of the Vice Provost. The Committee saw this as a wise move, so that the University Year for Action would have a legitimate academic base. With the transfer of the University Year for Action, the Committee felt that the Office of External Affairs should continue its present function for at least the next academic year. It was the Committee's feeling that the locus of the Committee was relatively unimportant provided its focus remained unchanged.

The review of the various functions of the Office of External Affairs led to the suggestion that a major agenda item for the Committee on Community Relations in the next academic year would be a reexamination of University policy vis-a-vis the community.

It was the feeling of a student member of the Committee that the Committee had been somewhat overly preoccupied with administrative function and that it had not dealt in sufficient detail with immediate problems on campus. The final meeting of the year examined particularly problems in which students had a concern.

It is hoped that during the next academic year, the Committee may undertake a wide reappraisal of the articulation of University and community needs. This seems particularly relevant since there have been major changes both within the University in terms of its ability to respond to the community, and in terms of further clarification by the community of its calls upon the University. Both of these aspects must be considered in light of the recent budgetary constraints.

—Robert L. Leopold, Chairman

IV. Educational Policy

The Committee on Educational Policy is a relatively new one, this being only its second year. Potentially the scope of its concerns is far-reaching since educational policy implications are apparent in the great majority of University actions and activities. In its initial meetings the committee considered possible agenda items, taking into account the work of overlapping committees and the restrictions placed on its own activities by lack of staff to carry out any extensive and systematic investigations.

Ultimately the committee dealt with two principal subjects which were, in its judgment, both timely and of major importance in terms of the educational interests of the entire University. The first of these was a review of those recommendations of the Development Commission which were most directly concerned with educational policy. Specifically, these dealt with undergraduate education, graduate education, and the proposal to increase the number of faculty chairs and endowed professorships and the qualifications for holders of these appointments. Brief consideration was also given to other recommendations such as those calling for changes in the University calendar. The committee's report was published in Almanac in March and presented to University Council where, with modifications, its recommendations were accepted. In all specific cases these recommendations reflected the basic assumption that excellence in our operations is less dependent on the details of teaching and learning arrangements than on the quality of students and faculty.

The second principal topic studied by the committee was the quality of teaching. Working particularly through a subcommittee composed of Charles Dwyer, chairman, Martin Seligman and Peter Nardi, a graduate student, a report was prepared which emphasizes teaching not merely within the confines of the classroom but in terms of the whole system of relationships between faculty and students. Special attention was given to two items, the evaluation of teaching and the quality of instruction, mainly that of teaching fellows. The committee considered a number of questions: Should teaching be evaluated? Can teaching be evaluated in a meaningful way? How are teaching competencies developed? What resources are available or could be developed on campus to assist students and faculty who are interested in improving both the quality of teaching and its evaluation? These questions are considered in the second report submitted to the University Council for consideration in the fall of 1973.* That report recommends an organized program center which can gather and disseminate information on college teaching and learning and provide assistance to students and faculty concerned with teaching and learning competencies.

—Vincent H. Whitney, Chairman

*Report is now on the agenda of the Steering Committee. Its text will be published for comment by the University community before action.
V. Facilities

When the Committee on Facilities first met on December 14, 1972, it accepted the following charge:

University Facilities Committee. The University Facilities Committee shall have cognizance of the planning and operation of buildings and grounds and associated services, including transportation, parking and security. It is understood that the new committee will have a subcommittee on transportation and parking.

In accord with its charge it established the following subcommittees:

Parking: Dr. E. Farnsworth Bisbee, Chairman; Joseph P. Burke, Dr. Julius Mackie; Neil Vogel.

Safety and Security: Edwin M. Ledwell, Chairman; Mary Love; Donald T. Shultis.

Transportation: Harold Taubin, Chairman; Dr. Walter D. Bonner; Richard Frost; Dr. Vukan R. Vuchic; Mark Zelisko.

While the Committee recognized that for the present year it would devote most of its time to ascertaining the status quo in its several areas of cognizance, it gradually came to the view that in the long run, in the process of analyzing these areas, it could hope to achieve the following goals:

1. At the very least, through its minutes and annual reports, provide the University with an ongoing archive which recorded developments in the several areas.
2. Provide specific and relevant parties in the University with as much advance notice as possible of developments in the several areas, and specifically invite these individuals, departments, schools and agencies to respond to developments which particularly concern the parties.
3. Actively provide the University community at large with a regular supply of information concerning developments in the several areas, through open meetings, public notices and other means.

In consultation with Vice President for Management Paul Gaddis, former Provost Curtis Reitz and Dr. Jean Crockett, the chairman ascertained that the Development Commission Report had not systematically anticipated the work of the Facilities Committee, and that indeed it was hoped that the Committee would find ways to fill in planning proposals in its several areas. During the year the Council did refer Development Commission Recommendations #89 and #90 to the Committee for report and review. The Committee reported in some detail, showing how it, working with three ongoing groups, could bring about the recommendations in question.

The Committee reviewed and approved a new traffic code for the University, examined the history and present state of the University Parking Service, recommending approval of a new 1973-74 parking fee structure, and created a subcommittee to develop a unified transportation proposal for the community. This last perhaps deserves some elaboration.

On November 1, 1972, the Penn Community Park Coalition submitted a proposal for a community transportation system. The Taubin subcommittee, charged with analyzing the proposal, used it as a catalyst to begin study for its own proposal, in the process adding Mr. Frost and Dr. Vuchic to its ranks. A full report was completed and approved by the Committee, which charged the chairman with presenting these proposed transportation policies to the appropriate University authorities. The group is also reviewing a proposal for the improvement of traffic movement on Spruce Street and the Hospital's ambulance delivery routes.

The Committee was briefed by both Mr. Ledwell and Mr. Shultis on the Safety and Security operations on campus, and on the activities of other groups concerned with the operation. Subsequent to the campus demonstration in support of improved security for women, the Committee was briefed by Mr. Hetherston on the implementation of new security measures.

In the area of development, the Committee satisfied itself that its predecessor had full cognizance of the planning for the Lot #8 or "Hilton Hotel" project, and that the Community Involvement Council position to the contrary (enunciated by mail and later in a personal appearance) was without foundation. In the process the Committee was given elaborate and detailed briefing, not only on Lot #8 but on the ongoing status of the development of University Square.

Problems concerning the campus environment came up regularly, ranging in importance from the new Community Park to the regulation of street vendors. The Committee received status reports on the Redevelopment Authority's land acquisition schedule, on a comparative survey of plant operating and maintenance cost (Penn emerged in a favorable light), and an overall ongoing report from Arthur R. Freedman on the campus environment, which was very inclusive indeed. It will continue next September.

Briefing on the Capital Facilities Program was begun this year, though the schedule did not permit proceeding past the first category. The Committee came away impressed with the danger of bewilderment at the number and variety of programs in the Program document, and felt the need of a context in which the individual programs could be weighed and evaluated in terms of the overall educational needs of the University. Capital Facilities Programs are a major item on the Fall agenda.

The Committee determined to keep a master file of its minutes, with full attachments, in the office of Mr. Hetherston, and that this file should be open to all members of the community. In addition, it was determined that a chairman's report be submitted to the Steering Committee of the Council for its information and record.

—Robert F. Lucid, Chairman

VI. Library

The 1972-73 Committee was smaller than in the two previous years. This appears to be more effective than would be the case if wide representation of departments were sought. Four students (two undergraduate, two graduate) were appointed in addition to faculty and library administration representatives. It is recommended that graduate students be selected during the spring term since the selection methods used in 1972-73 were very cumbersome—as a result, graduate student participation was limited.

The following summarizes the topics discussed by the Director of Libraries, Mr. DeGennaro, with the members of the Committee:

October 26: Use of food machines in the Library; book budget constraints in the Physical Sciences libraries and possible combination of these libraries (see also meeting of April 12, below).

December 7: Report of subcommittee on food machines (recommended against such machines); card-registration fee for courtesy borrowers; reciprocal privileges with Drexel University (subsequently became effective); closing of Dietrich Graduate Library entrance in the evening and on weekends; adequacy of facilities for the East Asian collection and staff.

March 1: Recommendations of the University Development Commission as they affect the Libraries; possible creation of a Student Study and Reserve Center in the Furness Building—and alternatives involving less cost.

April 12: Desirability of creating a consolidated Engineering-Physical Sciences Library (the chairman of the appropriate departmental library committees were invited to this meeting).

Minutes supporting the above summary were kept by Mr. Bernard J. Ford, to whom the Committee chairman expresses his thanks. A number of very substantial issues are reflected in the summary. Interested members of the University community may obtain copies of the minutes, which are more explicit, from Mr. DeGennaro. The maintenance of a quality collection and adequate service to all depends in large measure on the interest and understanding of the University community.

—Richard S. Woods, Chairman

Reports continue on Page 6
VII. Personnel Benefits

The items below represent generalizations of specific proposals and any one interested in more detailed information should contact the Personnel Office. The Committee:

1. Reviewed and concurred in revised policy statements on maternity leave and on personnel benefits for regular part-time employees.

2. Recommended to the Administration the elimination of the present $60,000 maximum coverage in the group life insurance plan.

3. Recommended the adoption of a program of optional life-medical insurance premium payments. Eligible personnel under this program would have the choice of fully-paid medical insurance premiums, University payment of life insurance and individual medical insurance plan premiums, or life insurance and major medical insurance without base plan medical coverage.

4. Proposed that for personnel who make individual contribution to TIAA/CREF during any portion of the normal three-year waiting period, the University at the completion of the waiting period would make a single-sum, retroactive payment covering its contributions for the period of the individual's participation.

5. Reviewed present medical insurance program and suggestions for modification in preparation for proposals concerning improved coverage and administration.

6. Initiated study of A-3 pension plan.

7. Recommended that the amount of group life insurance carried be increased to twice salary for all full-time employees.

—Robert A. Zelten, Chairman

VIII. Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics

The University Committee met five times during the year. For the most part, the meetings were forums for the discussion of matters ranging from football scheduling to means of broadening the base of faculty support of recreation and intercollegiate athletics.

At the request of President Meyerson, the Committee identified a series of issues for his use in preparing a memorandum for the December meeting of the Ivy Presidents.

The Committee submitted a list of faculty members to President Meyerson, with the request that he ask them to serve on a committee, the members of which will communicate with prospective freshmen with attractive academic and athletic credentials in order to acquaint these students with academic opportunities at the University in their areas of interest. (Mr. Meyerson wrote to the faculty members and all agreed to serve.)

The Committee considered a request from the sailing team for a return of that team to varsity status. The Committee vacillated on the issue, eventually recommending to President Meyerson that the request be granted. (The President, because of his firm support of the concept of club sports, and because of the difficulty in isolating all direct and indirect costs related to a sports activity, felt he could not support the Committee's recommendation.)

The Committee approved the report of a subcommittee setting up a fee schedule and regulations governing the use of the new Levy Tennis Pavilion.

Both the University and the Council Committees submitted statements to the Task Force on University Athletic Policy. The University Committee stressed the contributions of the University's intercollegiate athletic program to the University community which are unrelated to income production. The Council Committee recommended means of helping to defray the expenses of both the recreational and intercollegiate programs. The statements of the Committee appeared in full in Almanac May 29, 1973.

The Chairman wishes to reiterate the view expressed by last year's chairman that the Committee's charge is not clear. It would be desirable for the Council and the administration to call upon the Committee as a consultative body whenever matters of athletic policy arise.

—Ralph C. Preston, Chairman

OF RECORD

MATERNITY LEAVE

Following is the text of the University's current policy on Maternity Leave. The text differs slightly from that published December 5, 1972.

The inability of a woman to carry out normal duties due to or contributed to by pregnancy or childbirth, including miscarriage or abortion, will be treated as a temporary medical leave and will entitle the employee, staff or faculty member to all sick leave benefits currently in force for the individual, including the right to draw on accrued sick leave* and vacation time. A prolonged absence due to medical reasons attached to pregnancy or childbirth may also be treated as a temporary disability for those eligible for temporary disability payments.

Personnel who have completed six months of service before taking a medical leave for childbirth will also be entitled to personal leave without pay or benefits for up to five months following the termination of the allowable period of sick leave with full pay. In the case of faculty, this personal leave shall commence upon request with the Dean to conform as much as possible to the academic calendar. Payments for group life and medical insurance premiums which would normally be deducted from salary during this period must be paid quarterly in advance to maintain continuous coverage during the leave period.

There will be no accrual of sick leave, vacation or retirement credits during this period of leave without pay; nor, in the case of faculty, shall this period be counted as part of the probationary period toward the awarding of tenure.

In the case of an employee or staff member, if her position cannot be left vacant or filled on a temporary basis during the period of leave without pay, the position may be filled with the understanding that she may return to a position of equivalent status elsewhere in the University at the conclusion of the maternity leave.

*Sick leave for faculty/staff has been considered as 30 work days per year/non-accruable; temporary disability is considered 'extended leave' under the provisions of the LTD plan and will require a physician's certificate of disability (temporarily unable to perform her job duties).

PART-TIME A-3 ALLOWANCES

Sick leave allowances and personal days off for regular part-time A-3 staff of the University have been figured on the basis of percentage of the week worked, in the schedule approved by the Personnel Benefits Committee.

Full-time, year-round A-3 employees are allowed to take up to three "personal days" a year, noncumulative. Their sick leave allowance is based on one day per month the first year and .5 days per month in subsequent years (cumulative up to 54 days).

Part time staff who work one day a week receive 20% of these allowances, two-day staff 40%, three-day, 60% and four-day, 80%. Fractions are rounded off at half a day for .45 to .70, and a whole day for .75 and over. Thus the part-time allowance schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days worked per wk</th>
<th>Sick leave 1st yr.</th>
<th>Sick leave after 1st yr.</th>
<th>Personal days/yr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For nine-month and ten-month full-time employees, the sick leave is also figured at one day per month worked the first year and 1 1/2 days per month worked thereafter.

ALMANAC September 25, 1973
GRIEVANCE: 'THIRD MEMBERS'

A one-year test period has begun for the new grievance procedure developed for nonacademic personnel not covered by collective bargaining agreements. The procedures are described in detail in Almanac March 6, 1973, and reprints are available. Briefly, when informal review does not resolve a grievance, formal complaint is initiated through the Office of Equal Opportunity. A panel is then convened, consisting of one University staff member chosen by the grievant; one chosen by the appropriate senior administrative officer, and a third selected by those two from a list of “third members” maintained by Vice President Paul O. Gaddis. The list, developed with the cooperation of the Administrative Assembly, A-3 Assembly and other interested groups, consists of the following:

Arthur A. Brennan Jr., Administrative Director of the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.
Dolores Bristow, Chief Clerk of the School of Social Work.
Nora Bugis, Administrative Assistant in the Laboratory for Research on the Structure of Matter.
Eleanor M. Cox, Administrative Assistant in the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.
Anabel Cressman, Secretary in the Business Law Department.
Rachel Di Stefano, Assistant to the Chairman in the Department of Biology.
Sarah Donnelly, Secretary in the Laboratories of Anatomy.
Manuel Doxer, Business Manager of the College.
Alton Du Brey, Photography Department in the Harrison Department of Surgical Research.
Mary Emore, Administrative Assistant in the Department of Anthropology.
Oliver Franklin, Coordinator of Community Related Programs.
Karen C. Gaines, Editor of Almanac.
Susan Garson, University Museum, Assistant.
Paul Gay, Assistant Librarian of the Biddle Law Library.
Juan J. Graña, Administrator of the Biochemistry Department.
Camella Greenway, Assistant to the Director of South Asian Studies.
Jeanne Jensen, Business Administrator of the School of Social Work.
Peggy Landy, Junior Accountant in the Office of Budget Administration.
Martha B. Lightwood, Assistant Librarian of Lippincott Library.
Anne Mengel, Administrative Assistant in the College.
Alan Morrison, Head Fine Arts Librarian.
Phyllis Nemarow, Administrative Assistant in the Pathobiology Department.
Barbara Oliver, Assistant to the Dean of Students.
William G. Owen, Secretary of the Corporation.
Myrna Quetel, Administrative Assistant in Research Administration.
Joanne Rudd, Research Specialist in the Microbiology Department.
Ruth Smith, Supervisor of Keypunch Data Processing.
Iris South, Administrative Assistant in the Cardiology Section.
Robert Stewart, Head of the Processing Department in Van Pelt Library.
Carol F. Walker, Administrative Assistant in the Treasurer’s Office.
Jean B. Williams, Library Supervisor of the Biddle Law Library.

OPENINGS

FACULTY

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PATHOLOGY. M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M. or Ph.D., and other qualifications as listed in Almanac 9/18/73. Reply by September 30 to Department of Pathology, School of Dental Medicine. Women and minority groups specifically encouraged to apply.

ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL (A-1)

ASSOCIATE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER I to be responsible to the V.P. for Development and Public Relations or his designee for assistance in the planning, administration and implementation of University capital fund-raising. Major responsibility in medical development area, which would include capital annual support programs. Qualifications: College graduate, preferably from Penn. Two or three years' experience in public relations, sales or fundraising. Ability to write and speak effectively. $10,250-$12,750.

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES to be responsible for overseeing the Wage and Salary staff; coordinate employee benefit research, development, and cost analysis. Qualifications: Graduation from college with a degree in business or related field. Prefer advanced degree. Must have at least six years' similar personnel experience, especially in wage and salary. Salary to be determined.

ASSOCIATE FOR PUBLICATIONS, Undergraduate Admissions (9/4/73).

DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL AID. Continuous development of aid policies and programs dealing with undergraduate, graduate and professional schools; management of large institutional scholarship budgets and federal aid program budgets; liaison with admissions, academic deans and others. Qualifications: Extensive experience in financial aid administration required; other experience in student affairs desirable. To be filled January, 1974. Salary commensurate with experience.

ELECTRICAL ENGINEER II (9/18/73).

LIBRARIAN II for original classification and cataloging in variety of subject fields and making use of romance languages. Computer cataloging, especially Ohio College Library Center system. Qualifications: M.L.S. and knowledge of several romance languages. Experience in use of Library of Congress classification system. $10,250-$12,750 (midpoint).

MANAGER, CONTRACT ACCOUNTING, to be responsible to an Assistant Comptroller for all accounting aspects of grants and contracts awarded to the University which requires administration. Qualifications: Graduation from a recognized college or university, preferably with a degree in business administration and a major in accounting. At least six years of progressively responsible administrative experience with strong accounting background. $11,800-$14,700 (midpoint).

PLACEMENT ASSISTANT (9/18/73).

SUPPORT STAFF (A-3)

ABSTRACTOR for business office. Qualifications: Excellent clerical aptitude, accurate typing. Several years' experience preferred. $5,050-$5,875-$6,675.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I in academic office. Assist coordinator in establishing program. Establish office procedures, train and supervise student help, manage budget, supplies and other related duties. Qualifications: At least 2 years' University office experience and an interest in working with women. $6,250-$7,350-$8,450.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I in business department. Responsible for office operations, work flow, other office personnel and budget matters. Secretary and assistant to chairman. Qualifications: Excellent typing and shorthand, some bookkeeping. At least 3 years' office experience. $6,250-$7,350-$8,450.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I in residence unit. Assist directors in management of unit, office management and room assignments, keep records, handle complaints and perform secre-
tarial duties. Qualifications: Familiarity in handling computer printouts desirable. Typing and 2 years’ office experience, ability to deal with people. $6,250-$7,350-$8,450.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II (9/18/73).

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II institute in medical center. (9/4/73).

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

MEDICAL SECRETARY (9/4/73).


SECRETARY II (9) Qualifications: Excellent typing; some require shorthand as well as dictaphone. Ability to perform varied duties. $5,425-$6,325-$7,225.

SECRETARY III (2) Qualifications: Interest in working with figures. Excellent typing, shorthand and/or dictaphone. Ability to work with minimum of supervision in performing varied duties. $5,825-$6,825-$7,825.

STOCKKEEPER II for research area. Qualifications: Excellent clerical aptitude. Some figure inventory work preferred. Accurate typing ability. $5,425-$6,325-$7,225.

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

COMPTROLLER: FROM PAGE ONE

Mr. Jackson has been treasurer at the United Presbyterian Church Headquarters in New York. Earlier he was financial officer of the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia.

Mr. Manley also announces the appointment, effective July 1, 1973, of Robert L. Warren as Assistant Comptroller.

Mr. Warren, formerly Business Manager of the University Press, had been an acting assistant comptroller since March 1.

He will be responsible for the supervision of the Accounts Payable, Student Financial Accounting and Accounts Receivable.

FOLKLORE IN SONG: SEPTEMBER 26

Alhaji Bai Konte, a kora player and singer from Gambia, West Africa, will perform tomorrow at 8 p.m. in Harold Prince Theatre; tickets are free at the Annenberg box office.

Sponsors are the Afro-American Studies Program, Folklore Society, Graduate Students Association, Music Department and W.E.B. DuBois Residence.

Earlier in the day Bai Konte, an African classical musician noted for appearances at Philadelphia, Washington, Newport and Mariposa festivals, will give two workshops on campus: one at 11:30 a.m. in the Folklore Lounge of Logan Hall, the other at 3 p.m. in the House of the Family, 3914 Locust Walk.

RETURN OF THE PHOENIX: OCTOBER 7-21

After this coming weekend’s Viola Farber Dance Company concerts (Saturday 8 p.m.; Sunday 2:30) Annenberg Center’s next visiting attraction is the return of the New Phoenix Repertory Company of New York.

New Phoenix founder Harold Prince directs Duerrenmatt’s The Visit and Stephen Porter stages Feydeau’s Chemin de Fer.

The Feydeau comedy previews October 7 and opens October 10; the Duerrenmatt preview is October 8 and the opening October 9.

Tiffany Lecture: October 3

The Chairman of the Board of Tiffany & Co., Walter Hoving, will open the lecture series his firm co-sponsors with Wharton School. His topic Wednesday at 4:30 p.m. in the University Museum is “The Crisis of Design and Aesthetics in American Management.” Tiffany Vice President George O’Brien is on the same program, speaking on “The Impact of a Corporate Design Director.”

ENGINEERING: FROM PAGE ONE

University of Compiegne (Dr. Bordogna), University of L’Aquila (Dr. Zemel) and University of Tokyo (Dr. Humphrey).

10. To increase the undergraduate applicant pool in order to enroll 150 freshmen without loss of quality; this year's total is 107 (from the recent low of 97, but the 1969 figure was 165 Engineering’s highest since World War II).

9. To bring outstanding high school students into campus programs involving meaningful academic experience— including course work at the 100 level.

To strengthen graduate programs, he proposed:

1. To increase full-time, daytime enrollment from the present 487 to more than 500.

2. To increase evening, part-time graduate enrollment from 680 to more than 1000 by offering courses that enhance the professional performance of the student.

3. To increase support for graduate students, hopefully to the number of fellowships once provided by the College’s Ford Foundation funds (the endowment remains, but supports fewer Fellows than before).

4. To increase the current total of outside research support from $7 million to $8 million.

5. To strengthen the engineering component in interdisciplinary graduate programs in energy and power management, transportation, urban engineering and biotechnology.

6. To set a course that will in the next five years double the number of Engineering departments ranked among the top ten in the nation (two now rank there). Nine tasks have been set before the College as a whole:

1. To initiate an endowment program that will add at least $20,000,000 to the College of Engineering and Applied Science in the next five years, including at least eight endowed professorships.

2. To recruit faculty to bring the new Bioengineering and Systems Engineering departments at least to critical mass.

3. To define the Engineering College’s computer needs and fund them, including facilities for “hands on” research, for Computer and Information Science Department use and for other University undergraduate course work in computer sciences.

4. To achieve a viable Continuing Education Program, increasing the present 12 courses per year to 20.

5. To bring the Graduate Engineering Television System to a reasonable level of economic and educational success.

6. To explore fully the potential (and the limits) of cooperation with Drexel in library and audio-visual facilities, specialized interdisciplinary research and joint seminars and colloquia.

7. To bring the 50th anniversary of the Moore School to a successful conclusion.

8. To bring alumni into a closer relationship with the college through a frequent newsletter, special colloquia and minicourses.

9. To upgrade Engineering’s facilities and the visual environment in which its faculty and students work and study.

“Not only are we setting these very specific and tangible goals for ourselves as a College,” the Dean said following the September 18 Faculty Meeting, “but the departments and individual faculty members will be setting their own goals within the larger goals of the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences. 1973-74 will be a very important year for Engineering, one in which I hope several dramatic changes will occur in the direction of Engineering education.”