NEWS IN BRIEF

EDELMAN LECTURES APRIL 17, 18

Dr. Gerald M. Edelman, professor at Rockefeller University and 1972 Nobel Laureate, will speak on “Biological Systems of Selection and Recognition” at a Sigma Xi lecture next Wednesday at the Annenberg School Auditorium at 4:30. On Thursday, he will give the Edgar Fahs Smith Memorial Lecture on “The Molecular Biology of the Immune Response” at 8:15 p.m. in the auditorium of the New Chemistry Building. The Smith Lecture is sponsored by the University and the Philadelphia section of the American Chemical Society in celebration of its seventy-fifth anniversary this year. Events preceding the Smith Lecture are a tour of the New Chemistry Building at 3:30 p.m. and the dedication of a plaque commemorating the founding of the ACS’s local section in 1899, at which Emeritus Professor of Chemistry Claude K. Deischer will officiate. Cocktails and dinner follow at the Museum at 5:15 p.m. Reservations for dinner at $7 should be made by noon April 16, by telephoning the section office, 338-1589.

Dr. Edelman, a 1954 graduate of the School of Medicine, was named professor at Rockefeller University in 1966 and received the Ph.D. there in 1960. He shares the 1972 Nobel Prize in chemistry with Oxford biochemist Rodney Porter for research on the chemical structure of antibodies.

GROSSER RESEARCH FUND

A gift from Mrs. Albert J. Grosser in memory of her husband has established the Grosser Research Fund in Urban Land Use. The fund, totaling more than $100,000, is for study of the immediate problems of urban development and practical solutions for them. A committee of faculty of the city and regional planning and other departments here will administer the fund, with preference for projects relating to Philadelphia and its environs.

Mr. Grosser, who died in 1972, was a real estate broker specializing in industrial real estate transactions. He was president of the Grosser Company and the Tower Industrial Corporation.

MBA WEEKENDER

The Wharton Faculty voted March 26 to establish a special MBA program in which corporate executives can earn their MBA degrees attending Friday and Saturday classes for 21 months. A Graduate Special Degree Program Committee chaired by Dr. Jerry Wind submitted the Wharton/Industry Graduate Program, which contains the following highlights:

- The program is based on the same academic requirements as the regular MBA program (18 course units) and will use as many regular MBA courses as possible.
- Students may choose one of two areas of specialization: finance/accounting or marketing.
- About 40 mid-career managers will be admitted to the first class.
MORE ON BUDGET

I should like to respond to letters by Dean George Gerbner and Associate Provost John Hobstetter (Almanac, April 2), making reference to my analysis of budgetary directions (Almanac, March 19).

With respect to Dean Gerbner's delicate suggestion that I could not have known what I was talking about since I had not seen the 1974-75 budget proposals, the fact is that as a member of the Budget Committee I had indeed seen the first round budget proposals, and the questions I raised with respect to academic priorities were indeed relevant ones in the light of that information. I regret my overstatement of Annenberg's 1972-73 subvention, resulting from an error in the published financial statement.

With respect to the "interpretive error" attributed to me by Dr. Hobstetter, I agree that the 1972-73 subventions cannot be interpreted as policy decisions, since in large degree they reflect fortuitous circumstances; and I had thought I made this quite clear. Furthermore, changes that would have the effect of bringing subvention extremes in line with the general range of subventions may simply indicate the elimination of the fortuitous elements in the 1972-73 figures from the 1974-75 targets. Thus, significance in terms of policy directions should be attributed primarily to those changes which would move schools away from the general range of subventions into an extreme position, and these were the changes to which I endeavored to call attention. Even in these cases, it is not possible to infer a change in priorities, but it becomes clear what the priorities are: i.e., which schools are intended to receive subventions far above average and which subventions far below average.

—Jean Crockett, Professor of Finance

SPRING MEETING
OF THE
FACULTY SENATE
Wednesday, April 17
3-6 p.m. 102 New Chemistry Building

SENATE
FROM THE CHAIRMAN

Issues on April 17

In my previous message I tried to indicate to the Senate the nature of the issues scheduled for debate at the April 17 meeting. Since I have worked on several of the reports but am restricted from entering the debate as Chairman, I would like to say a few words about how I personally feel about some of these issues.

We have been discussing grievance mechanisms now for several years. I think it is desirable that we have a grievance system so that people can feel that they can obtain the independent judgment of peers without having to go to the courts. The committee that drafted the current version (Almanac, April 2) was acutely aware of the needs and feelings of the individual and the University and has, I believe, come up with a system that properly balances these needs while adhering to the spirit of the decisions taken at last fall's meeting. The two major changes in the document are in the selection of the Inquiry Panels and in the confidentiality provisions. In the previous versions, the Inquiry Panels were drawn solely from a 16-person Commission. We calculated that with as few as ten cases a year, each person would have to donate at least 100 hours a year to the grievance system. Since this seemed to us a grievance burden, we changed "16" to "at least 16" and more importantly allow each of the two parties to give a list of names to the chairman of the Commission who selects one name from each list and the next person on the Grievance Commission. While this method has certain problems, we could not agree upon any method of choosing a group of 100 people that was both representative of and acceptable to all segments of the faculty. Incidentally, there is a provision under which two additional members of the Grievance Commission can be added to a Panel.

In the section dealing with confidentiality, we have provided that the Panel can have access to the letters of recommendation. We have also provided that if the letters and their interpretation are crucial to the decision, the grievant's colleague may see the letters. If the grievant is not accompanied by a colleague, the grievant will be provided with a summary of the relevant parts.

The committee clearly recognizes that the document represents a compromise between the needs and views of various groups. We un unanimously support this document, but we have also agreed that any non-trivial change in the report would probably require each of us to reconsider the whole package, and it is unlikely to have a grievance system in operation in the coming academic year.

On the Senate's operation, let me make the following observation. Currently the Council, which is a legislative group, acts on recommendations of the Senate. Since the Senate, in effect, has delegated overview authority to a group that also includes administrators and students, I think the Senate's previous fears about delegating executive authority to its Advisory Committee now should be inoperative. I think the Senate can operate most effectively, if it delegates substantial executive authority to an enlarged Advisory Committee but with the right to overturn the Committee's decisions.

Finally, let me turn to the proposed tenure changes. First, the proposed change in the tenure by inadvertence rules have been prompted by a balance of the rights of the individual and of the faculty as a whole. People can stay beyond their probationary period without a positive tenure decision made because administrators foul up and because (a) no one realizes it or (b) some people who know of the error agree to do nothing. While it seems to be a very harsh penalty on the faculty to be forced to hire a person for life because of an administrator's error, we feel that at some point the rights of the faculty become paramount. Thus, when there is no notice of the end of the probationary period, the report allows a two-year period in which a person still must be judged for tenure. This is not a general extension of the probationary period since if it applies to more than a few cases, people responsible for the errors should be fired.

I think the care and upbringing of children is important and is different from time spent on consulting. Thus, I think it is appropriate to amend our tenure rules so that a person can be fully affiliated while being engaged half time with a corresponding adjustment in the tenure clock and pay. However, since we can think even while changing a diaper, it seems appropriate to increase the tenure period by a maximum of three years.

Finally, the revised rules on lecturers try to strike a balance between the desires of the University for job security and the desires of the faculty to grant tenure to people with certain qualifications. The new proposal will give substantially more job security, increase faculty control over the use of lecturers, and will force deans and departments to consider if they want to tie up a slot with a person without a terminal degree.

I hope you ponder these issues and come to the meeting April 17 at 3 o'clock in 102 Chemistry, 34th and Spruce.

Paul Tambor

ALMANAC April 9, 1974
Report of the Senate Committee on the Faculty
March 26, 1974

I. RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO ACTIONS ON TENURE TAKEN AT THE FALL SENATE MEETING

Replace Item 1 with the following:
1. Effective June 30, 1974, tenure shall be normally acquired only by individuals holding the ranks of Professor or Associate Professor by an explicit grant of tenure after appropriate investigation of qualifications at the departmental, school and central administration levels, except as provided in this section.

   a. Each department shall make a recommendation for or against a grant of tenure for each of its faculty members in tenure-probationary status well in advance of the end of the probationary period. This recommendation shall be based on a review of the qualifications of the faculty member and an assessment of departmental needs. The review shall be in conformity with the procedures stated in recommendations 1-3 of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Appointment and Promotion Policies and Procedures, as amended and adopted by the University Council on February 14, 1973, and published in the Almanac for February 20, 1973.

   On the basis of this departmental recommendation, the school shall recommend to the Provost either tenure or termination with appropriate notice. All required action at higher administrative levels (other than Trustee approval) shall be completed at least 12 months before the end of the probationary period; and if tenure is not granted, notice of termination shall be given at that time.

   A faculty member who does not receive the tenure review presented above has grounds for grievance, but does not automatically acquire tenure so long as he has been notified by the Provost 12 months before the end of his probationary period that tenure has been denied.

   a. Each department shall recommend to the Provost either tenure or termination with appropriate notice. All required action at higher administrative levels (other than Trustee approval) shall be completed at least 12 months before the end of the probationary period.

   i. He has been notified in writing by the Personnel Office not later than October 1 of that academic year that he is due for mandatory tenure review, or

   ii. He has notified the Dean of his school and the Provost in writing not later than November 1 of that academic year that he is due for mandatory tenure review.

   c. A faculty member, if not earlier notified by the Provost that tenure has been denied, shall automatically acquire tenure at the end of the penultimate year of his tenure-probationary period or at the end of any subsequent year of service in a tenure-accruing position up to and including the first year beyond his tenure-probationary period; provided

   i) He has been notified in writing by the Personnel Office not later than October 1 of that academic year that he is due for mandatory tenure review, or

   ii) He has notified the Provost that tenure has been denied, shall automatically acquire tenure at the end of two years of service in a tenure-accruing position beyond the tenure-probationary period.

   d. A faculty member denied tenure in a year subsequent to the penultimate year of his tenure-probationary period shall be entitled to a one-year terminal contract.

   e. For purposes of this section, the academic year shall be deemed to end on June 30.

II. PROPOSED NEW TENURE RULES

5. After the effective date of this change in the tenure rules, only individuals with a terminal professional degree may be appointed as Instructors or Associates. Such appointments must be approved by the Provost.

6a. For a faculty member without an appropriate terminal degree (as defined by his school), full time service in the rank of Lecturer shall be limited to 3 years. However, any school by vote of its faculty may authorize the suspension of this rule in a specified department for a specified renewable period not to exceed 5 years.

b. In the event of such suspension, such a faculty member may be retained beyond the third year if the Personnel (Appointments and Promotions) Committee of the school determines that (a) the individual's competence and performance are of an acceptable quality; (b) the need for his services is a continuing one and (c) it is in the University's best interests to continue to obtain these services by an appointment of a Lecturer rather than by an appointment at some other rank. A faculty member so retained shall be offered a 3-year contract.

c. Upon the termination of this contract, the person may be retained with the approval of the Dean and Provost if the rule is still under suspension and if the Personnel Committee determines that conditions (a), (b) and (c) continue to be met. The individual so retained shall be guaranteed continuity of employment so long as the individual's competence and performance are of an acceptable quality and the need for his services is a continuing one.

d. If it is subsequently desired to terminate an individual whose continuity of employment is thus guaranteed, his department must specify which of the conditions is no longer met. If the individual believes that the condition specified continues to be met, he may file a grievance with the Grievance Commission or he may request a determination by the Personnel Committee, which shall be binding upon the department.

e. In all cases where termination occurs after two or more years of continuous employment, the lecturer shall be entitled to twelve months' notice.

7. Ranks that are by present University regulations excluded from eligibility for tenure (e.g. Lecturer, Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor and Visiting Assistant Professor) should not be given to full-time faculty members holding a terminal professional degree and continuously engaged over an extended period in the same academic activities as faculty members having tenure or serving in a probationary period for tenure. Therefore:

a. Except in the case of individuals presently employed by the University, the rank of Lecturer may not be held full time for a continuous period longer than three years by persons with a terminal professional degree. If after the effective date of this rule an individual serves one year full time as Lecturer after receiving his terminal degree and is then appointed for the following year to a tenure-probationary rank, the year spent as Lecturer shall count as part of his probationary period.

b. Full-time service as Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor or Visiting Lecturer shall be limited to three consecutive years. If an individual who has performed such service after the effective date of this rule is appointed for the following year at a tenure-probationary rank, the time served in one of the visiting professional ranks after attainment of a terminal professional degree shall count as part of the probationary period.

9. Any faculty member, tenured or non-tenured, upon application one full semester in advance, will be granted a reduction of 50% of his University work load if he certifies that the purpose of the reduction is to care for one or more of his children less than six years old.

For persons who elect such half-time service, salary, University contributions to fringe benefits insofar as they are based on the level of salary, and the time which may be spent on consulting for pay will be reduced proportionately.

On the completion of every two years in such half-time service, the tenure-probationary period will be extended one calendar year, except that the probationary period shall not exceed ten years. The mandatory tenure review will occur in the penultimate year.

Comment. This rule will allow the University to hire faculty in a position of tenure or tenure accrual while allowing them to raise a family in the formative years. This proposal does not preclude a person's being hired in the non-tenure-accruing status of partially affiliated.

Maria Brooks
Phillip DeLacy, ex officio
Frank Goodman
Robert Summers
Florence Lief
Ludo Rocher, Chairman

ALMANAC April 9, 1974
ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW COMMITTEES

The importance to the University of academic planning based on adequate knowledge of the quality and needs of its constituent parts has been recognized for some time. The Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Planning and the University Academic Planning Committee were intended to provide such planning. However, not all schools in the University have as yet developed comparable planning mechanisms, and it is not evident that either on the school or the university level the existing machinery is providing the administration with adequate advice or reflecting the particular conditions and needs of the schools satisfactorily. The reasons are clear enough: planning and review require attention to a great deal of detailed information that has to be evaluated largely by faculty members outside of the particular field under review. Recommendations are all too likely to seem either invidious or self-serving. Nonetheless, for the health of the University, these are tasks that cannot be avoided. With serious financial restrictions prevailing, it is accepted that efficiency in pursuing our educational goals is necessary. Under a budgetary system that rewards schools and departments for the enrollment of numbers of students, clear guidance is needed lest financial pressures outweigh educational values. At the same time, when funds for reallocation become available through economies we have achieved, advice is needed for their best use.

When the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Planning and the University Committee for Academic Planning were established, a committee of the Council spelled out in some detail the areas of concern and the procedures to be adopted.* Bearing these in mind but without attempting to specify the details of a comparable mandate, the Senate Committee on Administration offers the following observations and recommendations.

1. Faculty involvement in the evaluation process should come in the development of the evaluation mechanism, in implementation of the mechanism through the generation of a report to the administration, and in opportunities for reaction to administration decisions resulting from these reports. Final decision concerning major funding changes or abolition of units must rest with the appropriate administrators; faculty decisions in these matters would clearly involve a conflict of interest.

2. The faculty of each school should form an academic planning committee to provide continuous review of the contributions and quality of all departments and groups and by this means to advise the administration of the school on the allocation of funds. Reports of each school's committee should be sent to the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and to the University Academic Planning Committee. Periodically, review of each department or group by a smaller sub-committee is recommended on a five- or six-year cycle. Source materials should include the results of the questionnaires put out by the University Academic Planning Committee; interviews with appropriate faculty; comparison with comparable units on other campuses acknowledged to be of high quality; and, where desirable, the reports of visiting committees. Written reports may need to be supplemented by oral reports on highly sensitive aspects. The departments or groups affected should be informed of the results of review and be given an opportunity to comment (procedures are suggested in the mandate for the University Academic Planning Committee).

3. The internal structure and needs of different schools in the University are so varied that no single mechanism can be recommended. Rather, we stress certain principles and examples fully realizing that the particular schools will need to develop appropriate mechanisms. Planning and review committees will only be effective if the significance of their function is clear. They should not, therefore, duplicate existing committees and there should be no duplication of functions and proliferation of committees at different levels in the University. Wherever possible existing committees should be adapted to the needs of planning and review with appropriate changes in the manner of appointment. Every effort should be made to see that the information and advice of the school committees feeds effectively into the University Academic Planning Committee.

4. The actual shaping of policy often takes place by means of immediate, short-term decisions on a particular appointment, grant or gift. The consultative mechanism used in such cases should be part of the general planning system. Obviously, short-term and long-term planning should work with cross-purposes. One possibility is for the dean's nominees on a planning committee to be in effect his advisers or "cabinet" on immediate issues.

5. The actual constitution of the school committees should not be prescribed by the Senate or any other outside body. But we urge that, however appointed or elected, the members of the committee report at least once a year to the school faculty. Attention should be given in forming a committee that balances be achieved through adequate representation of fields that are relatively small in terms of students and faculty. Rotation of membership should also be used to ensure varied representation.

6. Evaluation of ourselves, it is generally agreed, can benefit from the judgment of colleagues from other institutions. A single consultant is likely to have too limited an impact. Visiting committees for each department are major undertakings and may be moderately costly if they evaluate all schools and all departments at the intervals we have proposed. Funds in the Provost's budget should be reserved for this purpose. Recommendations as to which groups should be visited in the course of their evaluation may come from either the school or the University Academic Planning Committee. Whenever a major change in direction is under consideration, consultation with a visiting committee will be desirable.

7. Wherever a field is involved in undergraduate or professional teaching as well as Ph.D. programs, we would hope that review would involve both aspects. Fields which are represented only as graduate groups will be reviewed by committees reporting to the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and the Council for Graduate Studies, who shall utilize the findings of these committees and of the school review committees in ascertaining that University-wide quality standards for the Ph.D. program are met.

8. We ask that a report be available from the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Planning to the Senate at its annual meeting of the progress made in the formation of school committees and on the work of the University's Academic Planning Committee. Also, we ask that the Chairman of the Academic Planning Committee report to the Senate on its activities.

9. In all the activity of planning bodies within the University, the educational goals relevant to any major recommendations or decision should be clearly stated.

Jean Crockett	 Robert Mundheim
Philip De Lacy, ex officio	 Peter Nowell
Sherman Frankel	 Paul Taubman, ex officio
Michael Jameson, Chairman

*Report of the ad hoc Committee for the Creation of an Academic Planning Committee (1968-69), available from the Office of the Secretary, J12 College Hall.
WHITNEY FELLOWSHIPS, 1975-76

The Helen Hay Whitney Foundation has announced fellowships in biological or medical research for people holding the M.D. or Ph.D. and up to 35 years of age. Preference will be given to those interested in research in connective tissue and its diseases. The deadline for applications for fellowships to begin July 1975 is August 15, 1974, no late applications accepted. Inquiries: Helen Hay Whitney Foundation, 1230 York Ave., New York, N.Y. 10021.

Recent RFA Notices

Director of Research Administration Reagan Scourlock has issued three important memoranda for those conducting or administering sponsored research projects. Full texts are available at the Office of Research Administration, Ext. 7293.

Forecast Rates for Preparing Grant Applications

Employee Benefits: 
- for fiscal year ending June 30, 1975: 
  - A/1: 17.2% 
  - A/2: 18.5% 
  - A/3-4: 19.5%

Indirect Costs: 
- for fiscal year ending June 30, 1975: 
  - 12.2% 
  - 13.5% 
  - 15.3%

Personnel Costs: 
- When the term of the proposed grant or contract exceeds one year, increase the salary factor by 7½% for each succeeding year.

Need for Equipment

A March 18 memo details new guidelines for radiation safety when human subjects are used in research. The Radiation Safety Committee here has also a general guide to requirements for using radioactive materials and radiation equipment: Radiation Safety office, 191 Towne, Ext. 7187.


National Institute of Health: R. Barchi (Biochem./Med.) “Structure, Function and Assembly of Nerve Membranes” $41,836


R. Brister (Anim. Biol.) “Protein Metabolism in the Preimplanted Mouse Embryo” $58,353

J. Clark (Med.) “Regional Medical Program” $58,221

S. Cohen (Med.) “Neurohumoral Control of Gastrointestinal Motility” $25,000

B. Cooperman (Chem.) “Pyrophosphatase Mechanism Adenylate Affinity Labels” $32,772

L. Davis (Radiol.) “Radiation Therapy Oncology Group” $65,203

D. Detwiler (Anim. Biol.) “Comparative Cardiovascular Studies Unit” $44,530

W. Donawick (Clin. Stud./Vet.) “Heart Transplant and ALS Treatment” $25,000


M. Goto (Ther. Res.) “Therapy Oncology Group” $65,203

R. Hochstrasser (Chem.) “Photoprocesses in the Organic Solid State” $43,171

H. Jordan (Psychiat.) “Experimental Analysis of Regulation and Food Intake and Hunger in Man” $31,239

C. Lambertsen (Inst. for Env. Med.) “Oxytocin and Oxygen Effects in Man” $572,721

R. McFeely (Anim. Biol.) “Chromosome Studies of Mammalian Embryos” $52,299

S. Mulhal (Surg.) “Urinary Bladder Antibacterial Defense Mechanisms” $27,915

J. Ostron (Med.) “Alternate Pathways of Bilirubin Metabolism” $19,383

G. Reed (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) “NMR Studies of Phospholipase A2 Micellar Systems” $28,932

M. Reivich (Neurol.) “Control of Cerebral Circulation and Metabolism” $31,239

W. Silvers (Pathol.) “The Lymphocyte and Cellular Immunity” $165,366

R. Thurman (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) “Interaction of Drug and Ethanol Metabolism” $27,158

A. Winegrad (Med.) “Studies of the Uronic Acid Pathway in Human Diabetes” $82,034.

National Science Foundation: R. Erickson (Biol.) “Growth and Development in Higher Plants” $44,000

J. Hobstetter (VP/Res.) “Institutional Grant for Science 1973-74” $46,300

S. Inoue (Bio.) “Fine Structure in Living Cells” $53,700

J. Roden (Pathobiol.) “Collaborative Research on Bio-Mechanical Modeling of Lameness” $18,500


E. Thornton (Chem.) “Origin and Interpretation of Isotope Effects: Solvolysis Mechanisms and Biochemical Studies” $58,000

L. Tiley (Biol.) “Pattern Generation and Motility of Microtubules and Microfilaments” $6,200.

Navy: C. Brighton (Orthoped. Res.) “Stimulation of Fracture Healing by Electrical Fields” $40,000

C. Lambertsen (Inst. for Environmental Med.) “High Pressure Physiology” $375,000

R. Hamilton (Med.) “Liquid Membrane Capsule Systems for the Treatment of Chronic Uremia” $58,353

S. Cohen (Med.) “Neurohumoral Control of Gastrointestinal Motility” $25,000

R. Barchi (Biochem./Med.) “Origin and Interpretation of Isotope Effects: Solvolysis Mechanisms and Biochemical Studies” $58,000

L. Tiley (Biol.) “Pattern Generation and Motility of Microtubules and Microfilaments” $6,200.


City of Philadelphia: H. Dillon (Psychiat.) “GPH Mental Health and Mental Retardation Program” $677,453.


Private Foundations, Research Organizations and Associations and Industry

American Medical Association: R. Chamberlain (Radiol.) “Radiology—Virginia” $12,683

Commonwealth Fund: H. Lief (Psychiat.) “National Conference on Sex Education in Medicine” $15,000

Council on Tobacco Research: R. Hickey (Mgt.) “Problems of Evolutionary Ecology of Man on Chronic Diseases in Man” $55,066

Deafness Research Foundation: J. Saunders (Otolaryngol.) “Physiological Mechanisms Related to Priming for Audio Genetic Seizures in Rodents” $8,941


R. Hamilton (Med.) “Liquid
SPONSORED RESEARCH CONTINUED

Capsule Membrane for the Treatment of Chronic Uremia $2,668.


A Summmary of Contracts and Grants for Research and Related Activities Received by Faculty Members during February 1974.


ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION: S. Frankel (Physics) "High Energy Physics Research" $1,121,000.


HEALTH RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION: A. Gelhorn (Med.) "Health Professions Capitation Grant Program" $228,853.


OFFICE OF EDUCATION/HEW: D. O’Kane (GSAS) "NDEA Title VI Fellowships" $1,150.

PHILADELPHIA SCHOOL DISTRICT: P. Kurillo (GSE) "Jones Jr. High School Alternative Program" $10,000.

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS, RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS IN INDUSTRY:


Summary: Contract and Grant Awards from July 1973 through February 1974: 442, totaling $32,286,659.

OF RECORD

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY & HEALTH

Following is the text of a memorandum sent March 18, 1974 to deans, directors, department heads and budget administrators.

It is important for each of us to know about our responsibilities under the Occupational Safety and Health Act. The law puts teeth into the common law concept that we must provide a safe place for our people to study and work. It is the responsibility of each of us to see that this is done. If there is an accident due to negligence in a laboratory, for example, OSHA has determined that responsibility for the accident is that of the head of the specific laboratory.

It is also the responsibility of each of us to report any safety hazard noted on the campus. If an OSHA inspector presents himself at your building for an inspection, immediately notify the Safety Office on extension 6921 so a safety representative can exercise our right to walk around with the inspector.

The objective is to prevent accidents in day-to-day operations and to provide a safe and healthful environment. All of us share in this responsibility under law and must actively engage in the promotion of safety. Deans, directors, department heads and all supervisors are responsible for attention to this objective. Accordingly, procedures should be established to identify and minimize hazards to students, personnel, and property under your jurisdiction by directing compliance with safety procedures. Require the use of safety devices and protective equipment, and promote safety and health programs for the mutual benefit of all.

If you see a hazard, report it to the Office of Safety Engineering, on extension 6921, or by letter. The Director of Security and Safety is responsible for advising on the provision of pertinent laws and regulations. He will arrange for instructing University personnel and for monitoring University facilities and operations for compliance.

It would be appreciated if addresses of this memorandum would bring it to the attention of supervisory personnel in their respective areas who might not otherwise have occasion to see it.

—Eliot Stellar, Provost
NOW'S YOUR CHANCE

... to talk to SEPTA, which is conducting a city-wide survey to find out what area workers need or want from public transportation. They will plan to add new routes or change old ones using the survey results. Joseph Burke, director of the parking office, is coordinating the SEPTA study at the University. Send the following information to him at P241 Franklin Building Annex (16): Would you use public transportation to get to and from work? Time work begins ________ Time work ends ________ How you now get to work: ________ Campus address: ________ Home address: ________

DO NOT TRASH

Last week the 1973 yellow pages became one with the past, in the Franklin Building. But the Penn Recycling Group wants your old phone books, computer print-outs and other bundles of paper clutter. They will even come and get them to arrange a pick-up, telephone 382-4275.

OPENINGS

The following listings are taken from the Personnel Office's weekly bulletin and appear in ALMANAC several days after they are first made available via bulletin boards and interoffice mail. Dates in parentheses refer to publication of full job description in ALMANAC. Those interested should contact Personnel Services, Ext. 7285, for an interview appointment. Inquiries by present employees concerning job openings are treated confidentially.

The University of Pennsylvania is an equal opportunity employer. Qualified candidates who have completed at least six months of service in their current University positions will be given consideration for promotion to open positions. Where qualifications for a position are described in terms of formal education or training, significant prior experience in the same field may be substituted.

ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL (A-I)

ACCOUNTANT II (3/19/74).
ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER (3/19/74).
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, STUDENT ACTIVITIES. Provides administrative support for comprehensive extracurricular programs of interest to students. Serves as advisor to student groups and has primary supervisory responsibility for new student orientation and advising programs. Qualifications: Graduation from college. Master's degree in student personnel or related area preferred. At least two years' experience in student affairs, particularly in programming for new students, necessary. Experience at Penn desirable. $8,900-$11,975-$13,050.
ASSISTANT RESIDENCE UNIT DIRECTOR (4/2/74).
ASSOCIATE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER II (1/8/74).
COORDINATOR FOR SPECIAL SUMMER PROGRAMS (4/2/74).
DEPARTMENTAL DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR (4/2/74).
DEPARTMENT HEAD III, medical library (3/26/74).
ELECTRICAL ENGINEER (3/19/74).
MANAGER, ENGINEERING & BUILDING SVCS. (2/19/74).
RESIDENCE UNIT DIRECTOR (3/5/74).
STAFF NURSE (3/5/74).
SYSTEMS & PROGRAMMING STAFF TECHNICIAN. Acts as in-house consultant to staff in areas of problem solving, setting up structures, procedures, use of facilities, design improvement, and new developments in the field. Qualifications: Degree preferred. Extensive experience in administrative data processing with programming skills and some systems analysis background. Ability to communicate on highest technical level, working knowledge of PL/I, COBOL, JCL, OS and VS. Knowledge of MARK IV. Salary to be determined.

SUPPORT STAFF (A-3)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I, administrative office (3/5/74).
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II, administration service. Coordinates recruitment activities, schedules appointments and dates for schools to visit campus, maintains records, correspondence, stencils. Qualifications: Excellent typing, dictaphone, good telephone manner, ability to deal with people. $5,250-$7,350-$9,450.
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III, engineering (3/26/74).
DELIVERY CLERK, campus office (3/5/74).
ELECTRON MICROSCOPE TECHNICIAN II (2/5/74).
ELECTRONIC TECHNICIAN/ENGINEER (2/19/74).
FILM PRODUCTION ASSISTANT, public relations office (4/2/74).
MACHINIST II, research area on campus (1/8/74).
MAIL CARRIER, campus mail service. Qualifications: Ability to drive a truck. Some math background. Penna. driver's license required. $3.60/hour to start.
MECHANICAL ESTIMATOR (1/15/74).
MEDICAL RECORDS ASSISTANT, Graduate Hospital. Qualifications: Aptitude for detailed record keeping, accurate typing, knowledge of medical terminology. Prefer experience in medical office. $6,725-$7,950-$9,150.
MEDICAL SECRETARY (4)(3/19/74).
PROGRAMMER IV to be responsible for the design and implementation of computer programs for faculty research. Qualifications: Degree with background in mathematics and computer sciences. At least one year's programming experience. 360 OS plus two programming languages. Ability to work independently. $12,000-$13,975-$15,825.
PROJECT BUDGET ASSISTANT, college business office. To be responsible for all accounting books as well as for monitoring department budgets and expenses within the college. Qualifications: Several years' experience in bookkeeping, budget maintenance and/or accounting for several budgets or projects simultaneously. Bookkeeping or accounting background preferred. Some typing, knowledge of University budgetary systems desirable. $6,250-$7,350-$8,450.
RECORER, business office on campus (4/2/74).
RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II (2/26/74).
RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (3/26/74).
RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (4/2/74).
SECRETARY I, business office on campus (4/2/74).
SECRETARY II, ombudsman's office (4/2/74).
SECRETARY III (5), III (6) (1/8/74).
TECHNICAL SECRETARY, medical school (2/12/74).

PART-TIME (A-4)

CLERK II. Excellent clerical aptitude. Three hours on Friday.
SECRETARY I (4/2/74).
TECHNICAL SECRETARY (4/2/74).
PENN TEMPS: temporary assignments for people who have excellent typing and, in some cases, shorthand or dictaphone. Call Valerie Snadillo, Ext. 7285, weekdays, 9-11, 130 F.B.
THINGS TO DO

LECTURES

COHR seminar. Dr. Gordon E. Levenson, associate professor of histology and embryology at the Dental School, discusses experimental dental dysplasia in organ culture. 234 Levy, April 9, noon.

Dr. David Burke, assistant professor of child and family studies, University of Wisconsin, gives a GSE colloquium on Space, Setting and Children's Behavior, Faculty lounge, Stieler, April 10, noon-2 p.m. Bring your own lunch.

Onornastics of the Rubble. David Closson, assistant dean of students, Swarthmore, and Ph.D. candidate in folklore here, gives a Bethune-Fanon lecture on the study of naming systems. House of the Family, April 11, 4 p.m.

Two Anthropology Lectures. Dr. Victor Turner, professor of social thought and anthropology, University of Chicago, speaks on Pilgrimage as Paradigm and Process: Ritualized Work or Ritualized Leisure?, B-17 Museum, April 11, 8 p.m.; and Pilgrimage and Community: Pilgrimage from the Inside, B-17 Museum, April 12, 3 p.m. Sponsored by departments of anthropology, religious thought and sociology.

AMTRAK president Roger Lewis discusses the Northeast Railroad Crisis and what is to be done about it. W-1 Dietrich, April 15, 3:30 p.m.

Protecting the Investor. Dr. John C. Burton, chief accountant of the Securities Exchange Commission, talks about the SEC's role in financial reporting. B-1 Vance, April 16, 11 a.m.


FILM

Third Annual Festival of Films by Women. Films by sixteen Philadelphia women open the women's film series April 12 at the Studio Theatre; 6:15 and 9:45 p.m. There are nine programs this year, shown Thursday nights through June 7. Directed by Sandra Grilkes, the series brings together films made between 1922 and 1974 by women from all over the world. A panel discussion with eight local filmmakers will follow the first April 12 showing at 8:30 p.m. Tickets $1, Annenberg Center box office.

EXHIBITS


Mayan Mosaics from Tikal. Reconstructed figures found at the Museum's dig in Guatemala on display at the Museum.

Civilization of Lihuros. Norman Daly's one-man archaeology. Museum, through April.