NEWS IN BRIEF

FAS MEETING ON CLUSTERS

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences will hold a special meeting Tuesday, April 1, to continue debate begun March 12 on revisions in the B.A. requirements. Option 1 in the four-option Springer Report before FAS calls for a “cluster system” (now being followed by freshmen in the former College, but not CW) in which all courses in either departmental or interdisciplinary clusters are specified; in Option 1 a student who wishes to create an individualized cluster is referred to the FAS committee on distributional requirements for approval. On the agenda now is also a minority report introduced by SCUE-and-Springer-Committee member Heidi Solomon which calls for replacing the proposed cluster option with CW’s system of distributional requirements (3 courses each from three areas-humanities, social sciences and natural sciences).

WISTAR PRESIDENT: MR. ECKMAN

John W. Eckman, president of Rorer-Amchem, Inc., has been elected president of the Board of Managers of the Wistar Institute. He succeeds Paul B. Branin, who resigned for health reasons.

Mr. Eckman will continue to chair the corporate division of the Institute’s Conquest Fund which was established to raise money for its new cancer research laboratories.

AAUP VISITOR

AAUP Associate Secretary Joseph Schwartz will be on campus Thursday to meet at 11 a.m. with the GSE Faculty Liaison Committee headed by Dr. Charles E. Dwyer.

COUNCIL

UNSCHEDULED SUBJECTS: ED SCHOOL & VET MED

Two unscheduled items were added to the Council agenda for March 19, the first meeting held since November 13, 1974.

1. The Educational Policy Committee presented Veterinary Medicine’s request to offer a master’s degree for desirable students from developing countries who would ordinarily be in advanced certificate programs but whose governments will support them only if they are degree candidates; and

2. Statements by the campus AAUP board (page 2) and by the GSE representative to Council (pages 3-5) questioned procedures used in the decision to reduce and possibly disperse Graduate School of Education programs.

Both subjects will reappear on the April 9 agenda after study by the Steering Committee at its meeting tomorrow. In both cases, questions were raised on Council’s proper role in specific academic decisions. Precedent was found for Council approval of new degree programs (last year’s Bachelor of Applied Science). On discontinuation of programs, the sense of the March 19 meeting was that Council not be asked to make decisions on “axing” specific programs, but participate in defining the relationship between selective excellence and financial exigency; determining “rules of evidence” to be used; and proposing procedures for making final decisions. Steering Committee Chairman Phillip DeLacy related the GSE question to the newest statement by the Administration on Development Commission Recommendation #2: “It any school whose income in fiscal 1973 is less than direct cost, receive three years in which to equalize them.” Originally-proposed implementation involved the Council of Deans in decisions on subvention to those who failed to meet direct cost.

The latest statement (Almanac February 4) said a school should “present a long-range plan of cost control for evaluation by an appropriate group that will include faculty other than deans.” Dr. John Hobstetter then explained that events have overtaken the intent of the Development Commission: “If schools met only their direct costs, our deficit would run into many more millions of dollars. The Development Commission was not setting a management policy, but describing an emergency procedure" geared to the time in which the statement was framed.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT: THE BLOW FROM HARRISBURG

Expanding on last week’s bad news that the Governor has recommended no increase for state-aided schools while extending the Commonwealth fiscal year to 15 months and cutting out Institutional Aid Grants to private institutions enrolling Pennsylvania residents, Mr. Meyerson said the net effect for Penn amounts to an almost $5 million cut in unrestricted income; inflation has already reduced the unincreased $15 million by 10% or more; the lots of institutional grants subtracts more than $350,000; and extension of the budget period from 12 to 15 months is equivalent to the loss of $3 million.

What can Penn do? Approaches will be made, he said, to persuade legislators that while Commonwealth problems are
Statement Concerning the Situation Affecting the Graduate School of Education

The Executive Board of the University of Pennsylvania Chapter of the American Association of the University Professors met on March 17 to discuss the implications of the announcement by President Meyerson and Provost Stellar on February 21 to the faculty of the Graduate School of Education that the School would either be significantly reduced in scope in accordance with the concept of selective excellence, or closed completely with high quality programs being shifted to another school or schools. The reason given for this decision by the President and Provost was that the University lacked the resources either to develop the School or maintain it at its present level.

This decision contains an ominous ambiguity concerning the future status of tenured and non-tenured faculty under term contract. Furthermore, it is the position of the AAUP and this Board that all decisions affecting faculty status and educational policy are a primary concern of the faculty, and faculty participation in such decisions is essential to proper university governance. As far as this Board has been able to learn, no properly constituted faculty committee had examined the financial data necessary to determine whether or not a condition of financial exigency exists or is imminent enough to warrant such drastic action regarding an entire school consisting of 32 regular faculty, about 45 full-time and part-time lecturers, and some 630 doctoral and master's degree candidates. Nor had any such committee recommended either of the options presented by the President and Provost. In fact the Consultative Committee on the School of Education, chaired by Professor Marvin Wolfgang, the faculty committee charged with looking into the future of the School, recommended in its report of December 20, 1974 the appointment of a new dean, who would improve and expand the various activities of the School.

Certainly the administration has the right and duty to make whatever recommendations it feels are in the best interest of the University, but in making public their statement of February 21 and releasing it to the press, the President and Provost have presented the faculty with a fait accompli by creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. Neither students nor faculty, including a possible new dean, are likely to want to stake their careers on a school which has been publicly stated to be closed or dismantled. Therefore this Board is forced to conclude that the President and Provost have acted in a highly arbitrary manner in an area of primary faculty concern without any consultation with appropriate faculty bodies beforehand.

It is the opinion of this Board that such an arbitrary, and to a large extent irrevocable, decision as that regarding the Graduate School of Education can only lead to suspicion and to a breakdown of cooperation between the faculty and administration, and set a precedent inimical to the best interests of the faculty and the educational goals of the University. Moreover, this Board wishes to stress the point that "selective excellence" when applied to individual faculty amounts to a judgment of relative competence and consequently the termination of tenured faculty, or non-tenured faculty while still under term contract, must meet the standards and procedures of dismissal for cause as specified in the University's "Procedures Concerning Tenure."

In light of the above, this Board calls upon the President and Provost to take the following actions:
1) Do whatever is possible to mitigate the harmful effects of the public announcement of February 21.
2) Make available to properly constituted faculty committees financial and other data necessary to the proper consideration of any major actions affecting faculty status and educational policy both in this instance and in the future.
3) Reaffirm that the primary responsibility for these matters rests with the faculty.
4) Reaffirm the principles of tenure and their protection as outlined in the University's "Procedures Concerning Tenure."
—Lucienne Frappier-Mazur, President University of Pennsylvania Chapter, AAUP

WHAT THE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST SAID

At both beginning and end of Wednesday's Council discussion on GSE, the President and Provost pledged to uphold academic freedom and due process, specifically reaffirming commitment to the tenure rules as asked by the AAUP above. In addition:

President Meyerson said he, like the GSE faculty, would have preferred Option 1; but he added that Option 4 has been misquoted as "closing the school", without its qualifying phrases. He later asked Almanac to reprint all four options as originally stated to the faculty of GSE (below).

Provost Stellar said the principles of selective excellence had been approved by both Council and Trustees, and that he and the President have responsibility for their instrumentation. He summarized forms of consultation used in GSE's case: a fall 1974 meeting with GSE faculty where Option 4 was first presented; dialog with the GSE Faculty Liaison Committee and the Wolfgang Committee; discussion with faculty of other schools and with outside experts in the field. In response to inquiry on whether these satisfied the meaning of consultation with faculty before making decisions based on financial exigency, he asked Council members' opinions. After discussion, Senate Chairman Phillip DeLacy said the Steering Committee of Council will offer specific recommendations to Council for its April 9 meeting. —K.C.G.

REPRINT OF FEBRUARY 21 STATEMENT

The review of the status of the Graduate School of Education has taken a long time, and is, in fact, still in progress. In response to the proposal from the faculty of February 17, 1975, we are meeting with you today in order to report where we have come in the review. This memorandum sets forth the basic options we have considered.

1) Do whatever is possible to mitigate the harmful effects of the public announcement of February 21.
2) Make available to properly constituted faculty committees financial and other data necessary to the proper consideration of any major actions affecting faculty status and educational policy both in this instance and in the future.
3) Reaffirm that the primary responsibility for these matters rests with the faculty.
4) Reaffirm the principles of tenure and their protection as outlined in the University's "Procedures Concerning Tenure."

—Martin Meyerson and Elliot Stellar
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Selective Excellence and Financial Exigency:
What Precedent Will Be Established?

A Report to University Council March 19, 1975

by Erling E. Boe

The test case for the application of the concepts of selective excellence and financial exigency against an academic unit is now in process. Because of the enormous implications of these concepts for the character and stature of our University as well as for the welfare of every student, faculty member, and administrator, it is vital that the many issues entailed in action against an academic unit become widely known and that relevant elements of the University governance structure exercise their rightful role in the decision process. Only with an open examination of the issues and broad faculty input will the outcome of the test case be accepted as reasonable and justified, rather than as arbitrary and capricious, and will principles and procedures be developed which command widespread acceptance when subsequently used against other programs, departments, or schools.

As the elected representative to University Council from the Faculty of the Graduate School of Education, I have two primary responsibilities. The first is to ensure that matters of concern to us are widely known so that we may benefit from a review by Council and relevant University committees of the many issues raised by the action taken against the School. My second primary responsibility is to apprise Council of broad issues which are of import throughout the University. Council may then wish to study the need for new policy or revision of present policy.

Higher education in our nation is in a state of change. Over the last few years, we have seen the college population decline, the proportion of students in publicly-supported institutions increase, federal funds for research and training decline, and private institutions fall upon increasingly hard financial times, with many closing their doors. As the external environment changes, internal changes are necessary if an institution is to survive.

Over these same few years, our University has attempted to adapt to new realities. Not only have we attempted to survive, but we are attempting to enhance excellence. In the face of mounting budgetary deficits, we are attempting to control costs while at the same time attempting to enhance excellence by a combination of the following four primary strategies:

(1) Costs are being reduced by instituting more efficient operations.
(2) Tuition and other sources of income are being increased through higher rates.
(3) New resources are being acquired for high priority areas through contributions to the University development fund.
(4) General income is to be reallocated in such a way as to favor high priority areas.

The Graduate School of Education is the test case for the fourth strategy. The School was informed by President Meyerson and Provost Stellar on February 21, 1975, that it will be reduced significantly in scope or closed. Among the many possible consequences of this intended action are difficulties for present students in the completion of degree programs and the dismissal of tenured members of the Faculty.

The reasons given for acting against the Graduate School of Education were financial exigency and selective excellence. With respect to financial exigency, it was reported that it was no longer financially possible to maintain the School at its present level, even though it has made steady progress over a three-year period toward meeting and exceeding its direct costs. Moreover, the School required much less than its budgeted subvention in 1973-74. With respect to selective excellence, it was reported that the quality of the School's programs varied. Some were called high quality while others were described as weak. The strong are perhaps to survive, while the weak are to perish. Selective excellence means, apparently, that weak programs are to be terminated and the Faculty associated with them are to be either discharged or transferred to less desirable or less productive roles.

I am aware of considerable divergence of opinion regarding the merit of selective excellence thus applied. Some feel that weak programs should be strengthened, or, if financial exigencies preclude this, the right of faculty members to continue to teach and to conduct research in their areas of special competence should be respected until the terms of their contracts end. Others feel that under the condition of financial exigency there is no alternative to eliminating programs and associated faculty.

Regardless of the point of view held on program survival and faculty tenure, however, everyone with whom I have consulted agrees that strong action against a school (and possibly against individual faculty) should be taken only on the basis of precisely defined principles and by procedures which respect due process. Furthermore, these principles and procedures must have been thoroughly examined, clearly defined, and accepted by the University community in which they are applied; otherwise, action taken against an academic unit may appear to be arbitrary and capricious, and may arouse justified feelings of unfairness, fear, and outrage within that community.

It appears to those of us affiliated with the Graduate School of Education that the threatened actions against it are arbitrary and capricious. Whether or not this is actually so is difficult to
I. The concepts of financial exigency and selective excellence are not defined with sufficient precision to be useful in making credible decisions. If financial exigency defined in terms of absolute dollars, or in terms of percentage of total expenses of a responsibility center, or in terms of percentage of an overall University deficit? Who decides this and on the basis of what criteria? Furthermore, by whom and by what criteria is excellence defined? At what point on the excellence continuum and under what conditions does "selection" occur?

2. The formula for combining financial exigency with selective excellence has not been specified with sufficient precision to be useful in making credible decisions. For example, can action against an academic program be taken because of a combination of financial and quality factors even though the program is not below threshold on either when considered separately?

3. The standards of evidence required before financial exigency and excellence can be determined are not specified with sufficient precision. Does financial exigency require a performance trend over a period of years, or is one poor semester enough? What kind of evidence and what standard of reliability is necessary before a judgment of low quality will be credible?

4. Procedures to be used in defining financial exigency and selective excellence in particular instances are not specified. Likewise, procedures for arriving at an administrative decision to terminate a unit because of low quality are not specified, nor are appeal and review procedures. For example, what elements of the University governance structure must be consulted, in what order, and on what points?

During the past four weeks, my colleagues and I at the Graduate School of Education have consulted widely on campus and examined University policy regarding the closing of an academic program and the dismissal of faculty. On the basis of these inquiries, we do not believe that a decision at this time to reduce significantly or to close the Graduate School of Education can be justified. If our conclusion is valid, how could it happen that a premature decision was announced? A review of the events preceding the February 21st announcement is helpful in understanding the factors involved in an answer to this question.

The Graduate School of Education has been without a permanent Dean since January 15, 1974. It was not until seven months after the announcement of the resignation of the former Dean that the President's Consultative Committee on the Selection of a Dean for the Graduate School of Education was constituted in April 1974. This Committee was charged with the dual responsibility of (a) assessing the School and (b) recommending candidates for the position of Dean. This work began earnestly during the past fall term. Last December, the Committee reported to President Meyerson that the first charge should be held in abeyance until a new Dean could be appointed. The Committee then proceeded to conduct preliminary screening of candidates. Early this term, it became apparent that our central administration was reconsidering the second charge to the Consultative Committee. Finally, after several efforts by the Chairman of the Consultative Committee and the Faculty of the School to ascertain the administration's views, the President and Provost met with the Faculty to inform us of their intention to suspend the search for a Dean, and either to reduce substantially or to close the School. This announcement came approximately seventeen months after the former Dean announced his intention to resign. The Faculty is as yet unaware of the specific procedures used by the administration in arriving at their decision, and is unaware of any formal evaluation of the relative quality of its programs.

During the period without a permanent Dean, the School continued to more than meet its budgetary mandates; however, the School was placed in an extended period of uncertainty, and new faculty appointments were frozen. Lacking permanent leadership in a period of increasingly severe financial pressures, the School's future financial prospects apparently did not look promising to the administration based upon their projections. In the absence of formalized procedures for acting against an academic program on grounds of financial exigency and selective excellence, President Meyerson and Provost Stellar drew the conclusion that the School should be severely curtailed or closed. We believe that this conclusion was reached at the present time because the School was in a weak transition period and because clearly defined principles and procedures were not in place to make possible a fair and open hearing of the issues involved.

As a consequence of the premature announcement to curtail or close the School because of its alleged financial difficulties and academic problems, the School has been damaged to a certain extent in the following ways:

1. Tarnishing of the School's reputation by adverse public announcement creates problems in recruiting students. Because of this difficulty, tuition income may decline. The announcement of financial difficulties may thus become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

2. The morale of students and faculty has been lowered. Many good students and faculty are therefore contemplating relocation at other institutions. Thus, the announcement of academic problems may become another self-fulfilling prophecy.

3. The Faculty's success in competing for already scarce external funding may be diminished.

4. The value of a graduate degree from the School, either those already earned or yet to be earned, may have been diminished by the announcement. If so, past and future graduates have been harmed.

5. The tarnishing of the School's reputation and apparent loss of University commitment may cause deterioration of our support base in the educational establishment, including opportunities in field experiences for student teachers and educational specialists, and for placement opportunities for students upon graduation.

In addition to the possible damage done to the School, our University may also have been damaged in the following ways by this premature announcement:

1. The stature of the University suffers in general by significant damage to any element, particularly to an element of the size and importance of a school.

2. Financial income to the University will be decreased if income to any element is reduced. It is also apparent that the subvention of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the University is predicated on the rationale that the University provides useful service to the Commonwealth, particularly through its professional schools. Since the Graduate School of Education places a very large proportion of its graduates in Pennsylvania, the curtailment of the School may be viewed in Harrisburg as constituting a diminution of the University's service, and appropriations may be affected adversely in future years.

3. Action against an academic unit and against tenured faculty is viewed with considerable apprehension across campus. The implicit threat is that similar action might be taken against other programs, departments, or schools, and against other individual faculty without the protection of accepted principles and procedures. This circumstance can only affect morale adversely.

Only the procedures for discontinuing an academic unit and severing faculty contracts for reasons of financial exigency are specified in the document entitled Academic Tenure as adopted by the Trustees on October 16, 1959. —E.B.
Actions need to be taken to undo damage already done to the School and to the University, and to minimize further possible damage. Some actions can be taken or initiated by the School; other actions must be taken by various elements in the University governance structure. As for the Faculty of the Graduate School of Education, we are in the process of pursuing the following course:

1. Relevant elements of the University's governance structure are being asked to take appropriate issues under study. For example, the Senate Committee for Academic Freedom and Responsibility is considering itself with those principles and procedures that may be applied in weighing the fate of Faculty affected by the discontinuance of a program, department, or school.

2. An analysis of the School's financial status is being made in relation to the financial performance mandated by the administration during recent years, and in relation to the financial performance of other responsibility centers. As part of this analysis, the University's policies and procedures with respect to allocation of subventions to responsibility centers is being explored.

3. In anticipation that a permanent Dean will be appointed, options regarding interim alternatives to the School's internal programmatic structure are being analyzed for academic merit and efficiency.

4. Factual information is being amassed concerning the service of the School to the Commonwealth, the history of state financial aid to the School, the placement of graduates in positions located within the Commonwealth, and so forth.

5. Explorations are being made in Harrisburg regarding the possibility of a special appropriation for the Graduate School of Education. Similar explorations are being made regarding the importance of the Graduate School of Education in determining the level of the University's annual state subvention.

6. Redress of grievances is being sought through the Faculty Grievance Commission. The first two grievances concern (a) damage to the School occasioned by premature public announcement of the School's alleged financial and academic problems and (b) the apparent failure of the administration to follow procedures including wide consultation within the University.

7. The American Association of University Professors has been asked to monitor the action being taken against the School and investigate the appropriate representatives of the University against individual faculty, and to intervene if AAUP policy is not observed.

8. The legal bases of contracts between the University and individual faculty members and implicit contracts between the University and individual students are being explored.

9. The advantages and disadvantages of affiliation with the Pennsylvania Association for Higher Education are being explored.

In addition to the actions being taken by the Graduate School of Education, the following actions should be taken by the appropriate representative governing bodies of the University in collaboration with the President and the Provost:

1. The concept of financial exigency should be defined operationally, and standards of evidence required in establishing exigency should be specified.

2. The concept of selective excellence should be defined operationally, and standards of evidence required in establishing degree of excellence should be specified.

3. Principles should be formulated which can be used to determine the cut-off point on the scale of excellence below which programs can be selected for reduction or elimination.

4. A formula should be specified for combining the concepts of selective excellence and financial exigency when both are thought to apply to a program which is being considered for reduction or termination.

5. A specific policy should be formulated for the disposition of faculty and students affected when a program is reduced or eliminated.

6. Procedures should be established which provide for the following steps when a program is being considered for reduction or termination:

a. The program should be consulted first about its apparent problems, and should be given an opportunity to respond.

b. If the problems are significant, the program should be given a reasonable time to correct clearly-defined deficiencies. There should be provision for broad Faculty participation in setting performance mandates for such programs.

c. If a program is unsuccessful in meeting its mandates, provision for review and appeal should be made before action is taken to reduce or terminate a program. There should be broad Faculty participation in this step.

d. If the decision to reduce or terminate a program is sustained by the review and after appeals, only then should action be taken to reduce or terminate a program.

If the above principles and procedures are specified and adopted, there is little reason for concern that a program, department, or school will be subjected to arbitrary and capricious actions designed to reduce or discontinue it. Since these principles and procedures are not now established, the Graduate School of Education must rely on campus-wide concern for fair play, a characteristic of our academic community. Within this context, the Faculty of the Graduate School of Education is striving for a resolution to the present conflict. Under these circumstances, an appropriate and acceptable resolution entails the following elements:

1. The Graduate School of Education should be accorded normal support, just as any other school, to pursue its missions. Such support includes:

   a. the opportunity to secure the leadership of a permanent Dean from a national pool of candidates;

   b. the granting of subventions for operating costs of a magnitude in accord with normal University policy;

   c. the opportunity to recruit, appoint, and promote faculty under procedures and standards that apply to all academic units;

   d. the opportunity to maintain a size and level of operation that is in accordance with budgetary realities. Artificial restrictions on the number of faculty and other resources should not be applied.

2. The present cloud under which the Graduate School of Education is operating should be removed. This can be done by an announcement that the School will be supported at a level that is in accord with its obligations to students, faculty, and the Commonwealth, and with University fiscal policy. Such an announcement must also include a retraction of previous reports implying that the School was seriously deficient academically. Assurances must be given that continuing steps are being taken to strengthen the School as rapidly as financial considerations permit.

If these two steps are taken promptly, the School will probably suffer only short-term damage. For the future, we hope that widely acceptable principles and procedures for reducing or terminating programs are devised. If they are, all academic units, including the Graduate School of Education, must abide by them. We do not oppose the concept of academic evolution; we do oppose action against any program, department, or school which is taken in the absence of formal consultations in accordance with fully developed and accepted principles.

In conclusion, we all recognize that our University is in a period of serious financial hardship, and that further adjustments in our services and programs must be made. Although our central administration has been struggling with this problem for some time, a variety of factors, some unpredicted and uncontrollable, are responsible for further deterioration of our financial base. If the time has come to cut drastically into academic programs for fiscal reasons, University Council should assume a share of the burden in deciding where and when such cuts will be made.

Dr. Boe is the Council Representative of Constituency 26, the Faculty of the Graduate School of Education.
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To Join a Penn Committee

Last month, nomination forms were mailed to faculty and staff for use in proposing themselves or others for membership on University committees. Below, the Committee on Committees gives details of the size and purpose of each committee on which faculty and staff may serve. Additional copies of the nomination form are available from the Office of the Secretary, 112 College Hall.

FROM THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The following descriptions of University Council and University Operating committees are meant to acquaint members of the University community with the purposes and activities of these bodies. Persons who wish to indicate an interest in serving on one or more of these committees should return the Committee on Committees' self-nomination form to the Office of the Secretary, 112 College Hall, in the near future, or should mention their interest to any member of the Committee. If you have already filed this form, and wish to add a new interest, please feel free to do so. Late nominations are always welcome.

Approximately 185 faculty and staff members serve on the 22 committees for which we are responsible. The average term is two years; thus somewhat less than one-half this number of vacancies exists in a given year. The Committee annually receives many more nominations than the number of vacancies available, so it is inevitable that some people eager to serve on a committee may be disappointed. The Committee, however, would like to hear directly from members of faculty and staff with particular interests, especially from those who have not served on a University-wide committee in recent years.

Paul J. Korshin (English), Chairman:

Sidney A. Bludman
(Physics)
John S. de Cani
(Statistics and Operations Research)
Edward S. Cooper
(Medicine)

Alice F. Emerson
(Dean of Students)
Murray Gerstenhaber
(Mathematics)
Phoebe S. Leboy
(Biochemistry, Dent.)

University Bookstore (10 members). Active, with three busy subcommittees. This Committee watches the operations and financial policies of the Bookstore and assists in planning its future. It has been much concerned this year with the financial problems and with the quality of the Bookstore's service to the community.

University Budget (12 members). Very active, with weekly meetings. The Committee deals with matters of policy relating to University budgets, and participates in the formulation of the annual budget. Vacancies are scarce.

Committee on Committees (8 members). The Committee meets regularly throughout the academic year. It fills occasional vacancies on the twenty-one committees under its purview, oversees and evaluates their work, and presents lists of potential committee members to the Steering Committee of the University Council for its consideration.

Community Relations (8 members). Active, with four subcommittees (including many people who are not members of the Committee itself), which deal with Health, Education, Housing, and Other Services. The Committee examines the University's activities in regard to community and metropolitan affairs.

Conflict of Interest (12 members). Not very active; handles specific problems when they arise. The Committee is a subcommittee of both Faculty Affairs and of Research; in the last year it has been concerned with the faculty's adherence to the rules regarding the reporting of outside activities.

Disability Board (7 members). The Board exists to administer the University's Long-Term Disability Income Plan; it annually examines existing cases and considers a steady docket of new cases.

Educational Policy (16 members). Active, with three to five meetings per term. The Committee is concerned with matters of general educational policy which involve the interests of two or more schools and with educational topics of University-wide interest.

University Facilities (11 members). Active; monthly meetings. The Committee's concerns are with the maintenance of buildings and grounds; planning, design, and project management; and new construction. Technical expertise in such matters is highly desirable.

Faculty Affairs (14 members). Very active; meetings at least monthly, sometimes more often. The Committee's scope includes the general welfare and interests of the faculty and its relationship to the administration. Some of its recent concerns have been: the faculty handbook, classification of the faculty, tenure and promotion practices in the different schools, and continuing education.

Faculty Grants and Awards (11 members). Three to four meetings a year. This body is a subcommittee of the Committee on Research; its principal responsibilities are to establish policy on University research grants to faculty members, to review applications for these grants, and to make annual awards.

Honorary Degrees (11 members). A subcommittee of Faculty Affairs, this body does most of its work in the fall term. Its responsibility is to solicit recommendations for honorary degrees from faculty and students and to submit nominations to the Trustees; it also makes recommendations to the President on a Commencement speaker and on special convocations.

Implementation of University Policy on Conduct of Research Programs (4 members). This subcommittee of the Committee on Research is called into session only as needed to consider questions of University policy concerning the conduct of research programs.

International Services (10 members). Relatively inactive. This Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Office of International Services.

Laboratory Animal Care (4 members). Moderately active. This body advises facilities which use animals for experimentation on the maintenance of governmental standards for animal health. The Committee has been much concerned this year with surveying the status of all animal facilities in the Medical School. Special expertise is desirable.

Library (9 members). Moderately active; about four meetings a year. The Committee is advisory to the Director of Libraries on matters of Library policy within and without the University community; it also investigates scrutiny of policy concerning collections, facilities, and the general use of the University's libraries.

Personnel Benefits (11 members). Active, especially in the last two years. This Committee deals with policies and procedures relating to all employment benefits for faculty and administrative personnel. Special expertise in personnel, insurance, taxes, or law is often helpful.

Recreation and Undergraduate Athletics (13 members, plus 2 Trustees and 2 alumni members). Active, with several busy subcommittees. In the current year, the Committee has dealt with such matters as the provisions for women in athletics and recreation at the University; the status of our present facilities; and the place of recreational needs in the forthcoming Development Campaign.

Research (16 members). Active, with several busy subcommittees. The Committee's general concern is the research being carried on at the University. This year, it has dealt mainly with the problem of indirect costs; in previous years it has dealt with such problems as copyright policy.

Safety and Security (10 members). Active; still a relatively new committee, which is advisory to the Director of Security.

Student Affairs (18 members). Active; meetings at least once a month. This Committee is concerned with the quality of student life at the University, including allocations from the University to student activities, and with residential arrangements.
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GETTING TOO MANY OF A GOOD THING?

Faculty members now get the prize-winning Pennsylvania Gazette at their homes. Sometimes, however, they get more than one—if they are also baccalaureate alumni here, if their spouses are, or if two members of a family are on the faculty. To save the Gazette the money and yourself the bother of receiving more than one, please report to Publisher Mike Huber at 133 S. 36th Street the name, school (or faculty rank) and class year of each person receiving a copy.

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. 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 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.

The three figures in salary listings show minimum starting salary, maximum starting salary (midpoint) and top of salary scale, in that order.

ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL (A-1)

FISCAL AND BUDGET COORDINATOR. Wharton School, responsible to the Director of Administrative Services for the administration of interdepartmental budgets, to assist in the development of a management information system. Qualifications: College degree with accounting major; at least 3-5 years’ experience in financial field; knowledge of university accounting procedures, government contract regulations, and computer applications for management systems; ability to communicate effectively with faculty and staff. $10,675-$13,275-$15,875.

HEALTH EDUCATORS (2), Juniata County, Pa., to supervise special educational program within rural dental health program for children grades K-12: develop an instrument to pre- and post-test children in the program; write and implement a curriculum; and represent the program in the community. Qualifications: Bachelor’s degree in early childhood elementary education or health education is minimum requirement; experience in teaching, curriculum development, media development or communication necessary. Must be willing to relocate. $9,275-$11,450-$13,600.

JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST to perform experiments with early embryos of laboratory animals (mice, rats, rabbits), including injection of animals; collection of the embryos; preparation of media; cultivation of embryos and embryo cells in vitro; separation of proteins by electrophoresis; mathematical tabulation of data; and use of isotopes. Qualifications: Ability to work with minimum of supervision and high degree of responsibility; experience and B.S. degree in chemistry and biochemistry. $8,075-$10,050-$12,000.

NURSE TECHNICIAN for recording and scoring of behavioral and physiological data collected from children undergoing dental treatment; direct field supervision of expanded duty dental auxiliaries working in assessment of education program; maintain control of all data collection; and preparation of data for analytic section. Qualifications: Residence in Juniata County; B.S.N., R.N. with supervisory experience; interest in community health. $9,275-$11,450-$13,600.

OFFICE MANAGER, Medical Group, to hire, train and supervise medical office personnel; administer office procedures; maintain medical records systems and patient schedules. Qualifications: At least five years’ progressively responsible medical care administrative experience; experience in patient scheduling, medical records, and physician interaction; demonstrated supervisory experience required. $8,075-$10,050-$12,000.

SUPPORT STAFF (A-3)

BILLING ASSISTANT, medicine, for typing; bookkeeping; patient contact; feeding billing data to computer services. Qualifications: Three years’ bookkeeping experience, preferably in medical office; aptitude for figures; accurate typing; knowledge of medical terminology and benefits. Experience with insurance forms preferred; some college training desirable. $6,550-$7,925-$9,300.

CLERK, SENIOR ACCOUNTING. Qualifications: Ability to assist bookkeeper in the billing of patients and the recording of revenue; deal with patients when questions arise regarding insurance coverage; post checks. Clerical aptitude and some office experience desired. $5,700-$6,750-$7,800.

MEDICAL SECRETARY (2) (2/18/75).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II (3/18/75).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III. Three positions announced March 4 through March 18. One calls for chromatographic analyses of body and bacterial culture fluids; one for study of lung function in shock states in animals and man; and one for tissue culture experiments.

SECRETARY I (1) (3/18/75). SECRETARY II (4) (2/25/75).

TECHNICAL TYPIST for typing of manuscripts that contain advanced mathematical, statistical or scientific phraseology; faculty and staff contact. Qualifications: Excellent typing skills; direct experience typing scientific material preferred. $5,700-$6,750-$7,800.

HOURLY RATE (A-4)

Hourly rate is negotiable on the basis of qualifications.

DENTAL HYGIENIST, Penn Urban Health, 2 days/week (3/4/75).

FACULTY TEA CLUB: SEMINARS

Women faculty and staff or the wives of their male counterparts can join a seminar, join the Faculty Tea Club—or both.

The Tea Club is sponsoring weekly seminars given by Penn faculty. Meeting in the Faculty Club, the four-week classes begin April 2 and are free to Tea Club members.

* World Cries: Food and Agriculture—Energy with Dr. John Brainerd, professor of engineering; Wed., 4 p.m.
* History and Sociology of Science with Dr. Claude Deischer, emeritus professor of chemistry; Wed., 10:30 a.m.
* International Diplomatic Relations—An Analysis of the State of European Diplomatic History with Dr. Lynn Case, emeritus professor of history; Thurs., 5 p.m.
* Travels around the World with Dr. Evan L. Stubbs, emeritus professor of pathology; Thurs., 10:30 a.m.

To register: Doris Samitz, KIS-016 or Birgit DeGennaro, 527-3491. Yearly dues for the Club are $5; to join: Birgit DeGennaro.

ASSERTIVENESS FOR WOMEN

Assertiveness Training, a course offered this semester by the Free Women’s School, has been a success for the women who took it—and a disappointment to those who couldn’t because the class was filled. To accommodate at least twelve more participants, Marilyn Moyer and Gloria Einstein will teach another section on Thursday from noon-2 p.m. The six-week course begins April 3; fees, which are based on a sliding scale, reach a maximum of $15. To register, stop by at the Women’s Center, Ext. 8611.
severe (setbacks in the coal and steel industries among them), the educational system is being asked to bear too great a share of the burden. But persuasion of the legislature alone will not succeed, he added, unless the Governor himself can also be convinced of the need to restore or increase aid to educational institutions.

A student probed the President on renovation of Houston Hall, referring to reports that some students oppose the project. Mr. Meyerson answered that the renovation still has high priority in future fund-raising, and that while some students propose construction of a new student union, others oppose any expenditure for bricks-and-mortar even in the Quad. Code violations themselves dictate some renovation in University buildings, Mr. Meyerson said.

PROVOST'S REPORT: SEARCH COMMITTEES

Provost Eliot Stellar reported on the progress of University search committees for Dean of Admissions: both on- and off-campus candidates have been interviewed and committee recommendations have been submitted to the President and Provost; they hope to have the candidate chosen in time for Trustee approval on April 14. Dean of the Law School: candidates are still being interviewed by the committee. Museum Director: the committee is compiling a list of candidates and interviews will begin shortly. Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and University Life: Dr. Robert Dyson, professor of anthropology, has been appointed chairman. Invitations have been issued and members will be announced soon.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Dr. Allyn Rickett reported on a survey being conducted among Penn-related families in West Philadelphia, to determine patterns of use and need in health care facilities, schools and other services. He described approaches to day care using “Penn's natural resources in research and expertise” to draw outside funding in the hope of expanding the present center. He emphasized the advantages of day care—with its research and education components—over increasingly expensive but noneducational “babysitting” which an increasing number of University faculty and staff families need. He said the fundamental approach of his committee on community projects will be to propose specific, workable programs, fundable from outside on the strength of Penn expertise, then invite community participation—rather than announce sweeping plans which excite interest but may not come about.