NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Five University faculty members were among the eighty-five persons elected to the National Academy of Sciences at its 112th annual meeting in Washington last week. In addition, Dr. David R. Goddard, Provost Emeritus and University Professor of Biology here, was elected home secretary by the society.

Penn scientists elected to the National Academy are Drs. Baruch S. Blumberg, professor of medicine and human genetics; John R. Brobeck, professor of physiology; Werner Henle, professor of virology in pediatrics; Leo M. Hurvich, professor of psychology; and Dorothea Jameson (Hurvich), professor of psychology.

LINDBACK AWARDS

Eight faculty members received the 1975 Lindback Awards for distinguished teaching at Hey Day ceremonies last Friday. The annual awards of $500 each are given by the Christian R. and Mary F. Lindback Foundation. Candidates are nominated by faculty and students with final selection being made by the Provost’s Staff Conference. Recipients of the award this year:

- Dr. Jacob Abel, associate professor of applied mechanics, College of Engineering and Applied Science;
- Barbara Jacobsen, associate professor of nursing, Graduate Division of the School of Nursing;
- Dr. Alan C. Kors, associate professor of history, Faculty of Arts and Sciences;
- Dr. Robert F. Lucid, associate professor of English, Faculty of Arts and Sciences;
- Dr. Charles W. Nichols, assistant professor of ophthalmology and pharmacology, Medical School;
- Dr. Jean Piatt, professor of anatomy, Medical School;
- Dr. Susan M. Wachter, assistant professor of finance, Wharton School;
- Dr. Wilfried T. Weber, associate professor of pathology, School of Veterinary Medicine.

WORLD CITY PROJECT

Dr. Norman D. Palmer has been named director of a new Philadelphia Transnational Project (“Philadelphia as a World City”; details next week). The umbrella project, which will have ties to the local Bicentennial celebration as well as with scholars in the U.S. and abroad, has begun with a cross-cultural, cross-national project with Bombay’s Urban Systems Center at India’s National Institute for Training in Industrial Engineering. Dr. Palmer and Dr. Rashmi Mayur, presently director of the Urban Systems Center in Bombay, are developing a research design for the study of Bombay as a world city. They have also named co-chairmen and co-organizers of a special session on “Cities as Transnational Actors” for the Tenth World Congress of the International Political Science Association in Edinburgh in 1976.

EUROPENN: ALUMNI ABROAD

European graduates of the University have formed a multinational alumni organization, EUROPENN, with headquarters initially in Paris.

The European Alumni Society of the University of Pennsylvania will serve as an umbrella organization to coordinate all alumni activities throughout Europe and to assist cooperative ventures of the University, its faculty, and its friends overseas. The first known foreign alumni society of an American university which is multinational in scope, it will represent about 1500 Pennsylvania alumni in Great Britain and in continental Western Europe.

Americans living abroad comprise less than five per cent of this group. President Martin Meyerson will open the organizational meeting of EUROPENN to be held in Paris in early May.

SEARCH FOR GSE DEAN

The search committee for a GSE dean has been reactivated and is soliciting nominations from the University community. Contact Dr. Marvin Wolfgang, chairman, 289 McNeil, Ext. 7411.

PUBLIC POLICY APPOINTMENTS

Almarin Phillips, dean of the School of Public and Urban Policy in the Wharton School, has announced three major administrative appointments, effective July 1:

- Oliver E. Williamson, professor of economics, law, and public policy, will become Director of the Fels Center of Government, a major part of the School.
- Lowdon Wingo, now chairman of the University’s department of city and regional planning, will become Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs, and Morton Lustig has been reappointed as Director of the Fels’ Government Studies Center, the research administration sector of the Fels Center.
- Julius Margolis, Director of the Fels Center for the last five years, will return from sabbatical leave to reassume his position as professor of economics and public policy.

DEATH OF PROVOST WILLIAMS

Dr. Edwin B. Williams, Provost from 1951-56, died Sunday at 83. Funeral being arranged (probably Wednesday). Chaplain Johnson, Ext. 8456. Additional details next week.
This report deals first with matters following from the Senate meeting of October 30, 1974, and second, with activities of the Senate Advisory Committee.

1. Since the October Meeting
A. At the October meeting, the Senate passed five motions pertaining to tenured and non-tenured faculty status. They are recorded on pages 4-7 of the minutes of that meeting. I had hoped at this time to inform you whether or not the President and Provost had agreed to these motions, but my repeated inquiries, oral and written, have not been answered. This breakdown of communications is of course regrettable, and I don't know how to handle it, other than to report it to you.

B. At the October meeting, the Senate also passed two amendments to the Rules of the Senate, one of them changing the subject to certain restrictions. On November 6, 1974, the Advisory Committee decided to use the new nominating procedure, so far as possible, during the current year. It worked smoothly. Council constituency representatives nominated twenty-four persons for membership on the Nominating Committee, and the Committee of nine members, with Howard Lesnick as Chairman, was formed in good time. The slate of officers prepared by the Nominating Committee was published in Almanac on March 4, 1975, and as there were no nominations by petition, the Committee's slate has been declared elected. It is as follows:

Chairman-elect: Robert F. Lucid
Secretary-elect: Robert A. Zelten
Advisory Committee (3-year terms): Paul Barron, Dell Hymes, Barbara Lowery, Ann Miller
Advisory Committee (2-year terms, to fill vacancies): John Quinn, Robert Shayon
Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (3-year terms): Adelaide Dulluva, Murray Gerstenhaver
Academic Freedom and Responsibility pool of alternates (3-year term): Sol Goodgal

II. Activities of the Senate Advisory Committee
A. Under its authorization to act for the Senate, the Advisory Committee took the following actions:
   i. On November 6, 1974, it approved the use of a random order, rather than alphabetical order, in designating chairpersons and members of grievance panels.
   ii. On April 2, 1975, it accepted three committee reports that had been held over from previous meetings: the report of the ad hoc Committee on Students, dated April, 1973; the report of the Committee on Administration (April, 1974); and the report of the Committee on Education (also April, 1974). The two last-mentioned reports contain recommendations that will be placed before you later in today's meeting. The report of the ad hoc Committee on Students (April, 1973) contained no recommendations; rather, it stated that the Committee was unable to fulfill its charge. A report on the efforts of this year's Committee on Students to carry out the charge given to the Committee on Students by the Senate on April 5, 1972, was distributed at the door and will come up for discussion under agenda item number eleven.

B. The Advisory Committee has also engaged in the following activities:
   i. On November 6, 1974, in response to a communication from Mr. Meyerson, the Advisory Committee began consideration of the role of the Faculty in the forthcoming Development Drive. The subject was discussed further at a joint meeting of the Committee with the President and Provost on December 2, and at its next regular meeting on December 4, the Advisory Committee agreed to set up an ad hoc Senate Committee on the Development Drive. This ad hoc Committee was appointed in February, 1975, under the chairmanship of William Grigsby.
   ii. Also on November 6, certain questions were brought before the Advisory Committee regarding the rank of Associate Professor. It was decided to ask the Committee on the Faculty to study the matter. That Committee sent out a questionnaire on February 24, 1975, and it has received almost 400 replies. These replies are now being studied, and a report will be made in the fall.
   iii. Again on November 6, 1974, the Advisory Committee decided to offer its services, in whatever way might be appropriate, to help find a solution to what has come to be known as the Rackin case. At the next meeting, on December 4, we decided to seek the services of a respected faculty member who might get some conversations going with the parties involved. We were fortunate indeed to obtain the services of Covey Oliver, who since January has been acting on our behalf. It is not yet clear whether his efforts will succeed, but he reports that there are promising activities on both sides, and he has given us hope where there was none before. For this he has earned our heartfelt thanks.
   iv. Reacting to an article in the Winter, 1974, issue of the AAUP Bulletin, the Advisory Committee on February 5 agreed to ask the Committee on the Faculty to consider the question of the rights of faculty members in discontinued programs. This (was before the public announcement of contemplated reductions in the programs of the Graduate School of Education.) The Committee on the Faculty has set up a subcommittee, chaired by Robert Summers, to carry out this assignment.
   v. The Advisory Committee on March 5, 1975, responded to a request from Associate Provost Hobstetter for a meeting on procedures to be followed in reaching decisions regarding the Graduate School of Education. Three members of the Advisory Committee, Ralph Amado, Dell Hymes, and myself, met with Dr. Hobstetter, James Davis, and Bruce Johnstone, on Wednesday, March 19. The meeting was inconclusive, but it is an important part of the background for a proposed review procedure that was presented to the University Council Steering Committee on March 26. This proposal has now gone through several further stages. Its form as of April 2 was published in Almanac on April 8. There is a reference to it in the resolution to be presented as item 6 on the agenda.
   vi. At the request of the Advisory Committee (on January 15, 1975) an ad hoc Committee on Publication Policy for Almanac, chaired by Robert Shayon, has formulated a "Guide for Readers and Contributors." This proposed guide was published in Almanac on April 15, 1975. It has been provisionally accepted by the Advisory Committee; final approval will not be given until reaction to the proposal has been received from the Administration and from other interested members of the University community. In anticipation of final adoption, the Advisory Committee gave notice in the call to today's meeting of an amendment to the Senate Rules that would authorize establishment of a standing Committee on Publication Policy for Almanac (agenda item 3).
   vii. In line with its increased responsibilities, the Advisory Committee has restructured its meetings. Early in the meeting it receives reports on the activities of standing and ad hoc committees. Then it turns to discussion of matters of current concern. Nominations and appointments come late on the agenda. A subcommittee on nominations and appointments expedites this time-consuming task. This concludes the list of items to be reported at this time. Other activities of the Senate will come before you later in this meeting.

*Subsequently Provost Stellar reported that a response was forthcoming.—Ed.
SENATE

Highlights of the Spring Meeting
April 23, 1975

SUMMARY

Oral reports by Senate Chairman Phillip DeLacy (page 2) and by Senate Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee Chairman Henry Hiz were presented at the three-hour spring meeting on April 23. The Committee on Education's report (page 4) was distributed to members.

Four items on the lengthy agenda were debated and brought to action:
- A change in Senate rules that adds two new responsibilities to the charge of the Academic Freedom committee (passed, voice votes).
- Recommendations in the report of the Committee on Economic Status of Faculty, (passed, voice votes).
- SAC's resolution on discontinuation review procedures, Almanac April 8 (passed after amendment, 28-22).
- The report of the Joint Subcommittee on Responsibility Center Budgeting, Almanac April 1 (endorsed in principle, voice vote).

REPORT: ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Dr. Hiz said his committee had consulted with the administration on the GSE matter. He also called attention to the committee's report (Almanac April 22, accompanied by Provost's endorsement) on departmental procedures that (a) provide for appeal of a negative vote at departmental level and (b) set procedures for reassignment of faculty where programs are discontinued. In response to query, he said the term "faculty" means "faculty of a school," rather than faculty of a department, in this and other documents specifying the faculty role in determining the membership of the faculty.

His committee, he added, has advised the administration (in connection with talks of contract arrangements for the Veterinary school) to ensure that "any contract not abridge the academic freedom and tenure of a faculty.

Another agreement reached between the Academic Freedom Committee and the administration is that when a faculty member takes medical leave for more than half a year, that year does not count toward the probationary period for tenure. Such leave may extend up to two years.

ACTION: RULES CHANGES

Two rules changes read by Senate Chairman-Elect Ralph Amado and passed by voice votes were:
1. Section 8(b) The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. After (ii) add the following:
   (iii) The Senate Committee shall perform any duties falling to it under Sections IIIe and VI of the regulations governing grievance procedure, as adopted by the University Council, May 8, 1974.
2. Section 8(b) The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. After (iiii) add the following:
   (iv) The Senate Committee shall ensure that each faculty has a mechanism for implementing Article VII, paragraph 2 of the Statutes of the Corporation which states "Each faculty shall determine the qualifications for membership in that faculty."

Item (iii) passed without debate. On item (iv), Dr. Amado and others indicated that personnel committees appointed by deans and responsible to deans are not what is intended in the term "each faculty. . .".

ACTION: ECONOMIC STATUS

Amid broad and sometimes heated discussion of how Penn might achieve the "clout" to restore state appropriation to former or better levels, six recommendations introduced by Economic Status Committee Chairman F. Gerard Adams passed without amendment:
2. Membership of the Committee chairman on the University's Budget Committee.
3. Making explicit in the Committee's charge its role as a representative of the faculty in discussing salary issues with the Administration.
4. That the Economic Status Committee initiate meetings with the Administration on the long run prospects for faculty salaries.
5. That the Senate consider what role the faculty could play in increasing the political influence of the University in Harrisburg.
6. That the Senate propose to the Administration a cooperative study of new measures for improving the efficiency of the University's educational and supportive activities without damaging its academic standing.

Some issues raised in discussion: what the Commonwealth might want as quid-pro-quo that might affect admissions or academic quality; the relative power of statewide pressure organizations and unions to influence Harrisburg (Dr. William Gomberg said schools in the Pennsylvania State Education Association lobbied so successfully their share was taken out of Penn's share; but Dr. Helen Davies countered that PHEA member schools have been told they have to make layoffs), and some internal union questions. In response to rumor that some current union contracts contain provisions that will give their members raises in 1975-76 while none are yet specified for faculty and other staff in the University, both Dr. John Hobstetter and Dr. Gomberg said the University has no such contracts, but has obligations to negotiate as some contracts end in October.

ACTION: DISCONTINUATION PROCEDURES

With the original SAC motion on the floor, Provost Eliot Stellar gave a detailed outline of consultations taken before and after the February 21 GSE Faculty meeting in which reduced options were announced. He endorsed the last sentence of the motion, but moved to strike the first two sentences. "In the absence of established procedures for consultation, I consulted with the GSE faculty, the Wolfgang review and search committee, and outside consultants in arriving at the four options presented on February 21, 1975. After laying out those options, I extended consultation to the Academic Planning Committee, the Educational Policy Committee of Council, the Steering Committee of Council, and the Council itself among other groups; and I continue to consult with the GSE faculty. There is no question but that I would prefer to work with the Advisory Group once it is established," the Provost said in a post-meeting summary of his lengthy and more detailed talk at Senate.

Members critical of the administration's actions said the issue was failure to consult widely before the February 21 meeting. In response to concern over the public announcement itself, Provost's Executive Assistant James E. Davis said (a) the February 21 meeting was at the request of the GSE faculty and was open to non-faculty at their request as well; and (b) the fact that at least one Philadelphia newspaperman was already on the story earlier that week dictated that a written statement be issued to prevent inaccurate leaks.

The motion that passed (on a hand count of 28-22 after voice vote was inconclusive) was Dr. Jacob Abel's substitute:

The Faculty Senate is deeply concerned over the process by which a decision was reached on the future of the Graduate School of Education. This concern results from failure to solicit the judgment of the faculty with respect to the academic quality of the School by consulting with the established advisory bodies responsible for articulating such judgments prior to public announcement of the University's decision to reduce substantially or possibly close the School. The Faculty Senate endorses the proposal of the University Council Steering Committee for an Advisory Group review procedure as a useful means of avoiding such situations in the future, provided that there is consultation with the Academic Planning Committee well in advance of the presentation of a case to the Advisory Group for review.

ACTION: RESPONSIBILITY CENTER BUDGETING

Debated at length, the report introduced by Joint Subcommittee Chairman Jean V. Alter was endorsed in broad principle as the SAC meeting ended, but goes back to the Senate Advisory Committee for consultation with committees involved in implementation. The most discussed concern was recommendation 5, which assigns extensive new duties to the Academic Planning Committee. APC Chairman Lawrence Klein and others expressed concern about mixing the advisory role of the committee with an implementation role. Dr. Klein also stressed the inroads on faculty time that should be devoted to research and other academic pursuits. -K.C.G.
Report of the Committee on Students

April 23, 1975

The Senate Committee on Students began its deliberations in February 1975 as the second Senate Committee on Students, the first of which was appointed as a direct result of the Senate Resolution of April 5, 1972:

The University [Faculty] Senate, while commending the Administration for committing serious efforts to maximizing the educational opportunities of black students, is concerned lest the means chosen to carry out this commitment create undue risks of perpetuating racial divisions. The Senate notes that the proposed black residence center has been tentatively approved by the Administration as an experiment, for a one-year term, and that a thorough evaluation of its operation and prospects will be undertaken prior to consideration of any proposal for its extension. The Chairman is authorized and directed to request the Provost to appoint Senate representatives to the committee which will perform the evaluation. The Committee is further authorized and directed to appoint an ad hoc committee of the Senate, which shall have the following responsibilities: (a) to remain informed regarding the operation and effects of the proposed center; (b) to consider the overall questions of educational policy raised by it; (c) to report to the Senate, not later than March 1, 1973, with respect to the foregoing matters and any other related issues thought appropriate to be presented at that time. It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate representatives appointed to the Administration's evaluation committee be chosen from among the members of the ad hoc committee.

Almanac. V. 18, No. 31, April 11, 1972, p. 2

We reviewed the report of the Senate Committee on Students for 1972-73, we observed that that committee had elected to consider five living-learning programs, and we concluded that that committee had not met the charge of the Senate Resolution of April 5, 1972, as their statement below attests:

We are unanimously of the opinion that a systematic evaluation at this stage would be premature and we therefore restrict this report to a presentation of background information and remarks pertaining to the administration of the program.

(Report of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Students, April 1973, p. 1)

The report of the Senate Committee on Students for 1972-73 was accepted by the Senate Advisory Committee on April 2, 1973; it has yet to be presented to the Senate. The Senate failed to appoint a Committee on Students for 1973-74.

Our Committee chose to define its objective as follows:
The Senate Committee on Students will undertake to review and appraise the present status of the residentially-oriented W.E.B. DuBois House in the context of the relative success of similar programs within the University community, as mandated by the Senate Resolution of April 5, 1972.

We solicited background information from the office of the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the administrative body fiscally responsible for the operation of the residential learning programs. We were informed by that office of the existence of a resource that promised to make much of our inquiry unnecessary: the comprehensive report of the Provost's Committee to Evaluate Residential Learning Programs (the Boe Committee), apparently the second of the committees called for in the resolution of April 5, 1972. The Boe Report was submitted in October, 1973; no copy was on file in the office of the Faculty Senate.

Members of the Committee studied the report and wish to draw the Senate's attention to the summary evaluation of DuBois House that appears therein:

Because the Committee had more difficulty in securing cooperation of DuBois administration and students than any other project, it has less to go on in forming its impressions. There seems to be a high degree of "cohesion" among the students coupled with (and perhaps partly caused by) defensiveness. The latter condition is understandable in light of the circumstances surrounding the formation of DuBois and the public spotlight under which it has had to function. There is substantial opinion, both within and without the project, that the administration of DuBois has not been adequate to the task. In light of other assessments that have been made of DuBois and the Committee's very limited observations, deference is made to those who are in a position to make more informed judgments.

(Report of the Provost's Committee to Evaluate Residential Learning Programs, October 1973, p. 55)

We concluded that neither committee had met the objective of the Senate Resolution of April 5, 1972, and we began to identify objectives and establish procedures to pursue the mandate we had defined earlier.

The Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Humphrey Tonkin, convened a meeting on February 24, 1975, to consider the propriety of an evaluation of DuBois House by a Senate committee at this time: those attending included Howard Arnold, Faculty Master of DuBois House; Philip DeLacy, Senate Chairman; Robert Giegengack, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Students; Margo Marshall, Assistant Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies; Eliot Stellar, Provost; and Humphrey Tonkin. In the absence of agreement among the participants, Howard Arnold was invited to present his point of view to the Senate Advisory Committee on March 5, 1975. A revised mandate to the Senate Committee on Students emerged from that meeting:

1. To update the findings of the Boe Report in order to establish a uniform information base for
2. Establishing criteria and procedures for evaluating living-learning projects.
3. To carry out an evaluation of living-learning projects on the basis of these criteria and procedures.
4. To aim at a deadline of April, 1976, for submission of a report on their findings to the Senate Advisory Committee.

(Almanac, V. 21, No. 5, March 18, 1975, p. 2)

We regret that the office of the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies has felt the need to interfere with a legitimate Faculty inquiry into a matter clearly within the purview of the Faculty Senate, and we feel that the decision of the Senate Advisory Committee to modify our charge is clearly counter to the letter and the spirit of the Senate Resolution of April 5, 1972. Our opinion is that we are effectively blocked from pursuing the charge we had earlier defined; we are unwilling to undertake the broader task called for in the revised mandate because we feel that no committee could do justice to such a broad charge and still fulfill the requirements of the Senate Resolution of April 5, 1972, in the time allotted.

Thus, the Senate Committee on Students has unanimously agreed to resign, and to draw the attention of the Senate to the unfinished business represented by the charge of the Senate Resolution of April 5, 1972.

The Committee moves that the Senate charge the Committee on Students for 1975-76 with the specific responsibility to conduct an appraisal of DuBois House as directed by the Senate Resolution of April 5, 1972.

Robert Giegengack (Chairman)
Michael Cohen
Madeleine Jouille
Rochel Gelman
Ralph Amado (ex-officio)
Benjamin Hammond
Philip DeLacy (ex-officio)
Response to the Committee on Students

by Humphrey Tonkin

I hesitate to intervene to set the record straight in what appears to be a complaint by the Senate Committee on Students about the conduct of the Senate Advisory Committee, but the present report gives a very incomplete picture and the memories of its authors seem short.

The Senate resolution of April 1972 on the DuBois Program called for two committees: an evaluation committee to be appointed by the Provost and an ad hoc committee to be appointed by the Senate. In the fall of 1972, and in consultation and agreement with a helpful and understanding Senate leadership, we made two important decisions. First, we decided that it would be harmful to the campus as a whole and to the DuBois Program in particular to single out only DuBois for evaluation, when all the residential programs were in a developing stage and in need of close monitoring. Second, we concluded that any decision to terminate the DuBois Program would require time for implementation and hence that the program would have to have a two-year existence at the very least. These decisions were arrived at with the full concurrence of the Senate leadership—a concurrence reflected in the charge to the Committee on Students of 1972-73, which directed the committee to look not merely at the DuBois Program but at the other residential programs as well.

A word on the history of this committee seems necessary. The Senate leadership decided in the fall of 1972 to establish a committee structure. The committees were to be four in number, and to deal with each of four sectors of the University—students, education, administration, and faculty. Initially these committees were called ad hoc committees because they had not yet received the formal endorsement of the Senate as a whole. They are now standing committees. The first task given to the Committee on Students was a study of residential programs. (Indeed, it is unfortunately the only task that that committee has ever had.)

The ad hoc Committee on Students distributed its report to the Senate in April 1973. It was not a perfect report (what report ever is?) but it was a good attempt to come to grips with some of the issues. The Senate never gave it formal consideration, for whatever reason. Our office produced at about the same time a document entitled "Questions and Answers on Residential Programs" whose purpose was to clarify and explain the details of the college house system and assist the University community in understanding the report of the Committee on Students (Almanac March 13, 1973).

The Senate committee's report itself was less an evaluation than an attempt to provide some information on the college house system. The present committee, quite rightly, points this out. It does so, however, in a misquotation which casts doubt on the understanding of the present committee about the work of its predecessor. By changing the word "programs" to the word "program" it conveys the impression that the earlier committee had somehow specifically excepted the DuBois Program from full evaluation. In fact, the earlier committee's statement referred to all the programs, not simply to DuBois. The present committee has misread it.

While the ad hoc Committee on Students was doing its work, a larger, more comprehensive review of all residential programs was underway, led by Professor Erling Boe and a committee appointed by the Provost. This was the first of the two committees referred to in the Senate resolution. Its massive 136-page report was presented in October 1973. The report deals relatively extensively with the DuBois Program, by inference in its general discussion of residential programs, and specifically on pages 30-31 and 55, and in Appendix B (pp. 66-73). This helpful report was taken extremely seriously by the administration and the vast majority of its recommendations were carried out. In accordance with the Senate resolution, the Boe Committee included members of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Students. Hence this evaluation was carried out with full involvement by the Senate.

It has always been the policy of our office to treat the various residential programs in an even-handed manner as possible. We do not single out particular programs for special investigation, nor do we discriminate among programs in the application of policy decisions. This principle has proved a sound one: the programs work well with one another, their Masters know that they can count on our support, and they are willing to assist us in strengthening and improving our administrative procedures. We have made much progress in this area. The DuBois Program, for example, now has its own faculty master and strong administrative leadership.

When the 1974-75 Committee on Students announced its intention to single out the DuBois Program for special study, we felt we were on firm ground in requesting that this study not take place, at least not in isolation. Our request received a sympathetic response from the Senate leadership, especially when we reminded them of the earlier decision of 1972 to look at all of the programs and not just DuBois. We met to discuss the matter further. This meeting is alluded to in the present report. It was not a meeting characterized by "absence of agreement." Indeed, the agreement was rather clear—that Professor Howard Arnold, Master of DuBois, present his point of view to the Senate Advisory Committee. The SAC, responsive to Professor Arnold's expressions of concern, changed the mandate of the Committee on Students.

One matter continued to bother us. The report of the ad hoc committee of April, 1973, had never been accepted, or even discussed, by the Senate. It seemed curious to subject the residential programs to a further investigation before the first one had been acted upon. We pointed this out to the Senate leadership. Their response apparently was to accept on April 2, 1975, the report presented in April, 1973.

From that date until the date of the recent Senate meeting I heard nothing from the present Committee on Students, nor did they so much as suggest that their report would include so clear a censure of my alleged conduct (for I accept full responsibility for my office). I am still at a loss to explain it. "Interference" is a strong term. If my conduct constituted "interference" then the Senate is in a sorry state indeed—a state in which a request by an administrator sends a committee into such a tangle that it has no choice but to ditch itself in the nearest Slough of Despond. From my own time as a member of the Senate Advisory Committee I know that the SAC has a lively sense of its own prerogatives, and that, on the whole, it exercises them with restraint and good sense. It was just such good sense that I encountered from the Senate leadership this year. The fact that the SAC understood Professor Arnold's point of view and our own seems to have produced in the Committee on Students a condition bordering on hysteria. Perhaps next year's committee, furnished with the SAC's new mandate, will perform a valuable service for us all, by doing its homework carefully and by coming up with a constructive and helpful report. The present report qualifies on none of these grounds.

Dr. Tonkin is Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies.
RESPONSE ON ECONOMIC STATUS

The recent report (Almanac, April 15, 1975, pp. 4-6) from the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty presented a thoughtful analysis of the short-term and the long-term prospects for faculty raises, and made some very sensible suggestions for dealing more effectively with the latter. However, I am disturbed that the annual debate on uniform vs. discretionary raises in salary focuses attention on changes in salary rather than on total salary, as if equitable raises could be determined in the absence of an equitable long-range policy for the distribution of total salaries. Indeed, without some policy for distribution of total salaries, any discussion of equitable raises must occur in a vacuum.

Any salary policy must be readily applied, readily tested, and reasonably equitable. A policy of uniform increases is easily the best approach to the first two criteria, but fails rather miserably at the last, since it magnifies inequities which exist in the base salary structure. It is preferable to look for a more equitable salary policy, and assume we are sophisticated enough to deal with any extra calculation complications which result.

One basis for developing a more equitable model may be found by examining the career of a "typical" faculty member. After joining the University the faculty member becomes more productive and valuable to the University. However, the rate of increase in productivity becomes slower as the faculty member matures. Eventually, the faculty member's contributions reach a plateau, and may even decline. If the salary structure is to reflect the value of the individual to the University, the salary difference between any two faculty members who joined the University at different times should decrease and eventually disappear as time goes by. This argument is completely independent of inflation or of the size of the pool of funds for raises. Uniform percentage increases, which are regularly recommended by committees of senior faculty (who benefit most from such funds for raises. Uniform percentage increases, which are regularly recommended by committees of senior faculty (who benefit most from such a policy), clearly work in the opposite direction.

A number of salary formulae can be developed to reflect the leveling in productivity which comes with age. These range from a simple linear increase with time which levels out abruptly at some preset age to more complicated mathematical expressions which reach a level salary asymptotically and contain variables reflecting age, rank, length of service at the University, and other parameters. The particular formula to be used is much less important than that some equitable formula be developed.

There should of course be a place in the University salary structure for recognition of merit. However, since merit (or lack thereof) is exceedingly difficult to quantify, it should be used with extreme caution. Indeed, the use of the word has been excessively strained by the administration's continued insistence in referring to what are, in fact, discretionary raises to the entire University staff as "merit" raises. Exceptions to the overall salary policy, for merit or other reasons, should be limited to a few percent of the faculty. Such exceptions should be publicly announced by Chairmen and subject to review by a committee with faculty representation.

In summary, I would like to make the following specific suggestions for the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty:

1. An equitable long-range formula for faculty salaries should be developed and publicized.
2. Senate recommendations to the administration for salary increases should place first priority on achieving the levels specified in that formula.
3. The Senate should recommend to the administration that exceptions to the formula for merit should be restricted to a few percent of the faculty, and that these exceptions be publicly announced.

Alice F. Emerson  
Peggi Sanday  
Ann Beuf  
Janice Madden  
Alice F. Emerson  
Peggi Sanday  
Lucienne Frapier-Mazur  
Carroll Smith-Rosenberg  
Madeleine Joullie  
Carol Tracy

RESPONSE ON ALMANAC GUIDELINES

We would like to respond to the report of the Senate Advisory Committee's ad hoc Committee on Publication Policy which appeared in the April 15th issue of the Almanac. In the opening paragraph the report states in part that "Almanac is dedicated to and edited primarily for the faculty and staff." The rest of the report belies the Almanac's dual constituency and makes it quite clear that the ad hoc Committee, and because of its approval of the report the Senate Advisory Committee, believes that the Almanac is a publication of the Faculty Senate.

It seems to us that, if the Almanac is an all-University publication edited primarily for faculty and staff, it should not be under the exclusive guidance of the Senate, Senate Advisory Committee, or SAC Ad Hoc Committee on Publication Policy, as this "Guide" implies. There should rather be a policy committee on which the SAC is fully represented, as well as the Administrative, Library, and A-3 Assemblies.

Similarly, we are not so vain as to argue that messages from the chairmen of those assemblies would have as high a priority as messages from the Chairman of the Faculty Senate, but we may suggest they surely ought to have some priority.

In the same vein, we doubt that it is appropriate for the sole appeal route to be the Senate Advisory Committee. For faculty that would be entirely appropriate, but for staff a more widely representative committee is clearly needed. It could be a Council committee, provided it includes A-1 and A-3 representation.

—George Kidd Jr., Past Chairman, and Douglas B. Dickson, Chairman-Elect, of the Administrative Assembly

RESPONSE TO PURCHASING NEWSLETTER

Some of our members have noted with interest and anger the abbreviated and one-sided summary of Peter Holmes' HEW memorandum which appeared in the Purchasing Department's newsletter 218 dated February 21, 1975.

The statement that "Bias for or against any category of persons is unacceptable" is a dangerous oversimplification. The Holmes memorandum properly stresses that employers are not to take the cheap and easy way out of interviewing the oversupply of white and male applicants by giving them an "Affirmative Action Brush-Off" in advance (i.e., refusing even to consider them). But the memo states quite precisely that "voluntary affirmative action is permitted (underlines Holmes)" under both Title VI and Title IX...to overcome the effects of conditions which resulted in limiting participation by persons of a particular race, color, national origin or sex." The Holmes memo goes on: "It should be noted that where there has been a specific finding of discrimination under the Executive Order, Title VI, or Title IX, specific remedial or corrective action is required."

What is at least as disturbing is the contrary, the Purchasing Office's summary is the very fact that personnel policy is being transmitted in a newsletter ostensibly devoted to purchasing. While it is appropriate for that newsletter to discuss the Philadelphia Plan, which deals with contractors, it is extremely underhanded for anyone in the University to begin to promote a counter-Affirmative Action policy in a purchasing newsletter. This newsletter is distributed, we understand, primarily to business administrators and administrative assistants who do a great deal of hiring in the A-3 category where affirmative action for black women has so recently begun to be understood and accepted.

If the University wishes to convey the sense of the Holmes memorandum, whether correctly or in the biased interpretation given in the Purchasing newsletter, it should do so in open media where it can be debated, and if necessary, challenged by those who prefer a more affirmative Affirmative Action procedure here.

We call for appropriate action to be taken to correct the biased version of the Holmes memo published in the newsletter and to ensure that more suitable media are chosen for the transmission of hiring policies in the future.

—Carol E. Tracy, President, Women for Equal Opportunity at the University of Pennsylvania

LUNCHEON FOR MOSCOW EMIGRE

The Philadelphia Academic Committee for Soviet Jewry is sponsoring a luncheon in honor of experimental physicist Dr. Alexander Voronel, May 1 at noon in the University Museum. To attend: Dr. Barry Eichler, Ext. 7466 or Ellen Prince, Ext. 8183.
A College watched the birth of a Nation; a University celebrates its Bicentennial

The delegates to the Continental Congress passed a busy morning in Independence Hall enacting legislation to cease export to Canada, most of Georgia and the Floridas, and to forbid provision of the British coastal fisheries. Then, "agreeable to an invitation previously given them," they walked to Fourth and Arch and, as Virginia Delegate George Washington noted in his diary "Went to the Commencement at the College."

It was the custom of the day for each baccalaureate candidate to speak at the Exercises, and though three of the young men chose topics* that "did not admit of any reference to our present state of affairs," the rest rang with those variations on the theme of freedom that colonists more and more wanted to hear.

And that's the way it was on May 17, 1775, at the Commencement of what is now the University of Pennsylvania.

Archivist Francis James Dallett's essay in the 1975 Commencement Program will tell in greater detail what the young men said, how the Continental Congress itself was something approaching an alumni club of the College, and how students and alumni, professors and Trustees all went forward into the Revolution that is commemorated now.

That 1775 Commencement was the first of six occasions in which the Virginia Delegate was Penn's guest, and the first of a long line of celebrations where other Presidents came to speak or be honored. In 1975, President Gerald Ford will become the first President to do both while in office. He will give the Commencement address at the 2 p.m. ceremony at Franklin Field, (it being large enough so that as in 1775 Penn may seat "as many of the respectable inhabitants of the city [can] find room"). He joins a host of honorees whose offices make it uniquely appropriate to honor them in this occasion: the presidents of seven American and eight British universities that were in existence when this nation was founded.

Looking backward to the Presidents that have visited the University:

President Harry S. Truman spoke at a Kennedy-for-President rally in Irvine Auditorium in October, 1960.

John F. Kennedy gave a lecture at the University in 1956 prior to his term as President. General Dwight D. Eisenhower received an honorary LL.D. degree at the University's 1947 Commencement. While President, Franklin D. Roosevelt received an honorary LL.D. degree and spoke at the celebration (September 20, 1940) of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the University. President Herbert Hoover received an honorary D.C.L. degree at the University's bicentennial on September 21, 1940 and had addressed the University earlier in the week. President Hoover received an honorary LL.D. degree at the 1917 University Day program (an annual occasion that from 1826 to 1933 honored Washington's birthday). President Theodore Roosevelt received an honorary LL.D. degree and spoke at the 1905 University Day program.

Woodrow Wilson received an honorary LL.D. degree in 1903 at the University Day program prior to his term as President. President William Howard Taft attended two: while President-elect, he spoke at the 1909 program, and had received an honorary LL.D. degree at the 1902 University Day program. President William McKinley spoke at University Day in 1898 (see Harper's cover above). While President-elect, James A. Garfield received an honorary LL.D. degree on University Day in 1881.

A visitor to the Archives can see texts of the many Presidents' addresses and of the tributes that accompanied the honors conferred upon them. But one from 1905 stands out on the eve of the Bicentennial:

Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States: On the Fourth of July, 1873, the University of Pennsylvania conferred the degree of Doctor of Laws upon the first President of the United States.

The Trustees of the same University do now, after one hundred and twenty-two years, once again request the Provost to honor with the same degree our latest President. This makes all other comment needless.

*Mr. Ridgeley's Latin Salutary Oration, de Amicitia: Mr. Mifflin's On Politeness and Mr. Brown's On the Education of young Ladies.
DEATHS

Barry Lee Adler (February 10 at 22), a student in the College since 1971.

Dr. W. Norman Brown (April 22 at 82), professor of Sanskrit here from 1926 until his retirement in 1966. The leading Indian scholar served for nineteen years as the first chairman of the University’s South Asia regional studies department, the first department of an American university devoted exclusively to study of the subcontinent. The award-winning author of thirteen books and member of numerous scholarly organizations, he organized and became the first president of the American Institute of Indian Studies in 1961.

Dr. Theodore Hornberger (March 14 at 69), John Welsh Centennial Emeritus Professor of History and English Literature from 1968 until his retirement in 1974. The author of several books on American literature, the University of Michigan alumnus and former Guggenheim fellow came to Penn as professor of English in 1960 after serving for fourteen years on the faculty at the University of Minnesota.

Dr. George S. Koyl (March 14 at 90), dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts from 1932-1950. The recipient of an honorary doctor of fine arts degree from the University, the Penn alumnus had been emeritus professor of architecture since his retirement in 1955.

Howard A. Mazur (March 19 at 21), who entered the School of Dental Medicine in 1974.

HONORS

The American Association of Anatomists has presented the Henry Gray Award to Dr. Oscar V. Baison, professor emeritus of anatomy, for his “scholastic accomplishment in original investigation, teaching and writing in the field of anatomy.”

Alfred F. Beers, assistant vice-president for health affairs for finance, has been appointed director of Federated Medical Resources, a cooperative program sponsored by Philadelphia medical schools and hospitals to provide a wide variety of animal species for biomedical research.

Dr. William T. Fitts Jr., professor of surgery, has been appointed a member of the Pennsylvania State Advisory Committee serving the Board of Regents of the American College of Surgeons.

The Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation has presented a Faculty Scholar Award to Dr. Arnold S. Reiman, professor of medicine. The award program, designed to promote creative scholarship and international exchange in the medical sciences, will enable Dr. Reiman to take a sabbatical leave at Oxford next year.

GRANTS

A Summary of Contracts and Grants for Research and Related Activities Received by Faculty Members During February 1975.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION: D. White (Chem.) “Rotational Ordering in Solid Molecular Hydrocarbons” $30,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE: L. Klein (Econ.) “Link Econometric Model Tape in Fortran” $7,500.


NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION: J. Friel (Geol.) “Micropore and Oxygen Fugacity Study of Armacolite” $8,255.


FULBRIGHT-HAYS DEADLINE: JULY 1

The Council for International Exchange of Scholars is accepting applications for senior Fulbright-Hays awards for lecturerships and advanced research in over seventy-five countries during 1976-77. Applicants must be U.S. citizens. Other requirements include college or university teaching experience for lecturerships; a doctorate or, in some fields, recognized professional standing as demonstrated by faculty rank, publications, etc. for research awards. Advanced doctoral candidates are eligible for some awards. An information booklet is available from the Council, 2101 Constitution Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418; also, it may be consulted at Penn’s Office of Fellowship Information and Study Programs Abroad, 3537 Locust Walk, Ext. 8348.
ANIMAL CARE POLICY

The Federal Animal Welfare Act of 1970 (P.L. 89-544 as amended P.L. 91-579) regulates the care, handling, and treatment of animals used in research. Additional requirements are placed upon research institutions using Federal monies; these are enumerated in the DHEW Publication No. (NIH) 73-23. Certain specific areas of activities must be reviewed and approved by the University Animal Care Committee if funding is requested via grants or contracts.

Approval of all protocols for animal experimentation should be obtained from the University veterinarian and/or University Animal Care Committee. Research will encompass housing, exercise, surgical procedures, veterinary care, budget adequacy, species use, etc. In the case of the use of primates, additional justification for the selection of the animal model will be required by the committee. Approval may be obtained prior to the submission of the grant or contract proposal to the agency; however, all approvals must be obtained before the research is initiated. One of the following statements should become a portion of anygrant or contract request.

In the case of prior approval:

This research proposal has been reviewed and approved by the University Animal Care Committee, one of whom is a veterinarian. The committee certifies that the proposal and facilities to be used meet or exceed the requirements of P.L. 89-544 and P.L. 91-579 and DHEW Publication No. (NIH) 73-23, Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. The review has taken into consideration the humane aspects of animal experimentation as well as the proper use of anesthetics, analgesics, and tranquilizers.

In the case of submissions pending approval:

This research proposal has been submitted for review to the University Animal Care Committee, one of whom is a veterinarian. The committee will review the proposal for compliance with P.L. 89-544, P.L. 91-579 and DHEW Publication No. (NIH) 73-23, Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. The review will consider humane aspects of animal experimentation as well as the proper use of anesthetics, analgesics, and tranquilizers. The proposed research will not be initiated until such approval is obtained.

In order to implement the review process you should contact the University veterinarian or the Medical School veterinarian at the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine, Room 79, Medical Labs Bldg., Telephone 243-6468.

In instances where a project site visit is anticipated, please arrange to have a veterinarian present to answer those questions regarding animal sources, care, housing, and available facilities.

Thomas W. Langfitt, M.D.
Vice-President for Health Affairs


OFFICE OF EDUCATION/DHEW: H. Tonkin (Office of the Provost) “Student Learning and Management of Instruction” $246,495.


Private Foundations, Research Organizations and Associations and Industry:

Carnegie Corporation of New York: H. Tonkin (Office of the Provost) “Regional Seminars on Undergraduate Education in the Delaware Valley” $12,700.


Wallingford-Swarthmore School District: P. Kufilloff (Ed. Sch.) “Psychological Services Fund” $7,000.

Summary: Contract and Grant Awards July 1974 through February 1975: $5,14, totaling $36,380,351.

A Summary of Contracts and Grants for Research and Related Activities Received by Faculty Members during March 1975.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: M. Cotton & S. Broth (Insr.) “Preparatory Course for Agency Board Members” $19,974.


Requirements for Animal Cages

It has come to my attention, as the individual responsible for animal care at the University, through the University veterinarian, that in the past there have been several problems, some with serious financial implications, involving the purchase of animal cages. As you know, the Federal Government has effected rather strict regulations concerning cage sizes and types of construction for laboratory animals used for both teaching and research purposes. These regulations must be strictly adhered to; otherwise, we could jeopardize our entire research efforts if, upon inspection, we are found not to be in compliance. Accordingly, effective immediately, the following protocol will apply with regard to the processing of all purchase requisitions for animal cages:

1. After obtaining the required number of bids, if applicable, the purchase requisition, with bids attached, must be signed by the University veterinarian, Dr. Stanley Wampler, or his assistant, Dr. LeRoy Erickson, before it is forwarded to the University purchasing department. It is suggested that the requisition be either hand carried or mailed to Dr. Wampler, care of the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine, School of Medicine, Room 79, Med. Labs, G-3.

2. If, upon examination of the data, the University veterinarian deems the cages requisitioned to be in compliance with current regulations, he will approve the requisition and forward it to the purchasing department for processing. If the University veterinarian does not believe the cages requested to be in compliance, he will immediately contact the principal investigator to outline the deficiency and make recommendations concerning the proper cages to be purchased. Issues which cannot be settled between the University veterinarian and the principal investigator will be referred to the University Animal Care Committee for resolution. When the deficiency is resolved, the University veterinarian will forward the requisition to the purchasing department for processing. It is suggested that, in order to expedite the purchasing process for cages, principal investigators review their caging requirements with the University veterinarian prior to securing bids. Additionally, requisitions should not be submitted to the purchasing department without prior approval, since this too will only serve to delay the process.

Your cooperation in complying with this requirement will be appreciated.

—Thomas W. Langfitt, M.D.
Vice-President for Health Affairs
MEDICAL SECRETARY (3) (2/18/75).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III to test pulmonary function using spirometry, lung volumes, etc.; analyze blood gases and pH; and assist with fiberoptic bronchoscopies. Qualifications: Science degree and/or experience in respiratory techniques; ability to work with patients and deal with machines. $7,900-$9,450-$11,000.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III to perform advanced analytical procedures for the study of sugar and electrolyte transport in suspensions of isolated cells. Qualifications: B.S. or M.S., preferably in biochemistry, lab experience in analytical and preparative methods. $7,900-$9,450-$11,000.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III to prepare sterile media, maintain tissue cultures, and perform analytical procedures and enzyme assays. Qualifications: B.S., experience in sterile techniques, tissue culture, and spectrophotometric and radioactive assays. $7,900-$9,450-$11,000.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III to respond to inquiries, make appointments, and maintain schedules and files. Qualifications: At least four years' experience, preferably at Penn; excellent typing skills; ability to deal with people and maintain confidentiality. $7,050-$8,600-$10,150.

TECHNICAL SECRETARY, legal, to respond to inquiries, make appointments, and maintain schedules and files. Qualifications: Three years' experience in law office; experience in preparing legal manuscripts; excellent typing and shorthand skills; knowledge of legal terminology. $7,700.

HOURLY RATE (A-4)

ANIMAL LABORATORY TECHNICIAN, Bockus Research Institute, 4 hrs. day, weekend, to feed and water animals and clean cages. Qualifications: Reliability.

DENTAL HYGIENIST, Penn Urban Health, 2 days/ wk (4/15/75).

RECREATION INSTRUCTOR, women's unarmed self defense (4/8/75).

SECRETARY II, psychiatry, 20 hrs/ wk (4/15/75).

HOURS TO MOVE A PIANO

Kids all grown up and nobody lifts the lid on your piano except to dust the keys? Moving to a city apartment and finding you must choose between your dining table and the baby grand?

The President and Provost are looking for pianos, to place in campus locations for the use of University members. Penn will take care of moving for you, and donations are tax deductible (but check IRS for details—remember Mr. Nixon's letters!). If you or someone you know has a piano to offer, contact Michael Neiditch, assistant to the Provost, at 102 College Hall, Ext. 6888.

FROM WEST PHILLY TO VALLEY FORGE

Economy, convenience—and education—are available to Penn suburban students who sign up for any of the eight summer courses to be broadcast live from the West Philadelphia campus to the University's Valley Forge Research and Education Center.

Students needn't trade the commuter blues for isolation; "talkback" microphones will link the Center with the Moore School studios, enabling faculty and students in both locations to participate in discussion. A daily courser service will shuttle syllabi, assignments and tests, and a "core" library will be at Valley Forge.

Classes offered are as diverse as Russian History in the Soviet Period; Astronomy 4, The Universe; and Major American Writers Since 1900. For a complete course roster with times and instructors: Summer Sessions, Ext. 7327.

THINGS TO DO

LECTURES

The Wharton accounting seminars continue with Dr. Alfred Rappaport, professor of accounting and information systems at Northwestern, April 30, 3 p.m. in 285 McNeil.

Inside Neutron Stars. Professor David Pines of the University of Illinois delivers a Mary Amanda Wood Lecture, May 2, 4 p.m. in Auditorium A-2 of Rittenhouse Lab. Sponsored by the physics department.

Dr. H. Tristram Engelhardt, M.D. of the University of Texas' Institute for the Medical Humanities discusses Illness and Well-being: Some Philosophical Issues. May 2, 8 p.m. in HUP's Alumni Hall. Sponsored by area medical schools and the Health Care and Human Values Task Force.

FILMS

There won't be limousines, stars or spotlights, but the first-night jitters will rival those of any Hollywood director's at the world premiere of films produced by Annenberg School students, April 30, 4 and 7 p.m. The Screenings are free (and usually crowded) at the Annenberg Center, Ext. 6791.

What do Ida Lupino, Margaret Mead, Yvonne Rainer and Susan Sontag have in common? Each one is—among other things—a filmmaker whose work is screened during the Fourth International Festival of Films by Women. Programmed and directed by its founder Alexandra Grillikhes, the Festival runs every Friday and Saturday, May 2-31 at 7:30 p.m. in the Annenberg School Auditorium. Films span forty-eight years, nine countries and on May 2 include Christopher Strong (Dorothy Arzner); Rhythm in Light: Synchron 62; Abstronics (Mary Ellen Bute); Emerging
THINGS TO DO continued

**Woman (Women's Film Project); Circles I. Rocking Orange, Moongates (Doris Chace); Enigma, Googolplex, Metathesis (Lillian Schwartz).** May 3 highlights: Dorothy Arzner's *Nana* and three films each by Maya Deren and Lizzy Felsen.* You report IN TIME. To announce an event, make sure we receive information by the Tuesday before the Tuesday you want it published. Thanks — F. W.

**Mixed Bag**

With a friendly nod to Mircea Eliade, the Graduate School of Fine Arts and the ICA have subtitled their Beaux Arts Ball "The Sacred and the Profane." Attire is black tie or costumes "from the sublime to the ridiculous" for the May 3 gala at Franklin Institute that benefits the Peale House, 1811 Chestnut.

Asst Prof English, 309 Be H—326 S 19th 19103 *119 Be H/D1
Asst Prof English, 309 Be H—326 S 19th 19103 *119 Be H/D1

**LOOK WHAT YOU MISSED**

During the last few weeks you might have missed
- A Concrete Canoe Race: crews from Penn, Princeton and twenty-one other colleges paddled down the Schuylkill in...you guessed it.
- The Scriabin Happening: pianist Edith Finton Rieber's performance of the Russian composer's works complete with a sound and light show he conceived.
- Alternative Personal Lifestyles for Today's Professional Woman: a day of workshops and panels with ten business and professional women who discussed the problems of combining careers and family life.

Sound interesting? *Almanac* thought so, and would have tried to announce the events if we'd received information in time.

But we didn't. During the next two weeks, many campus groups will be scheduling end-of-the-semester events. *Almanac* will announce as many as space permits, but we can only publish what you report IN TIME. To announce an event, make sure we receive information by the Tuesday before the Tuesday you want it published. Thanks. — J.W.

**SUPPLEMENT TO FACULTY-STAFF DIRECTORY (4)**

Changes in listings and additions to the Faculty-Staff Directory are carried periodically in *Almanac.*

To report a correction or addition, contact Mrs. Ruth Iskoe at the Telephone Service, Ext. 8664.

**THINGS TO DO continued**

*Woman (Women's Film Project); Circles I. Rocking Orange, Moongates (Doris Chace); Enigma, Googolplex, Metathesis (Lillian Schwartz).* May 3 highlights: Dorothy Arzner’s *Nana* and three films each by Maya Deren and Lizzy Felsen. Tickets at $1 are available one hour before show time. For a complete program: Ext. 7020.

**MIXED BAG**

With a friendly nod to Mircea Eliade, the Graduate School of Fine Arts and the ICA have subtitled their Beaux Arts Ball "The Sacred and the Profane." Attire is black tie or costumes "from the sublime to the ridiculous" for the May 3 gala at Franklin Institute that benefits the Peale House, 1811 Chestnut.

Asst Prof Johnson Fdn, D-601 BB/G5—3650 Chestnut 19104
Asst Prof Johnson Fdn, B-501 Rich/G—280 S Ivan Av, St Davids 19087
Asst Prof Mgt, W-154 DH/CC

**LOOK WHAT YOU MISSED**

During the last few weeks you might have missed
- A Concrete Canoe Race: crews from Penn, Princeton and twenty-one other colleges paddled down the Schuylkill in...you guessed it.
- The Scriabin Happening: pianist Edith Finton Rieber’s performance of the Russian composer’s works complete with a sound and light show he conceived.
- Alternative Personal Lifestyles for Today’s Professional Woman: a day of workshops and panels with ten business and professional women who discussed the problems of combining careers and family life.

Sound interesting? *Almanac* thought so, and would have tried to announce the events if we’d received information in time.

But we didn’t. During the next two weeks, many campus groups will be scheduling end-of-the-semester events. *Almanac* will announce as many as space permits, but we can only publish what you report IN TIME. To announce an event, make sure we receive information by the Tuesday before the Tuesday you want it published. Thanks. — J.W.

**ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274**

Editor: Karen C. Gaines
Assistant Editor: Jane Wilson
Distribution: Dana Cummin