COMMENCEMENT: CIVIC CENTER

The following memorandum was sent by the Secretary of the Corporation on May 6 to the graduating seniors of the University:

As you may have heard by this time, it has become necessary to move the 1975 Commencement to Convention Hall as originally planned. This decision was made at the request of the staff of the White House following a site visit on Monday to Franklin Field and Convention Hall. It was made in preparation for President Ford's participation in the ceremonies. It should be apparent that several factors, not the least of all security, entered into their recommendation. In the light of our country's tragic experience in protecting its national leaders, we could not but comply with the request.

We share your disappointment in having to reinstitute a limitation on the distribution of tickets for Convention Hall. However, there will be closed circuit television available in an adjoining “Auditorium B” and sound-only can be heard in Irvine Auditorium. Tickets will not be required in either location. We have been told by the White House that President Ford will greet those assembled in “Auditorium B” at the close of the ceremonies.

I can assure you that 10,000 of the 11,000 seats in Convention Hall will be allocated to students and their families. The balance will be rationed carefully to University-related persons, e.g., faculty, trustees, staff, and members of governmental bodies. There will be no distribution to the general public. In essence, we continue to look upon commencement as being primarily for graduating students and their parents and spouses. We shall do everything possible to make it an enjoyable experience.

The exercises will begin at about 2 p.m. Those marching in the student procession should assemble in the basement of Convention Hall by 1 p.m. Please refer to the complete set of instructions distributed to you several weeks ago.

Please know that we acted in good faith, in concert with President Steve Greeley, in responding to the apparent demand for tickets to this year’s Commencement and were well advanced with our plans for the use of Franklin Field. Until the recent site visit by the White House staff, the possibility of further change was not in our plans for the use of Franklin Field. Until the recent site visit, it was expected that President Ford would greet those assembled in “Auditorium B” at the close of the ceremonies.

I can assure you that 10,000 of the 11,000 seats in Convention Hall will be allocated to students and their families. The balance will be rationed carefully to University-related persons, e.g., faculty, trustees, staff, and members of governmental bodies. There will be no distribution to the general public. In essence, we continue to look upon commencement as being primarily for graduating students and their parents and spouses. We shall do everything possible to make it an enjoyable experience.

The exercises will begin at about 2 p.m. Those marching in the student procession should assemble in the basement of Convention Hall by 1 p.m. Please refer to the complete set of instructions distributed to you several weeks ago.

BACCALAUREATE: IRVINE

The traditional Baccalaureate service of the University will be held Sunday, May 18, at 10:30 a.m. in Irvine Auditorium. Sir Hugh Robson, principal and vice-chancellor of the University of Edinburgh, will speak to the graduating seniors, their families, and guests.

NO MEALS ON UNIVERSITY BUDGETS

May 5, 1975

Effective immediately, no University controlled budgets are to be charged for meals of University employees in the Philadelphia area. The only permissible exceptions to this general policy will involve business occasions that include University guests in the course of University business. —Jon Strauss, Executive Director, Budget

CONTINUING ED: DONALD STEWART

Dr. Donald M. Stewart, who chaired the recent task force refining proposals for restructure of continuing education at Penn, has been named Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences for Continuing Education and Counsellor to the Provost—the joint title reflecting changes in structure which are detailed on page 5.

Change the academic calendar and cut down on our energy costs?...see page 3

UPDATE: ANNENBERG

Philadelphia newspapers have carried extensive coverage of Dean George Gerbner's letter to President Meyerson indicating that he will withdraw from leadership of the Annenberg Center (but not from the deanship of the Annenberg School). In the President's absence, Provost Eliot Stellar said he hopes that when he and the President talk to Dr. Gerbner early this week they may be able to persuade him to continue in his present role.

Dean Gerbner said: "I will assist with any plan for the Center's direction. This does not affect the Center for next year; it has to do with long-range direction. It is unfortunate that what was meant to be an internal matter has become a public one."

DEATH OF DR. MUDD

Memorial services for the late Dr. Stuart Mudd were being arranged as Almanac went to press; information should be available today at the microbiology department (Med.). Ext. 8011.

COUNCIL AND YEAR'S END

At its meeting on May 14, Council will consider a resolution to continue the Wharton B.B.A. degree.

Almanac's last weekly issue date is probably May 20, funds being reserved to produce an issue after the Trustees meet June 5-6.
GUIDELINES ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Question has arisen as to whether time spent on leave of absence is part of the probationary period for tenure-probationary faculty. The Handbook for Faculty and Administration, 1969 edition, page 35, states, "In the event of a leave of absence wholly or partly for academic teaching or research during the probationary period the states. "In the event of a leave of absence wholly or partly for tenure-probationary faculty.

In practice, the Provost, with the advice of the Provost's Staff Conference, has interpreted this regulation to mean that the time spent upon leave of absence will count toward the probationary period unless there is explicit agreement prior to the leave that the leave shall be excluded. I would like to reconfirm this interpretation as the current policy of this administration. This interpretation is fully consistent with that enunciated in the AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, 1973 edition, page 83, which states that "For a non-tenured faculty member on scholarly leave for one year or less, the period of leave should count as part of the probationary period. Exceptions to this policy should be mutually agreed to in writing prior to the leave."

Where a leave is likely to extend for more than one year, or where there are extraordinary circumstances which might justify a departure from this policy, I would be willing to consider an exception to this stated policy.

Medical leaves, however, I believe are a different matter. When a non-tenured faculty member is incapacitated for most or all of an academic year, I believe that exclusion of that year from the probationary period will generally be quite appropriate. Further, since the seriousness of the illness is not always possible to determine in advance, I am willing to consider approval of such medical leaves after the event of the leave and time can be properly assessed. Medical evidence of the severity of the illness, including statements from attending physicians, will in all cases be required for approval of the leave. In case of extended illness, a second year of leave can sometimes be approved.

These guidelines have been discussed with Professor Henry Hiz and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, who join in my endorsement and promulgation of these guidelines.

Elliot Stellar, Provost

TEN-YEAR TENURE OPTION: A CLARIFICATION
Open to clinical faculty only.

There has been some general confusion about the firmness of our policy regarding election to the ten-year tenure option. As a result of the policy, some faculty members have requested that they be moved from the seven-year tenure period to the ten-year tenure period during this academic year. Such a request is contrary to the policy approved last year in the statement, "The change to the ten-year probationary period...must be requested not later than June 15, 1974."

Since there is a possibility, however, that the publicity surrounding the implementation of the ten-year tenure choice was not understood by all, I am extending the grace period for application for the ten-year option to June 15, 1975. After July 1, 1975, no person who was a member of the faculty during the academic year ending June 30, 1974, will be permitted to elect to change his tenure period unless he requests the change by June 15, 1975. SAC believes this change satisfies the spirit of the April 1972 Senate resolution (Almanac, April 11, 1972).

LETTERS

ON COMMITTEE ON STUDENTS

The Senate will have to decide in the fall whether it intends to carry out the resolution of April 5, 1972 (text in Almanac, April 29, 1975), or whether that resolution is now to be considered inoperative. The Committee on Students, whose report and resignation was published in Almanac, April 29, 1975, has ceased to meet. As two individuals who were members of that Committee, we wish to respond to Vice-Provost Tonkin's remarks (Almanac, April 29, 1975).

Vice-Provost Tonkin still adheres to the fiction, as did Margo Marshall in her appearance before our Committee, that the massive 136-page report of the Bof Committee (Provost's Committee to Evaluate Residential Living Programs) contains extensive information about the DuBois Program. Ms. Marshall told us that we could find the answers to many of our questions merely by reading the Bof report — which we had to do. Dr. Tonkin refers to the information contained on pp. 30-31, p. 55, and Appendix B (pp. 66-73) of the report. The summary evaluation of DuBois on p. 55, in which the Provost's Committee states that it had difficulty obtaining information and was therefore not in a position to make an informed judgment, is contained in Almanac (April 29, 1975). The paragraph on pp. 30-31 simply lists the activities of DuBois House, with no pretext of evaluation. Appendix B consists of the answers given by resident supervisors of the various living units, in response to a questionnaire prepared by the Bof Committee. The questionnaire returned by DuBois House left many of the questions unanswered; all of the questions requiring written answers were returned with blanks in the space provided for answers. The unanswered questions included the following (pages 72-73):

"VII. Describe (as explicitly as possible) the governing or decision-making structure of the house.

VIII. Describe the student and staff selection policies of the house.

IX. Describe the counseling operation of the house.

1. Orientation activities for new students and freshmen.

2. Formal, informative programs (sex counseling, vocational counseling, academic counseling, etc.).

3. Staff coordinator's role and counseling. For example, are there staff meetings for discussion of these matters?

4. Briefly describe the counseling policy of the house."

We find it remarkable that Dr. Tonkin found the report "helpful" despite the non-answering of the questions concerning counseling and method of choice of participants. After all, one of the principal advertised reasons for setting up DuBois was to provide various supportive services for students who especially needed these services. Thus, it is necessary first to identify these students and then to provide the services.

Perhaps the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies was able to obtain information from sources available neither to the Senate Committee nor to the Provost's Committee, but this information was certainly not available to us. The Senate, in its resolution of April 5, 1972, instructed itself to remain informed regarding the operation and effects of DuBois House, and our Committee addressed itself straightforwardly (and unsuccessfully) to this task. It is really quite irrelevant whether Dr. Tonkin approves or disapproves of such an inquiry by a Senate Committee. Nevertheless, Dr. Tonkin was in a position to prevent the Committee from operating effectively. The Committee recognized that it was necessary to achieve an open and non-threatening relation with Dr. Arnold (the Faculty Master of DuBois House) as early as possible. Dr. Tonkin could have been helpful to the Committee (or at least neutral) in this respect, instead he encouraged Dr. Arnold in his view that an inquiry into DuBois House, without a similar inquiry into all living-learning units, would be discriminatory.

Quite frankly, we do not believe that the Senate has ever been particularly interested in maintaining continuous scrutiny of all living-learning units. As Dr. Tonkin points out, the report of the previous Committee on Students was nevereven discussed on the Senate floor. Nevertheless, the Senate was sufficiently concerned with the special problems posed by DuBois House to hold a dramatic special meeting on April 5, 1972 (with a quorum actually present!) and pass the resolution which our Committee took as its charge. All the members of our Committee had very full schedules, and it was clear that we could barely meet often enough to conduct an honest and useful inquiry into the operation of DuBois House. We could not afford to condone the ritual of spending six hours of time on the other living-learning units for each hour spent on DuBois House, in order to prove our lack of discriminatory intentions.

Michael Cohen, Associate Professor of Physics
Benjamin Hammond, Professor and Chairman, Microbiology, Dent.
Open Letter to the Faculty Senate:

The Splintering of the Graduate School II:
After the Fall

by Julian B. Marsh

In the Almanac of November 20, 1973, Jean Crockett called attention to the fact that the organization of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the lack of a Dean of the Graduate School would lead us away from one university and towards a splintered situation in which graduate groups outside the Faculty of Arts and Sciences would be parted out to the other schools involved. Her views are proving to be prophetic. The recommendations of the Ad Hoc Senate Committee on the Organization of the Faculty that the Graduate School should be retained and strengthened through the appointment of a dean who would also serve as a Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research have not been accepted by the President and Provost. Although a Vice-Provost has been appointed, his responsibilities have not been made clear to the academic community.

Last year, and again this year, the Council Committee on Educational Policy has been considering the problems of graduate education. At the start of this academic year, it was asked to submit names to the Vice-Provost for a Task Force on Graduate Education but no task force was constituted. During the year the National Institutes of Health, as is their wont nowadays, suddenly changed the ground rules for graduate training grants in the health sciences, and considerable difficulty was encountered in organizing applications for these in the short time available because of their multidisciplinary nature. The lack of a clear-cut organizational structure for graduate studies became evident to some of us at this time. After many meetings and considerable discussion, including many very helpful comments by Vice-Provost Langenberg, the Council Committee on Educational Policy unanimously approved on April 29, 1975, the following recommendations, which I reproduce here in full:

1. The Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research should have general responsibility for graduate degree programs except graduate professional degrees. This is not a departure from present arrangements except that there is no formal Graduate School of Arts and Sciences with a Dean. However, the Educational Policy Committee strongly believes that there should continue to be a Graduate Faculty as such. The Graduate Faculty consists of the Graduate Groups who will actually provide graduate education. The award of degrees at commencement will be by the Vice-Provost upon the recommendation of this Faculty.

2. The Graduate Faculty will be represented by the Graduate Council, chaired by the Vice-Provost. The Graduate Council shall consist of all chairs of Graduate Groups plus student representation from each quadrant and it shall elect from among its members an executive committee in which all four quadrants are equally represented. We believe this council would be truly representative of graduate education at Pennsylvania and that it would provide maximum opportunity for the kinds of cross-disciplinary interaction that would strengthen our graduate programs.

3. The Graduate Faculty will be represented by the Graduate Council, which will have the following responsibilities:

   a. The evaluation of all present Groups, and evaluation of candidates for graduate degrees.
   b. The evaluation of all present Groups, and evaluation of candidates for graduate degrees.
   c. The appointment of a dean who would also serve as a Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research.
   d. The appointment of a dean who would also serve as a Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research.

3. The chairman of Graduate Groups should be recommended by each group to the Provost. It is assumed that in cases where the Graduate Groups and the school department are identical, this recommendation shall be transmitted through the appropriate Dean. The Provost should request the Vice-Provost to appoint an ad hoc Search Committee to recommend a chairman in cases where he feels this is advisable.

4. Graduate Groups which cannot be placed under a single budgetary Dean because not all of its members are in one School will be the direct responsibility of the Vice-Provost, who shall make administrative and budgetary arrangements for these groups designed to assure that they are not at a disadvantage with respect to other Graduate Groups.

5. We recommend a budgetary allocation to the office of the Vice-Provost to enable him to award fellowships and to aid in the development of new graduate programs as well as to provide funds for these Graduate Groups which are his direct responsibility. Such an allocation should be a simple percentage of the tuition of every graduate student supervised by a Graduate Group.

6. The Graduate Council will have the following responsibilities:

   a. The evaluation of all present Groups, and evaluation of candidates for graduate degrees.
   b. The appointment of a dean who would also serve as a Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research.
   c. The appointment of a dean who would also serve as a Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research.

We further recommend that the Vice-Provost should seek the advice of the Graduate Council with regard to budgetary policy, and should provide it with regular reports of his activities in this area.

Whatever the fate of these recommendations in the University Council, I urge all faculty to consider them carefully and to make your views known to the chairman of the Senate. The future of graduate education at the University of Pennsylvania warrants widespread discussion by all of us.

The author is professor and chairman of biochemistry, Dental Medicine, and chairman of the Council Committee on Educational Policy. Vice-Provost Langenberg reports on pp. 4-5.
The Organizational Structure of M.A. and Ph.D. Graduate Programs at the University of Pennsylvania.

by Donald N. Langenberg

May 7, 1975

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent changes in the academic and administrative structure of the University, e.g., the organization of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the introduction of responsibility-center budgeting, and the establishment of the administrative office of the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research, have provided an opportunity and a need for redesign of the organizational and administrative structure of graduate programs leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. This structure has been studied in recent years by faculty and administrative groups of a variety which is equaled by the variety of resulting conclusions and recommendations about what the structure should be. This document is an attempt to distill from this wealth of ideas a structure which meets our immediate need for a workable organization, which hopefully is better than the existing organization, and which, above all, allows the flexibility we need to continue pursuit of the chimera of "ideal organization."

A longer document, containing in addition to the material presented here a summary of the recommendations of various faculty and administrative bodies which have considered this issue, has been sent to the members of the Graduate Council and the Graduate Group Chairmen.*

II. BASIC FACTS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Graduate education and research are a major concern of all Faculties and Schools of the University of Pennsylvania. Graduate education leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees is provided by Graduate Groups, presently sixty-one in number. Most lie within single Schools, often within single academic Departments, but a substantial number span several Departments and/or Schools. Our ability to maintain such cross-disciplinary and/or cross-organizational academic units materially enhances the flexibility and strength of our graduate programs.

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences is the home of about 60 percent of the Graduate Groups and 60 percent of the Ph.D.s awarded each year. Because of its general responsibilities for the arts and sciences within the University and because of the size of its contributions to graduate education, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences must and will play a major role in establishing the quality and character of our graduate programs. On the other hand, the graduate education and research programs in other parts of the University, including the professional schools, represent a commitment to scholarship and academic excellence in those schools which distinguishes them from many of their counterparts in other universities. These programs, too, are an essential part of the University's total graduate effort. It follows that the establishment and maintenance of standards and policies in graduate education is a University-wide concern and responsibility.

* Available from them or from Dr. Langenberg's office, Ext. 7236.
The organization of graduate programs outlined here is aimed at achieving three major goals:

1. To rationalize both academic and budgetary management of our graduate programs within a system which provides effective means for maintaining and strengthening the quality and vigor of Ph.D. and related Master's degree programs throughout the University.
2. To recognize the fact that graduate education and research are intrinsically more closely related than undergraduate education, hence to provide the Schools the maximum feasible amount of autonomy and direct responsibility for the conduct and quality of their own graduate programs.
3. To recognize, at the same time, the ultimate responsibility of the Provost for the quality of all graduate programs within the University, hence to provide the Provost, through the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research, with effective means for monitoring, advising and strengthening graduate education University-wide.

III. STRUCTURE

In what follows, the unqualified adjective "graduate" refers to the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees provided by the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

The general responsibility of the Provost for graduate degree programs, including graduate professional degrees, will be exercised through the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research (VPGRS), acting as a staff officer to the Provost. The VPGSR is responsible for overseeing and monitoring graduate degree programs and for advising and assisting the Provost and Deans in establishing and maintaining University-wide standards of quality.

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences will cease to exist as a formally established School of the University.

The Graduate Faculty shall be composed of the duly appointed members of the Graduate Groups.

The graduate group will remain the vehicle for graduate education leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees at the University of Pennsylvania. In many of our peer institutions, the inflexibility of traditional disciplinary departments in the face of a growing need for interdisciplinary education constitutes a major problem. In the graduate group, we possess a solution to that problem. We must preserve it and make it work better.

Uniform procedures for appointment of faculty to Graduate Groups will be established.

4. Chairmen of Graduate Groups will be appointed by the President upon recommendation of the Provost. Nominees for the position of Graduate Group Chairman will be recommended to the Provost by the VPGSR and the cognizant Dean in consultation with the members of the Graduate Group and the appropriate departmental chairman or chairmen. The responsibility for assuring the initiation of new appointments will rest with the VPGSR. The Provost may request the VPGSR to appoint an Ad Hoc Search Committee to assist in this process and to recommend a Chairman. Wherever applicable, graduate group chairmen will report to their deans through their departmental chairmen.

5. The Graduate Faculty will be represented by the faculty members of the Graduate Council, which will be advisory to and chaired by the VPGSR. The fundamental responsibility of the faculty of the Graduate Council is to act on the recommendation of candidates for the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees according to the Statutes of the Corporation, which specify that "degrees in course may be granted to all those persons who have completed satisfactorily the courses leading to degrees in the several faculties and have been duly recommended by said faculties for their respective degrees."

The responsibilities of the Graduate Council as a whole, including the student members, will include the following:

a. Assist the VPGSR in establishing procedures for the periodic academic review of all existing graduate programs, and in carrying out such reviews.

b. Assist the VPGSR in the evaluation and approval of all new graduate programs and in the termination of existing ones.

c. Assist the VPGSR in establishing policies for admission and allocation of fellowships and scholarships, and minimum University-wide requirements for graduate education.

d. Assist the VPGSR in establishing rules and procedures for election of individuals to the Graduate Faculty.

e. Establish rules and procedures for selection and operation of the Graduate Council itself.

6. Presentation of candidates for degrees at Commencement will be made by the VPGSR upon recommendation of the Deans.

7. Administrative coordination of graduate programs among the Schools will be facilitated by a Council of Graduate Deans, chaired by the VPGSR and composed of the Deans or, where applicable, their Associate Deans for Graduate Studies and Research or equivalent. This is not intended to be a policy-making body, but to be a forum for Deans of the Graduate Council. Rather, it will simply provide a forum in which the principal school administrative officers concerned with graduate education and research can discuss and coordinate administrative matters.

8. The Deans will have primary responsibility for the academic and budgetary well-being and integrity of all graduate groups. The intellectual and budgetary foundations of our graduate groups are inextricably intertwined with the corresponding foundations of our undergraduate and professional programs. To the maximum extent possible, the intellectual and academic integrity of our programs must be reflected in and fostered by our administrative and budgetary arrangements. Accordingly, each graduate group will be assigned to a single dean, to be selected primarily on the basis of the intellectual and academic center of gravity of the group, with less weight being given to the present structure of home department appointments of its members. This assignment will be made only after full consultation with the group and with all concerned department chairmen and deans.

9. To the maximum extent possible, admissions procedures and student record keeping will be decentralized to the Graduate Groups or Schools under the direction of the Deans. Necessary central functions such as routing of initial inquiries, coordination of bulletins and general information, and the gathering and processing of sufficient record information to permit monitoring of quality will be retained by the Office of the VPGSR. The intent here is to minimize duplications and improve efficiency.

10. The award and administration of graduate fellowships will, pending review of fellowship policy and procedures, remain the responsibility of the VPGSR and the Graduate Faculty as a whole, exercising its authority through the Graduate Council.

COLLEGE OF GENERAL STUDIES AND SUMMER SESSIONS

On the basis of various recommendations submitted to me regarding continuing education during the past two years, beginning July 1, 1975, the College of General Studies and Summer Sessions will be jointly administered by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Office of the Provost. This is in accordance with the position that administration and related budgetary well-being and integrity of all graduate groups. The intellectual and budgetary foundations of our graduate groups are inextricably intertwined with the corresponding foundations of our undergraduate and professional programs. To the maximum extent possible, the intellectual and academic integrity of our programs must be reflected in and fostered by our administrative and budgetary arrangements. Accordingly, each graduate group will be assigned to a single dean, to be selected primarily on the basis of the intellectual and academic center of gravity of the group, with less weight being given to the present structure of home department appointments of its members. This assignment will be made only after full consultation with the group and with all concerned department chairmen and deans.

I am happy to inform you that Dr. Donald Stewart, who chaired the latest committee on Continuing Education, has agreed to serve as Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences for Continuing Education and Counselor to the Provost. Dr. Stewart has been asked to work with Dr. Arleigh Hess, Jr., Miss Charlotte Fichter, and Dr. R. Jean Brownlee, and he will be in touch with Deans of the related schools in order to set up an academic advising committee on Continuing Education and work out technical details. In placing the joint administration of College of General Studies and Summer Sessions within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Provost's Office, it has been our aim to upgrade the quality of all of our offerings in Continuing Education and coordinating the University's commitment.

Dr. Stewart is presently the Coordinator of Continuing Education and Director of Higher Education Research Project in the Fels Center of Government and a faculty member in the City Planning Department. He has been Executive Assistant to President Martin Meyerson and earlier was a Program Officer for the Ford Foundation. An alumnus and trustee of Grinnell College, he was a Woodrow Wilson Fellow at Yale where he took his M.A. in 1960. He also holds an M.P.A. from Harvard and certificates in international law, organization and economics from the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva.

—Eliot Stellar, Provost
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Please Read What You Write

by Robert Erwin

According to a front-page story in the February 24, 1975, Chronicle of Higher Education, the National Bureau of Standards believes that half the data reported in scientific papers are either wrong or else "presented in such a way that no one can tell." The limited utility of this kind of "scientific" writing is obvious. Say a city wants to know how much pollution its coal-fired power plant of a certain size is discharging. Depending on whose figures are right, the plant may be spewing as much as 90 tons of mercury per week into the air or as little as one-fourth ton.

Of course some uncertainty, variation, and disagreement are bound to occur in the practice of science; some human error, and some mistakes resulting from haste in meeting deadlines imposed for non-scientific reasons. Bureau of Standards estimates themselves may be vulnerable. Publishers and printers doubtless compound errors. Still, anything like 50 percent unreliability is shocking. Moreover, the sloppiness is by no means limited to the physical and applied sciences. Social scientists, scholars in the humanities and learned professions, and technical writers of all sorts are susceptible. I recall from my own experience a high-powered economics manuscript in which the term New Jersey in several passages really referred to Pennsylvania. The "data" under suspicion or downright erroneous include names, dates, page numbers, formal relationships, words, views, and acts attributed to others, and so on.

The classic journalistic response to this situation would be to declare a data crisis. The classic academic response would be to seek a grant, a very large grant, preferably a series of grants, to study the problem. Out of common decency, anyone who wants to have a crisis ought to be allowed to have one. As for grantsmen and grantswomen, good hunting. I am willing to bet, however, that a grant to study the crisis, a very large grant, preferably a series of grants, to study the problem

The culturally preferred model of work in affluent countries, reflecting the dominant institutions, draws upon two sources: bureaucracy and industrial production. In a "proper" organization doing "important" work, level A decides policy, level B translates policy into directives, level C implements the directives in the operating units, level D monitors compliance, and so forth. In an "efficient" organization, experience is quantified into time, motion, resources, input, output, and the like.

Converted for the use of the scholarly writer, this model of work establishes as the first principle that the author, who is a "scarce resource," withdraw as early as possible from the process of conveying a final text into print. Where the money and people are available, team research and collaborative writing, stitched together by someone in a "coordinating" role, make withdrawal possible quite early. The author can clear the desk to go on to the next "policy" (i.e., the next piece of research and writing), thus making "optimal" use of time. When nothing so grand as a "team" is feasible, one can still leave details to part-time auxiliaries—students, research assistants, secretaries, paid proofreaders and indexers, draftsmen, and so on. The newly fledged scholar, though perhaps not able to command a great deal of this kind of help, can still hope to leave the dotting of the i's and the crossing of the t's to other scholars who read the work in MS and the to the publisher's staff. As a last resort, there is always the opportunity of doing a cursory job on one's own in seeing the work through press.

At all levels, the principle remains the same. The author, according to the model, ought to produce a correct holograph. Once that has been done, however, it is "drudgery" and a "misuse of time" to guard the actual words and numbers as they pass through several transcriptions to become published copies. The model contains a negative implication: don't read what you write after the first time.

Models get bent in practice, of course. (In this lies the salvation of the world?) Even intermittently approximated, however, the model I am talking about contributes to the data crisis. Every day, bright and energetic people with a wealth of knowledge about Assyrian omen texts, say, or renal diseases, or John Dewey's philosophy of art turn in manuscripts and proofs with misquotations, garbled sentences, and columns that fail to add up. These are mistakes in transcription, not in scholarship. Not nearly enough of these mistakes will be caught by publishers.

Here are a few examples I happen to know about from my experience before coming to the University of Pennsylvania Press. All crept into MSS that were originally correct.

- In a study of welfare payments: 6.1 million people are really 4.8 million people.
- In an essay on the social responsibility of business: Table 6, cited to support a conclusion, was omitted from the final draft, and the table now bearing that number has nothing to do with the conclusion.
- In a history of the conservation movement: two well-known figures appear in the index under nonexistent names.
- In an analysis of Congress: a key piece of legislation is referred to by the title of an earlier, unrelated act.

The circle closes. In theory, the "rational society" prizes accuracy and efficiency. In actuality, "optimal" use of a scholar's time—"that means slighting or withdrawing from the last stages of authorship—leads to inaccuracy by removing the most knowledgeable and committed craftsman from the scene.

Fortunately, craftsmanship often leads the scholarly writer to depart from the model of work that the culture favors. The purpose of specialization in scholarship is not to divide a mechanical or administrative process into work units. It is to enable the specialist to command virtually all the known evidence, all the established techniques, and all the reasonable interpretations in the field the scholar has chosen. "Drudgery" is accepted as the price of mastery, and care is enforced through criticism in the journals by other specialists as well or better informed than the author. Numerous factual errors would be avoided if the pains taken with the holograph were simply sustained a few more weeks or months in the transformation to print—and if the critics concentrated more on their prime function and less on logrolling.

The author who claims that "more important matters" prevent him or her from reading a typescript or proofs word-for-word for the third time had best be a genius or a hypocrite. William James found time to read the work of his copyists line by line. The great anthropologist Melville Herskovits was insulited by the notion that someone other than himself should index his books. Their careers were not exactly unproductive.

The author is director of the University Press.

ALMANAC May 13, 1975
FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE TEAM CHAIRMAN  April 28, 1975

My colleagues and I are pleased with the report of the evaluation team, especially as supplemented by Dick Cooper’s thoughtful letter of April 18, 1975 (excerpted on pages 11-12 – Ed.).

I have few additional comments to make. We recognize the need to improve our advising and counseling functions, and will be making a major step in this direction this coming academic year by shifting a number of these and other activities from the present offices of the Dean of Students and the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies to the new Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Further consolidation and coordination will be possible through a combination of the remaining functions of the two offices into a new office of the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies and Campus Life. Some of the other suggestions of the team—such as a common freshman year, an expanded but less costly University Scholars program, and new programs to better integrate the liberal arts and pre-professional training—have been high on our own agenda, and the report has given welcome impetus and direction to our thinking.

The need for more effective communication is also one which we recognize and, although probably inevitable in a complex University that is undergoing considerable change, is one which we will continue to address. Admissions policies especially have been a source of confusion and some debate in the past, but have improved remarkably in the last year and we hope will continue to do so under the new permanent dean we hope to name in the very near future.

I was pleased to read the team’s suggestions on ways to preserve the strengths of our new “responsibility center” budget system while avoiding the potential distortions which such an incentive system can create. Also in the section on finances, the cautions about the need to have sound projections of new ventures are well taken and ones which we recognize but which need to be heard from many sources.

In short, we are satisfied with the report of the team and believe that it can be a useful document in our own continuing self-examination.

—Martin Meyerson, President

SUMMARY

At the joint request of the University of Pennsylvania’s President, Martin Meyerson, and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, nine scholars and educational administrators visited the University November 13-16 for two-and-a-half days of intensive consultation with academic administrators, faculty, and students on the current state of and direction of Penn’s educational programs and in particular on the relationship between undergraduate and postgraduate education. On the basis of these consultations, of written materials submitted to us shortly before our visit, and of our own experience in diverse roles at other institutions, we submit the attached report of our findings. In brief, we found Penn to be a vibrant place, attractive to students and faculty alike, offering a diverse and generally high quality menu of educational activities. Penn has introduced a number of activities to bring the undergraduate into closer touch with professional training, without at the same time over-professionalizing him. We applaud these, and make a few suggestions for further change in the same direction. We noted a certain amount of confusion that inevitably attends a community in transition, in part the other side of the coin of innovation. But it does point up the need for continuous and forthright communication between the administration and other members of the community. For similar reasons, many students feel a need for more effective counseling. Finally, educational ideas are perhaps running out of financial wherewithal, and to avoid violation of expectations it would be desirable to bring the two into closer harmony.

I. INTRODUCTION

Colleges and universities have played a distinctive and dual role in American society. On the one hand, they represent the institutional embodiment of many of the cultural values of civilization, and through their “liberal arts” programs they have attempted to transmit appreciation of these values to generations of students. On the other hand, they have provided a training ground for “practical” subjects such as engineering and agriculture. In both these respects they differ from European universities, where a broad cultural background is assumed of the incoming students, where applied fields have generally been avoided, and where emphasis has been placed on concentration by each student on advanced academic work.

We believe that the American emphasis has served our society well, and that American colleges should continue to regard provision of a broad liberal arts training as their principal task in the education of undergraduates. At the same time, society and its occupations are becoming ever more complex, and it is desirable to bring a greater understanding of professional occupations into undergraduate education without making it vocational. It would be useful too for the professional schools to take a broader, more detached look at the role of their graduates in society.

Introduction of more consideration of professional learning into
undergraduate education would help to achieve this detachment, through exposure and criticism by students who are not committed to the professions.

The University of Pennsylvania has set itself a goal of being "one university," of achieving close cooperation among its various parts for the benefit of the whole. It strives to become a comprehensive unity which offers a wide variety of high quality educational services to its students and a genuine community of learning and scholarship for all its members, faculty as well as students. Given its size (20,000 students, 1800 faculty) and its diversity of offerings (14 schools, many programs within schools), this is an extraordinarily ambitious task. The temptation must be strong to organize simply as a loose holding company for largely autonomous activities, as many universities have done, providing central services such as library, computer, fund-raising and land-use planning only where that is necessary or efficient. Yet Penn has resisted this temptation and has taken some bold steps toward the notion of one university with a degree of success that surprised members of the team. But it also has some distance to go to realize its ambition fully.

The University of Pennsylvania faces three tensions that are endemic to American universities today. The first is the tension that inevitably arises between attempts to maintain both a faculty of first-rate scholars and researchers, on the one hand, and a lively, active and stimulating liberal arts undergraduate program on the other. Scholars tend to be highly specialized and educationally conservative. First-class undergraduate education calls for educational flexibility, reformulating old and new material to respond to the current interests of students and the changing problems of contemporary society. It calls for specialists to bring their work to the level of non-specialized students who, while intelligent and alert, often cannot be expected to have even a rudimentary technical background. Graduate and professional students can be assumed to be motivated to study in their respective fields. Young undergraduates are motivated to learn, but the burden of proof is very much on the professor to show why they should devote their scarce time to his subject. Serious scholars often find difficulty casting themselves in this motivating role. To appoint senior faculty members who excel only at teaching, however, has time and again led to damaging fissures: faculties that aspire to national recognition for scholarly achievement and to perceptions of second-class citizenship for those whose talents are mainly in teaching. Major struggles often develop over every new appointment. Yet to concentrate undergraduate teaching on junior faculty members often puts them in constant tension between their desire to teach well and their desire to provide the scholarship required for promotion.

This general tension between teaching and scholarship takes a somewhat different form when it comes to practicing professions. There is the risk that undergraduate courses become vocational, teaching the tools of the trade rather than teaching about the trade, as would be more appropriate in a program of general education.

The second tension concerns, on the one hand, the pull of national aspiration and the desire for national recognition, necessary indeed if first-rate faculty and postgraduate students are to be attracted, and on the other hand, the strong social interface with a local urban community, which has its own special problems and potentialities. Few universities have learned to be equally good citizens of several communities at once—local, state, national, even international—but that does not diminish the importance of striving to do so.

The third tension—which aggravates the first two—is the discrepancy between plan, hope, aspiration, on the one hand, and financial wherewithal to realize those aspirations, on the other. At the present time many universities are feeling the financial pinch and are having to re-examine their central missions with a view to cutting back their activities to fit the available cloth. Program innovation inevitably suffers in the process of retrenchment, although organizational innovation may be encouraged. Even in more expansive times, but especially now, universities to thrive must develop a sharp definition of their priorities and allocate their limited resources in the best way to achieve their priority objectives.

The University of Pennsylvania is grappling with all of these problems, which are not peculiar to it, and it has made some surprisingly successful innovations to help diminish the tensions, but further attention needs to be devoted to these problems.

This report is confined to certain features of undergraduate education and its relation to graduate and professional education, along with several matters, such as financial planning, that are inevitably related to educational planning of any kind. The limited time available to the team, and its relatively short visit, precluded a more comprehensive view of the entire university. As it was, the focus above brought the team into contact with many aspects of university management and teaching.

The self-study documents and interviews by members of the team brought out many of the efforts Penn is making to realize the concept of one university, and to cope with the tensions just described.

There is first of all the question of size. In the fall of 1974 Penn enrolled 20,000 students, of whom over 3000 were part-time students taking undergraduate courses in the continuing education program. Fifty-two hundred full-time undergraduates are enrolled in the College and the College for Women, and another 3000 full-time undergraduates are enrolled in other schools. (Penn is unusual in having extensive undergraduate programs in several of its professional schools.) There are nearly 9000 graduate and professional students. These numbers, even those for the liberal arts colleges alone, are too large to represent a unified community without extraordinary effort. Because of this, and because of limitations on space, there are no plans to expand full-time enrollment further. Indeed, the problem is to provide a sense of community for students at the present levels of enrollment. The smaller schools themselves of course can provide a comfortable home base, social as well as educational, for their students. But Penn is attempting to break the large undergraduate bodies down further into manageable living units, residential college houses that serve as more than just sleeping places. Some involve meals together, some involve educational programs and even formal courses, some involve residential faculty fellows, all designed to create a meaningful sense of community for those students belonging to them, and all remarkably successful so far as the team was able to determine.

In addition, attempts have been made to reduce class size, to increase faculty student contact within and as well as outside the classroom, and to expose undergraduates to glimpses of professional training through the freshman seminar program and through the College of Thematic Studies, whereby for a semester freshman and sophomores are offered clusters of related seminars and independent work on some interdisciplinary theme. Students are also offered specialized programs which permit them to explore postgraduate level work while they are still undergraduates, such as the University Scholars program and the provision for joint B.A. and M.A. work.

Penn happily resisted the national movement several years ago to eliminate field distributional requirements for undergraduates, so these provide a modicum of unity to the curriculum for most undergraduates, though not enough to be considered a common general education.

New emphasis in the matter of faculty appointments has been given to teaching and to university citizenship, as well as to the proper traditional emphasis on scholarship. Students engage in evaluation of their teachers, and these evaluations are given to all members of the Provost's Staff Conference. It is of course impossible for short-term visitors to discover just how much weight the three criteria are given on senior appointments, but we were assured that all were considered, although scholarship still...
undoubtedly is the dominant criterion, as it must be for a major university of quality.

Finally, in its financial management Penn has recently introduced the notion of “cost responsibility centers” to provide incentives to deans and program directors to be as frugal as they can with the University’s limited financial resources. We will comment below on the risks this development for realization of the concept of One University.

II. FINDINGS OF THE TEAM: GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

In our brief visit to Penn we could only get a snapshot of an institution that is obviously in flux. Indeed, our impression was one of great change within the last several years, with many features still in transition, and much that had not yet settled down into a new mold. This makes it difficult to evaluate what is being done, since at present the old, the new, and the transitional are thoroughly commingled. But we were much impressed with the quality of the faculty and with the good feeling both the faculty and the students have about Penn. Morale is high. The many innovative programs have succeeded in stirring up a sense of educational excitement and in generating enthusiasm by the faculty and the students that are involved in them, permitting them to succeed on their present scale. Moreover, there seems to have been some positive effect of these innovative programs on the regular curriculum, with the freshman seminars inducing several departments to offer smaller, more intimate classes, for example.

Furthermore, we were impressed with the remarkable fluidity of undergraduate students between schools, with many taking a substantial number of courses outside their school of registration. The flow is heavier into arts and sciences than out of it, and we heard suggestions that College students were sometimes discouraged from taking courses in other schools, but in general the freedom of students to move across faculties is one measure of success in achieving One University.

While Penn seems to be performing very well with high morale and commitment by both students and faculty, there were several areas in which the team found room for clarification or for improvement. Broadly speaking, they can be grouped into three headings: general education and career development, administration and communication, and financial management. The boundary lines among these categories are arbitrary, for there is much interaction among them, but they are convenient for organizing our observations.

A. General Education and Career Development

As implied above, Penn offers the typical undergraduate an almost dazzling array of courses from which to choose including not only the normal curriculum in his own school, but also the offerings of other schools and numerous special courses such as those in the College of Thematic Studies. In addition there are numerous programs that a student may enter with a commitment of time greater than that required for a specific course, and then there is the critical choice of a major field that confronts each undergraduate about halfway through his college years.

With such a plethora of offerings, the need for strong advisory services is especially great. We found almost universal interest among the students in better advisory facilities. While we believe that improved advice will not represent a panacea, since college students everywhere confront difficult curricular and career choices which fundamentally they must work out for themselves, we nonetheless feel that the present system is too spotty and casual to serve present needs, especially when the curriculum is in flux and the normal hand-me-down advice from upper to lower classmen has less relevance than it would have in a more stable environment. To this local uncertainty are added some national uncertainties concerning the prospects for alternative career lines and the prospects for realizing one’s desires with respect to entry into graduate or professional schools.

A special problem of advising and support arises for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Penn does an outstanding job at recruiting black students, but the background of many of these students is unequal to the demands early placed upon them in the classroom, and both advice and special educational support in the form of tutoring or remedial teaching would be desirable to hasten their progress.

We are aware that the question of advisory facilities and coordination is now one that occupies the administration, and we encourage them to take action to improve both the substance and the reach of advice. Undergraduates should have access to advice on curriculum matters covering all undergraduate programs, not just those of the school in which the student happens to be registered; and every student at some point should be asked why he has chosen the particular major he has. Faculty can often perform these roles on an informal basis, and the freshman seminars happily bring students into conversational contact with at least one faculty member early in their studies. But more is needed, especially in the crucial sophomore and junior years.

A second area in undergraduate education in which we note the need for improvement, consistent with the notion of One University, is general education, including undergraduate education relevant to choice of a profession. We were struck by the wide variation among schools in the dominant character of their undergraduate course offerings, with some having a highly professional, almost vocational quality, while others had a strong emphasis on liberal arts. We suggest that the liberal arts emphasis should be given to all undergraduate programs, even those aiming toward a practicing profession, on the double ground that such education is desirable for all educated Americans and that it is where Penn’s particular strength lies, given its geographical compactness, its objective of unity as a university, and its already high mobility of students among schools. One possible technique for accomplishing this, which we advance only tentatively because we have been unable to explore all of its implications in the context of Penn, would be a common freshman year for all undergraduates, with emphasis on general education, regardless of the school to which each student was admitted. Such a common year would have the additional advantage of postponing the final career choice of each student until he had some college training, since students could presumably alter their plans after the freshman year if their evolving interests and their performance permitted it.

A second suggestion for improving the undergraduate curriculum in the direction of One University would be to offer to undergraduates courses about the various professions, as distinguished from professional or vocational courses. For example, courses in the history and sociology of medical practitioners or of architects or of social workers or on the epistemology of legal thought or medical science might be given to undergraduates, as a way of introducing them to the several professions without actually starting them on a program of professional training. This would be beneficial also to students not planning to enter the indicated professions, for the role of professionals in modern society is itself an interesting and important subject of inquiry.

The team found promising the University Scholars program, whereby several students of the required capability elect to work simultaneously on their undergraduate and their doctoral degrees, integrated over a suitably long period of time and with assured admission to the relevant professional school. Along with independent studies, it represents a good device for bringing some undergraduates and postgraduate students together. We encourage its expansion from the present ten students as quality and available financing permit. We do however have reservations concerning just how large this program can or should become, partly because it is an expensive program in terms of faculty time, partly because of the prejudice to competitive admission to graduate and professional schools it would involve if it were mounted on a large scale. We note, however, that this program would undoubtedly
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attract to Penn additional top-notch undergraduates so long as it
held out the prospect for early admission to medical school.

We were not able to explore questions of medical and allied
education in nearly as much depth as we would have liked, and as
the topic deserves. We detect a certain confusion at Penn, as indeed
in the nation at large, regarding the future professional
relationships among those with various degrees of medical training,
and hence a certain lack of direction with respect to the nature of
the appropriate training. We strongly support the task force that
has recently been established, under Vice-President Langfitt, to
explore the relationship among different types of medical and
paramedical services. Penn is not likely to solve this problem alone,
but the national situation in medical care calls out for important
innovations in the use of personnel with medical training less
demanding than that for physicians, and for improvements in the
use of physicians. Any contribution Penn can make in this area will
be well received. We were pleased by the interest that members of
the medical school faculty take in undergraduate education, and
believe that interest should be further developed.

B. Administration and Communication

The present array of vice-presidents, associate provosts, associate
deans, etc., conveys an impression of confusion in lines of authority and of over-administration. This is
one of several places where the transitional character of Penn's
present structure is most evident, and we were assured that lines of
authority are being straightened, responsibilities are being
reorganized, and some present positions will be eliminated. We do
not have a collective view about whether Penn is over- or under-
administered (except in the realm of financial planning, discussed
below), but what is clear is that the community at Penn feels the
need for better definition of goals and communication of policies
by the central administration. A certain amount of confusion is
inevitable in a period of rapid change, since it is not possible to
communicate continuously and effectively to a community that is
mildly but not intensely interested in where things stand, where
they have been, and toward what goals they are moving. This is
especially true when the goals themselves are general, and the
transition involves a certain amount of exploration and of feeling
one's way through new possibilities. Nonetheless, we formed the
impression that even some policies that are not in flux are not well
communicated, that a feeling exists that the administration either
does not know what it is doing or else is concealing something,
and that good management would be well served by sharpening
some policies that are acknowledged to be transitional in
character.

Four examples may serve to illustrate the point, concerning
admissions, student aid, allocation of tenure positions, and
undergraduate curriculum.

Admissions is a delicate issue for all colleges, such as Penn, where
the number of persons who would like to enter substantially
exceeds the number who can be admitted (the ratio is about two to
one for the arts and sciences). A number of students expressed the
view to us that there is too much discretion in the admissions
policy. When we pointed out that too many students are allowed to enter
on grounds other than merit, although it was not clearly understood what those other grounds were, as we understand,
Penn divides its admissions into three broad categories. The first,
amounting to one quarter of each entering class, is selected on
academic merit alone. The second, also amounting to one quarter,
is made up (but in what proportions is unclear) of a series of "special
interest" groups, such as minority group members, athletes,
children of alumni, faculty, and employees, and so on. The
remaining fifty percent is admitted on the basis of diverse criteria
including but not limited to academic qualifications, and with an
eye to achieving a certain degree of diversity in the student body,
which includes both geographical diversity and diversity of non-
academic talents. We do not judge whether this is the right
combination or not, but we do wonder what is the academic quality of
persons being turned away to make room for diversity and special interest groups, and we believe that the strategy underlying
admissions policy should be more clearly articulated.

A problem of communication also arises with respect to financial
aid. As we understand it, Penn has a policy of giving financial aid to
undergraduates exclusively on the basis of need, defined in some
imperfect but reasonably objective way. About half of the
undergraduates receive some financial aid. Aid is given both to new
and to continuing students independently of academic achievement
and, admissions decisions are made independently of
financial need.

We note that this policy is a noble but expensive one. It should be
continued so long as resources permit it. But our conversations with
students suggest that this policy is not well understood, and there is
considerable uncertainty from year to year whether a given student's financial aid will be continued. Again a clear articulation
and wider dissemination of the policy is in order. If Penn is to
maintain such a generous financial aid policy, it should at least get
the credit for the policy with its own students.

An area in which better two-way communication seems to be
needed concerns faculty appointments, especially tenure
appointments. As financial limits become more binding and as
faculties cease to grow, at Penn as at other universities, greater
explicit attention must be paid to the balance between tenured
and non-tenured faculty appointments. This is necessary to avoid
unwittingly developing a faculty that is so heavily tenured that there
is little scope either for promoting the really exceptional junior
faculty member or for maintaining the intellectual liveliness and
cross-fertilization with other universities that comes from having a
sizeable portion of the faculty in junior ranks.

It is then important, in approaching the appointments process, to
look ahead several years, to assess prospective withdrawals from
the faculty through retirements and resignation, and to assess
prospective junior and senior appointments. We applauded what
we understand to be the policy of asking each school and
department to prepare a three- to five-year prospectus on expected
and desired changes in faculty positions, within general guidelines
laid down by the administration, so that each new appointment or
promotion can be put into broader perspective. Such prospectuses
should not of course be binding plans, but they provide some
overall guidance to faculty changes during the period covered.

Finally, while those faculty members who participate in the
innovative educational programs seem to be very enthusiastic
about them, we also formed the impression that many other faculty
members are not well informed about the direction the administration
would like to take in undergraduate education at Penn, and are
understandably skeptical about what they dimly perceive as
disjointed and not thoroughly planned activities that are not well
integrated into a broader, guiding conception. Again better
communication on what is being done, why, and with what
expected results seems to be in order. Such communication would
also help in evaluating the success of various curricular activities
and in determining which should be retained and which should be
dropped. It is possible, for instance, that the College for Thematic
Studies has already served a useful purpose in improving the
regular curriculum, and that at least parts of it have outlived their
usefulness.

In a period of rapid change some confusion is inevitable, and
suspicion and even myths are likely to arise among those who see
some favored mode or activity threatened; such suspicion is readily
spread to others. In these circumstances maintaining clear and
forthright lines of communication to the central administration is
especially desirable. Penn might consider, for example, having the
president and provost appear periodically in the college houses
elsewhere to indicate the current condition and their thoughts
about new directions for Penn, and to respond openly to questions
from students and faculty.
C. Financial Administration

It is not possible in the circumstances of universities throughout the country today, Penn included, to speak realistically of educational improvement and innovation without coupling them to resource availability and financial planning. Higher education throughout the United States will be under some financial pressure throughout the next decade or longer, and at least at present there is little prospect that Penn will represent an exception to this generalization. Indeed, Penn has already experienced a financial squeeze and has taken steps to husband its resources more carefully. An example of this, and one that illustrates the close relation between a financial and educational concern, is the introduction of cost responsibility centers throughout the University, with each center receiving a subvention and being expected to hold its expenditures within the limits set by its own income and by its subvention from the central administration.

Potential difficulties arise with the definition of each center’s “income,” especially where it is taken to include payments on behalf of course-taking students registered elsewhere in the University. This arrangement is still in transition, but it carries the danger of strongly undermining the “one university” concept. It may occasionally happen, for example, that a school will find it less expensive to hire its own faculty member to teach service courses in related fields than to send its students to courses in other schools. Yet such duplication would be wasteful for the University as a whole. Similarly, a center in a financial pinch may inadvertently put pressure on its students not to take courses elsewhere in the University. We found no evidence of such distortions, but point to them as possible dangers in pressing the notion of responsibility centers too far or too rigidly. Much depends on how precisely it is managed—in particular on what principles are used to determine the subventions, and how frequently the subventions may be altered—and whether it is used mainly for management information or whether, as the name suggests, it is to function as a system of incentives. If it is not to do the latter, the name should be changed and the concept de-emphasized; if it is to do the latter, then the Penn administration must take extreme care if they are to avoid imposing significant financial barriers to cooperation among different parts of the University. One approach would involve shifting from a principle of average tuition transfers among responsibility centers when students cross-register to a principle of average variable cost in the center where the student is registered. Properly applied, transfers on this principle would not introduce the kinds of distortions to incentives that a proration of tuition does. Another approach to frugal financial management within the University’s context of a university community is to appoint strong deans who command the respect of their faculties and students but who also see the university as a unity and are good team players. These are rare persons but Penn is fortunate in having several of them. In any case, we understand that the Educational Policy Committee is planning to discuss the concept of responsibility centers, and we assume that group will point out some of the educational pitfalls involved in too rigid an application of the concept.

A second source of concern to the team was the apparent absence of reasonably good cost estimates for the many new activities that are being considered for introduction or for expansion. Since on the surface some of these activities seem quite expensive, firmer cost analysis should be undertaken before commitments are made to expand them. Otherwise they will abort when the costs become known, or other programs will have to be squeezed to make way for them unless new sources of income can be found. Squeezing other programs may in some cases be desirable, but it should take place with deliberation, not as the result of bad homework.

One suggestion for improving the financial position of the University, or at least of the medical and related schools, concerns the desirability of having all student medical needs met by members of the faculty. In many universities the bulk of this income accrues to the university for use in furthering educational and research programs, and we suggest that Penn move strongly in the same direction.

Finally, although it is perhaps a reversal of roles between the administration and a visiting team charged with reviewing educational programs, we were concerned with the large discrepancy between what we assume to be the cost of implementing new ideas and expanding current programs, and the financial resources that seem to be available to carry them out. This is especially true for expansion of the college houses, which are expensive, and of the highly individualized educational programs. Expansion of the college houses is also of concern to a number of students with whom we spoke, who worry in particular about the increase in rents that might follow conversion of the Quadrangle into part of the college house system. Preservation of low-rent housing is one way to help students of modest means see themselves through college. While funds are easier to raise for concrete attractive programs than for the general idea of a university, it would be preferable to receive strong assurances on the availability of funds before making firm commitments to the expansion of expensive activities.

This is a cautious note on which to conclude this report. We want however to observe that we were courteously received and patiently educated throughout our short but intensive visit to Penn, and we want here to record our thanks to all of those who were involved in preparing for our visit and in seeing us through it.

Appendix

EXCERPTS FROM THE TEAM CHAIRMAN’S LETTER TO MR. MEYERSON APRIL 18, 1975

Advising, Counseling and Support Services

I believe it would be useful to establish a system of faculty advisers for freshmen and sophomores. This will not solve all or even most of the problems in this area, since faculty members are not usually qualified as guidance counselors, and there is usually a certain formality between faculty members and students. Nonetheless, other schools I have known assign every freshman and sophomore (before the choice of a major) to a particular faculty member. The relationship is usually only pro forma, as in approval of the student’s course plan for the first two years. But the very existence of a specific faculty adviser may diminish the psychological sense of isolation a new student often has, and in a few instances students will rely on their faculty adviser with great benefit. My impression also is that quite a number of faculty members welcome this kind of one-to-one contact with a few students outside of their own classes, so long as it does not become burdensome. Faculty members are not especially good at advising with respect to particular courses. That information is usually best transmitted among students. But a faculty adviser can talk in broad terms about career choice and can provide the possibility for a mature face-to-face conversation about a student’s goals and plans early in his undergraduate career.

In addition, however, there is also need for counseling officers who can discuss frankly, and even “clinically,” with each student the relationship between his apparent talents and his career plans, including, most importantly, his choice of a major and a realistic assessment of his prospects for graduate or professional school.

As to the administrative location of advising and counseling, I suspect the academic advising must be done by each relevant school. But there are substantial economies to having a general counseling service for all undergraduates with respect to their choice of major, career, job placement, and personal questions. When a student’s program is very specialized, as in nursing, the placement and career counseling should probably be in the school, but with a strong liaison to the central office.

As we suggest in the report, perhaps not much may come from all of this. But academic advising, and the awareness that it is readily available, is especially important in a period of flux in which a number of new and unfamiliar programs are offered to students.

With respect to support services, the team obviously was aware that some such service exists for minority students, since they are discussed on pages 58 to 60 of the report. * Penn prepared for the Middle States Commission on undergraduate education, although the title “Office of Supportive Services” is not mentioned there. I did not look into these

*Page 8 in the Almanac November 26, 1974 version of the report.
services personally, so I will simply quote from the report on the visit by one of the other members of the team: "I found a complete lack of supportive services not only for the black students admitted, but for the whites. Specifically, Penn's students need, whether it is admitted or not, help in gaining basic competence in reading, and writing, and math. A writing center, a reading center, and counseling help to all students could help..." Second, there should be a separate counseling organization for the black students on campus. Third, the counseling center should be strongly supported by tutorial efforts in basic academic skills, for despite the relatively high SATs of the black students (they are among the top 5% of black students nationally), they still fall below the median SATs of the whites in entering freshmen and their professors. But not all, of course, need academic help. "I cannot ascribe uniformity of this commitment, but the Penn report on undergraduate education emphasizes help to the weakest of the black students and perhaps the need is more general.

Relation of a Graduate to Undergraduate Programs

Here there are quite different but interacting elements involved: the role of the professional in modern society, the organization of each professional establishment, including the educational system that supports it, and the desirability of professional or quasi-professional training for undergraduates. We suggested in the report, and I reinforce the suggestion here, that a more attractive strategy might bring up the question of the professions into the undergraduate curriculum is through courses in sociology or philosophy of the major professions, for example the philosophical underpinnings of legal training and practice in the United States, or the ethics of pursuit of narrow professional codes of behavior when they may conflict with the broader values of society. Another example might be the evolution of the Hippocratic code in the contemporary context of abortion and geriatrics. The code was laid down at a time when life was brutish and short. A life saved could be saved for many healthy years. That is no longer true when many people live into their eighties. As Carl Schorske has said, in Professors Fox and Adams, Penn already has a good basis in its arts and sciences faculty for mounting such courses... Such courses would serve the dual purpose of exposing undergraduates to aspects of the practice of the key professions, especially law and medicine, and would also put those professions in a broader social context, something that is rarely done in the professional schools themselves. (The observations in the report on undergraduate offerings in architecture and social work came from Schorske's conversations as reported in his letter.)

Then there is the question of how the professions have organized themselves as well as the training programs that support them. There is little that any one university can do about this in a relatively short period, beyond sowing the seeds of change. The key problem at present is in medicine in my view, although law also has tendencies toward over-"professionalization." My judgment is that we need to detect a greater extent a medical professional whose training falls short of the present M.D., but exceeds that of nurses—someone who can legitimately practice external and simple medical prescription and prescribe a limited range of drugs, and can diagnose aliment sufficiently well to know to which specialist a patient should be referred. More complex medical care would then be done by specialists, as is occurring increasingly already. At present the M.D. alone has either too much training or too little. I hope that among its other tasks, the Langfitt Committee can make a seasoned judgment on this question, and perhaps Penn can start a long term move in this direction within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. If this development were to occur, we could eventually imagine undergraduate majors in "medicine," topped off by a professional Master's degree.

But that is for the future, not the present. With the professional criteria as now laid down by medical associations there is not much scope for immediate change beyond broad exposure to the liberal arts aspects of the professions discussed above, along with modes of acceleration into professional programs for those students who can do it without slighting their education. The Schorske Scholars program does this, and I believe it should be expanded as far as the constraints admit. One constraint is faculty resources for such special programs, but I suspect the more serious constraint against large scale is the requirement of advanced commitment by graduate and professional schools to freshmen and sophomores. Given the present size of Penn's professional schools I find it hard to imagine the program exceeding 25 to 30 new students a year, and even that size on only the assumption that the students are well distributed among fields. On training in education, let me quote the observations of another member of the team: "I will simply add that the maintenance of bachelor's degree granting program for elementary education through the School of Education seems outmoded in a time when teacher education is increasingly moving toward heavier emphasis on liberal arts subjects and on competency-based teacher education that is rooted in field work (student teaching). ... Pennslyvania might well lead in integrating its professional schools with its faculty of Arts and Sciences."

Administrative and Financial Management

I have no especially apt ideas on administration. Bad organization can obviously hurt, but there is no such thing as "good" organization except in the negative sense of avoiding the confusion created by bad organization. A key organizational decision for Penn concerns the treatment of undergraduate programs. If they are to be brought closer together, for example through a common freshman year (an idea I would support), then some central organization for at least the first two years of undergraduate education would be necessary. That organization could also deal with questions of counseling and housing. This obviously cuts across the vertical organization of the schools, but proper coordination can be managed through the inevitable committees. It might also be desirable to bring the various undergraduate professional programs closer to Arts and Sciences for curricular purposes, and that too would need the appropriate faculty coordinating committees. This central coordination of undergraduate programs could be done, as it has recently been done, out of the Provost's office or at least under the general aegis of the Provost, as the only academic official with responsibility that crosses all schools. A Dean of Students for all undergraduate programs, with responsibility for all common aspects of undergraduate academic and social life across the University. He would be responsible either to the Provost or directly to the President, preferably the former to reduce the burdens of the President.

I also believe strong financial control should be centered in the Provost's office, and therefore financial decentralization should not go too far. Later Presidents will regret the diffusion of authority that inevitably goes with financial autonomy. This means specifically that the concept of cost-responsibility centers should not be carried to the point at which schools are literally self-supporting, for they will translate a condition of financial independence into independence in determining policy. Wherever possible, general university income should be kept at the center and dispersed to the schools or other centers in the form of subventions. Desirable cost consciousness can be maintained if these subventions are set for some period of time, for example on a three-to-five-year schedule, so that schools which have overspent in any given year must repay from the subventions of later years or out of school-restricted endowment or other reserves that they may have. Schools which underspent might be allowed to retain some significant fraction of their "saving." In the end, of course, there is no substitute for having responsible Deans who are team players for the University as a whole.

On the specific issue of tuition transfers, as our report reflects, all the members of our team are disturbed by their potential for centrifugal effect, away from the notion of one university. My preference would be for abolishing them with inter alia would reflect in a rough way the services which each school renders to other parts of the university. For example, heavy course enrollments for several years by College of Arts and Science students in architecture programs would be reflected in the subvention to the School of Fine Arts. If, however, you wish to retain the tuition transfers, some of the undesirable incentives they create could be mitigated by calculating them on the basis of variable costs rather than existing tuition. For example, if to serve engineering and Wharton students, the College has to augment its mathematics teaching staff by, say, one assistant professor and four teaching assistants, the internal charge by the College to those two schools would be linked to those additional costs plus a modest allowance for additional administrative expenses. I have no illusions that such calculations can be done with exactness, but they can be reasonably approximated, and the Provost's office can oversee the calculations. The gain in doing so would be to provide a continuing incentive for schools to rely, if possible, on facilities and services already available in other schools rather than hire additional staff and faculty, thereby duplicating personnel elsewhere in the university.

Finally, as to the placement of women in senior faculty and administrative jobs, I know from experience how difficult it is to find well qualified persons, and in particular how competitive Penn can be in holding onto them! Inevitably, much will have to be done over a period of time by starting with relatively junior positions now. In some cases, however, qualified women can be found in research organizations such as Brookings or the National Institutes of Health—where they have pursued a successful professional, if not an academic, career. I hope these additional comments are at least of some help to you in dealing with your vast and fascinating enterprise.

—Richard N. Cooper
The Structure of the Academic Staff:  
A Report of the Committee on Faculty Affairs

The following document is an attempt to redefine and clarify the often somewhat ambiguous existing system of classification of the faculty. It represents the culmination of several years' work by various committees with input from numerous individuals in administration and faculty. It is being submitted to the Steering Committee of the Council as a recommendation of the Committee. Implementation, however, will probably have to await a second report, being prepared by a joint subcommittee of the Personnel Benefits Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee, on the assignment of benefits to each category of the Academic Staff. — A.L.L.

The University requires the services, abilities, and talents of a wide range of persons as members of the academic staff in teaching and research, including some who are still pursuing their professional training. This report attempts to define the broad outlines of the structure of the academic staff, while recognizing that special situations exist for some of our schools.

We recommend the division of the academic staff of the University into three major groups: the Standing Faculty, the Associate Faculty, and the Academic Support Staff. We further recommend that the current categories of full and partial affiliation be dropped.

I. THE STANDING FACULTY

The Standing Faculty is made up of (A) all tenured faculty and (B) non-tenured faculty serving in appointments (ranks) which are qualifying for tenure. The Standing Faculty is limited to those persons who have completed their formal professional preparation and who hold appointments at the University of Pennsylvania in one of the ranks (without adjectival qualifiers) listed below:

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- (Associate)
- (Instructor)

We recommend that the ranks of Associate and Instructor be limited to the schools in the medical area (Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Allied Medical Professions) and be used only to the extent that a special need for these ranks can be demonstrated in that area.

A. Tenured Faculty

The University normally grants tenure only to full-time and fully salaried professors and associate professors (except for those in other ranks who received tenure before June 30, 1975, and some faculty members in University-owned or affiliated hospitals). Rarely, the University may grant tenure on a partial salary basis for persons serving part-time. The University's financial commitment is only for partial salary.

1. University Controlled Funds

For full-time and non-tenured faculty members deriving their salaries through funds controlled by the University, the University assumes responsibility for the salary until resignation, retirement, or death, except as follows:

- a. Physical or mental disability for which a separate program exists.
- b. Termination under the terms of the tenure agreement.
- c. Salary reductions which are school or institution wide and non-selectively administered.

2. External Funds

The University may grant tenure of title to selected faculty members in clinical practice who derive their income (salaries) in whole or in part from University-owned or affiliated hospitals or in departmental or interdepartmental practice groups, or single practice. The University's obligation is to recognize the title so long as the individual continues as an active and effective staff member in such a hospital, limited by resignation or retirement. In some cases an individual is appointed with part of his salary paid by the University; such an appointment shall be made in writing with the agreement of the specific hospital, the University, and the individual. The University's financial responsibility is limited to the part (if any) of the salary that has agreed to undertake.

B. Tenure-Accruing Faculty

The tenure qualifying period begins with appointment at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor, on a full-time, fully salaried basis. The University's financial responsibility is limited to the period specified in the letter of appointment or reappointment. The appropriate professional preparation must be completed by the individual before taking up the appointment.

Permissible ranks:
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Associate
- Instructor

II. THE ASSOCIATE FACULTY

The members of the Associate Faculty play an important role in the teaching, research, and professional programs of the University, but members of this faculty are not eligible for tenure, nor does the time served on the Associate Faculty qualify for tenure.

A. Visiting Faculty

Ranks with the qualifier 'visiting' are normally used for persons holding academic appointments in other institutions or occasionally from government, business, the arts, or the professions. Appointments are for limited duration, usually not to exceed two years, but in no circumstances to exceed three years of continuous appointment. Permissible ranks (usually that of the home institution):

- Visiting Professor
- Visiting Associate Professor
- Visiting Assistant Professor
- Visiting Lecturer

1 Or as Associate or Instructor in the medical areas.

2 Except in rare instances where by specific action as provided in footnote 1 above, part-time appointees may acquire tenure.
B. Adjunct Faculty

These are normally part-time appointments in the University for persons who simultaneously hold appointments in other institutions, government, or business, or carry on an external professional practice. Appointment to the Adjunct Faculty is for a specified period, not to exceed three years, but reappointment for successive terms is permissible. Permissible ranks:

- Adjunct Professor
- Adjunct Associate Professor
- Adjunct Assistant Professor

C. Research Faculty

The University appoints qualified persons to the faculty whose primary obligation is to an area of research and whose salaries are normally derived from external research grants or funds. These appointments are normally for a specified period, or for the duration of the financial support, whichever is shorter. Permissible ranks:

- Research Professor
- Research Associate Professor
- Research Assistant Professor

D. Clinical Faculty

The University-owned and -affiliated hospitals may appoint, through the medical school, persons of professional level without tenure. Such individuals may receive their income in whole or in part from such hospitals or in departmental or interdepartmental practice groups or single practice. Clinical faculty without tenure are appointed for a specific period of time, but reappointment for successive periods is permissible.

III. ACADEMIC SUPPORT STAFF

This category includes many types of persons who contribute actively to the University’s programs in teaching, research, and clinical service; many are simultaneously candidates for a higher degree or continuing their professional training. The years served in these ranks do not count toward the accrual of tenure.

A. Lecturer. Persons qualified to teach may hold the rank of lecturer; they may be full-time or part-time; they may be graduate or graduate professional students, or they may have a terminal professional degree. Appointment is annual and is normally limited to three years (see, however, the Senate document on lecturers, which recommends certain exceptions).

B. Teaching Fellow/Research Fellow. A graduate or graduate professional student who participates in University instruction under supervision of a faculty member, or is an active participant in a research program.

C. Teaching Assistant. A graduate or graduate professional student who aids a faculty member in undergraduate teaching.

D. Assistant Instructor. This rank is used only in the Medical School as the academic title given to some residents.

E. Research Associate/Postdoctoral Fellow. These ranks are normally held by persons who have received their terminal degree and are actively engaged in research programs. Appointments are normally for one year, renewal is common, but appointments in this rank should rarely exceed three years. Though these appointments are primarily for research, a limited amount of teaching by these individuals is often desirable.

F. We recommend that the ranks of Investigator and Senior Investigator be professional ranks, with appointment on A-1 budgets, rather than A-2. These ranks should be limited to professionally qualified persons active in research programs usually financed by external funds administered by the University.

IV. EMERITUS FACULTY

We recommend that emeritus status, with all the rights and privileges pertaining thereto, be conferred automatically on Professors and Associate Professors of the Standing Faculty at the time of their retirement, unless contrary action is taken by the Provost.

V. APPROVAL OF APPOINTMENTS

Though the initiative and evaluation concerning faculty appointments, reappointments, leaves, and terminations come from the departments and schools, appointments at the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor must be approved by the Provost (Staff Conference) and the Trustees. This includes those titles designated as Visiting, Research, Clinical, or Adjunct.

The Dean of a school, with the approval of the Provost or an appropriate Vice-President, shall have power to appoint to all ranks below Assistant Professor; however, any such appointment which is tenure accruing (Associate, Instructor) must be recorded in the minutes of the Provost’s Staff Conference.

VI. VOTING

A. In Faculty

The By-Laws of the University limit voting in Faculty to persons having appointments as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. This is interpreted here to limit such voting to these ranks of the Standing Faculty. This is also in conformity with the rules on voting in the Faculty Senate.

B. Departments

Department members holding the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor (in the Standing Faculty) should normally have voting rights on departmental matters.

Exceptions:

1. Voting concerning faculty appointments, reappointments, and terminations may be limited to those members holding a rank higher than the individual under consideration, except that Professors vote on nominations to a Professorship.

2. Departments may extend voting rights to others on the academic staff for particular actions.

C. Other

Members of the Associate Faculty or Academic Support Staff may be asked to serve as voting members of departmental, school, or University committees.

Maria Z. Brooks
Arnold Chait
Richard C. Clelland
Robert E. Davies
David R. Goddard
William Gomberg
Joseph S. Gois
Victoria E. Kirkham

Eileen Mulligan
Eric J. Oliver
David T. Rowlands, Jr.
Shiro Takashima
Oliver E. Williamson
Michael Cohen, ex-officio
Phillip DeLucy, ex-officio
Benjamin Shen, ex-officio

Albert L. Lloyd, Chairman

TO ALL TIAA-CREF PARTICIPANTS

This bulletin comes as a reminder that you may change your participation in TIAA-CREF for the 1975-76 fiscal year. If you have no interest in doing so, you need not take any action. However, if you wish to make a change, please check the applicable items in the form you have received and return it to the Benefits Counseling Area by August 31. If you will be leaving campus soon and have not received a form, or if you have questions regarding changes, please do not hesitate to contact the Benefits Counseling Area, 116 Franklin Building, Ext. 7281.

James J. Keller,
Director of Personnel Administrative Services
REGISTRATION RENEWAL
A vehicle purchased or leased with University funds is like any other—its registration must be renewed periodically. To speed up the renewal process, departments with Penn vehicles are asked to submit the following information to both William Neuber of Purchasing (Ext. 7216) and Florence Scarafone in the Treasurer's Office (Ext. 7255): the vehicle's make, model and year; serial, title and license numbers; registration fee; and the department name and accounting code for charging registration fees.

CORRECTION
The Office of Research Administration notes that it incorrectly recorded in Almanac May 6 a grant awarded by the National Institutes of Health as having Drs. G. Fischer and R. Cox as principal investigators. Dr. Fischer is the only principal research investigator.

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)
ASSISTANT TO THE VICE-PRESIDENT FOR OPERATIONAL SERVICES to assist with daily activities; handle special projects; act as expeditor in areas of concern; analyze and prepare appropriate reports as requested by the vice-president; provide liaison with directors reporting to the vice-president; perform financial duties including budgetary reviews; prepare budget reports and financial data; review requests of departments reporting to the vice-president; perform related duties as assigned. Qualifications: College degree, preferably advanced degree in business administration; top-level administrative experience, preferably in a university; understanding of university academic and administrative organization; familiarity with accounting principles and budgetary procedures. Salary to be determined.

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR II responsible for the general administration of all budgets, preparation review and related duties, to analyze income and expenditures during the year and investigate significant deviations from budget amounts; prepare statistical reports as required by administrators; meet with department administration on procedural problems; serve as liaison between General Personnel Administration and Personnel Services; provide employee counseling and training services when necessary. Qualifications: College degree with some accounting background; knowledge of university accounting systems; min. 1 year experience in accounting; min. 1 year experience in personnel administration; ability to deal effectively with people, represent department concerns to various University officials, and perform under pressure. $9,275-$11,450-$13,600.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE SENIOR VICE-PRESIDENT FOR MANAGEMENT responsible to the senior vice-president for coordination of management staff activities, liaison with university officers and departments and other specialized tasks as assigned. Qualifications: College degree in management or administration, preferably at the master's level; at least three years' experience in administration with supervisory responsibilities; ability to express ideas effectively in written and oral communication and to interact effectively with high level management personnel. Salary to be determined.

JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST to isolate blood leukocytes from human and peritoneal leukocytes from animals, and quantify the phagocytosis, cellular viability and enzyme release resulting from their incubation with bacteria. Qualifications: Training in general hematology and immunology; experience in isolation and identification of blood cells and in handling lab animals. $8,075-$10,050-$12,000.

SUPPORT STAFF (A-3)
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I, Dental School, to handle correspondence; set up appointments; record expenditures; and maintain files and patient records. Qualifications: Three years' experience, preferably at Penn; good typing skills; some knowledge of university budgets; ability to deal with people. $6,550-$7,925-$9,300.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I, Medicine, to handle administrative responsibility; handle budgets; maintain calendar; prepare patients' charts; type manuscripts; screen phone messages. Qualifications: Three to five years' office experience; good typing skills; knowledge of medical terminology. $6,550-$7,925-$9,300.

BOOKKEEPER to perform daily coding and processing of checks for banking and very detailed accounting for money; maintain ledgers; handle telephone. Qualifications: Two years' experience with a university accounting system desirable. $5,700-$6,750-$7,800.

CLERK III, Qualifications: Experience in handling Admissions applications helpful; accurate typing and filing skills; good clerical aptitude; ability to deal effectively with people. $5,700-$6,750-$7,800.

MEDICAL SECRETARY (3/2) (75).
PSYCHOLOGY TECHNICIAN I to conduct data by taking blood pressures and performing relaxation treatments; help analyze results. Qualifications: Experience as a research assistant; background in psychology, physiology and statistics. $7,900-$9,450-$11,000.

PSYCHOLOGY TECHNICIAN I to conduct experiments with human subjects on learning, reading and thinking; recruit subjects; analyze data. Qualifications: B.A. in psychology or related area; experience working with children. $7,900-$9,450-$11,000.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III to prepare platelets and perform spectrophotometry; colorimetry; and enzymatic, radiochemical and immunologic assays. Qualifications: M.S. or B.S. in chemistry; at least two years' experience; skill in enzymatic assays, cell preparation and radioisotopes; knowledge of biochemistry desirable. $7,900-$9,450-$11,000.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III to perform enzymatic assays; chromatography and radioactive counting. Qualifications: B.S. in chemistry; biochemical research lab experience. $7,900-$9,450-$11,000.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III to perform routine laboratory isolation and identification of bacteria; serological and immunochemical analyses of bacterial antigens; automatic amino acid analyses; gas and liquid chromatography; colorimetry. Qualifications: B.S. in microbiology or chemistry. $7,900-$9,450-$11,000.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III to carry out general tissue culture and microbiological procedures for studies on mechanisms and consequences of bacterial leukocyte interaction. Qualifications: Experience in tissue culture, microbiology and immunology; some experience in handling lab animals. $7,900-$9,450-$11,000.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III. Four positions announced March 4 through April 29: three call for tissue culture and one for cell fractionation.

RECTOR, Medicine, to monitor and record grades, courses and transfer of credits; review records; maintain files; process students' transcripts requests. Qualifications: Three years' responsible clerical experience, preferably at a university; familiarity with detailed bookkeeping; sensitivity to students' needs. $6,125-$7,325-$8,525.

SECRETARY (1-4) (75); (1-4) (75); (1-4) (75). Qualifications: Three years' experience in clerical work; ability to handle confidential information. $6,125-$7,325-$8,525.

SECRETARY (5) (6-75). Qualifications: Experience in clerical work; ability to handle confidential information. $6,125-$7,325-$8,525.

TECHNICAL SECRETARY, legal (4) (75).
TECHNICAL TYPIST (5) (6-75).

OPENINGS continued page 16
WAYS TO SAVE

Virtue isn't its own reward; foresight guarantees savings if printing needs are anticipated now. For example, stationery ordered in bulk from the Publications Office before June 2 will cost roughly 20% less than small "as-needed" quantities purchased later. To increase savings, the office suggests that individual names and titles be replaced with a general department letterhead. Billing begins after September 1, so you can plan now and pay later. Order forms (complete with price list) have been sent to departments and are also available from Harriet Bratton, Publications Office, 110 Logan Hall. Ext. 7794.

From May 16 to August 15 the Houston Hall Copy Center offers a 25% discount and free collating and stapling on all work that is brought in at least one month before it's needed. Art services and September billing for journals are also available upon request. For more information: Ext. 5574.

Next year's Pennsylvania Calendar (the University's master calendar of events) is still on the drawing board, but a vote of confidence is rewarded: the cost is $3.50 if ordered before July 15, $3.85 for the finished product in September. If you "think big" and order 50 or more, the cost goes down to $2.50 each. Calendar-planners are especially interested in bicentennial events. If you've scheduled one for '76, report it to Jack Marquette, Penn Student Agencies, 201 Logan Hall. Ext. 6815.

THINGS TO DO

Dance Girl Dance by Dorothy Arzner leads off the May 16 program of the Fourth International Festival of Films by Women at the Annenberg School auditorium. Ida Lupino's Hard, Fast and Beautiful as well as film portraits of Louise Nevelson and Marjorie Howard screening on May 17. Showtime both nights is 7:30 p.m. with tickets at $1 available in the Annenberg School lobby one hour before screenings. For a complete schedule: Annenberg Library. Ext. 7027.

The Mouth as a Model for Studying the Ecology of Indigenous and Pathogenic Bacteria. Dr. Ronald J. Gibbons of Harvard's Dental School delivers the first of a three-course series, the lecture is named in honor of the emeritus professor of microbiology and former director of the Center for Oral Health Research at Penn.

The Pennsylvania Pro Musica, directed by Franklin Zimmerman, performs Henry Purcell's Dido and Aeneas, May 17 at 4 p.m. in Houston Hall. Tickets for the Alumni Day concert are available at $3 ($2.50 with a Penn I.D.) from the Houston Hall Ticket Office or at the door.

The bus leaves at 9 a.m. on May 18. After a continental breakfast en route, passengers taking the ICA trip to Purchase, N.Y. will make their first stop at the PepsiCo headquarters, a complex of inverted pyramids designed by Edward Durrell Stone on a 112-acre site. Highlight: a tour of the Neuberger Museum on the SUNY campus and a visit to the Gimbel mansion in Greenwich, Conn. Back on the bus, cocktails and hors d'oeuvres are served during the trip home. Tickets at $50 include transportation, food and a complimentary membership in the ICA. For more information: Ext. 7108.

The summer session of women's self-defense classes starts the week of May 19. 16. Open to women in the University at no charge, the classes meet at the times below in the dance studio of Weightman Hall, 33rd St. near Spruce. Registration will be held at the first meeting and instruction starts then too: loose clothing is suggested and participants should come prepared to exercise. Beginners: Mon. and Wed., 5:30-7 p.m. Tues. and Thurs., 3:45-5:30 p.m. Intermediates: Tues. and Thurs., 5-6:30 p.m. For more information: the Women's Center. Ext. 8611.

DEATHS

Dr. Martin P. Chworowsky (April 29 at 75), emeritus professor of human relations since his retirement in 1968, after holding academic appointments at Carnegie Institute of Technology and Columbia. Dr. Chworowsky joined Pennsylvania's faculty in 1951 as the first director of the Albert M. Greenfield Center for Human Relations and research professor of human relations, becoming department chairman in 1965. An alumnus of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, he received both his master's and doctoral degrees from the University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Robert Groff (April 25 at 71), emeritus professor of neurosurgery at the Medical School and chairman of the Neurosurgery department at Graduate Hospital, who joined Penn's faculty in 1937 as assistant professor of neurosurgery in the Graduate School of Medicine. A member of numerous medical societies, the Penn alumnus published more than fifty articles and one book on neurosurgery.

Dr. Stuart Mudd (May 6 at 81), emeritus professor of microbiology who joined the Medical School faculty in 1931 as founder and chairman of the microbiology department, a position which he held until his retirement in 1959. A pioneer in the development of techniques for freezing blood plasma (for which he won the 1944 William Guggenheim Cup), Dr. Mudd was the author of four major books and more than 200 articles in his field. He was an alumnus of the Harvard Medical School, member of Phi Beta Kappa and a founder and vice-president of the World Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is survived by four children and by his wife, Dr. Emily H. Mudd, one of the foremost authorities on marriage counseling and emeritus professor of family study in psychiatry here.

John S. Rosseter (April 27 at 57), who served on the management staff of the intercollegiate athletics department for twenty years until his retirement in 1971. The Wharton alumnus had been a founder of the Big Five Basketball Program here.

Karl de Schweinitz (April 20 at 87), director of the School of Social Work for seven years and professor of social administration for three years until his resignation in 1942. After four years as a journalist, the Penn alumnus became active in the field of social welfare as a staff member of the Charity Organization of New York, a consultant to the newly-formed Social Security Administration and director of the American Council on Education's committee on education and Social Security. He was the author of four books, including Growing Up, a sex education text released last year.

Bruce W. Slegtier (April 18 at 66), an electrician here for seventeen years until 1967.

Louis J. Strumato (April 4 at 65), a member of the Buildings and Grounds staff for sixteen years until his retirement in 1971.