SAMP: THE JEFFERSON OPTION

President Martin Meyerson and Provost Eliot Stellar will take to the Trustees Health Affairs Committee on December 20 a recommendation to pursue “the Jefferson option” for the future location of the School of Allied Medical Professions.

The Jefferson option is described as a joint program in the December 1 advice of the Reallocation Review Board, which urges the Provost to “proceed toward the joint program with Jefferson.” In its September 21 report, the board had given the option as one of two unranked recommendations, the other being to upgrade the school at Penn.

Details of the decision are in a four-page supplement to this issue of *Almanac*. It contains the text of the President and Provost’s recommendation to the Trustees Health Affairs Committee and three letters exchanged between the Provost and the Reallocation Review Board on November 30 and December 1.

SAMP’s Acting Dean Eugene Michels and members of the SAMP faculty are expected to issue a response next week.

Formal action on SAMP is on the agenda of the Trustees at their full meeting January 13-14, 1977.
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SUPPLEMENT: SAMP Documents

FAS ON GRAD ED: AUTONOMY

The FAS faculty on November 30 passed a resolution by its Ad Hoc Graduate Executive Committee reaffirming the Rosner report (*Almanac* December 2, 1975), which gives autonomy in its graduate programs to FAS, as amended by the Amado resolution (*Almanac* December 16, 1975) which urges the Dean to pursue University-wide structures to make possible a “unified program of graduate studies.” The new resolution:

- a) That the Dean implement the Rosner report as amended and adopted by this Faculty last year;
- b) That the structures for such implementation be consistent with
  1) the general principle that FAS has primary responsibility for graduate education in the arts and sciences within the University, and
  2) the forthcoming by-laws of FAS;
- c) That the Dean and the Provost reconcile this implementation with any other structures dealing with graduate education within the University;
- d) That the Dean give his faculty an opportunity to consider any proposed deviations from the Rosner report;
- e) That the Dean set up procedures for evaluating the governance of graduate education within FAS and report to his faculty within two years.

Dean Vartan Gregorian came out for “affiliation, yes; absorption, no” in discussing linkage of the biomedical faculty from the health area schools with graduate programs in FAS. “Affiliation is important, he said, "because it would provide for greater dialogue, integration and planning without our biomedical offerings,” and would place graduate basic science education “under one roof.”

The ad hoc committee’s chairman Dr. Henry Teune also read his committee’s “outline of an acceptable relationship with the biomedical faculty”:

- a) the creation of an affiliated faculty status within FAS.
  1. The affiliated faculty would be members of graduate groups.
  2. The Dean of FAS would appoint the affiliated faculty in consultation with his faculty.
  b) the creation of a Council of Affiliated Faculty.
  1. The membership would be composed of the Chairmen of the graduate groups in the bio-sciences.
  2. The members of the Council would be full voting members of FAS.
  3. The Council would be open to affiliation by faculty from other schools (e.g., Annenberg).
  c) the designation of at least two meetings a year of the regular FAS faculty and its affiliated faculty to discuss matters pertaining to graduate education.
  d) the creation of “a Biomedical Board” consisting of the Deans of FAS, School of Medicine, School of Veterinary Medicine, the School of Dental Medicine, and the chairman of the Council of Affiliated Faculty.

BIO SCIENCE FACULTY ON INSTITUTE: NO

The biomedical graduate group faculty, called together by Provost Eliot Stellar on December 1 to consider Dr. John Hobstetter’s proposal for a Biomedical Institute versus a structure designed by an ad hoc biomedical faculty group, unanimously chose the biomedical faculty plan (page 11).

The vote came after Dean Edward S. Stemmler presented a statement (page 12) which proposed an optional structure he characterized as being in line with the faculty plan, and which said the three health school deans did not support the idea of an institute.

Dr. Stellar has assembled a new committee (page 12) which will refine details, working with the Teune committee of FAS (left). The result of their work will go both to FAS and to the biomedical faculty members and, if approved by them, will be forwarded to the Senate Advisory Committee. If also approved by SAC, the plan will satisfy the condition imposed by Senate at its November 17 meeting, where the Hobstetter plan for graduate education as a whole (*Almanac* November 2) was accepted subject to the development of a plan for biomedical graduate education.

SENA TE ON SAMP: UPGRADE IT

The Faculty Senate passed, with none opposed and six abstaining, Dr. Britton Harris’s motion to support upgrading of SAMP rather than phase-out (via transfer to Thomas Jefferson University) at the special Senate meeting November 29. His motion read:

The Senate has noted the report of the 1975-76 Steering Committee of the Council, serving as a Reallocation Review Board, on the future of the School of Allied Medical Professions. The Senate commends the Committee for its diligence and fairness in pursuing its deliberations and expresses its preference for the Committee’s first recommendation, to “upgrade SAMP.”

The motion replaced one by Dr. G. Malcolm Laws “…that Senate go on record as supporting the continuation of the School of Allied Medical Professions” which had precipitated parliamen-
tary dissent and led Chairman Robert F. Lucid to yield the chair for the rest of the meeting.

Highlights of the debate itself were Acting Dean Eugene Miche's summary of what he called "inconsistent" positions taken by the central administration on grounds and sources of the Langfitt proposal for phase-out; Dr. Langfitt's list of reasons he was not persuaded by SAMP supporters that the school should be kept; and exchanges on the profession such as one between Dr. Langfitt and Dr. William Kissick on the need for SAMP's disciplines. (Dr. Kissick said that, based on federal support trends, the University would have to start SAMP again in ten years if it closed it now.)

Dr. Langfitt said SAMP supporters give three reasons for keeping the school: that it provides needed services, that it is of high quality in relation to SAMP-type schools elsewhere, and that it provides alternative health careers for Penn students. To the first he responded that manpower projections include the possibility of overproduction; to the second that the comparison, under selective excellence, should be with other health schools within Penn; and to the third, that Penn offers stronger alternatives including linkages with law, Wharton, and engineering, and is working on one for undergraduates.

SAMP Chairman Eleanor J. Carlin debated manpower projections with Dr. Langfitt, and on selective excellence asked who else is being reviewed. Other queries included three by Dr. Robert Rutman: What of SAMP's knowledge base will Penn have if the school goes? What will be the effect on collegial interactions? And what will happen to the SAMP faculty members themselves? To the last question Dr. Eliot Stellar replied that tenure agreements and contracts would be honored if SAMP were phased out.

NOT THIS ISSUE: FACULTY PROJECTIONS

Dr. Robert Zemsky's figures on five-year projections of tenure capacity in each school scheduled for publication today, are still being refined. He promises them as soon as possible.

UNDERGRADS AND HEALTH EDUCATION

A tentative timetable for detailed planning of a cross-disciplinary project in undergraduate education for the health professions has been announced by its coordinator, Dr. Burton S. Rosner.

This month, work teams are being formed to study major educational areas in FAS and the various professional schools expected to participate. The target date for their reports is March 1. One team, in the physical sciences, will look at curriculum in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biochemistry, biophysics and parts of pharmacology. There will be two teams in biology: one to study parts of biology, microbiology, parasitology, pathology, immunology and genetics; and the other in anatomy, physiology, parts of psychology, physical anthropology, parts of biology, and parts of genetics, pathology and epidemiology.

A fourth team will look at social aspects of health care: parts of sociology, cultural anthropology, health care administration, economics, history and sociology of science, economics and psychology. The fifth team will examine bioethics, including concepts from philosophy, law, sociology and health care practice, and a sixth will be formed around problems of admission to professional schools and of counseling undergraduates.

The project, which began with a 1975-76 recommendation by a faculty committee headed by Dr. Shinia Inoue, is expected to have about 100 students, some of them headed for early admission to the professional school of their choice in the University.

Initially proposed as an institute for education in health sciences and professions, the program would draw on faculty in FAS, the Schools of Medicine, Veterinary Medicine and Dental Medicine, the Wharton School and the College of Engineering and Applied Science. Dr. Rosner said. He defined its goal as "a better, more intellectually coherent education for students entering the health professions."

ALMANAC December 7, 1976
Charge: To continue to serve as the faculty's voice in salary matters in the University and to continue a study of the long-range prospects for faculty salaries and their profile.

F. Gerard Adams (economics), Chairman
Jean V. Alter (Romance languages)
Ann H. Beuf (sociology)
J. David Cummins—Personnel Benefits (insurance)
Nancy Leonard (English)
Walter D. Wales (physics)
Margaret G. Wood (dermatology)

Committee on Education

Charge: To complete a study of indirect cost centers and to prepare an analysis of the place of professional education in the University, with special attention to undergraduate programs.

Roger M. A. Allen (Oriental studies), Chairman
June Axinn (social work)
Eleanor J. Carlin (physical therapy)
Donald D. Fitts (chemistry)
Charles D. Graham (metallurgy and materials science)
Frederick G. Kempin (business law)
Malinda Murray (nursing)
Thomas A. Reiner (regional science)
Thomas H. Wood (physics)
Charles R. Wright (communications)

Charge: To continue the study begun by the 1974-75 committee on the limitations of discontinuation of faculty, with special focus on the questions of what is meant by tenure and financial exigency. Follow-up on the associate medical school faculty track, approved by the Senate in spring 1976. And take preliminary look at Grievance Commission, reporting to SAC in early fall, to determine whether or not to mount full-scale review of Commission and its procedures.

Hilary Conroy (history)
Jean Crockett (finance)
Peter Freyd (mathematics)
John Honnold (law), Chairman
William L. Kissick (medicine)
Seymour J. Mandelbaum (city planning)
Vivianne T. Nachmias (anatomy in medicine)
Vincent H. Whitney (sociology)

Committee on Publication Policy for Almanac

Charges: To monitor and assist in the application of Almanac Guidelines by the editor, and in open expression and right-to-reply cases to collaborate with representatives of the Administrative, A-3, and Librarians' Assemblies. to recommend Guidelines changes to SAC if necessary, to encourage timely disclosure of administrative and University policies and plans, and to seek ways and means of encouraging University community use of Almanac.

Herbert Callen (physics)
Charles D. Graham (metallurgy and materials science)
Fred Karush (microbiology in medicine)
Robert L. Shayon (communications), Chairman

Committee on Students

Charges: To analyze graduate student life at the University, including residential, curricular, and financial support systems and the relationship of graduate programs to job availability.

E. Digby Baltzell (sociology)
Frank P. Bowman (Romance languages)
James W. Cormann (philosophy)
Stuart A. Curran (English)
Helen C. Davies (microbiology in medicine)
Elizabeth Dussan (chemical engineering)
Mitchell Litt (chemical engineering)
Daniel J. O'Kane (biology), Chairman
Henry Teune (political science)

ELECTED COMMITTEES, 1976-77

Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Charge: Shall maintain a current list of the standing committees on academic freedom and responsibility of each of the faculties of the University and, where necessary, take appropriate steps to cause such committees to be appointed in each of the faculties of the University. The Senate Committee shall advise and consult with such committees and administrative officers on the establishment of appropriate procedures to be followed in the event of a claim of violation of academic freedom or responsibility. The Committee shall have power to make investigations, reports, and recommendations on any matter relating to academic freedom and responsibility within the University, and

The Senate Committee shall assist in the operation of the Grievance Commission as described in the grievance procedure, and

The Senate Committee shall insure that each faculty has a mechanism for determining the qualifications for membership in that faculty.

Paul Bender, professor of law (1974-77)
Adelaide Delluva, associate professor of animal biology in veterinary medicine (1975-78)
Murray Gerstenhaber, professor of mathematics (1975-78)
Britton Harris, professor of city and regional planning (1976-77) (Chairman-elect of Senate)
Phoebe S. Leboy, professor of biochemistry in dental medicine (1976-77), Chairman
Thomas S. Robertson, associate professor of marketing (1976-79)
Peter Sterling, associate professor of anatomy in medicine (1976-79)

Senate Advisory Committee, 1976-77

Charge: In addition to duties indicated throughout the Senate Rules, SAC shall be consulted by the officers of the Senate for guidance in all matters on which Senate action is indicated, or on which consultation with the administrative officers of the University is contemplated. SAC may act on behalf of the Senate, subject to the limitation indicated in the Senate Bylaws. SAC shall also nominate persons to serve on consultative committees, shall appoint the members of the Senate Standing Committees, shall select the members of the Nominating Committee, and SAC members shall serve on University Council.

Term expires May 1979
Jean V. Alter, professor of Romance languages
Helen C. Davies, associate professor of microbiology in medicine, Secretary-elect
Britton Harris, professor of city and regional planning, Chairman-elect
Seymour J. Mandelbaum, associate professor of city and regional planning
W. Allyn Rickett, professor of Chinese

Term expires May 1978
James W. Cormann, professor of philosophy
Barbara J. Lowery, associate professor of nursing
Robert F. Lucid, professor of English, Chairman
Ann R. Miller, associate professor of sociology
Thomas A. Reiner, professor of regional science
Robert A. Zeiten, assistant professor of insurance, Secretary

Term expires May 1977
Ralph D. Amado, professor of physics, Past Chairman
Steven C. Batteman, professor of applied mechanics, Past Chairman
Richard A. Cooper, professor of medicine
Richard Kadison, professor of mathematics
John A. Quinn, professor of chemistry and biochemistry
Robert L. Shayon, professor of communications
Walter D. Wales, professor of physics
Dr. Stellar responds: What I said to the DP was that there was very little substantive information presented at the Faculty Senate meeting on SAMP; furthermore, no information was offered to indicate that the additional resources required to upgrade SAMP could be found; therefore, I felt that the vote was based more on feelings people had before the meeting than on evidence presented at the meeting.

The President and I, in making a difficult and painful decision, will weigh in all inputs, including votes, petitions, substantive evidence and arguments, and, particularly, the recommendations of the Steering Committee functioning as a Reallocation Review Board.

It is the Reallocation Review Board mechanism that the University community formally adopted to protect the "tenure" of Schools.

Speaking Out is a forum for readers' comment on University issues, conducted under the auspices of the Almanac Advisory Board: Robert L. Shayon, chairman; Herbert Callen, Charles D. Graham, Jr., Fred Karush, and Robert F. Lucid for the Faculty Senate; Paul Gay for the Librarians Assembly; Shirley Hill for the Administrative Assembly; and Virginia Hill Upright for the A-3 Assembly.
WHORTON: TEN-YEAR PROBATION?

On November 30 Dean Donald C. Carroll read to the Wharton School faculty a motion of the School's advisory committee on policy and planning. The motion, "essentially extends the tenure-probationary period from six years to ten years by the insertion of the rank of associate professor without tenure as a normal step in progression through the ranks." He urged the faculty to air their views and lobby the question before they vote on December 14. Five of them do so below.

DAMNED UNCOMFORTABLE

I'm concerned that the revision of the tenure procedure would impose certain costs, and that these costs would be borne inequitably.

The additional burden would fall largely on the untenured. In this state (somewhat indented) a faculty member is under pressure to conduct research, publish, and be well-accepted by the academy. Such a person is also under pressure to defer to the opinions of senior faculty, particularly in matters of internal policy and politics. Furthermore, individuals may resist this pressure successfully, and when they do, the pressure remains. Additionally, it is simply damned uncomfortable lacking tenure. Prolonging the probationary period makes the life much tougher for individuals.

There are costs to the school as well. The dynamic of personnel selection processes is to postpone the evil day as long as possible. There will be some pressure to retain the marginal candidate as long as possible. Also, tenure and promotion decisions are notoriously disruptive and time-consuming. If the promotion to associate professor is a real selection point, we will effectively double this effect.

The question is whether the gain via better tenure decisions justifies the imposition of these costs. I'm not at all convinced that it does.

David Hildebrand, Professor of Statistics

COLLEAGUES IN LIMBO

I fail to see what the motion before the Wharton faculty will accomplish other than to erode some of the hard-earned protection of academic freedom that we can ill afford to compromise. The essence of the resolution is the extension of the probationary period. There is no precise period that we can unequivocally say is the right one. The period should, however, be short — not long. The longer it is, the greater the interval during which a faculty member must teach and publish without the protection of tenure. Tenure is designed to provide society with the fruits of research and teaching done without the fear of retribution. To the untenured that fear is never entirely absent even in an environment in which academic freedom is valued very highly. Unfortunately the shorter the period, the greater the possibility that a university will not have enough time to screen its faculty properly. The present probationary period reflects a historical compromise resulting from this tension. Inevitably there will be some difficulties with this period, but there is no evidence that extension will eliminate the agony of decisions; it will merely postpone it and increase the candidate's equity in the position.

Indeed, we would probably create new difficulties for ourselves. If we ask our junior faculty to remain in limbo for a longer period, what are we giving them in exchange? How many can we really assure that the delay will improve the odds? The better candidates won't wait. They will demand recognition and that is inconsistent with the anti-early decision stance of the administration.

As for the criticism that some ideas require long gestation periods, there will be some who would still postpone embarking on a hazardous program till they were granted tenure and this proposal would simply force them to postpone their studies longer still.

I don't want to pretend that the tenure system we have has problems, and the Dean has indicated two that are real. But a leaky faucet is not sufficient reason to tear out the sink and put in a new one. If we are to modify the system, let us modify it in ways that best meet the challenge of the times.

— Morris Mendelson, President, University of Pennsylvania Chapter, AAUP

OBJECTIONS MAJOR AND MINOR

I have read with considerable dismay the proposed new tenure rules for the Wharton School. I have two major objections and one minor one. (In what follows, the pronoun "he" is used because more sexually neutral constructions are clumsy.)

1. The rules are unfair to our untenured faculty. Under our present rules, an assistant professor who is not granted tenure faces nearly five years before he can move elsewhere. (Refusal of a second three-year contract to an assistant professor who is not granted tenure is very rare.) Typically, this is less than one-sixth of his professional lifetime. After six years, he is under thirty-five. He has teaching experience. His graduate education is not obsolete. He can compete effectively in the job market with younger people. He has been stigmatized, but not to a great extent, by failing to achieve tenure at a first-rate institution like the Wharton School. Under the new rules, if he is not granted tenure, he will have spent seven years here before moving elsewhere. (Refusal of a second three-year contract to an assistant professor who is not granted tenure is not acquired with promotion to associate professor, such promotion will be much easier and more frequent than at present. We will have "rank inflation," which is analogous to grade inflation. The person not granted tenure will have spent one-fourth of his...
I read in The Daily Pennsylvanian this fall that academic freedom is safe and that we no longer need tenure. That is the most cheerful bit of news I have read in a long time.

I wish it were so.

I don't know what is controversial in all of my colleagues' fields, but I do know about mine—and I can identify at least three members of my own department who, had they not been protected by tenure, would probably have faced themselves under severe attack from the financial community and some of our alumni.

The basic justification of tenure is that it is an essential condition of academic freedom. It always has been and it is a delusion to think otherwise. Tenure has created an atmosphere favorable to academic freedom for the nontenured as well as the tenured faculty, and has made of the latter an independent body capable of vigilant action to protect academic freedom for all.

In addition, it generates an institutional commitment and contributes significantly to institutional governance. It provides greater assurance that judgment is based on professional fitness rather than on competitive personal advantage. It limits the accumulation of equity on the job, and forces a timely evaluation. Since it has an economic value it even reduces the cash outlay necessary to run a university.

But there is a third "pro" argument and that is that many of the young people themselves are enthusiastic about this proposal. They realize that a five-year system is a very short period of time in which to establish themselves at the high level currently required to gain tenure at Wharton. Some of these people, as the dean has pointed out, require two or three years of capital building before beginning in-depth research and teaching. Given the current five-year system, this cuts them very short in terms of research productivity. The proposal of the dean gives them, and us, desirable additional time to explore and evaluate their "world class scholarship" potential, at no loss to them and ourselves.

—Claude Colantoni, Professor of Accounting

ASK THE JUNIORS

At the November 30 faculty meeting, both Dean Carroll and Dr. Colantoni made statements to the effect that the proposed change to a ten-year tenure-probationary period had support among the junior faculty. Dr. Colantoni's remarks implied that this support was strong and widespread. Speaking at that time, I indicated that I personally did not favor the change, and I challenged the notion that the proposal had substantial support among the junior faculty. Subsequent discussions with several of my colleagues have strengthened my belief as to the latter point. Unless someone can come forward with a clear indication of the junior faculty's sentiment, I strongly urge that speculative assumptions as to this sentiment not be used as a decision factor.

—Arnold J. Rosoff, Assistant Professor Business Law & Health Care Systems Unit
I. The Scope of Legal Protection for Tenure*

by Robert A. Gorman

The purpose of this paper is to survey the legal protection accorded tenure in institutions of higher education, particularly in private institutions such as the University of Pennsylvania. My definition of tenure comes from the 1940 Statement of the American Association of University Professors: “Service shall be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.” The Association’s Recommended Institutional Regulations (first formally articulated in 1968) have now added additional reasons for termination of tenure—medical reasons and the discontinuance of a program or department (apart from financial exigency)—and more detailed procedural safeguards than in the 1940 Statement.

The University of Pennsylvania, in its Faculty Handbook and Procedures Concerning Tenure, endorses the principles of tenure, due-process procedures, just cause and financial exigency. Discontinuance of program or department is addressed in more recent and less formal documents. The University rules become part of the contract of employment of faculty members—whether that contract is formal and in writing or is merely oral and informally continued from year to year—and may thus be enforced, as is true of any contract, in a court proceeding. Such contract actions are the principle mode of legal redress for improper impairment of tenure rights.

In public educational institutions, faculty members are technically employees of the government, and the government is forbidden by the federal Constitution to deprive persons of liberty or property without due process of law. At such institutions, a faculty member wrongly stripped of tenure may rely not only on contractual rights but also on constitutional rights. The Supreme Court has recognized that tenure is a property right, which may be taken away by government only after giving notice of reasons and providing a fair hearing. Moreover, expulsion from public employment because of the exercise of the right of free speech under the Bill of Rights of the federal Constitution (substantially congruent with our professional notions of academic freedom) will be treated as an unconstitutional impairment of “liberty,” whether the faculty member is tenured or not.

It remains to be determined definitely whether the University of Pennsylvania is a “public” institution limited by the Constitution. There is certain some measure of “involvement” by the federal and state governments in the operations of the University, at least in financial support and research contracts. Although a federal trial court recently held that the University was a “public” institution, that decision was not reviewed by a higher court.

* A more thorough treatment of many of the issues discussed in this paper can be found in “Financial Exigency” by Professor Ralph S. Brown, Jr., in the Spring 1976 issue of the AAUP Bulletin.

more recent decision of the United States Supreme Court suggests that the test will be more stringent. It might be noted that action by Harvard University was recently held to constitute action of a private institution only, and thus not subject to scrutiny under the federal Constitution.

In any event, tenure will generally be given greater protection on a theory of contract rights, whether the institution is private or public. In colleges and universities in which the faculty is represented by a collective bargaining agent, tenure standards and procedures are commonly spelled out in a collective agreement, and are enforceable through grievance and arbitration procedures. Where there is no collective agreement, tenure rights are embodied in individual contracts of employment. The “contract” between the University and the faculty member must be broadly understood. Even when a formal bilateral writing is absent, the terms of employment clearly incorporate university policies and provisions in the faculty handbook, which are in effect when tenure is granted. AAUP Statements will apply, when a university’s regulations articulate them or merely incorporate them by reference. Even when there is no such specific reference, a university may be held bound—as was recently held by the very influential United States Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia—by the more fundamental AAUP policies, which have been treated as part of the “custom and usage” of the academic profession, automatically incorporated in the contract of employment. (The decision referred to was in the Browzin case, mentioned again below.)

What features of the tenure rules at the University of Pennsylvania would be enforceable in court?

Compliance With Procedures. University rules provide for fair procedures and peer judgment on such matters as just cause, financial exigency, and discontinuance of program or department. (When these procedures are exhausted, University administration retains the ultimate decision-making authority.) If these procedures were not pursued in the course of terminating tenure, the decision could be attacked in court as in violation of contract. The Browzin court held such procedures to be an important part of the agreement between university and faculty, since peer participation was viewed as a safeguard against arbitrary or hostile administrative action.

Just Cause. If all of the above procedures were honored, and university administration still adhered to the decision to terminate tenure, claiming “just cause,” would there be recourse for the faculty member who disagreed? Technically, there could be a challenge, but it is not likely that any court would overturn a determination of “cause” which was made by an administration in good faith. Even the AAUP has no formal definition of incompetence or immorality, and treats “cause” as institution-specific. Most probably, a heavy burden would be placed on the aggrieved faculty member to demonstrate that the “cause” asserted was in truth a pretext.

Retirement. Even tenure does not shelter a faculty member against retirement for age. Several lawsuits have, however, been brought to challenge a reduction in mandatory retirement age for faculty members already tenured. While the option of early retirement, as a means of facilitating the entry of younger faculty into the profession, is not objectionable, mandatory early retirement creates serious legal problems. It is difficult to argue seriously —and the AAUP does not—that a person granted tenure becomes immediately and forever entitled to the retirement age which then obtains. But, at the other extreme, it is unconscionable to permit a university to lower the mandatory retirement age of persons close to, or past, the lower age. The AAUP believes that persons begin to rely upon their retirement rights some twenty years in advance, and that it would unfairly defeat such justified expectations to lower the applicable retirement age thereafter.

Two court decisions have sustained colleges which lowered the mandatory retirement age, at a time of considerable apparent unfairness to the affected faculty members. In the Rehor case (decided by the state supreme court in Ohio), a faculty member aged 65 challenged the reduction of the mandatory retirement age from 70 to 68 (when his college was merged with another, at which the retirement age was 65). In the Deans case (now being appealed in the state of Rhode Island), the court
permitted the college, which had no formal retirement age, to adopt a policy of mandatory retirement at age 65, thus rejecting the challenge of a faculty member aged 57. In both cases, the courts held that the tenured faculty member had no vested right to delay retirement until the mandatory retirement age which obtained when tenure was granted, and held as well that the faculty member consented to the lowering of the retirement age when he agreed to continue teaching and accepting a salary increase in successive academic years. It remains to be seen whether future courts will be more solicitous of the AAUP position that at some point in the career of a tenured faculty member, as retirement approaches, it becomes a breach of contract—and of reasonable expectations—to lower the mandatory retirement age.

Financial Exigency. The regulations of the University substantially accord with those suggested by the AAUP in cases of termination of tenure by reason of financial exigency. University administration may make a decision to terminate for such reason after consultation with a committee of our Senate; affected faculty members may appeal to a hearing committee to scrutinize the administration’s good faith and to determine whether there is an alternative suitable position within the University. If these procedures are not accorded, the faculty member would have a meritorious contract action. If they are accorded, may the faculty member nonetheless seek review in a court, claiming that there is in fact no financial exigency, or that in fact there is a suitable position available?

Two court decisions have indeed considered whether a university was in a state of “financial exigency.” One case involved tenure which was allowable. In New Jersey, Bloomfield College was operating with an annual budget of some $35 million; it opened, however, a golf course property valued at roughly $6 million. The AAUP argued that the bargaining faculty members stripped of their tenure, there was no financial exigency; its 1975 Recommended Institutional Regulations refer to an “imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by less drastic means” than terminating tenure. The New Jersey trial court agreed that there was no “immediate compelling crisis,” but the appellate court, defining exigency to mean a “state of urgency,” held that a determination made by the administration in good faith would be sustained. The other case involved tenure which was not allowable. In New Jersey, Bloomfield College was operating with approximately a $200,000 annual deficit on a total budget of some $35 million; it opened, however, a golf course property valued at roughly $6 million. The AAUP argued, on behalf of the aggrieved faculty members stripped of their tenure, there was no financial exigency; its 1975 Recommended Institutional Regulations refer to an “imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by less drastic means” than terminating tenure. The New Jersey trial court agreed that there was no “immediate compelling crisis,” but the appellate court, defining exigency to mean a “state of urgency,” held that a determination made by the administration in good faith would be sustained. The court went on to find, however, that even if there was a financial exigency, it was not the “cause in good faith of the termination of tenure; it pointed to the fact that an equal number of new faculty members were recruited at the same time.” A decision of an Iowa state trial court, now on appeal, treats any current operating deficit as a financial exigency. The AAUP is challenging this overly broad definition. It is problematic to determine whether a university was in a state of financial exigency; its 1975 Recommended Institutional Regulations refer to an “imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by less drastic means” than terminating tenure. The New Jersey trial court agreed that there was no “immediate compelling crisis,” but the appellate court, defining exigency to mean a “state of urgency,” held that a determination made by the administration in good faith would be sustained. The other case involved tenure which was not allowable. In New Jersey, Bloomfield College was operating with approximately a $200,000 annual deficit on a total budget of some $35 million; it opened, however, a golf course property valued at roughly $6 million. The AAUP argued, on behalf of the aggrieved faculty members stripped of their tenure, there was no financial exigency; its 1975 Recommended Institutional Regulations refer to an “imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by less drastic means” than terminating tenure. The New Jersey trial court agreed that there was no “immediate compelling crisis,” but the appellate court, defining exigency to mean a “state of urgency,” held that a determination made by the administration in good faith would be sustained. The court went on to find, however, that even if there was a financial exigency, it was not the “cause in good faith of the termination of tenure; it pointed to the fact that an equal number of new faculty members were recruited at the same time.” A decision of an Iowa state trial court, now on appeal, treats any current operating deficit as a financial exigency. The AAUP is challenging this overly broad definition. It is problematic to determine whether a university was in a state of financial exigency; its 1975 Recommended Institutional Regulations refer to an “imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by less drastic means” than terminating tenure.

Discontinuance of Program or Department. This rather recently evolving justification for termination of tenure was not in the 1940 Statement or in the University of Pennsylvania regulations when many of us were granted tenure. Yet it is acknowledged as a proper ground in the AAUP Recommended Institutional Regulations, and would presumably be regarded as within the general understanding of the profession. Even in the absence of financial exigency, tenure may be terminated—according to AAUP principles—if a determination is made in good faith, principally by the faculty, that the educational mission of the institution as a whole will be enhanced by the discontinuance.” (Here too, the university must seek a “suitable position” elsewhere in the university for the affected faculty members.) As with termination for financial exigency, aggrieved faculty members could have recourse to judicial protection in the event stipulated procedures were not followed, or the discontinuance of program or department was pretextual and in bad faith.

There may be some difficulty determining whether there has in fact been a discontinuance of a “program” or “department”; and whether there is a “suitable position” available. The Browzin court gave unduly narrow definitions to all these terms, holding that Professor Browzin’s tenure could be terminated when his department simply decided not to offer his courses any more, and that what looked like an available course rather close to his expertise could be offered by a new faculty member instead, for this was not within the “suitable position” rule. (The court did, however, require the university to bear the burden of proving that no suitable position exists.)

Conclusion
The moral seems clear. The best protection for tenure lies in clear standards within the regulations of the University—on such matters as mandatory retirement age, financial exigency, discontinuance of program or department, and the suitable-position rule. These must be allied with a strong tradition of faculty participation and peer judgment. Courts may be helpful as a last resort, but they are not immersed in the traditions of our profession and are as like as not to render decisions which simply do not accord with our norms and our expectations. These must be effected through informed and influential organs of faculty governance, and by an understanding and progressive university administration.

The final speaker at the AAUP meeting discussed the current situation at the University from two points of view—as a member of the University Budget Committee she said she would tell “what the University is unable to do financially,” and as chairwoman of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility she would tell “what the University “is not allowed to do procedurally.” Her summary:

II. Tenure Trends at Penn
by Phoebe S. Leboy

As of March, 1976, approximately two-thirds of the University's professorial faculty were tenured. The proportion varies considerably by school: with the exception of the School of Veterinary Medicine, the health schools are less than 50 percent tenured, for example, while FAS is 69 percent tenured, the veterinary medical school is 72 percent, and engineering 79 percent. The law school faculty is 83 percent tenured.

What does this mean? It may in some schools mean that relatively low value is placed on having junior faculty. However, most educators feel that, especially in the area of undergraduate teaching, University policy must provide for constant infusion of new blood into the faculty.

The Zemsky-Davis study published in Almanac (April 10, 1973) indicated that Penn’s 1973 policies, combined with zero growth of total faculty, would lead to more than 80 percent of the faculty tenured by 1980. In real terms, that means that while in the 1960s more than 100 new assistant professors could be appointed each year, in the 1980s fewer than 50 such new appointments could be made per year.

What can be done to change the picture?
The Zemsky-Davis report discussed some possibilities:
1. To allow continued growth of the faculty.
2. To extend the probationary period for tenure, or abolish tenure.
3. To encourage early retirement.
4. To convert any newly vacated tenured positions to assistant professor positions.
5. To decrease the promotion rate.

Taking a look at these possibilities, this is how the University has been responding to them:
1. Continued growth: It is the opinion of most that, in view of the declining birth rate which influences our enrollment, a continued unlimited expansion of university faculties cannot be justified. A more practical problem is where would we get resources to pay for faculty expansion. University policy is to define for each school what might be projected to be durable
income, and to insure that long-term commitments not exceed what can be supported by durable income. There are ongoing planning analyses with each Dean to define predictable resources through 1980 and to make tenure-planning decisions with that in mind. [See Almanac: November 23.]

2. Extension of probationary period or abolition of tenure. There are some philosophical problems with this from the perspective of academic freedom, of course; but even from the practical side there are two serious considerations. One is that the abolition of tenure involves legal problems related to the breaking of contracts—and, I hasten to add, no administrative official has suggested this as a reasonable possibility. The other is that to extend the probationary period or to allow promotion without tenure would be at best a short-term solution to a long-term problem. Instead of having a tenured-in faculty with little opportunity for new appointment we would have a partly untenured faculty that was just as limited in potential for new appointments.

3. and 4. Early retirement and conversion of empty tenured positions to assistant professorships. Both of these are now University policy, as proposed by the University Development Commission, discussed by University Council and adopted by the University administration in 1973. We do now have an early retirement package which enables faculty to retire by 65 without loss of income; and the policy of converting tenured positions to untenured ones was adopted as stated in the Development Commission report of 1973: “That whenever possible, a tenured position vacated by resignation or retirement be turned into a position for hiring a nontenured faculty member.” This procedure should be avoided, however, when it poses a serious threat to academic quality and reputation, especially in smaller departments.

5. Decrease in promotion rate. Short of the abolition of tenure, which again I stress no one proposes, this is the change that has the most profound effect on a university’s ability to hire junior faculty. In the 1960s, more than 50 percent of all new assistant professors eventually received tenure here. By the early 1970s, this proportion had dropped below 50 percent, and it is now in a range of 20 to 25 percent. The drop is due in some small part to a decrease in reappointment of assistant professors for a second three-year appointment—but mostly reflects a much more stringent examination of candidates for promotion and tenure. This includes for the first time a formal mechanism for review, at the Provost’s Staff level, by an outside panel of experts.

**FACULTY GRANTS: DEADLINE FEBRUARY 1**

The Research Committee’s Subcommittees on Faculty Grants and Awards announces the availability of summer fellowships and grants-in-aid for 1977-78 with a deadline for receipt of applications on February 1, 1977.

This year only, funds are available from the National Science Foundation as well as from the University. The NSF funds are available for support of projects in the natural and social sciences as well as mathematics and engineering. Summer fellowships of $2500 and grants-in-aid to not exceed $1000 will be awarded.

University funds are again available for support of projects in disciplines not supportable from the NSF funds. The committee will award summer fellowships of $2000 and grants-in-aid of $1500 to successful applicants. As in past years, preference will be given to applicants holding rank of assistant professor. Awards generally will not be made to faculty members who have received support from the Subcommittees during the past three years. A summer fellowship will not be awarded to an individual who has other sources of support.

Application forms are available from the Office of Research Administration, 409 Franklin Building/16, Ext. 7293.

—Anthony Merritt, Acting Director, ORA

**ORIGIN OF SAMP REVIEW**

Throughout the discussions of the SAMP issue, the letters that the department chairmen wrote to the President and the Vice-President for Health Affairs have been frequently referenced. The letters were written in July, 1973, soon after we received word that SAMP had been awarded a $250,000 grant from the Division of Associated Health Professions. D.H.E.W. Acceptance of the funds would obligate SAMP to the accomplishment of the objectives cited in the grant proposal which was approved by Provost Stellar. While Vice-President Langfitt has repeatedly stated that “the chairmen initiated the review by these letters,” the chairmen of SAMP maintain that the letters requested “philosophical support from central administration to assist SAMP in strengthening its academic endeavors and in fulfilling the obligations of the grant.” Indeed, the letters were written prior to the Dean’s decision to resign and three weeks before his resignation was submitted to the central administration. We request the publication of our letters for clarification of this issue.

—R.E.B./E.J.C./N.B.E.

**LETTER TO DR. THOMAS LANGFITT**

July 24, 1975

We are aware, as you are, that the Dean has been, and is, being sought out for other positions in allied health. We are proud of the stature he has gained as an allied health administrator and educator during his six years in SAMP, and we hope his leadership will not be lost to us. This particular time is an exceedingly crucial time, as we are sure you also recognize. Because the Dean has demonstrated such dedication and service far beyond the “call of duty” and that which most other people would give, his consideration of other positions signals the acuteness of the issues that relate to SAMP. As chairmen of the departments in SAMP, we feel the problems need to be dealt with expeditiously and effectively. We wish to initiate our dialogue with you by delineating issues that are of direct concern to you also.

1. Our first concern, naturally, is the responsibilities expressed in the grant proposal—and ones that we will be accountable for upon the award of the federal grant to relocate SAMP in TRINEB. Because TRINEB was originally “a nursing building,” we conservatively delineated our needs. We recognize that this has provided little “negotiating room” to finalize the building plans and requires strong leadership from you to conclude these plans in a timely manner. As negotiations have proceeded and working information gathered, we are uncertain, and thus concerned, about the directions and details in relation to the commitments stated in the grant.

2. A second consideration at this time is the future administrative structure of the Schools of Allied Medical Professions and of Nursing. Two years ago, during the Task Force Study of SAMP and Nursing at Pennsylvania, this school put itself on record as favoring an administration which would consolidate the two schools under one leadership. We still believe, in principle, that this can be a logical and administratively sound approach; however, we believe that it is not now appropriate to implement such a consolidation at Pennsylvania. If both schools achieve the dimensions that they should to contribute to current health care needs, individual administrations with cooperative and shared experiences—which will be facilitated in TRINEB—is probably the optimal plan for the future.

3. A third concern is the overall policy development, establishment of priorities, and initiation/modification of elements in health affairs that have a direct bearing on allied health. More involvement of— or in some
LETTER TO PRESIDENT MARTIN MEYERSON
July 25, 1975

As chairmen of the three departments in the School of Allied Medical Professions, we are writing to transmit to you our concerns about the possibility of the loss of the Dean of SAMP. During the past six years, the Dean has provided outstanding leadership during exceptionally difficult times for the School. Even with the limitations and events that prevailed through policy and administrative actions, at both the top administrative levels of the University and at the Vice-President for Health Affairs’ Office, his capabilities and accomplishments have achieved national recognition. As a result of this recognition, the Dean is now being actively sought by other institutions. We sincerely hope he will remain—both because of his outstanding capabilities and the leadership essential to consummating the pending grant award from the Division of Associated Health Professions.

The Dean’s consideration of other positions is based on severe problems within the University of Pennsylvania—not his desire to seek another position. These deficiencies and problems are equally serious to us as department chairmen. Therefore, we consider it essential to enumerate for you the major concerns and issues.

(1) The Development Commission delineated specific accomplishments that SAMP should achieve—and we concur with these goals. The goals are cornerstones for our planning and development:
   (a) Contribute to the concept of “One University”;
   (b) Facilitates interaction between the professions and the liberal arts and sciences in research and training;
   (c) Develop highly competent practitioners prepared for continuing self-education;
   (d) Prepare excellent teachers to pass on the discipline of the profession;
   (e) Engage in advancing the knowledge base on which the profession rests.

Although it was stated as a part of the priorities that the weaker professional schools need help from the rest of the University in developing stronger programs, support from the University to develop excellence and growth essential to achieve the goals has not been consistently available. In fact, exactly the opposite has occurred—our support has been reduced.

(2) A Task Force to study SAMP was created as a step in implementing recommendations from the Development Commission. The Task Force submitted its report to the University administration in 1973. The administration’s analysis of the conclusions and recommendations of the Task Force have not been related to SAMP nor has the philosophy or commitment of the central administration of the University regarding SAMP been clarified and expressed. This result in uncertainties as to the direction we are moving in our planning and development activities.

Our only recourse has been to move forward in our planning with a consideration of the directions indicated in the Development Commission report and the major findings and recommendations of the Task Force.

(3) During the planning for the Development Fund Drive, attention by SAMP’s Long Range Planning Committee to the reports of these two major bodies was an integral aspect of the process. When the total target figure for the Drive was reduced, the cuts were disproportionately large for SAMP, as compared to much larger schools, when the exact opposite should have prevailed.

(4) SAMP has fully met the demands of the responsibility center process. Faculty have been heavily loaded far beyond the expectations of faculty in other areas of the University. The consequences for meeting responsibility center demands and our enforcement of containment have effectively meant a reduction of University support through the subvention process and concomitant application of increased indirect costs. The net result in SAMP has been a loss of faculty and administrative positions which has magnified the inequity of expectations of faculty as compared with the rest of the University.

(5) It is a documented fact, through cost analysis studies, that education in the health professions requires substantively more resources per student than liberal arts studies. Because the health care services that our graduates provide are critical to society’s needs, a significant amount of public funds should support the School. Though we have received substantial support from the federal government over the years, we have not received state funds consistent with our services to the citizens of the Commonwealth. Whereas all other schools of allied health in Philadelphia have this support, SAMP does not. Though we have been discouraged from pursuing this revenue source, we believe it is vital that we have the opportunity to seek these funds with the active involvement of the University administration and its supportive resources.

(6) The Dean and a number of the faculty have established exceedingly important relationships with the NIH at the national level and the Department of Education at the state level. However, the heavy demands on our staff to conduct SAMP’s programs limit the involvement that is possible in these high potential avenues of activity.

(7) We endorse and support the concept of “One University.” SAMP’s record of involvement of faculty from other schools in our curriculum and committee activities is uncommon and exemplary. Likewise, we maximize the utilization of other courses provided through the University’s resources departments as required or elective credits. We are pleased that the new policy of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences will provide the reciprocal opportunity for our students. We seek to provide opportunities in our courses to all students of the University within limits of the facilities and resources of SAMP and conducive to their educational goals. We are confident that this will further enhance the understanding, attitudes, and accomplishments among the academic departments.

(8) In addition to this increased understanding of the academic departments, administrative areas must also attain a heightened awareness of being of optimal service to the School. For example, though the national trend in allied health education demonstrates an increase in applicants far beyond enrollment capacity to respond, this is not the case at Pennsylvania. We consider it vital to explore this issue and develop productive recruitment and admission strategies with the Office of Admissions. The alternative conclusion to reduce the freshman admission target to fifty percent of our capacity and increase transfer admissions, has significant import on the educational quality of our programs. Our curricula, which are based on a four year continuum of integrated liberal arts and professional studies, are
unique in this aspect. A fifty-percent transfer student body would drastically alter the characteristics of the curricula. The wrong solution was applied to the problem when the academic implications are considered.

(9) The most crucial element in SAMP's continued development is a faculty of vision, dedication, and excellence with an appropriate scope of responsibilities so that they can maximally contribute to our goals. Our excellent existing faculty is heavily loaded with academic assignments thus making implementation of new and essential scholarly endeavors exceedingly difficult. We have been unusually fortunate in attracting an excellent faculty primarily because of the outstanding potential at Pennsylvania. Potential must become reality to retain these recognized leaders in allied health—and indeed, we must expand our faculty and administrative resources.

These issues are important not only to us within SAMP, but also to the total University. We believe that SAMP brings to the University a unique resource to respond to the challenges presented to the health care community. To paraphrase Dr. Langfitt's comments to the Juniors and Seniors at the convocation at the beginning of the 1974-75 year: "The health care system and the health community at the University of Pennsylvania have made significant contributions to medical research—but we are now committed to broaden our mission to include an increased role in health care services. SAMP will be a significant component of the University's responses to its mission." We readily concur that the allied health professions will play a major role in responding to and ameliorating society's deficiencies in health care services. In a University where approximately forty-five percent of the entering students are pursuing an education leading to service in the health care system, a vital and dynamic School of Allied Medical Professions provides the students a perspective of total health care during their educational experiences that will be essential to them when they function in the health care system. With the new policy on elective credit within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, it is already evident that the resources and educational opportunities in SAMP are going to be in increasing demand by students in FAS. We are anxious to respond to their interests and to the philosophy of "One University."

The University of Pennsylvania, of all institutions in the Ivy League, is the only one that had the foresight to create a School of Allied Medical Professions which has played, and will continue to play, such a crucial role in the health care system of the future. Likewise, among all colleges and universities in the country, the University of Pennsylvania was the first to conceptualize and establish a School with allied health organization and identity—a model which has been emulated extensively. The unique character of SAMP—an integration and blending of liberal arts and professional study with an optimal balance of the theoretical and applied knowledge—has evidenced its value to the professions. The leadership achievements of SAMP's students and the national recognition of the school attest to this fact.

The goals in the Development Commission Report and the above charge by Dr. Langfitt are complementary and, indeed, synergistic. SAMP stands ready to respond to both, given the resources essential to respond. However, as we have analyzed and planned, and reanalyzed and replanned, these fundamental issues emerge as crucial deterrents. Though the specific impetus for this letter was the potential resignation of the Dean, these are issues that relate to the deanship and the chairmanships—regardless of the individuals involved. Indeed, a vacancy in the deanship with these problems unresolved would result in a recruitment problem of immense magnitude. Though the School is small—and current decisions mitigate against achieving optimal growth—the responsibilities of reports and involvement in the University are the same as for much larger schools. This requires a "critical mass" of resources—students, faculty, administrators, and dollars—with substantial proportional allocation of resources based on a realistic formulation which accommodates the factors delineated in this letter. The Dean and the Departments need a consistency and clarity of policy reflecting the commitment of the University to sustain the program at a level of excellence befitting the University of Pennsylvania.

We would be pleased to meet with you to further elaborate on these considerations.

Roma E. Brown, Chairman
Department of Medical Technology
Eleanor J. Carlin, Chairman
Department of Physical Therapy
Nancy B. Ellis, Chairman
Department of Occupational Therapy

cc: Dr. Thomas Langfitt
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RESPONSE FROM DR. LANGFITT to the statement of the SAMP chairmen introducing the letters that start on page 9

December 3, 1976

The letters written in July, 1975, by the SAMP department chairmen to President Meyerson and myself quite clearly were submitted because Dean Sidney Redenberg was thinking about leaving the University of Pennsylvania for another post. In my opinion, the most important statements in the letter to me were "...that the University community as a whole, and the Office of the Vice-President for Health Affairs in particular, needs to 'emphasize' a public stance regarding the future role and development of the School of Allied Medical Professions in the health affairs mission of Pennsylvania" and "it seems vital to us that the University's philosophic and resource commitment be reflective of this stance and be clearly delineated." In the letter to the President they stated "the Dean and the department need a consistency and clarity of policy reflecting the commitment of the University to sustain the program at a level of excellence befitting the University of Pennsylvania." I interpreted these statements as a request by the department chairmen that SAMP be recognized by the University as an important part of it by accepting the programs of the School within the mission of the University and making additional commitments of resources to them. I believed this could not be done without a review, and from the beginning of the review process, the department chairmen and I agreed that we would identify a number of options for the future of the School and a number of criteria to choose among those options. I conclude as I have before that the review was initiated by the department chairmen of SAMP through their letters to the President and me.

—Thomas W. Langfitt, M.D.

BIOSCIENCES

Editor's Note: The text below was adopted unanimously by the biomedical sciences faculty at its December 1 meeting (see page 1). On the next page begins Dean Edward J. Stemmler's statement on behalf of the deans of medicine, dental medicine and veterinary medicine.

PROPOSAL ADOPTED BY BIOMEDICAL FACULTY

Authors' Note: The following document was formulated by a group of the biomedical faculty to implement the consensus expressed at two open meetings of the faculty of the biomedical quadrant of GSAS. This group consisted of Sol Goodgal, Phoebe Lebroy and Neville Kallenbach, who are the biomedical representatives on the Graduate Council; Helen Davies of the Educational Policy Committee; and Fred Karush, a member of the 1975-76 Joint Committee of the SAC and the Biomedical Program Committee charged with the formulation of a graduate structure.

The proposal was presented by this group at a meeting on 18 September 1976 in the office of the Provost, also attended by Elliot Stellar, Don Langenberg, John Hobstetter and Varian Gregorian. The proposal was subsequently submitted to the Deans of the dental, medical and veterinary schools. The educational portion (A) was found to be entirely acceptable by all the deans. No serious objection to the second part (B) was expressed.


A Structure for Biomedical Graduate Education

A. Educational

The biomedical graduate groups should be an integral part of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Specifically:

1. All members of these graduate groups will have secondary appointments in FAS. They will participate equally with other FAS faculty in planning and decision-making on issues of graduate education.

2. The programs of the biomedical graduate groups will be subject to the same guidelines as other FAS graduate programs with respect to initiation, termination, evaluation and supervision.

3. Ph.D. recipients recommended by these groups will be subject to the same supervision, requirements and award procedures as other Ph.D. candidates. (continued)
COMMITTEE FOR BIOSCIENCES

On December 3 Provost Eliot Stellar announced the formation of a committee to resolve differences of detail in the preceding reports and to work with the FAS faculty committee and Dean Stemmler's committee to complete the design of biomedical graduate education. It will be convened by Dr. Phoebe Leboy, professor of biochemistry at the School of Dental Medicine, and on it are Dr. Neville Kallenbach, professor of biology at FAS; Sol Goodgal, professor of microbiology at the School of Medicine; Ernest Lawson-Soulsby, professor of parasitology/pathobiology at the School of Veterinary Medicine; Robert E. Forster, professor of physiology at the School of Medicine; and Barry Cooperman, associate professor of chemistry at FAS.

B. Budgetary

Provision should be made to deal with the special budgetary problems of the biomedical graduate groups as follows:

1. Establish a Biomedical Council consisting of the chairpersons of biomedical graduate groups, including Biology and Psychology. The chairperson of the Council will be elected from its membership.
2. The Council will be concerned with the budgetary needs of its Graduate Groups and with the development of sources of financial support. It will also deal with educational issues which are specific to the biomedical area.
3. Establish a Biomedical Board consisting of the Deans of FAS, School of Medicine, School of Veterinary Medicine, School of Dental Medicine and the chairperson of the Biomedical Council.
4. The primary concern of the Board will be to identify resources for the support of the biomedical graduate programs, especially funds generated by graduate tuition, gifts and overhead on grants. It will also advise on the appointment and promotion of faculty whose responsibilities include graduate instruction in the biomedical area.

PRESENTED BY DEAN STEMMLER DECEMBER 1

I. The health deans are deeply concerned along with the general University faculty about the need for us to improve the overall management and quality of graduate education.

II. We fully recognize the need for a coordinated effort and an administrative locus through which policy can be set and quality can be assured.

III. We further recognize that several alternative solutions might serve to accomplish the objectives of uniform quality standards, ease in recruitment, financial support, curricular planning, and the establishment and termination of programs. However, for practical reasons we believe that it is prudent and constructive for us to endorse the general formulation of the "Organization of Graduate Studies" as proposed by John Hobstetter (Almanac November 2), a proposal which has been approved conditionally by the University Faculty Senate.

IV. We do make three specific suggestions about the proposals in that document:
A. That the Council of Graduate Deans be renamed the Council of Deans for Graduate Education.
B. That the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences be appointed the Chairman of that body.
C. That time be set aside on the monthly Council of Deans meeting specifically to address agenda items related to graduate education.

V. We consider the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and his advisory committees (the Committee of Graduate Facilities and the Council of Deans for Graduate Education) to be operating at the policy level.

VI. We recognize that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences is establishing within its organization certain committees concerned with the modulation of graduate education. These will include committees charged to plan curriculum, maintain quality control, set admissions policies, etc. These academic committees will serve the graduate programs which lie wholly within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

VII. We have recognized previously the value of coordination among the health deans. As our graduate group chairmen are aware, the health deans have cooperated effectively in addressing one major problem through a meeting with the biomedical graduate group chairman, namely, the establishment of a fund to guarantee the stipends for a number of exceptional student applicants. The mechanism used for reaching that positive decision proved useful, workable, and, in this case, successful. We recommend that this mechanism be recognized as an element in the University's organization. This can be accomplished by two moves:
A. The establishment of a Board of Deans for Graduate Educational Affairs. This Board will have as members the deans of the Schools of Medicine, Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. We recommend that the Dean of the School of Medicine serve as Chairman of this Board and that the Chairperson of the Biomedical Council attend its meetings. The Board's functions will include, among other things, the resource allocation function for graduate education within the biomedical groups. It will become the administrative unit through which decisions about the utilization of resources will be made.
B. The establishment of a Biomedical Council. The membership of this body will include the graduate group chairmen from all bioscience programs, including biology and psychology should those groups choose to participate.
C. The Board and the Council will meet jointly each month or as often as necessary to accomplish their business.

VIII. In recognition of the value of the coordination of program management and the need for a single mechanism for program planning, curriculum planning, evaluation, admissions, etc., we support the use by the Bioscience Graduate Faculty of the academic committees which will be established in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. We recommend that these committees serve as the mechanism for the accomplishment of coordinated program planning. In a sense, therefore, we accept the notion of the delegation of academic management of the bioscience graduate educational programs to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences under the leadership of its dean.

IX. Further, we support and will approve the awarding of secondary appointments for interested biomedical faculty in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, if such secondary appointments are offered.

X. We remind you that the centrality of the graduate educational mission to the overall mission of the health professional schools. For this reason, we will resist with our full energies any move which, in our opinion, would tend to disarticulate basic research from medical education. We remind you that we are attempting to coordinate graduate education and not organize our basic research enterprise which appears to be functioning at a high level. Therefore, we do not support the need or even the desirability to create an organized Institute of Bioscience.

XI. We also remind you of the accountability that must be expected of all deans. Graduate education is an important program in most university schools. If a dean were to fail to support the university's mission in graduate education, that dean should be called into account by the provost.

XII. As stated in the beginning, there are a variety of structures which would serve the University's purposes in graduate education. The proposal before you (pp. 10-11) is one practical approach which, in our opinion, could work effectively. We believe that it is time that we cease our concerns with organization and begin the implementation of the purposes that we have defined. We are certain that the mechanism proposed will not please everyone. In fact, none of us will be pleased until the job has begun and we achieve the level of quality, effectiveness, and coordination we have defined.
CHRISTMAS IS WHERE YOU FIND IT . . .

This year for Christmas, you get what you see. Against the backdrop of an increasingly bleak season—the coldest in two decades, we’ve been warned—Christmas offers a warm visual array of decor, food, flora, and gifts, and most of them can be seen and bought at the convenient stores on campus. This year, Almanac decided to vary its annual browse by looking at the Bookstore offerings last.

PYRAMID SHOP . . .

The temptation at the Museum's Pyramid Shop is to revert to age 8 and play with everything in sight, but of course it can be fought off: invent a story about choosing a niece some presents if you don’t have one. Crayon enthusiasts hit the jackpot with Bellerophon coloring books that feature pictures of Ancient Greeks or a rebek-playing lion ($1.95; 95¢). Stained Glass Windows ($1.75); assorted posters to color ($1.50 each); and even color-your-own kits ($10; string, 15¢). Look through a small kaleidoscope (75¢), or Strange Things To Do and Make ($1.50), which tells how to grow a full-sized pear in a Coke bottle. A wooden animal coat hook from India ($4) might just be the thing, or an arrowhead (25¢), geodesic dome kits ($1 and $3), Chinese ceramic hand puppet (60¢), wood or bread-dough tree ornament (40¢-50¢), or an olivine necklace ($1), or polychrome creature (35¢) from India. We chose Strange Things (above), a Chinese butterfly kite ($1.50), a Gilgamesh poster to color (above), a magnifying box (35¢), and a marble to put it in (1¢), because our niece... no, we confess: although she gets the kite (we are Charlie Brown with kits), well, we found this old Coke bottle, and can hardly wait till the trees bloom next Spring—by then we will have turned 9.

MUSEUM SHOP . . .

The Museum Shop itself, a sanctuary as always, gathers its treasures from around the world. Color and rarity are the keynotes here. Powerful blues, reds, and oranges dominate animal appliqués from the Dahomey People of Africa ($22-$65), while quieter, aqueous shades prevail in 19th-century Persian tiles ($5.50-$45). These, glazed with flowers and animals on a quieter, aqueous shades prevail in 19th-century Persian tiles, appliques from the Dahomey People of Africa ($22-$65), while treasures from around the world. Color and rarity are the
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WOMEN'S CULTURAL TRUST . . .

As we walked in the door of the Women's Cultural Trust, a loom loomed before us. Beyond it, we had a look at the watercolors by Miho Tanaka, and made our way into the shop where the cashier later told us that the large gallery space was to be filled starting December 13 with extra prints and ceramics on sale just for Christmas. The specialties of the house are hand-and-woman-made goods such as lined and padded tote bags ($14 each), pots and pot holders, pillows (about $8), weavings, batik hangings ($12-$15), and jewelry. Almost all the rings, earrings, bracelets, and necklaces are sterling silver, but there are some copper enamel earrings and beaded necklaces as well; prices range from $5 to $25.

The adjacent bookstore is planning nothing special for Christmas, but it doesn't really have to. The unique selection of journals (Albatross, Majority Report, etc., plus feminist comics), books (a new paperback edition of Little Women for only 95¢), posters, and records for and about women (Olivia recordngs—expensive, but hard to get) fills a special niche in the CA and in Christmas shopping. Our favorite posters (and gift selections) were some woodcuts by Marlene Miller of Emmeline Pankhurst and of Alice B. Toklas and Gertrude Stein ($3.75 and $3.25).

. . . AND THE BOOKSTORE

The motto in the publishing industry this Christmas seems to be: Two, three, MARYY picture books (to paraphrase Che Guevara). In spite of a certain postliterate pall that so many dazzling photographs bring, the Bookstore's selection of such elaborate gift books is probably one of the best in the city. Not only are there books to give for Christmas (more about them later), there are all kinds of books about Christmas: Christmas Decorations ($6.95) from the Williamsburg Folk Art Collection teaches how to make ornaments from burlap, starfish, wood shavings, paper, and walnut shells; The Santa Claus Book's ($9.95) cover says it is illustrated—that's something of an understatement, it should have said it had a little bit of text; also The Christmas Tree Book ($10.95) and The Annotated Christmas Carol ($12.95) by Charles Dickens (annotated means more words than the original, but in this case it also means more illustrations).

There is an ecumenical collection of glossy photographs and text of Orthodox Jewish life, Mormons, and Jerusalem, plus a secular tome on the life styles of wealthy people through the ages (The Very Rich, $24.95) and a study of Cavalry. Twenty-five natural calamities are pictorially recorded in Eyewitness to Disaster ($12.95). Other heavy books have light topics such as Hitler, assassinations, pirates, and inventions.

All of these books are magnificent, in appearance as well as price; in addition, the technical printing aspects are superb—excellent stock, beautiful inks, great design. We somehow always feel, though, that we have been treated to fancy promotion of a particular subject after we have read one of these books, and have still not got to the real meat of the matter. Not so with the collections of photographers' work on another table; after all, their photographs are both their medium and their message. Impressive books by George Hurrell, David Douglas Duncan, Alice Austen, Richard Avedon, and others surround a masterful collection. Masters of the Camera ($25). We've only covered about half the glossy specials here. Even if you don't buy one of these for yourself or anyone you know, at least go see them; it's free, and it's a real show.

Get your own picture with the help of the photography shop: lenses, pouches, flashes, film, tripods, timers, darkroom equipment—almost everything you'd need. Also, right next door is a selection of cassette tapes and a display of calculators for adding up what you would spend if you bought everything you really wanted in the place.

Cookbooks, of course, have habitually suffered from the picture mania, as if the cook were going to display the picture of the next meal in advance so the patrons would know what they were getting. In The Bookstore's large collection, the inanity of this was bound to come out if you compare the large format, glossy picture version of Crockery Cookery ($4.95) with the paperback book ($1.95); in either case, a good book if you are learning slowly to cook—but one has $3 worth of pictures. There is no excuse for using the wrong wine after consulting the two shelves of books on this topic. Also, The Tortilla Book ($4.95) by Diana Kennedy looks good, with some nice line drawing illustrations, and the latest addition to The New York Times's guides is The New York Times Weekend Cookbook by Jean Hewitt—it probably has an eight-course Sunday brunch to go with the paper.

The 70s are the "Me Decade," claims Tom Wolfe in Mauve Gloves and Madmen, Clutter and Vine ($8.95). If this year's releases are any indication, he's hit the nail right on the head. If the author is important, it's about himself (Moshé Dayan: Story of My Life, $15; As I See It, J. Paul Getty, $10.95). If not, it's a personal recollection of someone who was. Kay Summersby Morgan tells why her love affair with Dwight D. Eisenhower was Past Forgetting ($9.95). James Roosevelt shows us what FDR and Eleanor were really like in My Parents—A Differing View ($12.50). The Final Days of Nixon's presidency hit the spotlight (Woodward and Bernstein, $8.95) from several angles as Watergate participants recall their roles in the scandal; John Dean in Blind Ambition ($11.95); Leon Jaworski in The Right and the Power ($9.95); Sam Dash in Chief Counsel ($10). And while we're on the Presidents, try Kurt Vonnegut's Slapstick ($7.95) which features memoirs of a future ex-president named Dr. Wilbur Daffodil-11 Swain whose slogan was "Lonesome No More."

Herb Caen gave fans a last look at The Blue Painter, Vol. I ($23). For the holidays: tree ornaments in wood, glass, or even holiday postcards ($3. UNICEF), which cost only 9¢ to mail. —D.W./D.C.

TOMORROW NIGHT: 20% OFF

Bookstore hours for the holidays were published in the November 16 Almanac. Tomorrow is an exception: the bookstore will be open from 9:30 a.m. to 8 p.m. But the big story is that until 5:30 there will be a 15% storewide, across-the-board sale. And after 5:30 faculty and staff are entitled to a 20% discount. Fail to miss this budget-pleaser.
OPENINGS

The following listings are taken from the Personnel Office's bulletin of December 1. Dates in parentheses refer to the Almanac issue in which a complete job description appeared. The full list is made available weekly 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 figures in salary listings show minimum starting salary and maximum starting salary (midpoint).

ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL

ACCOUNTANT I (10-19-76).
ACCOUNTANT II (10-12-76).
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (11-16-76).
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF RESIDENCE UNIT (11-23-76).
ASSISTANT TO DIRECTOR (11-23-76).
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR IV (11-23-76).
DIRECTOR OF CGS & SUMMER SCHOOL (9-14-76).
DIRECTOR OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (9-14-76).
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE SENIOR VICE-PRESIDENT is responsible for 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.

FACILITIES PLANNER (9-20-76).
JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST (11-9-76).
LIBRARIAN II (media service) (11-9-76).
LIBRARIAN II to catalog in Arabic, Persian, Turkish. (9-14-76).
LIBRARIAN FOR RARE BOOKS (11-16-76).
MEDICAL CO-ORDINATOR initiates action with respect to grants management and coordination, prepares reports, checks requests for contracts and grants, establishes and supervises centralization of administrative data, plans and conducts administrative data and administrative meetings, and manages the director's office. Liaison and coordination with University Cancer Center, Fox Chase, CHOP, and Wistar Institute; conducts surveys for planning and evaluation. Qualifications: Administrative experience with ability to meet and work with people, to speak and write effectively. College degree in business administration. Health care background desirable. Experience in grants management and administration plus personnel management essential. Salary to be determined.

PROJECT MANAGER (11-23-76).
REGISTERED NURSE counsels patients in family planning procedures; answers problems from patients over the phone; follow-up care of patients, sees that they have needed tests and laboratory work; fills in for head nurse when needed; general nursing duties; other related duties as assigned. Qualifications: Ability to supervise clerical and technical staff, good communication skills. At least one year's experience in OB-GYN outpatient area. Must have the ability, willingness, and desire to adapt to a variety of situations and individuals. $9,100-$12,275.

RESEARCH SPECIALIST I (11-23-76).
STATISTICIAN (11-16-76).
SUPERVISOR (FUNCTIONS) (11-23-76).

SUPPORT STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (11-9-76).
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (2) (11-2-76).
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (New York) (10-5-76).
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II (11-16-76).

CLERK IV assigns all job orders numbers; maintains accounting control over all input; determines validity and accounting requirements for all work requisitions and insures that funds are adequate for the requested work; distributes monthly and final statements of account to other University departments and to various facilities associated with the University. Qualifications: High school graduate. Two to three years' college education in business administration with emphasis on accounting and data processing; or equivalent experience, preferably in a "job shop" or industrial organization. Excellent facility with numbers and data compilation. $6,500-$8,120.

CUSTODIAL FOREMAN (11-2-76).

ELECTRON MICROSCOPE TECHNICIAN II (11-19-76).

LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE (2) (11-16-76).

MAINTENANCE MAN (NEW BOLTON CENTER) keeps floors and equipment cleaned, polishes brass portions of equipment; assists with painting; operates electric steam jennys; performs related duties as assigned. Qualifications: Ability to perform general janitorial duties including painting. Graduation from elementary school. Physically able to move about actively and perform strenuous work occasionally. Salary to be determined.

MEDICAL RECEPTIONIST general reception duties plus a great deal of filing, pulling, and replacing files; arranges laboratory and X-ray appointments; interviews patients. Qualifications: A pleasant, resourceful, resilient, intelligent person who can efficiently and diplomatically mediate an extraordinary number of requests, demands. No typing required. $6,050-$7,550.

MEDICAL SECRETARY (9-14-76).

PAYROLL CLERK responsible for one portion of University payroll. Computes earnings/withholding; posts salary cards; answers inquiries; checks out errors, etc. Qualifications: Good aptitude for clerical work and figures. Operates adding machine. Graduation from high school with a course in bookkeeping and office practice. Two years' experience in an accounting department preferably in the payroll section of a college or university (eight months only) $6,950-$10,000.

PERSONNEL OFFICE COORDINATOR is a public relations employee who represents the first official contact a prospective employee or employer has with the University and is frequently the point of contact for faculty and staff, reporting to the manager of personnel relations. Qualifications: Graduation from high school and further training; some college or secretarial preferred. Two years' office experience, preferably with substantial people contact. Ability to work well with others, handle heavy volume of different kinds of individuals seeking employment, perceive and solve problems, type accurately. Willingness to accept greater responsibility; demonstrated maturity and flexibility. $7,475-$9,350.

POSITIONS AT ARBORETUM

SUPERVISOR OF EDUCATION has overall responsibility for supervising, planning, and coordinating popular education and interpretive programs for adults, young people, and teachers in horticulture, botany, practical gardening, environmental awareness, and artistic use of plants. Qualifications: B.S. or M.S. in horticulture, plant science, botany, or science education with at least two years' appropriate work experience. Basic botanical and horticultural skills. Salary to be determined.

PLANT PROPAGATOR manages greenhouses and facilities; supervises and instructs volunteer greenhouse workers; researches, teaches, and publishes propagation methods for unusual plant species; teaches adult education classes; writes articles for newsletter. Qualifications: At least two years' formal training in landscape horticulture plus practical experience. $5,900-$9,500.

Resumes and references for both jobs should be sent to Nina Gomez-Ibanez, Morris Arboretum, 4914 Meadowbrook Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa. 19118.
PROGRAMMER I to write, test, and debug data entry applications programs in a medical research environment; to code and run routine data analysis programs and to write data base management (DBTG-type) programs. Qualifications: One to two years' programming experience in a high-level language (PL-1, FORTRAN, COBOL) plus familiarity with data base management concepts; experience with a DEC System 10 very helpful. $8,000-$10,000.

PROGRAMMER II (11-16-76).

RESEARCH BIBLIOGRAPHER I (11-23-76).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II (5) (11-9-76).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (8) (11-9-76).

SECRETARY I to do general correspondence for ten faculty members and answer all inquiries concerning admission to the program; processes applications to the programs (approx. 1000 per year); maintains student files (235) and applicant files (1000). Qualifications: Graduation from high school or approved training program. Typing, shorthand, dictaphone, office machines. $5,625-$7,025.

SECRETARY II (4) (11-16-76).

SECRETARY III (11-9-76).

SECRETARY III (6) (10-12-76).

SECRETARY III (10-12-76).

SUPERVISOR-MECHANICAL SYSTEMS (10-12-76).

UNIVERSITY POLICE OFFICER (2) (11-2-76).

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSEMBLY: DECEMBER 17

The Administrative Assembly's fall meeting and Christmas social are combined on December 17 this year, Chairman Alfred F. Beers has announced.

From 2:30 to 4 p.m. the fall meeting is held in B-6 Stetler Hall, with an address by Vice-Provost Donald N. Langenberg on "The Role of Research at the University of Pennsylvania" highlighting the business meeting. Committee reports will include one on the change of the former salary equalization committee to a "human resources committee" with broader responsibility for issues in advancement and reward for administrative and professional staff of the University.

Immediately after the meeting the Assembly moves to the Faculty Club for its Christmas social (with cash bar). All members of the administrative staff and of the professional staff (research A-Is and others in similar status) are welcome.

WEOP: DECEMBER 8

Women for Equal Opportunity at the University of Pennsylvania meets at 1 p.m. Wednesday, December 8, 112 Logan Hall. On the agenda: the future of the Women's Center.

THINGS TO DO

LECTURES

Today, at 4 p.m., the Women's Faculty Club presents a report on the 1976 HERS-Bryn Mawr Summer Institute for Women in Academic Administration. Charlotte Fiechter, Karen Friedman, Karen Gaines; and Bernadine Miller are the speakers; Room 151, School of Veterinary Medicine.

Crime ring around the collar: Jonathan Goldstein, U.S. Attorney for New Jersey, discusses Federal Prosecution of White Collar Crime today at 4:30 p.m. in Hoover Lounge of Vance Hall.

An open session on Electronic Funds Transfer Systems and the National Commission, with SPUP Dean Almarin Phillips and George Mitchell, of the Commission, is scheduled for 8 p.m. this evening in Room B-6, Stetler Hall.

Martha Kearns, biographer of Käte Kollwitz, speaks about her subject Wednesday at 4 p.m. The talk is part of an exhibit of Kollwitz's graphics at the Penn Women's Center through December 15. See and hear Ralph Bernstein speak on Vision at the computer science colloquium December 9, 3 p.m., in alumni hall, Towne Building. The December 14 talk is by Ken Knowlton of Bell labs; topic: Computer Graphics; place and time: same.

ICA presents Poetry III: Helen Adam, Ron Padgett, and Paul Voli

read from their works December 9, 8:30 p.m., at the ICA; $2.
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ICA presents Poetry III: Helen Adam, Ron Padgett, and Paul Voli

read from their works December 9, 8:30 p.m., at the ICA; $2.

Getting a rise: Visiting Professor Donald White's chemical and biochemical engineering lecture December 10 is Alternative Methods of Preparing Yeast—SCP. Then comes Funny Fluids—A Definition of Flow-Field Instability in Converging Flow in Vicoseastic Fluids December 13, by David Boger of Monash University. Each is at 3 p.m., alumni hall, Towne Building.

The Pennsylvania Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages will have its fall conference at the Graduate School of Education this Saturday; 10 a.m.; Room A-36, $5.50.

Dr. Robert Maddin, University Professor of Metallurgy and Materials Sciences, goes back to the roots with Early Iron Technology December 13, 4 p.m., at a colloquium sponsored by the history and sociology of science department in Room 107, Smith Hall.

The Contemporary Middle East Scene is analyzed by Dr. Shaimon Shamir, visiting associate professor of middle east studies, at a December 15 Faculty Tea Club lecture, 10:30 a.m.

MUSIC

William Parberry conducts the University Choir in a performance of J.S. Bach's Mass in B Minor December 10 at 8 p.m. in Irvine Auditorium.

Eine kleine Getagether: The Museum String Orchestra plays 20th-century compositions for small ensembles at its December 12 concert; 2:30 p.m. in the Harrison Auditorium.

Sing Along With Patricia (McFate) and the Glee Club December 10 on the Vice-Provost's campus caroling walk that starts from the steps of College Hall at 4 p.m. Anybody can join—but no fair turning up for the hot rum and cookies at Houston Hall at 6 p.m. if you didn't raise your voice in the chilly air beforehand.

FILM

The PUC presents The Producers Friday at 7:30 p.m. and On the Waterfront Saturday at midnight; both in Room B-1, Fine Arts, $1.

The University Museum children's film on Saturday is The Little Ark; 10:30 a.m., Harrison Auditorium.

THEATER

A fiftieth anniversary production of The Plough and the Stars by Sean O'Casey comes to the Annenberg Center tomorrow. The Abbey Theatre Players perform through December 19. For reservations and ticket information, call the Annenberg Center box office, Ext. 6791.

MIXED BAG

Clean and green, good buddy: the annual Morris Arboretum holly and green sale is December 10-12. Take your pick of holly, juniper, pine, cedar, etc., and make a wreath while you're there. Hours are 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.; use the Hillcrest Avenue entrance to the Arboretum, 10-4.

As part of her month-long exhibit, Joan Jonas presents The Juniper Tree for children over six this Saturday; 2 p.m. at the ICA; 50c; the exhibit continues through January 5.

Get lit along with the Christmas tree at the Faculty Club tree lighting December 14. 5 to 8 p.m. Santa has goodies for children, wassail for the rest of us, before the big family style dinner.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Duncan Williams

Karen Gaines

Dana Cummin

Karen A. Graves