TRUSTEES

At their stated meeting, Friday, January 13, the University Trustees passed a resolution on extending faculty appointments when a University school is discontinued. The action was taken to allow faculty members of the School of Allied Medical Professions (S.A.M.P.) to teach beyond their normal probationary tenure periods without acquiring tenure. S.A.M.P. is scheduled to complete its phasing out period in 1981. Dr. Eliot Stellar, provost, said that the resolution would assure that "no tenure will be given by default."

Robert Trescher, speaking in the absence of John Eckman, chairman of the Trustees' Development Operating Committee, reported on the Program for the Eighties. As of January 6, gifts and pledges collected totaled $135,201,462, or 53 percent of the goal of $255 million. The total collected for annual giving to date was $1.8 million, which is approximately $250,000 and 3,000 donors ahead of last year's figures. The Campus Campaign has collected $4.35 million of its $5 million goal.

Other resolutions passed authorized the Trustee Honorary Degrees Committee to select candidates for receipt of honorary degrees at the May 22 commencement; approved the appointment to the Board of Overseers of the School of Veterinary Medicine of John A. Hoyt and Mrs. Gerard B. Lambert and approved the appointment to the Advisory Board of the Institute of Contemporary Art of Mrs. John W. Eckman, Mrs. Adolf Schaap and Dr. Irene J. Winter. The Trustees also approved the election of the Board of Managers to the Wistar Institute of Anatomy and Biology.

President Martin Meyerson's report to the Trustees on the state of the University will appear in next week's Almanac.

DR. FOX NAMED ANNENBERG PROFESSOR

Dr. Renee C. Fox - professor of sociology in the departments of sociology, psychiatry and medicine and chair of the Department of Sociology since 1972 - was named the first Annenberg Professor of Social Sciences. Dr. Vartan Gregorian, dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, announced at the Trustees meeting. Dr. Fox is the second woman at the University to receive such an appointment. Last year, Dr. Dorothea Jameson Hurvich was named University Professor of Psychology.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Starting on page 4 of this issue is the Report of the Senate Committee on Administrative Structure. Faculty Senate Chairman Irving Kravis reviews the document's background in his forward.

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 1911-1978

Senator Hubert Humphrey died Friday night at the age of 66. President Martin Meyerson issued the following statement:

"Senator Hubert H. Humphrey was first a college teacher before he was a political official. As mayor, senator and vice-president, he continued to be a teacher for his colleagues, his fellow citizens and the world as well. His last speech at a major university and his last event in Philadelphia were at our commencement in May, 1977. No one who was there that day, a republican or democrat, old or young, will ever forget his inspiration and his spirit. When the history of this century in America is written, Senator Humphrey will be remembered for suggesting solutions while others were still groping for the questions."

NEWS BRIEFS

STUDENTS INJURED IN FIRE

Two graduate students in chemistry, Filho A. Torres, 29, of Bahia, Brazil and Yen-Chu Hsu, 23, of Taipei, Taiwan were injured about 11 a.m., Friday, January 13 in a fire and explosion in Room 226 of the new chemistry building. They were taken to the Burn Center of St. Agnes Hospital, where their condition was listed as serious pending further examination and complete determination of their injuries. The chemical involved was diphosphene, which must be kept in a vacuum. One of the 25 cc. containers broke, and the chemical then spontaneously exploded and caused a flash fire.

HOUSEKEEPERS RETURN TO WORK

January 9 witnessed the return of 302 housekeeping workers to the University. The returning employees, members of Teamsters Union 115, are receiving the same five percent pay increase given other University employees last summer. Allied Maintenance Corporation and the Macke Corporation will manage housekeeping operations, supervising the operations will be 13 Allied and Macke employees and seven University employees.

STATE APPROPRIATION CUT BY $1.3 MILLION

Governor Milton Shapp, as part of an over-all cut of $10 million in appropriations for colleges and universities, decreased the University's appropriation by $1.3 million. The Governor declared that the reductions were necessary because new tax measures approved by the State Legislature would not produce sufficient revenue to fund the appropriations.

The $1.2 million cut from the Veterinary school's budget all but erased the $1.7 million increase granted in 1976-7. The Dental school's appropriation reduction of $100,000 was in the area of clinical operations. These cuts represent a return to the Governor's original budget recommendations, which had been increased by the Pennsylvania General Assembly.

Appropriation cuts at other schools in Pennsylvania include: Penn State, $2,135 million; Pittsburgh, $1,247 million and Temple, $1,109 million.

President Martin Meyerson called the cuts "drastic" and predicted that "the damage will be tragic." (Continued)
Helen C. Davie’s
ACTION BY THE SENATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DR. PREUCEL RECEIVES HUP APPOINTMENT

Dr. Robert W. Preucel, associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology at the School of Medicine, has been appointed associate administrator for medical support services at the Hospital. His responsibilities will include laboratory and pathological services, radiology, utilization review and radiation therapy.

GAUDIOSI TO CONSULT ON GOVERNMENT, P.R.

Albert V. Gaudiosi, former Philadelphia city representative and director of commerce, has accepted a part-time position as consultant to the University on government and public relations.

A newspaperman for many years, Gaudiosi won a Pulitzer Prize in 1964 for his investigation of police bribery. He left the Philadelphia Bulletin in 1971 to head Frank Rizzo’s first mayoral campaign.

FAS AWARDED CHALLENGE GRANTS

A total of $2,115,000 in “challenge grant” funds for the humanities has been offered the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, a sum which must be matched by $4,395,000 to be raised by the University.

The National Endowment for the Humanities awarded the largest grant, on a three-to-one basis, of $1,144,935, for development in all fields in the humanities and library collections.

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation’s grant of $575,000 will be used to found a Center for Early American Studies at Penn. The Ford Foundation’s $400,000 award will go towards strengthening the University’s South Asia Regional Studies program. Both the Mellon and Ford Foundation grants are to be matched on a one-to-one basis.

RANDOLPH S. DRIVER, 1911-1978

Randolph S. Driver, a professor of graduate studies at the Wharton School, died January 4 at the age of 66.

An alumnus of the University, Mr. Driver was appointed deputy undersecretary of the Navy by President Lyndon Johnson in 1967. In 1968 he was assistant secretary of the Navy for manpower and reserve affairs. For more than 30 years prior to that, he was associated with Atlantic Richfield, serving as that company’s industrial relations director and in other staff positions.

GRIEVANCE REVIEW BOARD

The Senate Advisory Committee has established a Grievance Commission Review Board to analyze the operation of the grievance machinery and to ascertain whether conceptual or operational changes are called for. The Review Board has been requested to submit its analysis and whatever recommendations it may produce to the Senate Advisory Committee as soon as its inquiry is completed.

The Review Board has received written comments previously solicited by the Faculty Grievance Commission from faculty members who have been involved in a grievance process. In addition, the Board has received statements requested by the chairman of the Academic Senate from other members of the faculty.

The Grievance Commission Review Board seeks any additional opinions and comments about the grievance mechanism which faculty members wish to offer. Faculty who have already written to the Grievance Commission or to the chairman of the Academic Senate are invited to supplement or amplify their previous comments, should they so desire.

Since it is the intention of the Review Board to accomplish its task at the earliest possible date, any statements should be sent to the Review Board no later than January 31, 1978. Correspondence should be addressed to:

—Grievance Commission Review Board members: Professor Phillip Mechanick, Chairman; Dorothea Hurvich, Covey Oliver and Paul Taubman.

ACTION BY THE SENATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

At its December 7, 1977 meeting the Senate Advisory Committee selected its nominees for the Senate Nominating Committee for 1978-79.

In accordance with the requirements of the Senate Bylaws, Sec. 8(c) and Sec. 11(b), official notice is herewith given to the entire Senate membership of the Senate Advisory Committee’s nine-member slate of nominees for the Nominating Committee for 1978-79. The nine nominees, all of whom have indicated their willingness to serve, are:

June Axinn (social work), Chairman
James C. Davis (history)
Sherman Frankel (physics)
Peter Freyd (mathematics)
Larry Gross (communications)
John Kastor (medicine)
Janice Madden (regional science)
Robert Maddin (metallurgy & materials science)
Robert Regan (English)

Again pursuant to the Bylaws, Sec. 8(c), you are hereby invited to submit “additional nominations, which shall be accomplished via petitions containing at least twenty-five valid names and the signed approval of the candidate. All such petitions must be received no later than fourteen days subsequent to the circulation of the nominees of the Advisory Committee. Nominations will automatically be closed fourteen days after the circulation of the slate of the Advisory Committee. If no additional nominations are received, the slate nominated by the Advisory Committee would be declared elected. Should additional nominations be received, those nominated by petition have the right to learn the names of all other candidates and withdraw within five days after closing of petition. A mail ballot would then be distributed indicating which nominees were nominated by petition and which by the Advisory Committee. The ballot shall be circulated no later than fourteen days subsequent to the close of nominations. Voting shall be noncumulative.

The closing date for receipt of nominations by petition is Tuesday, January 31, 1978. Please forward any nominations by petition to the Faculty Senate Office, 303A College Hall CO.

—Helen C. Davies, Secretary, Senate Advisory Committee
From the Senate Chairman

Irving Kravis, the incoming Senate Chairman, will serve in that post through May, 1979.

The years ahead seem likely to be years of contraction for higher education in America. Demographic trends are unfavorable, costs may be expected to continue to expand, and the public purse strings have already been tightened.

Given this prospect, the past seems rosy. There were, to be sure, serious problems that elicited disagreements. Over some, tough battles were fought, with many words expended, some passionate. Now one can see how much those problems were eased by the background of expansion. It was easier in those circumstances to make room for younger faculty members, to cut off types of research deemed inappropriate by substantial parts of the University community, to provide special arrangements for students from disadvantaged groups.

Here at Pennsylvania, good use was made of the three decades of expansion following World War II. A reasonably attractive campus was created in which provision for student housing permitted a shift from a largely commuting student population to a largely residential one. The University was improved administratively, and a more committed and effective group of trustees was gathered. The faculty was significantly strengthened. The Senate and the Council came into existence; and understandings about the governance of the University, some written and others honored in practice, evolved.

Thus, we face the future with a better University than we ever have had before. The question confronting us now—confronting all parts of the University, the faculty as well as the administration and trustees—is how to preserve the gains the University has made and move on to new ones despite adverse conditions.

The function of the Senate in the evolving process by which this question will find its answer, it seems to me, twofold. On the one hand, it is the mechanism through which faculty opinion can be expressed and advice given to the administration and trustees. The faculty will not always be able to speak with one voice on the difficult problems ahead. The Senate should provide an opportunity for faculty members espousing various philosophies and interests to air their views before their colleagues from a platform that will also enable them to be heard by the administration and trustees.

Just as faculty members are and should be held accountable for the quality of their performance as teachers and scholars, so administrators should be accountable for their policies and actions. The Task Force on University Governance and the Senate Committee on Administrative Structure both recommended periodic reviews of the performance of administrators. The Senate should, as the latter Committee suggested, join with the trustees and the administration in working out suitable arrangements and subsequently provide the vehicle for the faculty contribution to their operation. The Senate should also be prepared to make representations to the trustees about trustee decisions in areas of direct concern to the faculty.

The University Council provides opportunities for elected representatives of the faculty and for other faculty members serving on Council committees to express opinions, give advice, and even call the administration to account. Why then is the Senate needed to fulfill these functions?

The answer is that the voices of the faculty are so intermingled with those of other groups in the Council that they are not heard clearly in the compromises that emerge. The issues ahead are so serious and so important to the vital interests of the faculty that they need to be debated and resolved, if possible, in a faculty forum. If agreement cannot be reached, the pros and cons of the alternative positions and the extent of faculty support for each should be permitted to emerge clearly. The Senate has already debated and voted decisively against a proposal to extend the probationary period before tenure is awarded. We may not have heard the last of movements to change the tenure rules and we may expect other proposals to meet financial pressures, such as calls for "increased productivity" or for reductions in programs. Perhaps some of these proposals will have to be put into effect, but there is a need for a strong and effective Senate to ensure that there is an opportunity to discuss both the principles on which the measures are based and the application of those principles to specific situations.

In view of the importance to the faculty of these problems, I feel it is necessary to reorganize the Senate to make it a more effective instrument to serve the functions of faculty expression and administrative accountability. Several past leaders of the Senate think that the time has come for such a step. One possibility that has been advanced is to enlarge the Senate Advisory Committee, making it more representative, and to expand its authority to speak on behalf of the faculty. Means would have to be worked out to ensure its accountability to the plenum of the Senate. The possibility of referenda by mail ballot should be considered.

A matter affecting the expression of faculty opinion that should be less complicated to work out relates to the control of *Almanac*. *Almanac* was designed to serve the dual functions of a journal of record and of an open forum for the discussion of University issues. As a journal of record, *Almanac* has become a very convenient and even essential feature of the administrative life of the University. Its limitations as a forum arise more from the failure of the faculty to make more use of its columns than from the arrangements for its control. Nevertheless, I, like other faculty members, have been troubled by the way in which *Almanac* was used to present the administration's viewpoint during the labor dispute involving the housekeepers. *Almanac* will be less than it should be if it is used as a house organ. Such matters could be better controlled if the editor of *Almanac* reported only to the Almanac Advisory Board.

Although the financial problems seem at this writing to loom largest for the coming years, there are other important issues on the immediate agenda of the Senate. Among them are the consideration and implementation of the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Administrative Structure, the resolution of the problems encountered in the operation of our grievance machinery, and the proper codification of existing practices affecting the faculty in the form of the long delayed faculty handbook.

—Irving Kravis, Chairman, Faculty Senate
Report of the
Senate Committee on Administrative Structure

CHAIRMAN'S FORWARD

January 5, 1978

The sequence of events leading to the appointment of the Faculty Senate Committee on Administrative Structure started with an evaluation by an ad hoc trustees' committee of problems in the organization and functioning of the senior administrative structure of the University. (See Almanac September 13, 1977.) The trustees' report dealt with a number of points having to do with faculty participation in governance. It also made certain short- and long-term recommendations about senior administrative posts. The administration's response to the report included the immediate creation and filling of a new post of deputy provost.

The Senate Advisory Committee (SAC) promptly stated its objections in meetings with the administration and the trustees both to the tenor of the ad hoc committee report and to the creation and filling of a senior academic administrative post without faculty consultation. The objections were set out in a statement published in Almanac September 13. The discussions with the trustees and administration led to a joint statement by the administration and SAC (Almanac September 20) which reaffirmed the principle of collegial governance, provided for the withdrawal of the creation and filling of the deputy provost position, and committed SAC to set in motion a study of the problems to which the trustee report was addressed. The Senate, at a special meeting on October 5, unanimously passed a resolution commending the actions of SAC in responding to the trustees' report and endorsing the proposal to constitute a committee to review the problems at issue.

The resulting Committee on Administrative Structure, for which Robert F. Lucid [acting chairman of the Faculty Senate, fall, 1977] served as convener, was charged not only to examine the tenor and implications of the trustees' report, but to define the character of faculty participation in University governance. It was further charged to formulate recommendations on the organization of the offices of president and provost—including the places, if any, of associate and deputy provost—as well as of improved methods for faculty consultation. Methods for consultation on the appointment of academic administrative officers were to receive special attention. The committee presented an interim report to the Senate at the regular meeting held on November 30. The final report of the committee follows.

In the two months following its first meeting on October 14, the committee met more than a dozen times. The committee had as guests at separate meetings the president, the provost, the senior vice-president for management, past Provost Curtis Reitz, Trustee John Eckman and Associate Provost John Hobstetter and consulted by mail and otherwise with many other people as well. It should perhaps be recorded that the spirit of collegial cooperation displayed by all of the committee's guests and consultants was warm and cordial.

The report was considered by SAC at two of its meetings. Some members of SAC were concerned by the separation of research and graduate instruction in the assignment of responsibilities to the vice-provosts. As a means of offsetting this disadvantage, SAC recommends that the associate provost chair the Graduate Council of the Faculties and the Council of Graduate Deans. In addition, the associate provost should have the responsibility for the appropriate fostering and assessing of inter-school programs of instruction and research.

Subject to this amendment, SAC has approved the report and is recommending that it be adopted by the Senate at its next meeting. Meanwhile the report is being forwarded to the administration and trustees for their consideration pending its reception by the Senate.

—Irving B. Kravis,
Chairman, Faculty Senate

January 3, 1978

This report is based firmly on the principle of shared responsibility for governance between the administration and the faculty. We do not mean to ignore the crucial role of the trustees in interpreting the needs and aspirations of the University to the outside world and in making sure that the resources available and the objectives pursued by the University are compatible, or the contribution of students, whose direct experience with the University's teaching programs cannot be matched by any of the other groups. Our concern in this report, however, is primarily with the role that the faculty can play and how institutional arrangements can be developed to make that role an effective one.

It would hardly be necessary to state the case for faculty participation in governance were it not for the apparently pejorative allusions to such participation in the trustees report on administrative structure. Our understanding is that this report, though reviewed by the executive board of the trustees, has never been considered by the full body of trustees, and it is not at all clear that the trustees as a group would be desirous of altering the role of the faculty in the governance of the University. Nevertheless the report has raised the issue, and the action of the trustees and the administration, the summer of 1977, in restructing the offices of the president and the provost suggests that the question may not be merely one of unfortunate rhetoric in a report.

No great university could govern its affairs without the participation of the faculty in the formulation of policies and in the decision-making designed to effectuate these policies. The nature of faculty teaching and research activities simply do not lend themselves to hierarchical forms of governance. A great university has faculty members working at the frontiers of knowledge, expanding man's understanding of the physical and social worlds into new areas. Such people will give their loyalty and support to the University only if they can feel that adequate provisions have been made for them and their colleagues to have a voice in the affairs of the University. The statutes of the University capture some of the spirit of this need for consultation in providing that the faculty initiate recommendations for appointments, promotions, curricula of instruction, and the granting of degrees.

We recognize that participation has some disadvantages. The faculty is large, spread over many fields and schools, and diverse in its professional interests and personal philosophies. The process of forming collegial consensus on the problems confronting the University is a difficult one. The difficulties are partially reduced by the fact that many of the necessary decisions are made within the schools or departments, where there is greater cohesion among the faculty members. Where University-wide decisions have to be made, the process may seem particularly time consuming, but it is indispensable to the achievement of the University's mission.

For these reasons, the committee reaffirms the principle of faculty participation in the governance of the University. We believe that this principle enjoys virtually unanimous support within the faculty.
We begin with an outline of suggestions for the improvement of the arrangements for faculty participation in governance, and then proceed to discussions of the organization of the central administration and of procedures for consultation.

AN AGENDA FOR IMPROVEMENT

The committee must recognize that the concerns expressed in the report of the trustees about the administration of the University cannot lightly be set aside. A complex committee structure, which has developed gradually over the past decade, may be impeding the efficient administration of the University. It may also be diminishing the effectiveness of the faculty participation in governance.

The committee’s consideration of these problems suggests that action may be required along a number of different lines:
1. A better organization of the faculty for the purpose of formulating and transmitting faculty views.
2. Better communication between the leadership of the faculty and the administration.
3. A channel of communication between faculty and trustees, though the administration should continue to serve as the normal link.
4. Better organization of the offices of the president and the provost.
5. A streamlining of the consultation procedures.

Only the last two fall squarely within the purview of this committee, but because the others are also relevant to the charge of the committee some brief comments may be made about each.

Better Organization of the Faculty

When the University Council was formed, the committees of the Faculty Senate were disbanded in order to avoid duplication between Council committees and Faculty Senate committees. The Council has served as a meeting place where the different constituencies on the campus—students, faculty, and administration—have been able to exchange views about the problems facing the University. There has developed, however, a very considerable dissatisfaction with the Council’s effectiveness in giving advice to the administration. From the faculty standpoint in particular, the cumbersome procedures of the Council and its breadth of membership have muddied the voice of the faculty even on issues that are of the most urgent concern to it, such as, to pick a recent example, rules governing faculty research activities.

At the same time, the Faculty Senate has been less than a model of success in providing for the expression of faculty opinion. Its meetings often have been poorly attended, and particular issues sometimes bring forth interested minorities of the faculty, producing votes that may not always be representative of faculty opinion.

In view of these difficulties, both with the Council and the Faculty Senate, the committee recommends that SAC put into motion a study of a possible reorganization of the Senate that would make it a more effective instrument for the expression of faculty opinion in the affairs of the University. Such a study would necessarily have to consider whether the role of Council should be modified.

Better Communication between the Leadership of the Faculty and the Administration

Some years ago SAC used to meet periodically with the administration to exchange views on problems facing the University. The president has recently suggested that these meetings should be resumed. The committee recommends that SAC agree to this proposal. These meetings should be regarded as a means of exchanging information. Through them, faculty leaders can be alerted to emerging problems and the choices confronting the administration, and the administration can obtain the informal views of what may be a representative group of faculty members.

SAC should take care to make it clear that these informal meetings must not be regarded by the administration as a substitute for formal consultation procedures.

Links between Faculty and Trustees

The mission and concerns of the trustees have a different focus from that of the faculty, although there are important common interests. The administration is necessarily occupied with the full range of University problems, and it is probably desirable to continue the arrangement whereby the administration serves as the main channel for communication between and coordination of these two groups. However, the recent report of the trustees on administrative structure makes it clear that faculty members can contribute information and viewpoints that would be helpful in the decision-making processes of the trustees. We suggest that whatever committee is desired to study the reorganization of the Faculty Senate also consider ways of establishing lines of communication with the trustees. One possibility would be to have one or two non-voting faculty members attend meetings of committees of the trustees. The trustees need not invite the faculty members to every committee meeting, but to a sufficient number so that a faculty viewpoint on the important matters under committee consideration could be made available. A recommendation along similar lines was made by the Task Force on University Governance.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

Some Principles of Administrative Organization

An important item of business for the Senate Committee on Administrative Structure has been an improved table of organization on the level of senior administration. We begin, however, with a word of caution. Organizations are managed by people, and organizational problems can be caused by people just as readily as by structural design. The committee feels that part of the current problem in the organization of the University’s central administration arises not from a defect in the organizational chart but from an inadequate use of existing positions. We have not tried to determine what the causes are or where the blame lies, especially since we are inclined to view that the two chief officers would be overworked even if all present offices were in fact being utilized to maximum advantage.

An improved design should take account of the following general principles:

a. The need for separation as well as communication. It is fundamental that, in a large and complex organization, there be adequate avenues for direct and regular communication among the various divisions. This is especially important in academic institutions which are organized for teaching and scholarship, but which require many personnel devoted to the production and management of the resources that support this academic mission. But the need for communication, and the inevitable necessity for interdependence among the various organizational parts, cannot be answered by the collegial participation of both primary officers in all executive decisions. While the sharing of responsibility reflects mutual respect, it must give way to the division of authority and to delegation to subordinates if the institution’s primary officers are to cope with the overwhelming demands on their collective time. We cannot have government by simple consensus, nor can we expect our senior officers to function as interchangeable figures. The division of responsibility, while reflecting the talents and tastes of the individuals involved, must be clearly understood and reasonably stable over time.

b. The need for a chief academic officer. The University must continue to have a chief academic officer (currently the provost) who devotes his or her time predominantly to academic matters and whose primary responsibility is to ensure academic quality across the University. Such authority can be second only to that of the highest University officer (currently the president). Ideally, both the president and the provost should possess distinguished academic credentials, but the provost must.
c. The need for academic primacy in budget planning. We especially recommend that the executive director of the budget report to the president, either directly or through the chief academic officer. Given the budgetary constraints facing the University, it is vital that academic concerns be given first priority in the setting of the budget. In addition, if academic decision-makers are to operate in a context where they have all of the available budget information, they must be involved directly in the creation of the budget at all stages. This requires that the executive director of the budget work closely with the provost, the president and other academic officers. Although we would expect the budget office, and the executive director of the budget in particular, to consult with the vice-presidents in the business areas, the construction of the budget itself would remain the function of the budget office operating under the provost and the president, with the advice of the budget committee.

d. The need to establish procedures for the review of administrators. The review of senior academic administrators at predetermined intervals was recommended by the Task Force on University Governance and endorsed by President Meyerson in the earliest days of his incumbency. We support this principle, and propose the extension of such periodic review to the non-academic vice-presidents as well. We recommend that the president initiate the development of procedures with the trustees and SAC.

e. The need for means to deal with the enlarged requirements of the University's external affairs. It is clear that activities related to fund-raising, to dealing with various levels of government, and to public relations generally, are now impinging heavily upon the time of both president and provost. In the long run it may be necessary to introduce a third senior officer. Although our strong preference is for continued two-person leadership, we also present some alternatives in the following section for the roles of the individual members of a triumvirate of leaders, should such an expansion become necessary.

Some Suggestions for the Organization of the University's Administrative Leadership

Our proposed organization is set out in chart I. The president and the provost would continue with their present assignments, functioning with more specialization of labor than in the past. An associate provost for academic planning and faculty affairs would be the third ranking officer of the University, acting as president in the absence of the president and the provost. Under the authority of the provost, he or she would have primary responsibility for academic planning, for academic budgets, and for faculty appointments and promotions. The deans of the schools would deal primarily with the associate provost, although they would be free to take fundamental policy issues to the provost or even lesser issues in cases of disagreement. Ideally, the associate provost would reflect the views of the provost in decision-making so consistently that recourse would be taken infrequently.

The other responsibilities of the provost would be grouped so that subordinate officers would report through one of three vice provosts: for academic services (e.g., dining, student health), for educational affairs (e.g., admissions, international programs), and for research (including libraries and museum).

The staffing arrangements outlined above should ease the burden on the provost and enable that officer to relieve the president of some of the more academically oriented pressures. In addition to the provost, three vice-presidents in the non-academic areas would report to the president. They would consist of vice-presidents for financial services (supervising the treasurer and comptroller), for operations (e.g., physical plant, bookstore), and for external affairs.

The vice-president for health affairs would continue to report to the provost (preferably through the associate provost) on academic affairs, and to the president with respect to business affairs. The health area of the University is of such magnitude and complexity that this vice-presidency remains a position of major importance.
The committee has not attempted to redefine the present job description.

It will be noted that we have omitted reference to two vice-presidencies now in existence—one for management and finance, and another for administration. In keeping with our obligation to report our view of an optimum structure, and without casting aspersion on the occupants of those posts, we must express our judgment that the first position is no longer required and the second post, while necessary, might better carry some other title.

The number of officers reporting to the senior vice-president is not so large that an important saving in the time of the president is likely to be achieved, particularly in view of the need of the president to deal directly with the three vice-presidents on many matters. The present functions of the senior vice-president should be divided among the vice-presidents in the business area. This is not to diminish in any way the valuable contributions that the present incumbent of the senior vice-presidency has made to the University.

In addition, the committee believes that the title of vice-president should be reserved for positions with direct line responsibility. The president requires a high level aide who can be a trusted advisor and director of other presidential staff functions. Since the incumbent now holds the title of vice-president, we do not recommend any retroactive change in title. In general, however, there should be a clear division of line and staff positions, both in responsibility and title. Furthermore, the reward structure for excellent advisors and administrators should be based on salary increases and promotions among already existing positions. New titles should be rooted solely in the necessities of the organizational structure, independent of the personalities filling the positions and cleared through the proper consultative procedures.

As noted earlier, it is our hope that the rearrangements proposed above will enable the University to continue with a two-person leadership team. This hope may be doomed to disappointment by the urgent need for the University leadership to devote much more time and effort to external affairs.

Should this prove to be the case, it may be necessary to create a three-person team to lead the University. We have considered a number of ways in which this could be done. We have ruled out as unpromising proposals which would make the person responsible for external affairs subordinate to one of the other officers. Many persons with whom the external affairs officer will need to deal will not wish to treat with any University representative below the first rank.

We recommend two alternate structures, in both of which the president would remain the chief executive officer. Our preference is for the arrangement, sketched in chart 2, in which the internal task of running the University is left to the president and the provost, but the external affairs of the University are placed in a new office which might be entitled, "chancellor." Ideally, the chancellor would not only be an effective ambassador and negotiator for the University to the outside world, but would have known the academic world from the inside at some point in his or her career. The difficulty of recruiting a person who would be able and willing to take on this task is very great. We are against filling such a post unless a very strong candidate for it can be found.

The alternative plan (chart 3) really represents a further evolution of the two-person leadership proposal outlined in chart 1, and resembles the long-run plan of the trustee report on administrative structure. The associate provost would be replaced by a dean of faculty whose duties would cover similar responsibilities but who would have greater authority. Rather than reporting to the provost on many short-run academic issues, the dean would effectively have the final word. The dean's decision could ultimately be overruled by the provost, but this would presumably be a rare occurrence. The provost, still recruited from the academic world, would be the inside operating officer to whom the business vice-presidents would also report. A major focus of the efforts of the president would be concerned with external affairs. Major academic decisions would be made by the provost, subject to the approval of the president. Long-run planning would be carried out by a committee of the president, provost and dean of the faculty.

**CONSULTATION**

The second main item of business for this report concerns administrative consultation with the faculty. Consultative procedures have come to signify the participation of the faculty in the selection of academic administrators. The ability of academic administrators to command the confidence and support of the faculty is enhanced if the faculty knows that it has played a role in their selection. Indeed, the faculty may properly look with doubt upon an administrator who accepts an important post without the benefit of faculty consultation.

It is equally important that the administration consult with the faculty on major policy decisions. With respect both to personnel and policy consultation, there is a need for streamlining the advice-giving procedures that are in effect. The complexities and delays of our procedures are in part responsible for the dissatisfaction that is reflected in the trustees' report.

To improve these procedures may require a restructuring of the Faculty Senate. We leave recommendations along these lines to the future committee which we hope will be established by SAC.

**Consultation with Respect to Administrative Appointments**

With respect to consultative procedures regarding the appointment of administrative personnel, we recommend a greater degree of flexibility in the nature of the arrangements. In this regard we
pattern our recommendations closely upon those of the Task Force on University Governance.

Appointment of the president. Indeed, as concerns the office of the president, we support the Task Force recommendations as they stand. The Task Force called for a search committee consisting of six trustees, eight faculty members, and four students, the faculty members to be appointed by the Advisory Committee of the Senate. The search committee was to have the power to rank-order the candidates if the slate presented to the trustees for their consideration contained more than three names. The time to implement these recommendations is now rather than at the moment of need for them. We urge the trustees to approve this plan at an early date. If it is decided to establish the post of chancellor, a similar procedure should be used.

Graduate procedures for other officers. For the other administrative offices, we recommend variation in the procedures so as to provide a graduation in the degree of faculty influence in the selection process. The faculty voice would be given greater weight in naming candidates for key academic administrative posts and lesser weight for other posts. Posts such as that of provost, associate provost, or deans would certainly require a search. There should, however, be substantial freedom of choice on the part of administrators in the selection of aides whose tasks are to facilitate the work of their chiefs rather than to make independent contributions to the operation of the university.

Where in this range a particular post falls should be determined by a standing committee on consultation consisting of the chairman, past chairman, and chairman-elect of the Faculty Senate, with replacements named when necessary by SAC. The president and provost should advise the standing committee of any administrative vacancy or of any significant reassignments of duties of important administrative officers. The president and provost should err on the side of inclusiveness in seeking opinions from the committee about the need for consultation. The committee, in turn, should dispose of each request very promptly, usually within a week or ten days. In the event that the administration is dissatisfied with a particular consultative process, the standing committee should be prepared to discuss with the administration the sources of the difficulties and the means for resolving them.

Search committees. Where a search committee is established, it should actually do the searching. The search committee should seek advice from the president and the provost on the responsibilities of the posts to be filled. Nominations of candidates to a search committee may come from any source, certainly not excluding the president and the provost. But it is the duty of a search committee independently to produce a slate of candidates. It might expedite the work of such committees if staff assistance were made available to them. If one person in the office of the secretary were designated to provide support for successive search committees, knowledge of precedents would be made available to such successive committees.

When the standing committee determines that a search committee is to be created, the president should request from SAC nominations of a number of persons specified by the president. The president may appoint to the committee a number of other persons equal to those nominated by SAC. In addition to the above appointments, the president shall appoint two students nominated through the appropriate student nominating committee. The president and SAC should agree on a chairman.

The search committee is responsible through its chairman for reporting to the Faculty Senate on the nature of the search, on the number of persons recommended by the committee, on whether or not the person selected to fill the position was recommended by the search committee, and on additional matters bearing upon the problems that the search committee encountered in carrying out its duties. The role of the search committee is, of course, an advisory one. The final authority for the appointment must rest with the president and the trustees.

In the case of the dean of a faculty a similar procedure should be followed, except that the faculty of the school concerned will nominate the faculty members of the search committee.

The standing committee may opt for a search committee for administrative posts that are not of a purely academic character, but have a clear and important influence on the shape of the academic programs of the University. This might apply, for example, in the case of a vice-president or other administrative officer in charge of development programs. It is, of course, difficult to draw precise lines between posts which exert a major academic influence and those which do not, especially in the light of the administration's recent emphasis on the inextricable intertwining of business and academic affairs.

Apart from the positions already mentioned, it seems preferable to leave to the discretion of the standing committee decisions concerning which other positions should be subject to the search process.

Advisory committees. For posts which involve relatively little direct academic authority and impact, such as most vice-presidencies in the business areas, the standing committee should call for an advisory committee rather than a search committee. It would not be the responsibility of an advisory committee to make a search for candidates, but merely to respond to the administration's suggestions concerning one or more candidates proposed by it. For posts such as vice-provosts and associate deans, an intermediate procedure might be employed. The advisory group in these cases might at once offer its own suggestions and react to the suggestions of the senior administrator for whom the officer is being chosen. While the committee would have some meetings with the senior administrator, it would make its decisions about its advice in executive session.

Appointments by increments. The present committee is concerned with a recent tendency to move people into important posts by accretions of responsibility, and without faculty consultation. Persons occupying posts that do not warrant search procedures have in some instances been gradually assigned increasingly important duties to the point that a change in title seemed required in order to acknowledge increased responsibilities. It has been claimed in these cases that consultative procedures were unnecessary since the person was already doing the job. The mere description of this procedure is an indication of how evasive it can be of consultative arrangements. Although we recognize that shifts in responsibilities will be necessary for best use of personnel, we recommend that any significant reallocation of responsibility in the offices of president or provost routinely be called to the attention of the standing committee.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The committee reaffirms the principle of faculty participation in University governance, including advice to the administration both with respect to administrative appointments and important University policies.
2. The committee recommends that SAC set in motion a review of the organization of the Senate in order to provide a more effective means for the expression of faculty opinion.
3. Better communication between the faculty and the trustees should be sought.
4. Although some complementarity is necessarily involved, a greater degree of specialization of labor between the president and the provost is desirable.
5. In order to ensure academic primacy in budget planning, the budget officer should continue to report directly to the president or to the president through the provost.
6. There should be periodic review of the performance of top administrators, both academic and business, at predetermined intervals.
7. The committee recommends that the burden on the provost be eased by assigning greater and broader responsibilities to the associate provost. The associate provost would, under the
authority of the provost, have primary responsibility for academic planning, for academic budgets, and for faculty appointments and promotions.

8. The other responsibilities would be grouped so that the other officers under his or her supervision would report through one of three vice provosts—for academic services, for educational affairs, and for research.

9. These staffing arrangements should ease the burden on the provost and transfer to that officer some of the more academically oriented obligations of the president.

10. In addition to the provost, the vice-presidents in the non-academic area and the vice-president for health affairs would report to the president. The vice-president for health affairs would, as at present, continue to report to the provost on academic affairs and to the president regarding business affairs.

11. Should this rearrangement prove inadequate to relieve the burdens on the president and the provost, it may be necessary to create a three-person team to lead the University. The most desirable arrangement, in the opinion of the committee, would be to add an external affairs officer who might be designated as chancellor. Within the University it would be understood, however, that the president is the chief executive officer. It would be very difficult to recruit a person both able and willing to assume this chancellor's task, and the plan should not be followed unless the external position could be filled by an eminently qualified candidate.

12. An alternative plan, which may have to be adopted, would replace the associate provost by a dean of faculty whose duties would cover similar responsibility but who would have greater authority. The provost would then become the inside operating officer to whom the dean of the faculty and the various vice-presidents would report. He or she would exercise authority over major academic decisions, subject to the approval of the president. A major focus of the president's efforts would be concerned with external affairs.

13. There is need for streamlining the advice that the faculty gives to the administration, both on administration appointments and on policies.

14. With respect to administrative appointments, flexibility would be provided by having a greater faculty voice in senior administrative appointments and a lesser voice for lesser posts.

15. The committee endorses the Task Force on Governance recommendations for a combined search committee for the office of president consisting of trustees, faculty members, and students.

We urge the trustees to adopt this plan at an early date.

16. For the other administrative posts a standing committee consisting of the past and current chairman of the Faculty Senate and the chairman-elect of the Senate would advise the administration on the nature of the consultation procedure that appeared to be called for.

17. For the more important academic offices, including the provost and deans, search committees should be established which would function as in the past.

18. For lesser posts advisory committees would be established in which the administrator for whom an aide was being recruited would have a larger voice. Other steps that would facilitate the process of consultation would be the position of staff support for search committees and the availability of the standing committee referred to above to discuss with the administration situations in which a particular consultative process was not proceeding satisfactorily.

In conclusion, the committee would like to stress that in none of these matters does it regard itself, the leadership of the Faculty Senate or the faculty at large, as being in an adversary position with respect to the administration or to the trustees. Each group is right to be concerned about its ability to carry out its responsibilities, and there will be times when one will question whether another has erred by omission or commission. It is clear, however, that the ties of common interest in the welfare of the University that bind them together are much more important and powerful than the issues on which they may differ. It is not the province of the faculty to make final administrative decisions. That is the job of our administrative officers and our trustees. But their decisions concerning academic appointments and University policies will be better ones if the knowledge and experience of the faculty are drawn upon.

**Senate Committee on Administrative Structure**

Alexander Capron (law), Convener
Richard Cooper (hematology-oncology), Peter Nowell (pathology)
Jean Crockett (finance)
David DeLaura (English)
Irving Kravis (economics), Senate Chairman

**Grant Deadlines**

**National Institutes of Health**

3/1/ Deadline for new and supplemental applications for research grants. (Next deadline July 1.) Ten institutes are inviting applications for research grants in the general area of diabetes mellitus and related problems. Program specifications available in ORA.

**National Science Foundation**

2/1 U.S.-Australia Visiting Scientist and Seminar proposals.

2/3 Engineering Research Equipment Grant proposals.

3/1 Earthquake Research Program.

3/1 Research Proposals for Division of Earth Sciences—geochemistry, geology and geophysics.

3/3/ Continuing Education for Scientists and Engineers.

3/3 Instructional Scientific Equipment for Undergraduate Science Education.

3/6 U.S.-India Exchange of Scientists proposals.

3/17 Research in Science Education proposals.


**Office of Education**

2/21 Applications for basic grants under the College Library Resources Program.*

**National Endowment for the Arts**

2/3 Proposals for certain areas of the Architecture and Environmental Arts Program.

**National Endowment for the Humanities**

3/1/ General Research Program applications in the following areas: (a) basic research (b) state, local and regional History (c) archeology.

**U.S. Department of Agriculture**


*Brochure in Office of Research Administration (ORA)

**Faculty Grants: February 1**

The Office of Research Administration reminds faculty that February 1 is the deadline for receipt of applications for summer fellowships and grants-in-aid for 1978-79 sponsored by the Research Committee's Subcommittee on Faculty Grants and Awards. The committee will award summer fellowships of $2,000 and grants-in-aid not to exceed $1,500 to successful applicants. As in past years, preference will be given to applicants holding the rank of assistant professor. Awards generally will not be made to faculty members who have received support from the Subcommittee during the past three years. A summer fellowship will not be awarded to an individual who has other sources of salary support for that period including income from teaching summer session. Application forms are available from the Office of Research Administration, 409 Franklin Building: 16. Ext. 7295.
ON TENURE

Professor Clelland’s letter (Almanac, December 20, 1977) concerning tenure and the probationary period stimulates me to write my first letter to Almanac, in order to clarify a number of issues he raises and some that he omits.

As I said in my oral statement to the Senate when the issue was considered, I do not regard a seven year probationary period as having a sacred status. But neither do I regard any other number as having such a status. In view of the absence of evidence that the extension of the probationary period will have more than marginal utility in protecting and extending the excellence of our faculty, I am disinclined to change in that direction at this time precisely because of the apparently intensifying attacks on the very concept of tenure.

Professor Clelland and I appear to agree that the tenure system is one of the most important methods devised to protect academic freedom. I also believe that it is a system which attracts some of the best minds to the academic profession. In view of the attacks on the system, one cannot help but regard proposals to extend the probationary period at this time as stepping stones to the ultimate abolition of tenure. This is not to attribute such motives to any of our colleagues who have proposed extensions of the probationary period; it is to argue that one effect could well be to aid and abet those who have other purposes. While I agree with Professor Clelland that blind defense of the status quo is no way to defend the underlying concept, I do not agree that the defense of the current probationary period—in the absence of any evidence of benefits to be derived from its extension—is such an instance.

I also agree with Professor Clelland that the best way to defend tenure is to eliminate to the greatest possible extent the errors committed in its implementation.

In this respect, however, it must be recognized that the granting of tenure is inevitably a matter of prediction, and, in complex human activity, it may be possible to reduce errors, but it is impossible to eliminate them altogether. Even if the tenure system were abrogated completely, errors of all kinds would still occur, quite possibly more of them. It is impossible to foretell what new dynamisms would replace the system, but the American social context provides examples of all kinds: arbitrary administrative actions, unionization (with the usual sequelae, including emphasis on job security with very short probationary periods), etc.

What are the types of errors with which we must be concerned? They are of two kinds: the false positives and the false negatives, where positive and negative refer to the prediction of scholarly and teaching quality, and true and false refer to the judgment of outcome. From the institutional point of view, the most serious errors are the false positives. From the point of view of the individual being judged, the most serious errors are the false negatives.

The institutional point of view is that when the issue of tenure is involved, but since tenure judgments are made by human beings, they are inevitably modulated by many other considerations, including fairness to the individual involved.

In a period of retribution, the judgments will indeed have to be tightened. False positives are harder to endure in a period of declining numbers of faculty. They can be reduced by raising the standards for the granting of tenure, as is being done now. It might be well to recall that in the 60’s, when the need for faculty was great and the talent available scarce, the granting of tenure was sometimes used to keep people from leaving even when quality was questionable. Taking the granting of tenure more seriously seems to me a return to the original intent, and should result in improved faculty quality over the long term.

It is my guess that the extension of the probationary period will actually increase doubt in those cases coming up for tenure after 10 years. Reduced certainty of prediction can only result in increased errors.

One has to take seriously those who argue that their particular fields require longer probationary periods. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that speed of achievement is one indicator of overall quality of achievement. Moreover, I am impressed by the fact that with the current probationary period, the tenure faculty in those areas whence come many of our colleagues, are of very high quality.

Thus, the evidence does not suggest support for such an argument.

Finally, I must take minor issue with Professor Clelland’s notion of “55 percent-65 percent range of tenure faculty as reasonable.” Assuming a working academic life of 35 years (surely a minimum estimate), 28, or 80 percent, of those years would be spent in tenured status by those who meet the standards. Of course, it would be an extreme oversimplification to equate that with the percentage of tenured faculty, but it does lead one to expect that in a good system, upwards of 65 percent of the faculty will be tenured at any one time. This is as it should be if there is to be a stable core to the University.

—Julius Wishner, Professor of Psychology

Professor Clelland responds: Since Professor Wishner is a colleague for whose opinions I have the highest regard, I can only say that I wish we were on the same side of the current discussion. Nevertheless, I am glad to have stimulated his first letter to Almanac. I shall try to respond to the issues he raises in some detail, thus clarifying further our major points of difference. His letter has 10 paragraphs, and it will be useful to use this structure for reference purposes.

The central section of Professor Wishner’s letter, that contained in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7, is a short discussion of the need for greater care in making tenure decisions and of the need for increased accuracy in those decisions in such a way as to protect, and indeed enhance, the future quality of the University. There is nothing here that is particularly new and nothing with which I disagree. Since paragraphs 1 and 4 contain no controvertial material, we need only consider paragraphs 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10.

Paragraph 9 deals with a discrete issue. It appears to state that at the University those departments which support an extension of the tenure probationary period are of excellent quality. Frankly, I had not considered this possibility, and if Professor Wishner, the chairman of the University’s Educational Planning Committee, can make such a judgment, I will accept it. However, I must disagree with his conclusions. If a number of excellent departments were telling me that they needed several more years to make reasonably confident tenure decisions in a future when new tenured positions are scarce, I would be inclined to listen to them. While the past history of those departments may be relevant, it is certainly not controlling.

Paragraph 10 brings up another separable issue. How large the ratio of tenured faculty to total faculty must be to provide a “stable core” for a university is a matter of opinion. Almost any faculty member would judge that 0.25 was far too low. Regrettably, I feel that the economic situation of higher education will not be sufficiently favorable to support the high ratios that Professor Wishner recommends. The 0.35 to 0.65 range is a compromise that in my opinion will be economically feasible and will provide a satisfactory level of faculty stability for the long run. I note that the University Senate, in April 25, 1973, found a 0.60 ratio satisfactory. We know more about the 1980’s now than we did in 1973, and in my opinion this additional information does not support the case for high tenure ratios.

However this may be, the less said of paragraph 10 the better. The ratio of tenure faculty to total faculty depends only very weakly upon the length of the tenure probationary period. It depends heavily upon such factors as the percentage of positive tenure decisions and the rate of termination of tenured faculty because of retirement, death, and acceptance of positions elsewhere. The argument given was described by its author as an “extreme oversimplification,” did he consider the term “thumping non sequitur”? All this aside, his letter brings out two serious differences between his position and mine. One of these is discussed in paragraph 8. He believes that extension of the probationary period will “actually increase doubt in those cases coming up.” This is a matter of judgment, of course, but I feel that the contrary is true. The evidence that will accumulate during the extension should decrease the number of false positives rather than increase the number of false negatives.

The error that Professor Wishner and I both feel...
must be of overriding concern. At the Wharton School, those of us who have been closely concerned with the granting of tenure have found that tenure recommendations made seven to nine years after the terminal degree in cases involving associate professors hired from other institutions can be made with much more confidence than tenure recommendations made four to six years after the terminal degree in cases involving assistant professors. Also, the notion that increased information reduces the probability of a "correct" decision is not one that I cherish intensely.

The final—and central—point of difference is expressed in paragraph 2 when he states that he is "disinclined to change—precisely because of the apparently intensifying attacks on the very concept of tenure." This point of view is reinforced in paragraph 3 by the sentence, "In view of the attacks on the system one cannot help but regard proposals to extend the probationary period at this time as stepping stones to the ultimate abolition of tenure." Here we part company. The point of my December 20 letter to Assembly is to urge the faculty to go beyond this sort of easy knee-jerk reaction and to take a second look. As we revise the institution of tenure to make it defensible in the 80's, we must be more careful about all the dimensions of the decision. There is no reason to omit the time dimension from this analysis. Taking several years longer in difficult cases is just as much of a part of being careful as are making sure that letters of recommendation come from acknowledged experts and eliminating tenure by inaction.

Professor Wishner does not "regard a seven-year probationary period as having a sacred status." Yet, since he can see no defensible middle ground between seven years and the abolition of tenure, he advises us to act as though a seven-year period was indeed sacred. I will only suggest another look at 10 years and mention that stonewalling strategies without much support in logic have a tendency to be counter-productive.

HOUSEKEEPING SERVICES

The pros and cons of the decision of the University to terminate the employment of the housekeepers on August 7, 1977 have been reviewed at some length in these columns. This decision has now been revoked and the housekeeping staff have been offered reinstatement of their jobs beginning January 9, 1978. Quite apart from the need of the University to cut costs versus the need for the housekeepers to be employed, at least one comment should be made at this juncture. Speaking for at least one department in the University (and I suspect this applied to many more), our space and facilities have been much better maintained since August by the contractor hired by the University than for many years previously by the housekeepers who are now being reinstated at a five percent increase in salary. With a few exceptions, the housekeepers working in this area have been completely unsatisfactory for years, despite many requests for improved service. I think we have the right to expect significant upgrading of the level of effort in the work of the housekeepers, and adequate supervision by the University to see that it is maintained. To return to the slovenly and inefficient housekeeping habits of the past would be an insult to us all.

—James M. Sprague.

Professor of Anatomy; School of Medicine

CORRECTION

In mentioning the CASE (Council for Advancement and Support of Education) Recognition Program's awards in the December 20 Almanac, we neglected to single out the "University of Pennsylvania Walking Tour and Campus Guide," produced by the Alumni Council on Admissions, which won in the category of Exceptional Individual Publications. Michael Neiditch, director of the Alumni Council on Admissions, edited the pamphlet; the University Publications office designed it. —Ed.

OF RECORD

STATE INCOME TAX

RECIprocAL AGREEMENT

The following was sent to deans, directors, department chairmen and business administrators on December 20.

As a result of the reciprocal income tax agreement entered into between New Jersey and Pennsylvania, effective January 1, 1978, compensation derived in Pennsylvania by a New Jersey resident will not be subject to the Pennsylvania State Income Tax.

Therefore, Pennsylvania income tax withholdings will not be required on wages paid to New Jersey residents on or after January 1, 1978, provided an "Employee's Statement of Non-Residence in Pennsylvania" form is filed with the employer.

Further, New Jersey income tax will not be withheld provided the employee is subject to Philadelphia Wage Tax withholdings, since the city tax exceeds and is considered a credit against a New Jersey resident's New Jersey tax liability.

Employees of the University who are New Jersey residents may pick up "Employee's Statement of Non-Residence in Pennsylvania" forms in Mr. J. Curran's Office, Room 116, Franklin Building. The forms must be returned to Mr. Curran intact. He will forward the lower half to Harrisburg and retain the upper portion for his files.

The form will be compared to the address as shown in the University's record; however, if an employee's record still shows a Pennsylvania address, the exception cannot be honored until the change of address is reflected in Personnel Action Form (PAF). It is incumbent upon each employee to be sure his or her form is submitted immediately to effect the change in tax withholdings. No refunds will be made by the University for taxes withheld before the form is submitted. The employee, if late in filing the form, will have to claim the refund from the State when filing the 1978 tax returns.

—Alfred F. Beers, Associate Comptroller

INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP DEADLINES

Royal Oak Foundation

Royal Oak Foundation, Inc. offers two tuition scholarships to the Attingham Summer School. The program, which runs from June 6 to 25, concentrates on the English country home. Applications should be sent, by February 10, to the Royal Oak Foundation, Inc., 4 East 72nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10021.

U.S.-India Exchange of Scientists

Support grants for travel to India are available to senior scientists under the United States-India Exchange of Scientists, co-sponsored by the National Science Foundation and the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research in Delhi. The purpose of the visit is to work on collaborative research projects; travel support is for short visits lasting from two weeks to several months. Applications should be submitted by March 15 for visits beginning after November 15. Information and applications are available from the U.S.-India Exchange of Scientists, Division of International Programs, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550.

Danish Health System

For students who wish to study Danish health care—social medicine, national health service, surgery and internal medicine—a course is offered in Aarhus, Denmark for three weeks in July and August. Instruction is given in English, and housing in furnished rooms is provided. Two years of previous study are required for applicants. Cost for the program is about Dkr. 1300 ($230) per three weeks. Deadline date: May 1. Write to International Medical Cooperation Committee (I.M.C.C.), Vih. Bergsgoejevej 17, DK-8210 Aarhus V. Medical Summer School.

Additional information is available from the International Programs Office, 133 Bennett Hall, D1, Ext. 4661.

-Jaika M. Raidl, Advisor, Foreign Study
OPENINGS

The following listings are condensed from the Personnel Office's Bulletin of January 12. Dates in parentheses refer to the Almanac issue in which a complete job description appeared. The full description is made available weekly via bulletin boards. Those interested should contact Personnel Services, Ext. 7285. The University of Pennsylvania is an equal opportunity employer. The two figures in salary listings show minimum starting salary and maximum starting salary (midpoint). An asterisk (*) before a job title indicates that the department is considering promoting from within.

ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL

ASSISTANT TO DIRECTOR (12-20-77).

ASSOCIATE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER I responsible to the assistant dean of external affairs, Wharton School, in coordination with the director of corporate and foundation relations for planning, administration and implementation of the Wharton Partnership Program. M.B.A. degree, preferably from the University; two to three years' experience in public relations, sales or fund-raising. Only internal candidates will be considered. Submit resumes only. $14,400-$20,550.

ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL assists in management of legal concerns of the University and the Hospital. Duties include: formulating strategies to avoid legal problems and advising University officers on general legal affairs. L.L.B. or J.D., at least two years' practice or judicial clerkship experience, membership in the Pennsylvania Bar (within one year). Salary: to be determined.

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR I (12-20-77).

EDITOR (10-4-77).

FISCAL COORDINATOR (12-6-77).

HEAD NURSE supervises nursing and clerical staff of large outpatient clinic. Pennsylvania licensure and accreditation. $11,525-$16,125.

JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST (a) (12-6-77); (b) assists principal investigator in conducting biochemical research (B.A. in chemistry, biochemistry or biology; experience in biochemical laboratory). $9,275-$13,000.

PRODUCTION MANAGER responsible for the manufacture of 20 new books and six reprints per year. Practical knowledge of graphic design, printing and binding techniques. $9,275-$13,000.

SPACE AUDITOR maintains an inventory of information on buildings, rooms and lands. Completion of a post-secondary program in architectural drafting. $9,275-$13,000.

STAFF NURSE, CLINIC COORDINATOR (12-6-77).

PART-TIME

Seven part-time and temporary positions are listed. See bulletin boards for details.

SUPPORT STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO THE CORPORATION SECRETARY (12-6-77).

CLERK IV receives, prepares and maintains students' files. High school graduate, some college or business school courses. $6,700-$8,575.

COMPUTER FACILITIES SECRETARY (12-20-77).

CONTRACT ACCOUNTANT (12-6-77).

MEDICAL DENTAL RECEPTIONIST (two positions) maintains file charts. High school graduate, knowledge of medical terminology. $6,225-$7,975.

RECEPTIONIST greets students and parents, answers routine questions. High school graduate, at least one to two years' experience. $6,225-$7,975.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II* (a) runs clinical assays for hospitals and practitioners in tri-state area (immunological and related procedures); (b) involves the care and feeding of snails and maintenance of snail breeding colonies (Bachelor's degree or previous laboratory experience). $7,650-$9,800.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III performs routine biochemical lab work. B.S. in biology or chemistry. $8,625-$11,050.

SECRETARY II (two positions) $6,225-$7,975.

SECRETARY III (four positions) $6,700-$8,575.

SECRETARY III provides secretarial services for four professors. High school graduate, three to five years' experience. $6,700-$8,575.

SECRETARY IV (12-20-77).

SECRETARY, MEDICAL TECHNICAL (eight positions—on two promotion from within) $7,150-$9,150.

SECRETARY, MEDICAL TECHNICAL types grant applications and scientific manuscripts. High school graduate, two years' business school and experience.

SECRETARY TECHNICIAN, WORD PROCESSING programs Xerox 800 word processing equipment. High school graduate; typing experience with word processing equipment. $7,150-$9,150.

TYPIST receives visitors, answers routine questions. High school graduate, two years' experience. $5,800-$7,400.

PART-TIME

Nine part-time and temporary positions are listed. See bulletin boards for details.

SCHOOL OF DENTAL MEDICINE

TEMPORARY LABORATORY ASSISTANT (five months) to prepare solutions and work in biochemistry, pathology and histology laboratories. Previous lab experience and scientific academic background required. $3.50 hour. Call or write: Barbara D'Ullisse, School of Dental Medicine. Ext. 6091.

THINGS TO DO

LECTURES

Satellites and Ancient Sites are explored by Dr. Christopher Hamlin, assistant professor of anthropology, in the second lecture of Archaeology!, a series sponsored by the University Museum's Women's Committee. January 18, at 3:30 p.m. in the Museum's Rainey Auditorium. $2.50.

Donald Lach, from the University of Chicago's history department, conjures Elephantiasis— Early European Impressions of Indian Animals—for the South Asia Seminar series. January 19 at 11 a.m. in the University Museum, Room 138.

Dr. Paul Bender, professor of law and former general counsel to the U.S. Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, discusses Obscenity, Pornography and the First Amendment with the Faculty Tea Club. January 24 at 1:30 p.m. in the Faculty Club.

EXHIBITS

German Exiles after 1933, a traveling photo exhibit depicting the emigration of German and Austrian intellectuals to the United States after 1933, is on view in the Klein Exhibition Corridor of Van Pelt Library now until January 31. Monday through Thursdays 8:45 a.m. to midnight, Fridays 8:45 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Wharton and the Fine Arts of Wharton bring Jimmy Lynch: A Tale of the Brandwine, a loan exhibition of watercolors and paintings, to Penn January 19 through February 25 at Vance Hall's Hoover Lounge. Monday through Saturday 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; Sunday noon to 5 p.m.; opening reception January 18, 5 p.m.

FILMS

Children learn that Animals Are Beautiful in the People University Museum's Children's Film Program, January 21, 10:30 a.m., Harrison Auditorium.

Adults can rediscover Huckleberry Finn, portrayed in the film version by Red Skelton, in Leadbelly, January 22, 2:30 p.m., Harrison Auditorium.

Billboards, drive-ins and the lights of the Las Vegas strip flash by in Signs of Life: Symbols in the American City, premiering at the Institute of Contemporary Arts January 25 at 7, 8 and 9 p.m., Fine Arts Auditorium.

MIXED BAG

Off-Broadway's Best at Annenberg opens with the Circle in the Square production of The Club in the Zeiller Theatre on January 25 through 29 (preview January 24). Creditors, the originally scheduled production, was cancelled because of unexpected problems incurred by the producer. Call Ext. 6791 for information.

You can avoid bad seeds this spring by attending the Culling Through Seed Catalogues workshop offered by the Morris Arboretum January 24 from 10 a.m. to noon. Members $4, non-members $5. Call CH 5777.