United Way

President Martin Meyerson and Provost Vartan Gregorian unveiled a sign this morning temporarily changing the name of Locust Walk to United Way, thus signaling the start of the University's 28th year of active participation in the United Way program.

Last year more than $25 million was raised in southeastern Pennsylvania to help support the United Way's 250-member human-care service centers.

At least 18 member agencies are in the University vicinity, ranging from the Crime Prevention Association in the West Philadelphia Community Center to the Wharton Centre's settlement house programs.

United Way funds have also supported a number of projects at the University Hospital.

Treating Radiation Victims

Dr. Linnemann doubts genetic consequences of the Three Mile Island nuclear accident

Dr. Roger E. Linnemann, M.D., clinical associate professor of radiology at the Medical School, told a group of 40 nurses and physicians last weekend that opponents of nuclear energy are "acting in an informational vacuum. There is less than a million-to-one chance of an accident. Considering that minimal risk, it would be inadvisable to shut down the plants totally. There would be an economic disaster."

Linnemann, who also is president of the Radiation Management Corp. (R.M.C.), a consultative group, delivered his remarks at a conference entitled "The Primary Management of Radiation Injury." The conference was sponsored by the continuing medical education office of the Medical School in cooperation with the department of radiology and R.M.C.

Linnemann told his audience that "there was never a possibility at Three Mile Island" that area residents would suffer from overt radiation sickness.

"The lack of information regarding the doses [of millirads] required for illness resulted in fear and confusion," said Linnemann of the TMI incident. Linnemann, conference director, had served as a consultant to several federal commissions following the accident at Harrisburg last March.

As for an increase in cancers associated with radiation exposure, he believes these will be insignificant in the area around Three Mile Island, but he urged caution.

"Radiation is one of the least potent carcinogenic agents on the basis of the human studies conducted. There are over 100,000 studies of cancer effects dating back to 1906," he said. "In Japan, some 90,000 radiation victims have been followed since Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Only about 185 cancer deaths in that group can be attributed to excessive radiation exposures—over 100,000 millirads—associated with the bomb blasts."

While acknowledging that the long-term effects of low dose rates are less clearly understood than the effects of single high doses. Linnemann said that evidence to date suggests that there would probably be no genetic consequences from the accident at Three Mile Island.

"There is simply no evidence to indicate that radiation has caused genetic mutations in humans. This does not mean that it does not occur. There just have not been enough humans irradiated with large enough doses to be studied."

Experiments with mice indicate that the ova of female mice recover from the radiation exposure as long as the dose is neither massive nor swift, explained Linnemann. The only experiment involving a large number of humans who were irradiated was one which studied 71,000 children conceived and born to survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings, he said.

(See LINNEMANN, page 3)
TO THE EDITOR:

As you know, your interview with Mr. James Robinson and me took over two hours at the end of a very busy day. I had viewed this interview with reservations but I thought an article in ALMANAC might help affirmative action on our campus by making the faculty and administration more aware of affirmative action goals and better acquainted with the procedures for implementing these goals.

As I read the article, I realized that the interview was insufficient to acquaint a newcomer to our campus with work that has been going on for about four years. I am sure you did not intend to give a distorted view of affirmative action efforts on campus but unfortunately the article contains several inaccuracies and distortions. Therefore, I would appreciate if you would publish this letter in the next edition of ALMANAC to clarify some points as soon as possible.

A major distortion is the confusion between my role as the chair of the Council on Equal Opportunity and my function as affirmative action officer for FAS. Chairing the council is not very taxing. Since Mr. Robinson and all the committee members work extremely hard, I have relatively little to do in this position. Furthermore, the council is only an advisory body to the president and the provost and therefore does not pose any particular threat to anybody. However, the council also has a subcommittee made up of affirmative action officers for all the schools in the University and this is what prompted my remarks as affirmative action officer. This position is indeed a very demanding one, not only because of the amount of time it requires, but because one may in fact antagonize many people, most of all faculty, as the job involves the monitoring of hiring and promotion practices.

This conversation led to my comments about the lack of uniformity in hiring practices in which I mentioned the medical school. It should have been emphasized that with the present affirmative action forms that are now utilized by all schools, this lack of uniformity is being eliminated. Although the medical school came to mind as one school that had rather different hiring practices, these problems are being resolved since the medical school has two outstanding affirmative action officers who have brought about important changes in their affirmative action procedures.

Last but most importantly you quoted me as saying “the faculty resent being told anything. They feel they ought to be able to hire whomever is competent.” This is indeed a misquote and one that puts me in a position which is diametrically opposed to the view I hold and that I attempted to make clear during the interview. This misunderstanding also perpetuates an unfortunate piece of mythology about affirmative action—the mistaken belief that the demands of affirmative action are somehow in conflict with the legitimate desire of a faculty to hire the most qualified candidate for a position. By widening the pool of applicants for each position and assuring that all applicants will receive fair consideration, affirmative action does improve the quality of our faculty as well as making it more representative. As I told you during the interview, there have been cases where male candidates, recommended through the old boys’ network, were preferred by departments to better qualified female candidates. In refusing to sign the affirmative action forms in such cases, I have contributed to the excellence of our faculty as well as to its fairness in its hiring and promotion procedures. I have never, to my knowledge, done anything to oppose or compromise the goal of academic excellence.

MADELEINE M. JOUILLIE
Professor of Chemistry

Editor’s Note: ALMANAC is pleased to publish Prof. Jouillie’s clarifying remarks concerning her role in the University’s affirmative action program. Insofar as the alleged misquote is concerned (“The faculty resent being told anything…”), ALMANAC stands by its story.

TO THE EDITOR:

I have watched with interest the revision of the style of the ALMANAC under its new editorship. One cause for very serious criticism has been the sloppy proofreading, but this is allied with somewhat more subtle difficulties which in my view are indicative of a possible misunderstanding of the role of the paper in the University and of the University in the larger community.

In an effort to achieve a more informal style in the interest of wider appreciation and understanding of the ALMANAC message, the editor has permitted a somewhat unseemly abuse of the English language to creep into the paper, and a correction of this difficulty would go somewhat deeper than simple proofreading. Even this problem is not the end of the story. The University of Pennsylvania is a serious-minded institution of some considerable national and international importance. Such seriousness does not necessarily imply self-importance; witness the success of the irreverent but splendidly edited Gazette. But the new ALMANAC, in an exclusive effort to strike a popular chord, tends to trivialize and demean the life of the University.

Unfortunately, this impression seems to be widely shared with my academic colleagues. There is some strong feeling that the new editorship, in attempting to correct a very real problem with the character and reputation of the paper, has overshot the mark by a rather wide margin. What is needed is a much clearer appreciation of the role of ALMANAC as a channel of information within the University and a presentation of the character of the University to the rest of the world—including our peer institutions, our colleagues, and a wide spectrum of the reading public.

BRITTEN HARRIS
Dean, School of Public and Urban Policy

Reply to Britten Harris’ letter:

The members of the ALMANAC Advisory Board have benefited from Professor Harris’ views on the publication’s recent issues. We are all grateful for the views of other members of the University community who have written or called us to express their concerns about the directions they sensed ALMANAC was taking. We are encouraged to find that people care about ALMANAC.

In hiring the new editor, the Board hoped to institute a new era in ALMANAC’s history—one in which the first priority is a deeper, more substantive treatment of important issues on campus. We also seek to create a wider familiarity with the personalities concerned with those issues.

The transition is a difficult one: the format is in flux. Staff limitations have imposed extraordinary burdens on the editor. We hope that, in the interim period, the University community will be charitable and patient. We urge continued University input, particularly now, in the form of letters to Speaking Out which will help shape the new ALMANAC. We would also welcome short articles of serious academic substance.

We would like to reassure our colleagues: the Board stands committed to the responsible reporting that has generally characterized ALMANAC in the past. We are equally committed to an evolution of the publication to new dimensions of service to the University community. We earnestly desire that (See SPEAKING OUT, page 3).

Speaking Out is a forum for readers’ comments on University issues. It is conducted under the auspices of the ALMANAC Advisory Board: Robert Lewis Shapen, chair; Herbert Colman, Fred Kanush, Charles Dwyer, and Walter Wales for the Faculty Senate; Curtis L. Barnes, director of the University of Pennsylvania; Valerie Pena for the Libraries’ Assembly; Shirley Hill for the Administrative Assembly; and Virginia Hill Upright for the A-3 Assembly. Copies of ALMANAC’s guidelines for readers and contributors may be obtained from ALMANAC’s offices, 133-135 Franklin Building.
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Confidentiality of Records

Pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, the University designates the following categories of personally identifiable material as "directory information" which it may (but need not) disclose from the records of an individual, without his consent, who is or has been in attendance at the University:

- Name
- Address (Local and Home)
- Telephone Number
- Date and Place of Birth
- Major Field of Study
- Participation in Officially Recognized Activities and Sports (Including Social and Honorary Fraternities)
- Weight and Height of Members of Athletic Teams
- Dates of Attendance and Degree and Awards Received
- Previous Educational Institution(s) Attended

Individuals in attendance have the right, for themselves, to refuse to permit the designation of any or all of the above categories as directory information. To do so, they must notify the University in writing of the category or categories to which designation as directory information is refused by Nov. 16, 1979. Written notification should be addressed to the Office of the Registrar, Attention FERPA, Franklin Building, 3451 Walnut St./16, Philadelphia 19104.

This designation has no bearing on the publication of the 1979-80 Student Directory, the information to appear in which has already been specified by individuals in attendance.

Failure to respond to this notice will not result in the routine disclosure of one or more of the designated categories of personally identifiable information. The University will continue to exercise informed discretion in responding to requests for information contained in records maintained by it which directly relate to students.

—Vartan Gregorian, Provost

Postdoctoral Awards

The National Research Council has announced its 1980 Research Associateship Programs which provide postdoctoral opportunities for scientists and engineers in the fields of atmospheric and earth sciences, chemistry, engineering, environmental sciences, life sciences, mathematics, physics, and space sciences.

More than 200 awards will be offered on a competitive basis in 1980. The basic annual stipend (subject to income tax) will be $18,000 for recent recipients of the doctoral degree. Higher stipends will be determined for senior awardees. Awards will include relocation allowances and limited support for professional travel during tenure. Awards generally will be for one-year periods. Senior applicants may request shorter tenures.

Applications to the NRC must be postmarked by Jan. 15, 1980. Awards will be announced in April, 1980.

Application materials and detailed information about specific opportunities for research and the federal laboratories which participate should be requested from the Associateship Office, JH 608-D1, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20418.

October 17th Curtain

Jeffrey Duarte and Ed Hall in the Trinity Square Repertory Company's production of The Shadow Box, Michael Cristofer's Pulitzer Prize-, Tony Award-winning play that opens in the Zellerbach Theater on October 17 (preview on October 16) and runs through October 21 as part of the Annenberg Center's Theatre Series Z.
The Colloquium in Nineteenth Century French Studies will be held at the University from Thursday, Oct. 18 through Saturday, Oct. 20. The series is sponsored by the University's Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the department of romance languages, the office of the provost, the office of the president, and the Anspach Institute. Scholars will be in attendance from such institutions as Columbia University, Yale University, the University of Michigan, and the University of Toronto. Some of the program topics include: Autour D'un Poeme: Le Cygne by Baudelaire, Literature and the Fine Arts, Tocqueville and History, and Victor Hugo and Religion.

The colloquium begins with a buffet dinner on Thursday at the University City Hilton Hotel and then moves to the Annenberg Center where the sessions will be held. The Friday evening banquet in the University Museum will feature talks by Provost Vartan Gregorian and Professor Armand Hoog from Princeton University. The registration fee is $15 for full-time participants and $5 for graduate students and University staff members. All inquiries should be directed to Professor Frank Paul Bowman at Ext. 6351.

French Studies Colloquium

The registration fee is $15 for full-time participants and $5 for graduate students and University staff members. All inquiries should be directed to Professor Frank Paul Bowman at Ext. 6351.

The University Museum will offer weekly guided tours of its world famous archaeological collections every Wednesday, throughout the fall semester, at 1 p.m. Each tour will focus on a particular culture and the ways in which societies utilized and adapted to their environment. Some of these collections include material from ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, China, Greece, Rome, Central and South America, Africa, the South Pacific, as well as the North American Indians. The Wednesday museum tours were designed to fit into a lunch hour—tours last forty-five minutes. Admission is free, but a $1 contribution is invited.

D. Bruce Johnstone, former vice president for administration at Penn, will discuss “Quality of Morale—Worry about Campus Climate” at the sixty-second annual meeting of the American Council on Education, which gets under way in Houston, Texas, later this month. Johnstone, who left Penn earlier this year, has been president of the State University of New York College at Buffalo since August.

QUOTABLE

H.E.W. SECRETARY PATRICIA R. HARRIS speaking to a group of 70 women's college presidents: “Too often we [H.E.W.] may have been part of the problems your institutions have had to face.”

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL PRELIMINARY MEMBERSHIP LIST 1979-80

STEERING COMMITTEE

June Axinn
Alice Beck
Paul Bender
Michael Cohen
Jeannine Coyne
Vartan Gregorian
Philip J. Kellman

Barbara J. Lowery
Martin Meyerson
Jack E. Reece
Walter Wales
Robert A. Zelten

Term expires May 1980

1 Bernard Wailes
2 Stuart Curran
3 Michael Cohen
6 Gerald Prince
7 Jack E. Reece
10 Steven C. Battman
12 June Axinn
14 David Cohen
15 Mark N. Blitz
18 John J. Furth
19 Marilyn Hess
20 Albert J. Stunkard
21 Frank I. Goodman
23 Wilfried T. Weber
25 Barbara Lowery
26 Peter J. Kuriloff

*Jacob M. Abel
*Regina Austin
Paul Benoit
Clifton C. Cherpack
Peter Conn
*John S. DeCani
Charles E. Dwyer, Secy.
*Robert Inman, Past Secy.
Anne Keane, Secy.-Elect

*Observer

Members of the Senate Advisory Committee

Ivan B. Kravis, past Chairman
Paul M. Lloyd
Peter C. Nosell
Daniel D. Perlmutter
Rosemary A. Stevens
Walter D. Wales, Chairman
*Leon P. Weiss
Irene J. Winter

*Joseph F. Kane
**Frank Serpico

Members of the Administration

Morris S. Arnold
Lee Copeland
Robert H. Dyson, Jr.
James O. Freedman

Britton Harris
Thomas W. Langfitt
Benjamin S. P. Shen
Janis L. Somerville

Assistant Professors

Term expires May 1980

Joseph Beckham
Denise Koval
Moderator
Herbert S. Levine
Librarians' Assembly
Eleanor Allen
A-3 Assembly
*Observer

Term expires May 1981

Elinda Kornblith
Mark B. Snyder
Parliamentarian
*Christian Day
Administrative Assembly
Maureen Parrish

Undergraduates

Terry Andrews (FAS '80)
Alice Beck (FAS '81)
David Cohen (FAS '80)
Laura Foggan (FAS '80)

Kevin Gorin (SEAS '81)
Brian Klock (SAMP '81)
Mitch Portnoy (WH '80)
Cheryl Saban (FAS '82)

Graduate-Professional Students

Haym Benaroya (SEAS)
Mitchell Blutt (Medicine)
Margaret Chilida (GrFAS)
Diane Clark (GSA)
Jeannine Coyne (Social Work)
Mike Griffin (Ann)
Keith Grove (Vet)

Phil Kellman (GrFAS)
Alan Leifer (WhGrad)
Randall D. Marks (Law)
Steve Rood-Jalvo (GrFAS)
Gretchen Rossman (GrEd)
John R. Sills (Nursing)
Ralph Jay Van Brocklin (Dental)
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FOR THE RECORD

1978 Task Force on University Governance
May 3, 1979

I. Introduction
The re-establishment of a Task Force on University Governance to build on the work of its predecessor was suggested by the President for the March 6, 1978 agreement which marked the end of the student sit-in. This suggestion was subsequently discussed by the Senate Advisory Committee and accepted in the name of the faculty. The composition of the Task Force was determined by the Steering Committee of the University Council, acting through a subcommittee consisting of one administrator, one faculty member, and one student. The members of the Task Force were selected by their respective constituencies. The formal charge to the Task Force and the membership of the Task Force are contained in Appendix I.

The 1978 Task Force was given two relatively distinct charges relating to University governance. The more immediate charge was to "review the status of the recommendations of the Task Force on University Governance which reported in 1970 and to consider governance issues posed by the agreements reached by students and Administration during the weekend of March 4-5, 1978." The other charge was to "consider the governance problems created by the likelihood that it will be necessary to shrink the size of the University." The Task Force began its work in late April of 1978. The initial discussions centered on the relations between the Trustees and the University, with particular emphasis on the suggestion that students and faculty members be placed on the Trustees for a one-year experimental period. A preliminary report on this aspect of the work of the Task Force was presented to the Trustees at their meeting of June 8, 1978. The fall and spring semesters of 1978-79 were devoted to the review of the remainder of the 1970 Report and to discussion of the governance process. The re-establishment of a Task Force on University Governance to build on the work of its predecessor was suggested by the President for the March 6, 1978 agreement which marked the end of the student sit-in. This recommendation was subsequently discussed by the Senate Advisory Committee and accepted in the name of the faculty. The composition of the Task Force was determined by the Steering Committee of the University Council, acting through a subcommittee consisting of one administrator, one faculty member, and one student. The members of the Task Force were selected by their respective constituencies. The formal charge to the Task Force and the membership of the Task Force are contained in Appendix I.

The 1978 Task Force was given two relatively distinct charges relating to University governance. The more immediate charge was to "review the status of the recommendations of the Task Force on University Governance which reported in 1970 and to consider governance issues posed by the agreements reached by students and Administration during the weekend of March 4-5, 1978." The other charge was to "consider the governance problems created by the likelihood that it will be necessary to shrink the size of the University." The Task Force began its work in late April of 1978. The initial discussions centered on the relations between the Trustees and the University, with particular emphasis on the suggestion that students and faculty members be placed on the Trustees for a one-year experimental period. A preliminary report on this aspect of the work of the Task Force was presented to the Trustees at their meeting of June 8, 1978. The fall and spring semesters of 1978-79 were devoted to the review of the remainder of the 1970 Report and to discussion of the governance process. Section II of this report is devoted to examination of the 1970 Report. Section III contains the results of the discussion of governance processes at the University.

II. Review of the August 21, 1970 Report of the Task Force on University Governance
The 1978 Task Force was asked specifically to "consider those recommendations of the original (1970) Task Force which have not been implemented and base its advice on whether these proposals should be dropped or adopted." In addition, the Task Force was asked to give its advice on a proposal for a one-year experiment in faculty and student membership on the Trustees. As the Task Force began its work it became clear that many of the proposals of the original Task Force could not be classified unambiguously as either implemented or not implemented. Accordingly, we have given some attention to almost all of the proposals. It was also clear that an item-by-item account of the status of the proposals made in the 1970 Report, while consistent with our initial approach to the 1970 Report, would probably obscure many of the conclusions and recommendations we wished to make. The body of this Report focuses only on those areas which we feel should be emphasized at this time. However, an item-by-item analysis of the 1970 Report is included as Appendix II.

A. The Trustees

1. Young Alumni Trustees
The 1970 Report recommended that a total of six Young Alumni Trustees be elected to the Trustees, with two being elected each year for three-year terms. It appears that the addition of young alumni to the Trustees has provided a useful point of contact with those alumni who are just embarking on their careers. This purpose is probably most effectively satisfied if the Young Alumni Trustees begin their term very soon after graduation. There may be some advantage to making the terms overlap, so that some continuity is provided. This goal can be achieved by increasing the number of Young Alumni Trustees. However, care must be taken to assure that the efforts of the Trustees are not diluted by the addition of young alumni who, while well-intentioned, can not at this stage of their careers devote the time or effort necessary to make major contributions to the work of the Trustees. We recommend that a Young Alumni Trustee from the undergraduate schools be elected every second year and that a Young Alumni Trustee from the graduate and professional schools be elected in alternate years. Each Young Alumni Trustee would be elected for a term of three years. Nominations would be made by the Nominating Committee of the General Alumni Society from members of the current year's graduating class or of the previous year's graduating class. Election would be by members of those classes. Special efforts should be made to provide orientation so that the newly-elected Young Alumni Trustee can quickly understand the operations of the Trustees. We recommend that faculty members and students be named as non-voting liaison members of appropriate Committees of the Trustees for informational purposes. However, since this concept is as yet untested, it is important that it be approached carefully and cautiously if it is to be implemented effectively. In this regard it is important that faculty members and students recognize that there will inevitably be instances in which a Committee of the Trustees will find it essential to meet without the presence of the liaison members. Correspondingly, it is important that the Committee members make special efforts to include the liaison members as fully in the Committee operation as possible. In view of the fact that this is an untried mechanism it appears useful, at least in the first year, to limit the number of liaison members to no more than one faculty member and one student on most committees. No liaison members will be selected for the Audit Committee. One undergraduate student and one graduate/professional student will be selected for the Committee on Student Life.

Liaison members should be selected each year before the end of the spring semester. They should assume their responsibilities effective June 1. The initial set of liaison members should be selected during the spring semester of 1979 to begin service on June 1, 1979.

Liaison members will be selected by a group consisting of the Chairman of the Trustees, the President, and the Chairman of the Steering Committee of the University Council. Selection will be made from nominations presented by the appropriate constituencies. Each liaison member will be selected for a term of one year, but may serve continuously for as long as three years. The distribution* of undergraduate students and graduate/professional students will be determined by the students before the nominations are made. In the event that the Chairman of the Steering Committee is uncertain of the priorities among the nominations presented or is unable to honor those priorities, it is expected that he [In this report the term "he" will be understood to mean "he or she", whichever is appropriate.] will consult with the appropriate constituency organization.

Liaison members of the Committees of the Trustees will be expected to report to the appropriate constituencies and to the University Council. It shall be the responsibility of each constituency to develop mechanisms for reporting on the activities of the Trustees. A special meeting of the University Council in the spring semester of each year should be devoted to reports from faculty and student liaison members.

*The liaison members selected for 1970-1980 will be distributed as indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Faculty Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Policy</td>
<td>1 faculty member, 1 undergraduate student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>1 faculty member, 1 undergraduate student, 1 graduate/professional student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Finance</td>
<td>1 faculty member, 1 undergraduate student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Campus Planning</td>
<td>1 faculty member, 1 graduate/professional student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>1 faculty member, 1 undergraduate student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Responsibility</td>
<td>1 faculty member, 1 graduate/professional student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Affairs</td>
<td>1 faculty member, 1 graduate/professional student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Informal Meetings Among Trustees, Faculty, and Students
The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees actively develop additional opportunities for informal meetings between its membership and the faculty, student body, and others. This recommendation is not intended to have been adequately implemented. Although social interchange between individual Trustees and other members of the University family would be beneficial in stimulating understanding and developing, under comfortable cir-
1. Organization of the Office of the Provost

The 1970 Task Force recommended that a Senior Associate Provost and an Associate Provost for Medical Affairs be established. It also recommended that the then current posts of Vice Provost for Student Affairs, for Research, and for Planning be continued. In the past few years the Provost's Office has consisted of the Provost, the Associate Provost for Academic Planning, the Vice President for Health Affairs (who also reports to the Provost), the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs and University Life, and the Chair of the Graduate School and Research. Currently Vice Provosts for University Life and for Research are being named to replace the two Vice Provosts mentioned above.

The Task Force discussed the organization of undergraduate studies and University Life and consulted with the Provost-elect on the organization of his office. Although we did not reach a clear consensus on either subject, it is not obvious that the new organization is inferior to any other which has been discussed. The Vice President for Health Affairs seems to be functioning as an Associate Provost for Health Affairs, and the other posts are not greatly different from the recommendations made in the 1970 Task Force Report. It appears that the precise details of staff assignment should be left to the judgement of the Provost who will, after all, be properly held responsible for the success or failure of his Office.

2. Associate Deans

The 1970 Task Force recommended that Associate Deans with divisional responsibilities be appointed in large schools. This recommendation appears to be most pertinent now for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which was originally constituted from a wide spectrum of disciplines and has since been broadened even further by the partial incorporation of the Graduate Biomedical Groups. Although concern has been expressed (in, for example, the dissent which accompanied this recommendation in the 1970 Report) that appointment of Associate Deans responsible for cohesive sub-groups within a large faculty might hamper the development of cohesiveness across a wide spectrum of disciplines, the organizational advantages of such appointments outweigh the possible fragmenting effects. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences is now firmly established, and it is now appropriate for them to give this option serious consideration.

3. Title of Dean

The 1970 Task Force recommended that the title of Dean be reserved for Deans of a Faculty. At the present time, no Deans except Deans of Faculties exist.

4. Responsibility of a Department Chairman

The 1970 Task Force emphasized that the ideal arrangement in an academic department is one in which the Chairman holds his position of leadership because of the confidence his colleagues as well as his administrative superiors have in his integrity, judgment, and abilities. At the present time, it is evident that the Chairman's responsibility to the Department as a collectivity is an important aspect of the promotion of a sense of collegial responsibility for the educational enterprise, and recommended that the official charge to Department Chairman include the statement that the Chairman is responsible to the Department as a collectivity for his conduct of its affairs. The present operating statement of the responsibilities of Departmental Chairman (from the 1969 Faculty Handbook) does not include this statement. It is essential that the charge include this statement and, in addition, that the statement of the charge be given formally to a Chairman on initial appointment or promotion.

The paragraphs above represent the views of the majority of the members of the Task Force on the question of faculty and student representation on the Trustees. However, a minority of the members is convinced that the advantages of a one-year experiment with student representation on the Trustees outweigh the disadvantages. A summary of their views appears as Appendix III.

B. The Administrative Function

In the interval since the 1970 Report many changes have been made in the organization of the Administration. While some of these changes followed or were consistent with the recommendations made in the 1970 Report, other changes were in directions not envisioned by the 1970 Recommendations. As a result, the existing administrative structure is not a linear combination of the structure which the 1970 Task Force studied and which the Task Force recommended. Accordingly, it has not always been possible to make simple recommendations on implementing proposals in the 1970 Report.

1. Organization of the Office of the Provost

The 1970 Task Force recommended that a Senior Associate Provost and an Associate Provost for Medical Affairs be established. It also recommended that the then current posts of Vice Provost for Student Affairs, for Research, and for Planning be continued. In the past few years the Provost's Office has consisted of the Provost, the Associate Provost for Academic Planning, the Vice President for Health Affairs (who also reports to the Provost), the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs and University Life, and the Chair of the Graduate School and Research. Currently Vice Provosts for University Life and for Research are being named to replace the two Vice Provosts mentioned above.

The Task Force discussed the organization of undergraduate studies and University Life and consulted with the Provost-elect on the organization of his office. Although we did not reach a clear consensus on either subject, it is not obvious that the new organization is inferior to any other which has been discussed. The Vice President for Health Affairs seems to be functioning as an Associate Provost for Health Affairs, and the other posts are not greatly different from the recommendations made in the 1970 Task Force Report. It appears that the precise details of staff assignment should be left to the judgement of the Provost who will, after all, be properly held responsible for the success or failure of his Office.

2. Associate Deans

The 1970 Task Force recommended that Associate Deans with divisional responsibilities be appointed in large schools. This recommendation appears to be most pertinent now for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which was originally constituted from a wide spectrum of disciplines and has since been broadened even further by the partial incorporation of the Graduate Biomedical Groups. Although concern has been expressed (in, for example, the dissent which accompanied this recommendation in the 1970 Report) that appointment of Associate Deans responsible for cohesive sub-groups within a large faculty might hamper the development of cohesiveness across a wide spectrum of disciplines, the organizational advantages of such appointments outweigh the possible fragmenting effects. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences is now firmly established, and it is now appropriate for them to give this option serious consideration.

3. Title of Dean

The 1970 Task Force recommended that the title of Dean be reserved for Deans of a Faculty. At the present time, no Deans except Deans of Faculties exist.

We recommend that this exclusive use of the title of Dean continue, and not be blurred by careless usage, particularly for functions at the Associate and Assistant Dean level.

4. Responsibility of a Department Chairman

The 1970 Task Force emphasized that the ideal arrangement in an academic department is one in which the Chairman holds his position of leadership because of the confidence his colleagues as well as his administrative superiors have in his integrity, judgment, and abilities. At the present time, it is evident that the Chairman's responsibility to the Department as a collectivity is an important aspect of the promotion of a sense of collegial responsibility for the educational enterprise, and recommended that the official charge to Department Chairman include the statement that the Chairman is responsible to the Department as a collectivity for his conduct of its affairs. The present operating statement of the responsibilities of Departmental Chairman (from the 1969 Faculty Handbook) does not include this statement. It is essential that the charge include this statement and, in addition, that the statement of the charge be given formally to a Chairman on initial appointment or
reappointment. A recommended replacement for the present charge appears as Appendix IV.

5. Terms of Office of Academic Administrators

The 1970 Task Force recommended that subject to earlier termination at the pleasure of the appointing authority:

a. The term of office of the President should be a single term of twelve years.

b. The term of office of the Provost should be seven years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of five years after review.

c. The term of office of a Dean should be seven years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of five years after review.

d. The term of office of a Departmental Chairman should be five years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of three years after review.

The Task Force believes that these are useful guidelines which set reasonable outer limits to administrative service. The guidelines should be set down explicitly and the reviews specified should be defined and routinely performed. Specific review procedures are now being developed by the Senate Committee on Consultation and the Administration.

6. Integration of Undergraduate Education

The 1970 Task Force recommended the integration of undergraduate education at the University of Pennsylvania and the establishment of a Faculty of Arts and Sciences which would have responsibility for all undergraduate degrees. Although a Faculty of Arts and Sciences has not been established, no integration of undergraduate education has occurred. We believe that the integration of undergraduate education deserves the most serious study.

We recommend that the Steering Committee of University Council, in consultation with the Deans of the undergraduate schools, promptly establish a select panel to consider the integration of undergraduate education. The panel should include knowledgeable representatives from all Schools which are significantly involved in undergraduate education. The panel should assess the advantages and disadvantages of integrating undergraduate education, and report its findings and conclusions to the University Council.

7. Student Membership on Committees

The 1970 Task Force recommended that as a general norm each committee of the University and of its schools have at least two student members and as many as twenty-five percent. Although it is evident that this recommendation has been generally implemented at the University level, the evidence of implementation at the school or departmental level is not readily available.

We recommend that the Provost regularly remind the Deans of the desirability of including students on Committees, and that the Deans in turn remind their Chairmen. The Chairmen and the Deans should regularly report, to the appropriate Dean and to the Provost respectively, on their accomplishments in meeting this guideline.

8. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness in Promotion Consideration

The 1970 Task Force recommended that students' opinion on the effectiveness of teachers be taken into account in the consideration of promotions at the department and higher levels. It also recommended that review authorities not approve a promotion unless they are satisfied both with the procedures used to collect and the documentation of student opinion.

Teaching performance has been given much greater emphasis since the report of the 1970 Task Force. Evidence of student opinion is now routinely required by reviewing authorities at the School and University levels. It is important to assure that this certification of evidence not be reduced to a purely pro forma exercise, and that Departments treat teaching ability as a serious component of qualification for promotion, particularly to tenure. Regular inquiries to the Department from the Dean regarding customary practice may be beneficial.

9. Advising and Counselling

The 1970 Task Force recommended that the question of the removal and revitalization of the system of academic advising be the subject of a detailed study. It further recommended that Departments provide adequate counselling for all students served by their courses.

While the advising and counselling in some areas appears to be nearly adequate, on the average it is at an unacceptably low level. If the University is to prosper and attract and hold excellent students this system must be improved.

We recommend that the advising and counselling system be made the subject of an extensive study, the results and conclusions of which should be given wide dissemination. Furthermore, the responsibility for coordinating advising and counselling services should be assigned either to the Council of Undergraduate Deans or to an appropriate Vice Provost.

C. Additional Recommendations

The 1970 Report contained several recommendations on the Faculty Senate and Student Government, which are also part of the governance at the University of Pennsylvania. One such recommendation, which has not been implemented, is that the Student Government be formally recognized in the Statutes of the Corporation. We believe that this is still a reasonable recommendation.

We recommend that a new Article VII be added to the Statutes:

Student Government

1. Students of the University may adopt forms of student governance by referenda open to all fully matriculated students in the school(s) in question, or by other democratic means which are broadly representative.

2. Such associations shall have the authority to discuss and express their views upon any matter which they deem to be of general University interest. These associations shall also be responsible for the development and procedures for the administration of activities and functions delegated to them. In addition they shall have the power to make recommendations to the Council and Administration and to solicit information from them.

III. Governance Problems Created By Shrinking Resources

In a period of generally increasing resources, the costs of improving existing programs or developing new programs can be taken from the added resources. While there is often vigorous debate about which program should be improved or developed, this debate is tempered by the realization that the ultimate decision will not be made with the approval of all members of the University community. On the other hand, in a period of shrinking resources, or even in a period of unchanging resources, any improvement or new development must come at the expense of existing programs. Any discussion of new or improved programs must then inevitably assume, either explicitly or implicitly, that necessary resources will be reallocated from other considerations of the University rather than derived from supplementary funds. Under these circumstances the debate on program development can become undesirably vigorous.

There is a basic conflict in the making of important decisions, particularly those dealing with reallocation of resources, between the protection of the continued viability of different parts of the University on the one hand and the involvement of the various constituencies in the decision-making process on the other hand. Public decision-making may require public discussion of the possibility that a given program will be curtailed or abolished. Even the possibility that this will happen is often extremely detrimental to the recruiting of both students and faculty and to the retention of the best staff members. Any announcement setting in motion a public deliberative process to determine which of a number of activities will bear the brunt of a specific expenditure reduction is likely to injure them all.

Since the appropriate approach for each difficult decision is likely to be different from all those appropriate for previous decisions, it is not possible to develop an all-purpose prescription or even a general outline. The quality of decisions will continue to depend primarily on the ability of those who must make them; the acceptance of difficult but correct decisions will continue to depend on the basic intelligence of the University. However, a few observations and recommendations may be helpful:

1. The Task Force on Governance recognizes that actual decisions on reallocation of resources must always be made and will usually be formulated by administrative officers of the University. Indeed, one of the essential attributes of a good administrator in an era of limited resources is the ability to make sound decisions on reallocation. It is imperative that the governance process not become so cumbersome that tentative decisions are endlessly debated while necessary action is deferred.

2. The Task Force is convinced of the desirability of obtaining advice on major decisions as widely as possible. Such advice, at least on occasion, may result in uncovering new alternatives or unanticipated pitfalls and may thus play an essential role in the formulation of the decision itself. Even where no new insight is provided by an advisory review mechanism, the review itself can help justify necessary decisions which might otherwise prove corrosive to the University Community.

3. It seems clear to the Task Force that the views of various constituencies must be considered in the decision-making process. There are some cases in which public debate may not be harmful and may even be helpful. Public discussion is clearly appropriate in instances in which a particular unit of the University has already been identified for assessment with respect to its future role in the University. Such public discussion is particularly necessary where there is prima facie evidence that the activity is not being conducted at a level which is consistent with the University's objectives and aspirations, or where the prospect is that a choice will have to be made between diminishing or terminating support for the activity or significantly increasing the allocation of resources to it. The decision to close the School of Allied Medical Professions is a recent example of a case in which wide public discussion was necessary.
On the other hand, public discussion may simply not be feasible in many situations. Looking backwards, it seems clear that the proposed economies in the Division of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics, which led to the decision to drop ice hockey from varsity status, illustrate the situation where administrative decision-making without wide public University consultation is in the best interest of the University.

It may not be easy as particular cases emerge to distinguish between the two kinds of situations. However, it is the responsibility of administrators who must make decisions to both be aware of the impact of these decisions on all constituencies of the University and to consult as widely as possible, particularly where the impact on the University may be large.

4. The present Advisory Committees and review mechanisms appear to be completely adequate for most current circumstances. There are many bodies already in existence which could be assigned further roles in this process if necessary, ranging from standing committees of University Council to the full Council itself. It is not obvious that new advisory bodies and review apparatus would be more effective. It is clear that no advisory body can function effectively if its advice is not sought.

5. Advisory Committees and review mechanisms must be more widely recognized before they are called upon for critical judgements, rather than materializing in an ad hoc fashion to justify a predetermined approach to a particular problem. Frequent efforts should be made to keep the community aware of the review mechanisms which exist. In particular, the roles of the Budget Committee and of the Educational Planning Committee need to be publicized.

6. More public information on fiscal problems might sensitize the community to pending administrative decisions. One approach would be for the Administration to keep the University Council fully informed about fiscal realities and to attempt to solicit general advice on priorities and on decision criteria.

7. It may be useful to have a small group available to provide advice on what advisory mechanisms might be most appropriate in particular situations. Such a group would advise only on procedures, never on the substance of the decision itself. The Senate Committee on Consultation might be called upon to perform this service. When an Administrator (President, Provost, Dean, etc.) was considering an explicit decision he should, at his option, ask the advice of the committee. He might also wish in addition to seek such advice from any constituency which he perceived might be particularly affected.

Most decisions on advisory mechanisms would be made without the involvement of this consultative committee. However, in a few difficult situations its advice on procedures might be very helpful. The committee, in order to function effectively, would have to be aware of the consequences of potential decisions for various University constituencies.

8. It is conceivable that circumstances might arise under which the Administration would decide that the present array of advisory mechanisms were not adequate. The Educational Planning Committee, which undoubtedly would have already provided advice on any major issue, might not then be an appropriate group to make an independent review. In such a case, the Administration may wish to seek advice from an existing committee whose members had prior exposure to the University community. We believe that the Steering Committee of University Council can best fill this role. It is obviously a very demanding one, however, the need for reallocation review of major decisions should occur relatively infrequently. In addition, the Steering Committee should reserve the right to decline any request which the Administration makes for such a review.

9. We have not addressed the questions of implicit decisions on program reallocations, which may in practice be of greater significance than many explicit decisions. Insofar as these implicit decisions are not recognized it is of course impossible to utilize any formal review apparatus. It is therefore essential that administrators recognize the implications of all decisions they make and try to involve the constituencies most likely to be affected in those decisions which are potentially disruptive as at an early stage as possible.

It is the responsibility of administrators to make decisions on allocation and reallocation. Their performance in this critical area provides the basis on which their performance in office must ultimately be judged. Since the advisory and review mechanisms cannot assume any significant portion of this responsibility, it is important that these mechanisms neither unduly delay nor hamper necessary decisions. However, the ultimate vitality of the University depends on acceptance of these decisions by the community. The administrator's discriminating use of advisory mechanisms and thorough understanding of the impact his decisions will make on all segments of the community can both assist in the development of wise decisions and ease the community's difficulty in accepting them.

Appendix I

Charge to the Task Force on University Governance

The immediate responsibility of the Task Force will be to review the status of the recommendations of the Task Force on University Governance which reported in 1970 and to consider governance issues posed by the agreements reached by students and administration during the weekend of March 4-5, 1978. Specifically, the new Task Force is asked to consider those recommendations of the original Task Force which have not been implemented and to give its advice on whether these proposals should be dropped or adopted. In addition, the Task Force is requested to give its advice on issues that are referred to it by the Steering Committee of University Council. Among these matters, the Task Force is requested to turn its attention first to the proposals relating to the role of faculty and students in the work of the trustees. Of these proposals which originated both in the 1970 Task Force and in the sit-in negotiations the suggestion for a one-year experiment in faculty and student membership should be reported upon as soon as possible. These responsibilities should be discharged by the end of this semester.

The other major charge of the new Task Force is to consider the governance problems created by the likelihood that it will be necessary to shrink the size of the University. The group should review the procedures that were followed in recent efforts to reduce or phase out academic and non-academic programs including the School of Education, the School of Allied Medical Professions, professional theater at Annenberg, and certain intercollegiate athletic programs. The purpose of this review should be to determine whether procedures can be developed that will afford adequate opportunity for participation by students and faculty in the choices that will have to be made without providing veto power by the groups most directly affected. It is recognized that work will have to continue in the fall on this portion of the charge.

March, 1978

Task Force on Governance

Administration

Britton Harris (SPUP)
William G. Owen (Dev. Office)

Faculty

Peter A. Cassileth (Medicine)
Peter Conn (English)
Noyes E. Leech (Law)
Michael L. Wachter (Economics)
Walter D. Wale (Physics)

Students

Philip A. Carlson (Wh., '81)
Philip J. Kellman (GRF '80)
David D. Langfitt (FAS '79)
Randall C. Marks (Observer) — (Law '80)

Trustee

Paul F. Miller, Jr.

Ex Officio

President/Provost — Martin Meyerson/Eliot Stellar/
Vartan Gregorian
Chairman of the Faculty Senate — Irving Kravis
Head of the Undergraduate Assembly — Mark D. Lerner
Secretary of the Corporation — Janis I. Somerville (Observer)
(effective September 15, 1978)

Staff

Barbara B. Wiesel (Office of the Secretary)

Appendix II

Appendix II contains a statement of each of the recommendations of the 1970 Report of the Task Force on University Governance (hereafter 1970 Report). Following each statement is an analysis of the present status of the recommendation, comments by the new Task Force, and a specific recommendation, if appropriate, by the new Task Force.

1. The 1970 Report recommended that the basic structure be retained under which the University of Pennsylvania is governed by the Trustees. This structure has been maintained.

2. The 1970 Report recommended that a total of six Young Alumni Trustees be added to the Trustees, with two being elected each year for three-year terms. This recommendation has been partially implemented; two Young Alumni Trustees are elected every three years for three-year terms.

It appears that the addition of young alumni to the Trustees has put all a useful point of contact with those alumni who are just embarking on professional careers. The purpose is probably most effectively satisfied if the Young Alumni Trustees begin their terms very...
soon after graduation. There may be some advantage to making terms overlap, so that some continuity is provided. This goal can be achieved by increasing the number of Young Alumni Trustees. However, care must be taken to assure that the efforts of the Trustees are not diluted by the addition of young alumni who, while well-intentioned, can not at this stage in their careers devote the time or effort necessary to make major contributions to the work of the Trustees.

We recommend that a Young Alumni Trustee from the undergraduate schools be elected every second year and that a Young Alumni Trustee from the Graduate and Professional schools be elected in alternate years. Each Young Alumni Trustee would be elected for a term of three years. Nominations would be made by the Nominating Committee of the General Alumni Society from members of the current year's graduating class or of the previous year's graduating class. Election would be by members of those classes. Special efforts should be made to provide orientation so that the newly-elected Young Alumni Trustee can quickly understand the operations of the Trustees.

3. The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees develop a formal mechanism for terminating the trusteeship of an individual who becomes unable to discharge the responsibilities of his position. Current statutes provide that absence from three consecutive meetings may constitute resignation; however, no formal mechanism exists.

The Task Force found no reason to believe that the current informal mechanisms are not working satisfactorily. Accordingly, no further action is recommended at this time.

4. The 1970 Report recommended that vacancies on the Trustees be promptly filled. It further recommended that the Nominating Committee develop mechanisms to solicit formally suggestions for potential Trustees from all the constituencies of the University. The most recent as well as the present Chairman of the Nominating Committee of the Trustees has actively solicited recommendations about possible candidates for Trustee membership.

Overall, the present mechanism appears to be working satisfactorily. It is, however, a mechanism which can easily be neglected. We recommend that the Office of the Secretary continue to solicit suggestions from the University Community including notifications in the Almanac.

5. The 1970 Report recommended that a continuing effort be made to broaden the membership of the Trustees to achieve diversity. It appears that this has been a continuing effort, within the constraints of the term of Trustees, and that the Trustees share the concern of the Task Force.

6. The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees develop a formal mechanism for dealing with questions of conflict of interest concerning its members. We understand that a new policy is being drafted by the University Counsel and the University Secretary.

We are pleased that progress is being made in this area and look forward to the final policy statement.

7. The 1970 Report recommended that two members of the faculty and two students be named as non-voting liaison members for each Committee of the Trustees, to attend at least three meetings per year for informational purposes. Although the meetings of the Trustees and of the Trustee Committees have been more open in the past few years, the recommendation for liaison membership has not been implemented in any effective way.

It appears to us that specific liaison membership on Trustee Committees might provide a very effective conduit for information between the Trustees and the rest of the University Community. However, it is obvious that four liaison members may be excessive for some of the smaller Trustee Committees.

We recommend that faculty members and students be named as non-voting liaison members for appropriate Committees of the Trustees for informational purposes. Since this has not been done as yet, it is important that it be approached carefully and cautiously if it is to be implemented effectively. In this regard it is important that faculty members and students recognize that there will inevitably be instances in which a Committee of the Trustees will find it essential to meet without the presence of the liaison members. Consensus, however, is important that the Committee members make special efforts to include the liaison members as fully in the Committee operation as possible. Liaison members should be selected each year before the end of the spring semester by a group consisting of the Chairman of the Trustees, the President, and the Chairman of the Steering Committee of University Council. Selection will be made from nominations presented by the appropriate constituencies. It is expected that the Chairman of the Steering Committee of University Council will return to the appropriate constituency if he is uncertain of its priorities or unable to honor them. The student representation (the proportional representation of graduates and undergraduates) will be determined prior to the selection. Liaison members of the Committees of the Trustees will be expected to report to the appropriate constituencies and to the University Council in the spring semester of each year, or more frequently if useful.

8. The 1970 Report recommended that the role and effectiveness of the various advisory boards be reviewed continually by the Trustees and by their appropriate committees. The Trustees have initiated a process of inviting the Boards of Overseers to make formal reports to the Trustees, and have moved toward greater involvement through appointment of Trustees to the Boards.

9. The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees actively develop additional opportunities for informal meetings between its membership and the faculty, student body, and others. This recommendation does not appear to have been adequately implemented.

Although social interchange between individual Trustees and other members of the University family would be beneficial in stimulating understanding and developing, under comfortable circumstances, acquainanceships which might be of great value in more stressful situations, it seems unreasonable to place the burden of initiating such interchanges directly with the Trustees, who usually are concerned with much more pressing business. It is much more reasonable to assign this responsibility directly to the Office of the Secretary, which not only has the overall task of liaison with the Trustees, but also has the support staff necessary to implement and maintain a sequence of informal meetings.

We recommend that additional opportunities for informal meetings between members of the Trustees and the faculty, student body, and others be developed as needs are identified. We believe that the primary responsibility for arranging such meetings would be assigned most logically to the Office of the Secretary, acting at the request of various University constituencies.

10. The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees codify the procedure for the selection and election of new Presidents. Although a procedure was approved by Council, the Trustees have deferred action.

There appears to be no reason to delay codifying the procedure. There is probably a great deal of advantage in codifying procedures at a time when they are not urgently needed.

We recommend that the Trustees codify the procedure for the selection and election of a new President.

When it becomes necessary to select a new President, the Executive Board of the Trustees shall constitute a joint trustee-faculty-student committee to nominate a slate of candidates to the Trustees. The faculty members shall be appointed by the Advisory Committee of the Senate. The student members shall be appointed by analogous procedures evolved by the respective student groups.

11. The 1970 Report recommended that the academic Vice Presidency for Engineering Affairs and for Medical Affairs be ended. The Vice Presidency for Engineering Affairs has been discontinued, while the Vice Presidency for Medical (Health) Affairs has been continued.

Although the title of Vice President has been retained in the Health Affairs area, the evolution of the position itself has brought its function very close to that of the "Associate Provost for Medical Affairs" which was recommended by the 1970 Task Force. There do not appear to be strong reasons for changing the form of the title, particularly since the present title does have some advantages in extra-University relationships.

12. The 1970 Report recommended the establishment of two posts of Associate Provost; a Senior Associate Provost and an Associate Provost for Medical Affairs. Neither has been formally established.

The present Associate Provost seems to be evolving toward the concept envisioned in the original recommendation for a Senior Associate Provost. In the absence of any other Associate Provost the "senior" designation is unnecessary.

13. The 1970 Report recommended that the present (1970) Vice Provosts dealing with Student Affairs, Research, and Planning be continued. These posts have been changed considerably since the 1970 Report.

The present plans for the Provost's staff include Vice Provosts for University Life and for Research. While we have not been able to reach a consensus on the "best" assignments for the Vice Provosts, it is not obvious that the proposed designations of any other which has been discussed. The effectiveness of the office will in any event depend more on the particular incumbents and the use to which the Provost puts their talents than it will on the details of the organizational structure.
14. The 1970 Report recommended the establishment of a Senior Vice President (for management). This position was established.

Although the post has been phased out, it is generally conceded that it served a valuable function which is no longer needed.

15. The 1970 Report recommended the appointment of Associate Deans with divisional responsibilities in large schools. This has not been accomplished.

The recommendation for the appointment of Associate Deans with divisional responsibilities appears to be most pertinent for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which was originally constituted from a wide spectrum of disciplines and has since been broadened even further by the partial incorporation of the Graduate Biomedical Groups.

We recommend that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences consider whether there may not be net advantages to divisional Associate Deans.

16. The 1970 Report recommended the establishment of a Dean of Engineering. This post has been established, and a School and a Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science, which combines the single engineering schools which previously existed, has been established.

The recommendation for the appointment of a Dean of Engineering, this post has been established, and a School and a Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science, which combines the single engineering schools which previously existed, has been established.

17. The 1970 Report recommended that the title of Dean be reserved for Deans of a Faculty. At the present time, no Deans except Deans of Faculties exist.

The retention of the title of Dean for Deans of Faculties is serving us well, and should be preserved. It is important that this exclusive use for the title of Dean continue, and not be blunted by careless usage, particularly for functions at the Associate and Assistant Dean level.

18. The 1970 Report recommended that the official charge to department chairman include the statement that the chairman is responsible to the department as a collectivity for his conduct of its affairs. The present operating statement of the responsibilities of Departmental Chairman (in the 1969 Faculty Handbook) does not include this statement.

It is essential that the official charge should contain such a statement. It is also important that the entire statement be presented explicitly to the chairman.

We recommend that such a statement be added to the official statement of the responsibilities of Departmental Chairman. We further recommend that the entire statement be included in the charge given to each chairman on initial appointment or reappointment. A recommended replacement for the present charge appears in Appendix IV.

19. The 1970 Report recommended that each department have a standing personnel committee. It appears that actual practice varies widely, both within schools and between schools.

Ideally, decisions on appointments and promotions should be considered by all members of the department holding equal or higher rank than those involved in the appointment or promotion being considered. While a standing personnel committee may be of aid in formulating these decisions, the formal existence of such a committee is neither necessary nor sufficient to assure democratic processes. More important is the continuing scrutiny of the Dean or Provost and the commitment of the faculty itself.

20. The 1970 Report recommended that departmental decisions on curriculum matters be made in a democratic process with the participation of all those holding professorial rank. While this practice is widely used, there are at present no mechanisms to monitor compliance.

Inasmuch as decisions on curriculum matters are among the most important that a faculty makes, it is essential that a more serious attempt be made to assure full participation of department faculties. Possible mechanisms might include regular promulgation of these principles and the formal request for a record of the faculty vote and the date of department meetings on those requests for course approval which are forwarded to the Dean.

We recommend that an effort be made to assure that decisions on curriculum matters be made in a manner which encourages full participation by all those holding professorial rank.

21. The 1970 Report recommended that:

A. Departments encourage their students to form advisory groups.

B. Departments provide adequate counseling for all students served by their courses.

C. Students' opinions on the effectiveness of teachers be taken into account in the consideration of promotions at the department and higher levels.

While evidence that student opinion has been surveyed is now required for promotion proposals forwarded to schools, there is no mechanism in place to assure compliance with these recommendations at the departmental level. The departments should be asked to report their procedures for advising to the dean, and to have them available for inspection.

22. The 1970 Report recommended that more careful attention be given to the need for compensatory reductions in teaching loads for faculty assumption of administrative responsibilities below the Dean's level and for other assignments such as burdensome committee chairmanships.

The 1970 Report stressed that compensatory reductions would only be appropriate for those duties which went well beyond those that a faculty member is normally expected to accept in contributing to the running of the University. Where particularly demanding requests are made of a faculty member, adjustments in his or her total workload should be prearranged with the Chairman, Dean, or Provost.

23. The 1970 Report recommended that subject to earlier termination at the pleasure of the appointing authority:

A. The term of office of the President should be a single term of twelve years.

B. The term of office of the Provost should be seven years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of five years after review.

C. The term of office of deans should be seven years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of five years after review.

D. The term of office of a departmental chairman should be five years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of three years after review.

The Task Force believes that these are useful guidelines which set reasonable outer limits to administrative service. The guidelines should be set down explicitly and the reviews specified should be defined and routinely performed. The Senate Committee on Consultation and the Administration are currently developing explicit review procedures.

24. The 1970 Report recommended the integration of undergraduate education at the University of Pennsylvania. It suggested that a single undergraduate faculty might have overall responsibility for undergraduate studies. This recommendation has not been implemented.

The integration of undergraduate education at the University of Pennsylvania is a subject which the present Task Force has not discussed in detail. It would appear appropriate to set up a special study group devoted to this purpose and ask that it report its findings and conclusions to the University Council.

25. The 1970 Report recommended the establishment of a Faculty of Arts and Sciences which would have responsibility for all undergraduate degrees and for the Master's degrees in Arts and Sciences and the Ph.D. degree. Although a Faculty of Arts and Sciences has been established, it does not have responsibility for all undergraduate degrees or for all of the Ph.D. degrees.

It appears that further implementation of this recommendation must be deferred until (if ever) undergraduate education is integrated at the University.

26. The 1970 Report recommended the discontinuance of the College for Women. This has been done.

27. The 1970 Report recommended that professional graduate degrees be offered under the jurisdiction of the appropriate professional schools. This is being done.

28. The 1970 Report recommended that where a department has teaching responsibilities in more than one school of the University, it be located for budgetary purposes in the school responsible for the degree programs that are most important to it.

The recommendations of the 1970 Task Force were formulated at a time when the potential transfer of the Wharton social science departments into the then-hypothetical Faculty of Arts and Sciences loomed as a serious problem. The transfer was accomplished in accord with these principles.

29. The 1970 Report recommended that issues of departmental affiliation arising out of the principle stated in Recommendation 28 be resolved by University Council for advice to the President and Trustees.

See comment above under 28. These issues do not seem to be of great current relevance.

30. The 1970 Report recommended that any faculty group which is located in one school but which normally teaches a substantial number of courses to a significant number of students in another school should have representation proportional to its weighted contribution when educational decisions affecting those students are made. At the present time, although secondary term appointments are frequently made between schools which mix student populations, no formal mechanism for proportional representation exists.

The 1970 recommendation, which focuses on membership in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of significant numbers of Engineering and Wharton faculty, appears to be based on the assumption of an integrated undergraduate education under the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Unless this integration occurs it appears unnecessary to go
31. The 1970 Report recommended that the new Academic Planning Committee and the related administrative officer be called the University Planning Committee and the Vice Provost for University Planning. The committee has been named the Educational Planning Committee, and at the present no Vice Provost for University Planning is contemplated. While the present name is not identical to the one suggested in the 1970 Report, the Educational Planning Committee appears to be serving the function envisioned by the 1970 Task Force. However, the absence of an officer in the Provost’s Office with a specific assignment in the area of planning is distressing. It is essential, in assigning responsibilities within the Provost’s Office, that this function not be overlooked.

32. The 1970 Report recommended that the University Planning Committee be specifically authorized and required to conduct an independent periodic assessment of the standing of each of our various academic groups. The review process, as applied to academic groups within the University, appears to be operational. This process includes participation by the Educational Planning Committee, the Provost’s Office, and the relevant Dean. Both internal and external panels are used to facilitate these reviews.

33. The 1970 Report recommended that consultative procedures in which a consultative committee independently recommends a slate of nominees be employed for the selection of Provost, Associate Provost, Vice Provosts, and Deans, and that procedures involving advisory committees but permitting greater administrative discretion be employed for other posts. It also advised that a small Standing Committee on Consultation (the Chairman, Past Chairman, and Chairman-Elect of the Senate) be available for advice on consultative procedures. The consultative procedures recommended are now part of the Bylaws of the University Council (April, 1977). The Standing Committee on Consultation exists and does advise on consultative procedures.

Although there has been some controversy over the application of these procedures, all recent normal appointments in the Provost’s area, including the Associate Provost and the Provost, have been made in this manner. In addition, all of the current set of Deans were so selected. The mechanism does not appear to have presented serious problems except in those cases in which the responsibilities of the position were not well-defined. The best solution to this difficulty might be to reach a full understanding of the responsibilities of an office before filling it.

We reaffirm the recommendation for independent search processes and advisory committees and believe they will, on balance, be of great benefit to the University.

34. The 1970 Report recommended that reports of consultative committees, advisory groups, and the Standing Committee on Consultation should be as full as appropriate and should be widely circulated. This recommendation has not been widely implemented.

Faith in the consultative process (and consequent confidence in the incumbent) can best be established by open publication of relevant information in a journal of record. We recommend that the charge to each consultative committee include the requirement that a final report, including the general nature of the pool of candidates, explicit or implicit restrictions on the search process, and the statement of whether the candidate selected was on the committee’s slate, be published promptly in the Alma Mater. We further recommend that the Chairman of the Senate, in his reports in the Alma Mater, report both on the activity or lack thereof of advisory panels and on the actions of the Standing Committee on Consultation.

35. The 1970 Report recommended that, as a general norm, each committee of the University and of its Schools have at least two student members and as many as 25 percent. It suggested that the precise number and proportion of students on each committee should be graded according to the extent to which their experience enables them to contribute meaningfully to the work of the committee. It recognized that this proportion might be significantly higher for those committees dealing with such matters as residence rules and discipline and much smaller (or zero) on committees dealing with faculty appointments and promotions.

Although it is evident that this recommendation has been generally implemented at the University level, the evidence on implementation at the School or Departmental level is not as readily available. The Provost or Associate Provost should regularly remind the Deans of the importance of having students on school committees, and should ask them to remind their departmental chairmen of these recommendations. An occasional request for a report (perhaps to be published) might also be helpful.

36. The 1970 Report recommended that reviewing authorities on promotion proposals at the school and University levels should not approve a promotion unless they are satisfied with the procedures used to collect and the documentation of student opinion. They also recommended that student opinion be obtained on the evaluation procedures used by each department to assess teaching performance.

Since the 1970 Report teaching performance has been given much greater emphasis in personnel decisions. At the present time, evidence from student ratings is required at the Provost’s level, and additional evidence (letters from students and faculty) is routinely presented. The exact practice within schools and departments is not as well documented. It would be helpful if schools would file statements of their current practice.

37. The 1970 Report recommended that students should be consulted on the appointment of an administrative officer in student life. This is the current practice.

38. The 1970 Report recommended that the question of the renovation and revitalization of the system of academic advising be the subject of a detailed study. Although studies have been made in the past the present system of academic advising is not, on the whole, one which inspires great confidence.

An excellent advising system is one of the most critical elements in assuring an optimal educational experience for our students. Although the responsibilities of the present system currently fall on individual schools, it is essential that a University overview be maintained. The ultimate future of the advising system is clearly intimately involved with the question of integration of undergraduate education at the University. If a plan for integration should be adopted it is clear that the system of advising must be an important element of that plan. On the other hand, it is important that the advising system be improved even if the undergraduate education is not integrated.

We recommend that a survey be made of the advising systems within the University, and that the results of that survey be made widely available. We further recommend that if a plan for integration of undergraduate education is not developed in the near future the overall responsibility for advising be assigned either to the undergraduate deans’ council or to an appropriate Vice Provost.

39. The 1970 Report recommended that the University Council take the initiative in insuring the establishment of disciplinary procedures in the graduate and professional schools. These disciplinary procedures have not been established.

The 1970 Report was written at a time when the University Council was considering procedures for handling disciplinary procedures in the undergraduate schools. No concerted efforts were made, at that time or since, to deal with that problem at the graduate and professional level. At the current time an ad hoc committee of Council is addressing the general question of the judiciary system, and could perhaps be persuaded to give attention to the graduate and professional students. We recommend that the Council Ad Hoc Committee on the Judiciary be given the added charge of including the graduate and professional students in their considerations.

40. The 1970 Report recommended the establishment of an Ombudsman’s Office. This has been done; the Office functions effectively.

41. The 1970 Report recommended that an Office of the Assistant to the President for External Affairs, with responsibility for maintaining contact with the University’s neighbors in the community, be established. The recent re-establishment of the position of Director of Community Relations and the naming of the Director satisfies the spirit of this recommendation.

Appendix III

Minority Opinion on Student Membership On Board of Trustees

This reconvened Task Force on University Governance was charged with the consideration of the creation of a one year experimental term for a student trustee of the University. The case for this experiment far outweighs the arguments against it, and yet due to political sensitivities, this proposal was endorsed by the President, the Provost, and the Undergraduate Assembly was nevertheless rejected by the Task Force. While human nature typically opts to maintain the status quo, a university—more than any other institution—offers the ideal setting for constructive experimentation. Furthermore, the 1970 Task Force on University Governance recommended (Recommendation Number 5) that “a continuing effort be made to broaden the membership of the Trustees with respect to . . . age . . . and other considerations designed to achieve diversity.” This was approved by the University Council and partially endorsed by the Trustees.
A young person, in touch with the campus community, can provide a dynamic and creative perspective which is unique to his/her full-time involvement in the University community. However, one argument against a student trustee was his/her inability to raise funds for the University as is expected of other Trustees. While it seems unlikely that a Young Alumni Trustee, one year out of college is in a significantly better position to raise money, the overall validity of this point is debatable. While in no way intending to diminish the value of capital resources to the University, the designation of one student as an experimental trustee could be looked upon as an investment on the part of the University. Not only could he/she provide immediate service to the University, but if properly trained, could provide a capital return to the University in the future.

Another expressed concern was that if given direct access to the Trustees, students would involve the Trustees in the day-to-day operations of the University. Currently, students have as much access to the Trustees as the individual members of the Board of Trustees. The Trustees have been long aware of the problem and there is no reason to believe that it would be in the future. The administration must be allowed to run the day-to-day operations of the University. Having a student trustee who is available and accessible to the Trustees, who are individually and collectively involved in myriad tasks of personal and corporate concerns improves the communication and the resultant effectiveness of all concerned.

The last significant issue was that of the legal liability of the Trustees. There were those who opposed the proposal on the grounds that a student should not be exposed to potential legal liability for his/her acts as a trustee. Justifiable as this point is, Article XII, Constitution of the Corporation outlines the indemnification of trustees and eliminates this issue from being a major obstacle.

Though the President, Provost, and undergraduate members of this Task Force stood by their original recommendation for the establishment of a one year experimental student trustee position, it became clear that the Trustee position has been abused in the past and there is no reason to believe that it would be in the future. The administration must be allowed to run the day-to-day operations of the University. Having a student trustee who is available and accessible to the Trustees, who are individually and collectively involved in myriad tasks of personal and corporate concerns improves the communication and the resultant effectiveness of all concerned.

The last significant issue was that of the legal liability of the Trustees. There were those who opposed the proposal on the grounds that a student should not be exposed to potential legal liability for his/her acts as a trustee. Justifiable as this point is, Article XII, Constitution of the Corporation outlines the indemnification of trustees and eliminates this issue from being a major obstacle.

Though the President, Provost, and undergraduate members of this Task Force stood by their original recommendation for the establishment of a one year experimental student trustee position, it became clear that the Trustee position has been abused in the past and there is no reason to believe that it would be in the future. The administration must be allowed to run the day-to-day operations of the University. Having a student trustee who is available and accessible to the Trustees, who are individually and collectively involved in myriad tasks of personal and corporate concerns improves the communication and the resultant effectiveness of all concerned.

The last significant issue was that of the legal liability of the Trustees. There were those who opposed the proposal on the grounds that a student should not be exposed to potential legal liability for his/her acts as a trustee. Justifiable as this point is, Article XII, Constitution of the Corporation outlines the indemnification of trustees and eliminates this issue from being a major obstacle.

Though the President, Provost, and undergraduate members of this Task Force stood by their original recommendation for the establishment of a one year experimental student trustee position, it became clear that the Trustee position has been abused in the past and there is no reason to believe that it would be in the future. The administration must be allowed to run the day-to-day operations of the University. Having a student trustee who is available and accessible to the Trustees, who are individually and collectively involved in myriad tasks of personal and corporate concerns improves the communication and the resultant effectiveness of all concerned.

The last significant issue was that of the legal liability of the Trustees. There were those who opposed the proposal on the grounds that a student should not be exposed to potential legal liability for his/her acts as a trustee. Justifiable as this point is, Article XII, Constitution of the Corporation outlines the indemnification of trustees and eliminates this issue from being a major obstacle.

Though the President, Provost, and undergraduate members of this Task Force stood by their original recommendation for the establishment of a one year experimental student trustee position, it became clear that the Trustee position has been abused in the past and there is no reason to believe that it would be in the future. The administration must be allowed to run the day-to-day operations of the University. Having a student trustee who is available and accessible to the Trustees, who are individually and collectively involved in myriad tasks of personal and corporate concerns improves the communication and the resultant effectiveness of all concerned.

The last significant issue was that of the legal liability of the Trustees. There were those who opposed the proposal on the grounds that a student should not be exposed to potential legal liability for his/her acts as a trustee. Justifiable as this point is, Article XII, Constitution of the Corporation outlines the indemnification of trustees and eliminates this issue from being a major obstacle.

Though the President, Provost, and undergraduate members of this Task Force stood by their original recommendation for the establishment of a one year experimental student trustee position, it became clear that the Trustee position has been abused in the past and there is no reason to believe that it would be in the future. The administration must be allowed to run the day-to-day operations of the University. Having a student trustee who is available and accessible to the Trustees, who are individually and collectively involved in myriad tasks of personal and corporate concerns improves the communication and the resultant effectiveness of all concerned.

The last significant issue was that of the legal liability of the Trustees. There were those who opposed the proposal on the grounds that a student should not be exposed to potential legal liability for his/her acts as a trustee. Justifiable as this point is, Article XII, Constitution of the Corporation outlines the indemnification of trustees and eliminates this issue from being a major obstacle.

Though the President, Provost, and undergraduate members of this Task Force stood by their original recommendation for the establishment of a one year experimental student trustee position, it became clear that the Trustee position has been abused in the past and there is no reason to believe that it would be in the future. The administration must be allowed to run the day-to-day operations of the University. Having a student trustee who is available and accessible to the Trustees, who are individually and collectively involved in myriad tasks of personal and corporate concerns improves the communication and the resultant effectiveness of all concerned.
October 11—October 21

Items to be included in this section should reach the ALMANAC office the week preceding the Thursday of publication.

11 Coffee House: The Modern Languages College House hosts two hours of conversation for students of Italian and German at 4 p.m. in the Class of 1925 House.

Lecture: The Folkline Center of the International House begins its first in a series of five lectures entitled Making Music Together: An Introduction to Improvisational Music at 8 p.m. in the International House. Irish musical traditions will be discussed and demonstrated. Admission is $1.50 for house members and $2 for others.

Movie: The Zurich Filmcollective's Cineema, Dead or Alive and Olim's Il Posto are shown in the International Cinema series at 7:30 and 9:30 p.m. Admission is $1.50.

Lecture: The department of history and sociology of science features Professor Robert Bannister of Swarthmore College on Darwinism and American Sociology at 8:30 p.m. in Room 107, Smith Hall.

Lecture: The department of chemical and biochemical engineering presents Dr. Harry P. Greenespan of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on Some Fluid Flow and Heat Transfer at 3:30 p.m. in Alumni Hall, Towne Building.

Lecture: The Communications Colloquium sponsors Dr. Erich Eisenstein of the University of Michigan on The Emergence of Print Culture in the West at 4 p.m. in the Colloquium Room of the Annenberg School.

The Eta Chapter of Pi Lambda Theta sponsors a Program of Presentations by Organizations for and about Women at 4:30 p.m. in Room B-24, Graduate School of Education. Call 757-6993 for information.

Sports: Penn meets Lafayette in Women's Field Hockey at 7 p.m. in Weightman Hall.

16 Lecture: The Hillel Foundation features Mr. Meron Benvenisti, Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem, on Jerusalem: The Torn City at 8 p.m. in Hillel.

Lecture: The materials science and engineering department and the laboratory for research on the structure of matter present Dr. R.C. O'Handley of the IBM Research Center on Magnetoelectric Effects in Metallic Glasses at 4 p.m. in Room 105, LBSM Building.

Lecture: The department of psychology features Dr. Charles Harris of the Bell Laboratories in Room B-21, Stiteler Hall at 4:45 p.m.

Lecture: The geology department sponsors Dr. Daniel E. Appelman of the American Museum of Natural History on Complexities in the Crystal Chemistry of Silica at 4 p.m. in Room 104, Hayden Hall.

Theater: The Annenberg Center opens its season with the premiere of Michael Cristofer's The Shadow Box in the Zellerbach Theater. Call 243-0791 for information and reservations.

Sports: Penn faces off against Ursinus in Women's Field Hockey at 3:30 p.m. at Ursinus.

Movie: The Penn Film Alliance presents Bunuel's Los Olvidados at 7:30 p.m. in Fine Arts, Room B-3. Admission is $1.25 and $1 for students and members of the University staff.

Movie: Exploratory Cinema shows Turin's Turkish in Annenberg's Studio Theater. Tickets are $1 for students with I.D. cards and $2 for others.

Movie: The International Cinema Series at International House offers Malick's La Jetée at 7:30 and 9:30 p.m. at the International House. Admission is $1.50.

Lecture: The History and Policy Colloquium Series presents James Bennett of the regional science department on Historical Data Analysis at 3 p.m. in Room 207, Fine Arts.

Seminar: The Center for the Study of Art and Symbolic Behavior presents the second in a series of five workshops conducted by Professor Arthur Danto of Columbia University on The Concept of Representation and Definition of Art at 4 p.m. in Room G-29, Annenberg Library.

Lecture: The Language in Education Colloquium Series features Professor John Szwed on Creolization of Literature at 7 p.m. in Room B-21, Stiteler Hall.

Seminar: The University hosts an orientation seminar for new faculty members on the use of the libraries for teaching and research at 3 p.m. in the Conference Room, floor 1 West, Van Pelt Library. For information call 757-6993.

Tours: The University Museum sponsors weekly guided tours of its collections on Wednesdays at 1 p.m. Admission is free, but a $1 contribution is suggested.

Coffee Hours: The Modern Languages College House hosts coffee and conversation hours for students of French, Spanish and Russian at 4 p.m. in the Class of 1925 House.

Sports: Penn meets Yale in Men's Cross Country at 3 p.m. in New York; Penn plays Brown in Men's Soccer at 8:30 p.m. on Franklin Field; Penn takes on Immaculata in Women's Volleyball at 4 p.m. at Immaculata; a session of the Penn Figure Skating Group is held at the Class of 1925 Ice Rink from 4 to 6 p.m. All students, faculty, and staff are invited to join.

Workshop: Morris Arboretum sponsors a one-day class on A Walk Along the Fall Line from 10 a.m. to noon (members $6, non-members $8). Call 247-5777 for information.

Family Day: The General Alumni Society sponsors a splash party for alumni and their families in the Sheer Pool of Gimbel Gymnasium at 10 a.m. Call 243-7811 for information.

Sports: Penn takes on Brown in Football at 1:30 p.m. at Franklin Field; Penn competes against Cornell in Freshman Football at 4:30 p.m. at Cornell; Penn plays Cornell in Lightweight Football at 10 a.m. at Cornell; Penn meets Temple in Men's Cross Country at 1 p.m. at Temple; Penn faces off against Brown in Women's Field Hockey at 11 a.m. at Franklin Field; Penn plays Penn State in Women's Tennis at 11 a.m. at the Lott Courts; Penn takes on Navy, Seton Hall, and Loyola in Women's Volleyball at 2 p.m. at Navy; Penn competes in Sailing in the Women's Intersectional at Yale, the Mono Sloop Championships at SUNYMC, and the Elfin Island Women's Intersectional at Princeton.

Conference: The Women's Studies Program presents a day-long conference in memory of Margaret Mead in the second floor conference room of the McNeil Building. Registration begins at 9 a.m. Call 243-8740 for more information.

Symposium: The Archaeological Institute of America and the University Museum present a symposium on The Mediterranean Market: Aspects of Trade in Classical Times beginning at 9:30 a.m. in the Harrison Auditorium, University Museum. Call Ext. 6231 for information.

Penn Day: Morris Arboretum sponsors guided tours for University alumni, faculty, staff, and students. Admission free.

Concert: The University Museum Film Series presents a concert in the Harrison Auditorium at 2:30 p.m. Call 243-4025 for information.

Seminar: Ms. Maxine Hobgood of LaSalle College and Temple University leads the discussion on Celebrating the Black Churches at 6 p.m. at the University Lutheran Church, 37th and Chestnut Sts. Supper begins in the evening at 5 p.m. Call 387-2885 for information.

Lecture: The department of art and architecture presents John Lent from Temple University on Press, Pen, and Print at 9:30 p.m. in Room 204, smiling Hall.

21 Movie: The University Museum Film Series offers The Shadow Catcher at 2:30 in the Harrison Auditorium, University Museum.

Italian and German at 4 p.m., Class of 1925 House.

Movie: The International Film Series offers Lefebvre's The Old Country Where Rimbaud Died at 7:30 and Mizoguchi's Life of Oharu at 9:30 in the International House. Admission is $1.50 and $1 for matinees.

Blood Drive: The University Hospital sponsors a blood drive at the Christian Association between 11 a.m. and 6 p.m.

Seminar: The geology department presents Dr. James R. Stockdale of the State University College at Buffalo on Constraints of Body Size and Environment on the Temperature Regulation of Dinosaurs at 4 p.m. in Room 104, Hayden Hall.

Seminar: The South Asia Regional Studies Center presents Robert Hornick of the Annenberg School on Communications in Under-Developed Countries at 11 a.m. in Room 2, University Museum.

The Law School presents Sydney Kentridge, S.C., delivering the twenty-first annual Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture at 5:30 p.m. in the University Museum. Tickets are available at the Law School.

Seminar: Reverend Bob Moore leads the discussion on Peace Mobilization on the Local Level at this week's Brown Bag Lunch Seminar at noon, University Lutheran Church, 37th and Chestnut Sts.

Colloquium: An interdisciplinary colloquium in the study of women in French culture and literature for and about Women at 4:30 p.m. in Annenberg Library. Registration for the colloquium begins at 8 a.m. and runs through Friday. Registration is $15 for full-time students and members of the University staff. All sessions are held at the Annenberg Center.

Sports: Penn plays Princeton's Field Hockey Doublesheader on Franklin Field at 7 p.m. West Chester plays Delaware at 8:30 p.m.

Coffee Hours: The Modern Language College House hosts coffee and conversation hours for students of French, Spanish and Russian at 4 p.m., Class of 1925 House.

Movie: The International Film Series at the International House features Lefebvre's The Old Country Where Rimbaud Died at 9:30, Mizoguchi's Life of Oharu at 4 p.m., and Richter's Vietnamese American Journey at 7:30 followed by a discussion with the director. Admission is $1.50 and $1 for matinees.

Colloquium: The interdisciplinary French Studies Colloquium continues at the Annenberg Center.

Sports: Penn takes on Lafayette in Football at 7:30 p.m. on Franklin Field; Penn competes against Princeton at 3 p.m. in Lightweight Football on Franklin Field; Penn plays Navy in Men's Soccer at 6 p.m. at Navy; Penn competes in the two-day Delaware Tournament for Women's Volleyball beginning at 5 p.m. at Delaware; the Penn Figure Skating Group holds a session at 4 p.m. at the Class of 1925 Ice Rink; Penn's Sailing team competes for the McMillan Cup through Sunday at Navy.

20 Colloquium: The French Studies Colloquium concludes at the Annenberg Center.

Workshop: Morris Arboretum offers a workshop for children entitled Create a Mini-Fernery at 10 a.m. (members $3, non-members $4). Call 247-5777 for information.

Fall Festival: The Morris Arboretum's fall celebration begins with a parade through campus. Call 247-5777 for a schedule of the week's events.

Family Day: The General Alumni Society sponsors a soccer clinic for boys and girls of all ages with the varsity soccer team on River Field at 4 p.m. Call Ext. 7811 for information.

Sports: Penn meets Lafayette in Freshman Football at 2 p.m. on Franklin Field; Penn competes in a Big 5 Meet of Men's Cross Country at the Fairmount Park home course; Penn faces off against Lafayette in Women's Field Hockey at 11 a.m. on Franklin Field; Penn competes in the Philadelphia Intracity Sailing Meet at Drexel Beach afterward.
The following listings are condensed from the personnel office's Oct. 4 bulletin. Bulletins boards at 13 locations list full job descriptions; part-time positions are listed as full-time. Placing an asterisk (*) before a job title indicates that the department is considering promoting from within.

### Administrative/Professional

*Accountant I (two positions)* (a) monitors accounts receivable; keeps petty cash records and petty cash accounts (B.A. in accounting, two years' experience in accounting or fund-accounting); (b) prepares journal entries, subsidiary ledgers, financial statements, and reports (B.A. in accounting, computational skills). $10,375-$14,375. Applications Programmer Analyst II consults with users of systems and programs; analyzes segments/systems for computer operations, develops system flow charts. B.A. in computer science or experience with PL/I or Fortran. $14,850-$20,550.

*Associate Development Officer I* coordinates fund-raising activities, works with dean on campaign objectives, presents attractive programs to bring in funds. Fund-raising experience preferred. B.A. in accounting and academic administration work. $24,650-$34,750.

*Associate Editor* supervises institute's technical communications, edits scientific documents, procures photographic and printing services. B.A. in English, journalism, or related field, extensive writing and editorial experience, knowledge of scholarly research writing processes. $14,850-$20,550.

*Bibliographic Data Systems* maintains and updates computerized medical data base on melanoma; prepares reports. Experience in computer programming, statistical software, and medical base data management. Salary to be determined.

*Clinical Psychologist* works with cancer patients and performs crisis intervention counseling of patients and families. B.S. or M.A. in psychology; experience with support groups; familiarity with methodology and data analysis. $16,125-$22,725.


*Department Head II* supervises and operates technical services, acquisitions, cataloging, and serials; plans, directs, and supervises various phases of public services, including a staff of nine. B.A. in accounting. Salary to be determined.

*Director* (three positions) (a) coordinates fund-raising program; implements corporate and foundation strategies; raises and allocates funds. (b) prepares schedules, works on faculty evaluations. Salary determined.

*Director of the General Assembly* supervises career planning, summer employment, and internship opportunities to expand job opportunities for students; directs program to enable students to plan for their careers by utilizing University resources. Familiarity with corporate recruiting, development, and training programs; managing, leadership, and career planning experience. Salary to be determined.

*Director of the University Finance Office* supervises development, implementation, and maintenance of financial systems (B.A. in accounting, computational skills). $14,850-$22,725.

*Fiscal EOP Coordinator* handles systems planning, research, and design approaches to data generated within the organization. B.A. in business administration, experience with budgets, accounting, and data analysis. Salary to be determined.

*Research Specialist II (two positions)* (a) makes biochemical and immunological studies; consults on physics problems (Ph.D. in physics, knowledge of Fortran). (b) assists in developing computer programs and services. Salary to be determined.

*Research Specialist III (two positions)* (a) makes biochemical and immunological studies; consults on physics problems (Ph.D. in physics, knowledge of Fortran). (b) performs clinical studies (BA in science, three years' experience in biochemistry laboratory). (c) prepares biochemical analyses for protein separations (two-dimensional gel electrophoresis, one-dimensional gel electrophoresis). Salary $16,125-$22,725.

*Research Specialist* (three positions) (a) creates online data acquisition systems for compatibility with other laboratory systems. Salary determined.

*Staff Nurse* serves as clinic coordinator and teacher, performs duties of a registered nurse. Salary determined.

*Support Staff* (Administrative Assistant I (nine positions) (a) maintains bills and grant sheets, performs office duties (two years' experience in clerical and secretarial work). (b) supervises scanning electron microscopes, vacuum evaporators, and freeze fraction equipment. (c) makes general analyses of blood, gas, and tissue. $10,375-$14,375. Support Staff
Gardener performs general gardening throughout campus. Training or past experience in landscaping, operations, and maintenance is essential. $8,575-$10,550.

Herdsman II (position available for twelve months) conducts evaluation of dairy cattle, observes health of animals, and performs related tasks. College course in animal sciences is essential. $11,550-$14,775.

Mail Carrier sorts, bundles, and delivers mail to campus buildings; operates postage machines. Knowledge of postal rates, experience. Union scale.

Office Automation Operator (two positions) operates word processing equipment on computer-based systems, performs keyboarding, word processing, data entry, and types. Knowledge of computer sciences is essential. $8,625-$10,950.

Project Budget Assistant (two positions) prepares monthly voluminous and expenditure reports; assists with the preparation of budgets and types varied materials (knowledge of University accounting system desirable, bookkeeping experience). (A) New Bolton Center coordinates budget, maintains individual accounts; (B) New Bolton Center prepares data and grant proposals, budgets, records, and expenditures; prepares summary sheets (some college or business school training essential). $11,500-$14,775.

Project Secretary (two positions) functions as a research secretary, maintains appointment and referral records, prepares reports (B.S. in biology, some chemical or biological vocabulary). (g) is responsible for all budget related activities, maintains personnel records, and performs general administrative work. (A) New Bolton Center maintains budget and employee time sheets, buys and leases equipment, schedules farm collections (minimum two years' college, business and accounting experience and typing). (A) oversees office operations, assists compiling office budget, administers telephone system, and coordinates work-study program for departmental personnel. (B) New Bolton Center has familiarity with University procedures, good typing skills). $8,625-$10,950.

Research Bibliographer II serves as a research librarian, maintains subscription records and card catalog. (B.A., in library science, proficiency as a research/reference librarian, typing skills, business ability, knowledge of University procedures, good telephone manner, must type 440 w.p.m., $5,900-$7,525.

Research Laboratory Technician III (13 positions) (a) performs isolation of glucose for radiochemical assays; (b) performs analytical work (B.S. in chemistry or biology, upper division experience preferred). $9,625-$11,950.

Research Laboratory Technician IV (13 positions) (a) prepares blood samples, maintains medical procedures preferred, one year laboratory aide experience; (b) performs radioimmunoassay of thyroid hormones; (c) performs radioimmunoassay of hormone activities; (d) performs research; (B.S. in biology, some cell culture experience). $11,550-$14,775.
Professor Lawrence Eisenberg: The Pleasure of Polynomials

Noted teacher and Energy Center director

He is principal investigator for at least a dozen research projects in energy management ranging from ocean thermal energy for Puerto Rico to the energy-environment policy of Pennsylvania. He is director of the Energy Center. He is a professor of systems engineering and public policy analysis of the Moore School of Electrical Engineering. He works hard in a high-pressure environment. He doesn't take as much time to relax as he would like to.

But there is another side of Lawrence Eisenberg that most employees of the University seldom see.

He likes to play pool, for example. "It is a game, like chess, which requires thought," he says. "You have to think two or three shots ahead."

"Willie Mosconi is the champ at pool. Over the long-term there has been no question of that. But I prefer watching Minnesota Fats. He's more of a Damon Runyon character. He can lose and tell you about how he won. He has chutzpah."

Although he says pool relaxes him, Eisenberg rarely gets to play the game nowadays. "Since I became director of the Energy Center [in 1975], I don't think I've made it to the basement of the Faculty Club to play pool even once," he says.

Most days he is at the office until 7:00 p.m. or later, except Thursdays, when he teaches a course in engineering mathematics in the Systems Engineering Department of the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.

"I have made it a point to teach at least one course each semester in my home department since I came here," he stated.

There was a time when he was best known on campus for winning the 1973 S. Reid Warren, Jr. Award and the 1974 Christian R. and Mary F. Lindback Foundations Awards, both for distinguished teaching.

His true love in college was mathematics, or, to be more specific, polynomial equations. In high school he was told that there was "no explicit equation for finding the roots of polynomials of order five or higher."

"That really irritated me," he remembers. "I wanted to solve the problem."

He carried the interest in solving higher order polynomial equations with him through his undergraduate and graduate studies in engineering. Finding the roots of these equations is important to engineers who design automatic control systems such as those used in space vehicles or large industrial plants. By evaluating the roots of these equations, engineers can tell whether a system will be stable, or whether it will tear itself apart.

Eisenberg began studying the works of Padé, a French mathematician who died in 1953. Padé had developed a method for approximating higher order polynomial equations. Eisenberg found that using Padé's method, called "Padé's Approximant," he could find the roots of higher order polynomial equations—at least approximately.

In 1965 he published an article entitled "Approximate Roots of nth-Order Polynomials" in a journal of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. In it he presented the equation which all but solved the puzzle he had encountered in high school.

"Earlier mathematicians, like Pade', had to be more elegant than we do," Eisenberg said. "Their calculations took far longer. They did not have computers."

Now, thanks to high-speed computers, calculations to change the path of a spacecraft can be performed while the craft is still in flight.

Eisenberg, 41, was born in New York City. He earned a bachelor's degree in electrical engineering at Fairleigh Dickinson University in 1960, a master's degree from New York University in 1961, and a doctorate in engineering from the Newark College of Engineering in 1966. He has been at the University since 1968.

Max Lebow

---

Job Postings

Information on job openings can be obtained from postings on 13 campus bulletin boards. The list normally changes every Thursday. Bulletin board locations are:

- Franklin Building: outside the personnel office, Room 130;
- Towne Building: mezzanine lobby;
- Veterinary School: first floor, next to director;
- Leidy Labs: first floor, outside Room 102;
- Anatomy-Chemistry Building: near Room 358;
- Rittenhouse Labs: east staircase, second floor;
- LRSM: first floor, opposite elevator;
- Richards Building: first floor, near mailroom;
- Law School: Room 28, basement; and
- Dietrich Hall: first floor, outside Room E-108.

Symposium on Cults

Cult phenomena will be the topic of the seventh annual Bertram D. Lewin Memorial Symposium, which has been scheduled for Saturday, Nov. 3, from 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., 102 Chemistry Building.

Sponsored by the Philadelphia Psychoanalytic Institute, in collaboration with the Philadelphia Psychoanalytic Society, the psychoanalytic perspectives of cult phenomena will be discussed in depth by three prominent psychoanalysts: Drs. Ana Maria Rizzuto and Stanley Cath of Tufts University's School of Medicine, and Dr. W. W. Meissner of Harvard Medical School. Dr. Selma Kramer of the Medical College of Pennsylvania will moderate the panel.

Admission for residents, interns, and students in related fields is $10.00; for all others, $25.00. Tickets are available from Mrs. Ruth Cooper of the Philadelphia Psychoanalytic Institute, 111 North 49th St., Philadelphia, PA 19139.

---

WORTH NOTING

- University-sponsored van pools operating out of the Media and Main Line areas are seeking additional riders. Media van pool also needs a driver-coordinator and a back-up driver.
- Interested parties should contact Hugh O'Doherty, assistant director of transportation, at Ext. 8667.
- O'Doherty says University employees who participate in the van pool program typically spend about $37 monthly for transportation to and from campus.