Implications and Applications: Reactions to the Yeshiva University Decision

The Supreme Court’s ruling last month that faculty members at Yeshiva University are managerial employees and thus not entitled to bargain collectively under federal labor law may carry implications for the University of Pennsylvania and other private universities across the nation.

The effects of that decision will become evident in the coming months as other universities test collective bargaining agreements and faculty unionization efforts against the Yeshiva decision.

In a 5-to-4 decision on February 20, the court upheld a 1978 decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit that full-time faculty members at Yeshiva University have so much authority over academic matters and institutional policies that they are, in effect, substantially and pervasively operating the enterprise.

The National Labor Relations Board and the university’s Faculty Association held that faculty members were “rank and file” employees and thus entitled to bargain collectively.

In delivering the majority opinion, Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr. said that faculty members “decide what courses will be offered, when they will be scheduled and to whom they will be taught. They debate and determine teaching standards, grading policies and matriculation standards They effectively decide which students will be admitted, retained and graduated ... When one considers the functions of a university, it is difficult to imagine decisions more managerial than these.”

Additionally, Powell noted, the faculty’s power at Yeshiva “extends beyond strictly academic concerns. The faculty ... make recommendations to the dean or director in every case of faculty hiring, tenure, sabbaticals, termination and promotion. Although the final decision is reached by the central administration on the advice of the dean or director, the overwhelming majority of faculty recommendations are implemented.”

While the NLRB maintained such decisions were not managerial “because they require the exercise of independent professional judgment,” Powell said the Court was “not persuaded by this argument.”

Powell was joined in the majority decision by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger and Justices William H. Rehnquist, John P. Stevens and Potter Stewart.

In a dissenting opinion, Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. charged that the “Court’s perception of the Yeshiva faculty’s status is distorted by the rose-colored lens through which it views the governance structure of the modern-day university.”

“The Court’s conclusion that the faculty’s professional interests are indistinguishable from those of the administration is bottomed on an idealized model of collegial decision-making that is a vestige of the great medieval university. But the university of today bears little resemblance to the ‘community of scholars’ of yesteryear.”

While the Yeshiva faculty offer recommendations to the administration on a variety of policies and actions, ultimately “the administration gives what weight and import to the faculty’s collective judgment as it chooses and deems consistent with its own perception of the institution’s needs and objectives,” Brennan said.

Brennan defined the “touchstone of managerial status” as “an alliance with management” and the key factor whether in the performance of his duties the employee “represents his own interests or those of his employer.” He believes the Court failed to understand that “whatever influence the faculty wields in university decision-making is attributable solely to its collective expertise as professional educators and not to any managerial or supervisory prerogatives.”

Brennan was joined in his dissent by Justices Harry A. Blackmun, Thurgood Marshall, and Byron White.

Across the nation, the decision was criticized recently by representatives of major faculty unions.

Martha Frieman, president and interim general secretary of the American Association of University Professors was quoted in the March 3 Chronicle of Higher Education as “surprised and dismayed” by the Court’s decision.

“It is disheartening that any faculty member is denied the protections of the National Labor Relations Act which other professional employees have traditionally enjoyed,” she said.

(continued on page 5)
Quis Custodiet Ipsos Custodes?

Editor: The Educational Testing Service in Princeton, N.J. has been on the defensive as a result of increasing criticism by professionals and the public. Many persons have been questioning the short-answer questions on tests, and even the validity of the tests themselves. The ETS has not hesitated to utilize opportunities to reply to its critics.

It may be advisable for ETS to test itself. Its newsletter, Developments, contained an announcement of an international symposium on educational testing identifying the location of the co-sponsors, the University of Leiden and the University of Antwerp, as “both in Belgium.” Presumably the supervisors of the publication have already passed their Scholastic Aptitude Test in geography.

William W. Brickman
Professor of Educational History and Comparative Education
Graduate School of Education

United Way Agreement Clarified and Defended

Editor: A local television program, Meetinghouse, on Sunday, March 2, inspired me to respond to a letter in ALMANAC (2/14/80) about the “secret agreement” between the Catholic Church and the United Way.

According to Rev. Henry Nichols, vice-president of United Way, a guest on Meetinghouse, the “agreement” between the Catholic Church and the United Way, at least originally, was only a statement in a letter from the Church, reserving the right to withdraw from its alliance with the United Way if the latter funded charities serving purposes in opposition to Church beliefs. This seems a rational position for the Church to take.

University Newman Center Director Charles Hagan, in the Daily Pennsylvanian of 2/18/80, dispelled the fiction that the “agreement” was “secret.” In support of his statements, I offer the admission to me by one of the signers of the Speaking Out letter of 2/14/80 that the original agreement was announced in her [Catholic] Church.

Another guest on Meetinghouse was Ms. Judith Harris, head of the coalition of women’s groups whose refusal of funding by United Way initiated this brouhaha a few weeks ago. She explained that their application as a coalition was a major factor in the refusal by United Way. Rev. Nichols agreed that had the member organizations of the coalition applied individually, at least some of them might have been approved. Ms. Harris said that her board had discussed that possibility, but decided to apply as a coalition primarily because it would prevent the member organizations from maintaining a valuable exchange of information and services. The United Way position is that they do not fund coalitions as such, in order to be more accountable to the community for the way in which the funds are spent. This also seems a legitimate argument.

The groups comprising the coalition may still, if they wish, apply for United Way funding as individual groups, and the United Way would have no objection to the maintenance of the coalition and therefore the continuation of exchange of services and information; there are a number of coalitions comprised of organizations which receive United Way funding. The problem for Ms. Harris and her Board, however, was that all their member organizations might not be approved for funding by United Way, and that was apparently what they hoped to preclude by applying as a coalition.

A University employee in the Meetinghouse audience who claimed that he is bombarded with requests—practically demands—that he contribute to United Way is, I believe, staggering. As one who has worked for a “give-or-else” employer, I must compliment the University on the freedom of choice allowed its employees, at least in my own twelve years’ experience at Penn. Certainly the year that my office was in charge of the University’s United Way campaign, we neither instructed solicitors to put pressure on anyone to contribute, nor did we receive a single complaint of coercion or undue influence. From all my experience at Penn, including hearsay, I believe the policy regarding United Way has been simply to provide each employee with a convenient method of contributing if he or she wishes to do so.

Finally, the argument was made that the United Way discriminated against homosexuals because it refused funding to a “gay” coalition, and in similar manner is discriminating against women because of its refusal to fund Ms. Harris’ coalition. The reply given was that women, like homosexuals, can and do benefit from many of the agencies which receive United Way funds. It hardly seems fair (much less rational) to fault the United Way for “keeping poor women pregnant,” as Mses. Tracy and Jensen claim, nor for “keeping [them] ignorant, destitute, and dependent on the welfare system and . . . [charity].” Even Ms. Harris, a principal in the controversy and a strikingly intelligent and articulate person, levelled no such preposterous charges at the United Way.

Virginia Hill Upright
Coordinating Assistant
Planned Giving/Development
Kintner Urges Vigorous Defense Posture

For many years the Soviet Union sustained a strategic nuclear program which they anticipated would bring them "a window of opportunity" to put "our major strategic force in peril," observed Professor William R. Kintner. "I don't mean the Soviets are going to strike," he cautioned, "but in a deep crisis situation, we could be in trouble."

The professor of political science and president of the Foreign Policy Research Institute recently shared his assessment of the crisis in the Persian Gulf and the deteriorating relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In his January State of the Union Message President Carter tossed aside the foreign and security policies he had followed the past three years, Kintner observed. In the budget message he asked for a steep increase in defense expenditures. He practically buried detente except for one item: Carter wanted to push SALT II past the Senate once the Soviets pulled out of Afghanistan. His reason was familiar: SALT II will increase our security and help reduce one of our major defense problems.

Many of Carter's opponents in the U.S. Senate don't agree. In the past years, Kintner pointed out, our defense expenditures have fallen behind those of the Soviet Union. As a result, the Soviets have overtaken the United States in certain areas of defense.

"The Soviets have shown little rest in defense spending," he observed. "They first sought to achieve parity (with the United States), which they now have. The question is whether they now want meaningful superiority."

In a talk before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations last October—long before the current crisis—Kintner explained the Soviets' rationale:

"The Soviets probably believe that in an all-out arms competition, our technological superiority could defeat them in the end. Because of that underlying fear, the Soviets feel a need to be one-up on us, if possible, for protection."

In attempting to one-up the United States, Kintner said, the Soviet Union follows its own timetable of operations, usually oblivious to the actions of the United States. "The Soviets don't build up their defense systems because of what we do," he said. "They just continue to do what they've been planning all along."

The challenge facing the U.S. currently is to "restore a strategic balance with the Soviets without having time to build those defenses," Kintner said. Although the U.S. may be in trouble strategically, the fault does not lie completely with the present administration but with the nature of our political system.

"In a democracy, it is difficult to maintain the momentum necessary for long-term spending on defense, which shows no immediate benefit," Kintner said. Such budget expenditures vary with the whims of Congress, national political outlook and the administration in office.

Although "in some areas we are five, six or seven years behind," Kintner believes "we will be able to establish parity (with the Soviet Union) if we keep up the substantial effort."

While the Soviets were steadily raising their arm outlay, the U.S. decreased its defense spending, action which Kintner attributes to a "Vietnam backlash. When we began withdrawing our troops during the Nixon administration, that administration had trouble getting defense appropriations from Congress," he said. Although in fiscal year '77, President Gerald Ford increased the defense budget, Carter turned around the following year "and knocked a lot of things out of the budget."

Carter's defense budgets were the lowest in terms of a percentage of GNP since the Korean War.

But in his fiscal year 1981 Budget Message Carter asked for a sharp increase in defense expenditures. Defense Secretary Harold Brown provided the rationale for this surge: "We face a decision that we have been deferring for too long. We can defer it no longer. We must decide now whether we intend to remain the strongest nation in the world. The alternative is to let ourselves slip into inferiority, into a position of weakness in a harsh world whose principles unsupported by power are victimized."

Over the next five years, the U.S. should be able to "keep up the substantial effort" necessary as the defense budget is slated to rise 5.2 percent. That increase is due not to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, but to several key Senators, particularly Senator Sam Nunn, "who would otherwise oppose SALT II."

Kintner sounded relieved when he said, "the administration finally realized the need for increased defense spending, for this is really a sizeable increase."

"I'm glad Carter's woken up from his dreamworld," Kintner said, criticizing the president's former reluctance to increase defense spending. "The differences between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in defense budgets is staggering. In 1977, the Soviet military effort was about 50 percent larger than our own."

While the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is not directly responsible for the present U.S. support for increased defense spending.
Humanities Exploit Computer Revolution

"I assume a lot of humanists have little card files and they keep lots of notes," said Howard Brody, associate dean for computing in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. "When you get 40 boxes of those card files, you can start losing control of what you're doing."

So Brody is trying to "rev up" use of the computer in the humanities for simple tasks like sorting and remembering, and more time-consuming work like correlation of research data.

The departments of music, religion and linguistics have all found innovative uses for the computer in the humanities, Brody pointed out.

Professor Franklin B. Zimmerman, music, is in the midst of a complex program to index melodic themes.

"My ambition," Zimmerman said, "is to set up a very detailed index of baroque composers." This index is being done in three steps, the first being compilation of thematic indexes by first lines. "The theme of most works is revealed in the first ten tones," he said.

Step two is to trace thematic usage and borrowing. Handel, for example, whose index is complete, used some 26,000 themes and borrowed repeatedly from himself.

Step three, Zimmerman said, is "letting the computer analyze the stylistic fingerprints of melodics," to help determine authorship.

Another goal Zimmerman will reach with the computer is the reproduction of the 19 and 31 tone octaves sometimes used by baroque composers, which are not available on today's musical instruments.

In the religion department, Professor Robert A. Kraft is trying to apply the computer to indexing work on ancient Greek texts.

Under the auspices of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the Society for Biblical Literature, Kraft is developing a system to reduce the prodigious amount of hand copying and paper shuffling involved in producing critical texts of the Bible.

"The computer also makes it possible to format the text in different ways," he added. With Greek and Hebrew side by side, for example, or alternating lines.

Linguistics professor William Labov, director of the Urban Language Survey, has his own PDP-11, which has been churning out data on linguistic variables.

According to Gregory Guy, a graduate student in linguistics who is watching the Linguistics Lab while Labov is away for the semester, the computer is "primarily used for vowel analysis. An analyzer gives you an acoustic analysis of speech sounds, as they are being spoken."

In Labov's well-known study of Black English, the computer was used, "for statistical analysis of linguistic variables...like the verb 'to be,'" Guy said. "The occasions on which (the verb) is used are often influenced by linguistic and social context."

In his office at Rittenhouse Labs, Brody pointed to an advertising flyer he has received, noting with glee that "you can now buy the complete works of Virgil in machine readable form for $30."

What about the objection, sure to be raised, that the computer is an anonymous machine, not suited to the study of the humanities?

"It's an anonymous machine, like a typewriter," Brody said. "But I don't see people rebelling against the typewriter."

Through financial inducements, loans of equipment and lavish attention, Brody hopes to make the humanists' first experience with the computer "so sweet, so painless and so cost-free," that they will continue to use the computer regularly.
Beginning next month, FAS will have a new computer for Brody to sell his colleagues on. FAS is replacing its IBM 360-65 with a new IBM 4341.

The old computer was “down” too often and maintenance costs were rising “at an alarming rate,” Brody explained.

The new machine will cost less to purchase, less to maintain and will have the ability to compute through terminals which are to be installed in the university’s high rise dormitories. It will also be able to process information about twice as fast as the old unit.

The computer will be paid for by a grant from the Department of Energy for high energy physics, along with matching funds from FAS. “The support of the computer: the budget for operators, the manager of the computer, the programmers, the paper… all come directly out of our contract for doing high energy physics research,” explained Professor Alfred Mann, physics, who heads the University’s high energy physics program.

“If you estimate the number of hours we use the computer,” he said, “you can figure out how much it costs per hour. Based on that rate we set the charge for all other user groups in the physics department and outside the physics department. There are more or less standard procedures for this.”

The physics department is the largest user of computer time on campus, devoting most of it to high energy physics, a popular specialty among the faculty.

Mann, a leading authority on high energy physics, explained that high energy physics needs the time because the discipline is so heavily dependent on probability and statistics.

To design a detector to verify whether protons ever decay, he said, you must run off a large number of complex calculations, called Monte Carlo calculations, which describe the interaction of the products of the proton decay with the material of the proposed detector.

“It is a great deal of computing,” Mann said, looking over a thick printout. “If you did it on a little hand calculator it would take forever. On the computer it is a few-minute job.”

The economics and sociology departments are also heavy users, sorting and analyzing large amounts of data generated by the markets and by surveys. Some biologists, Brody noted, have a social science orientation, and they too are using the computer frequently.

Rittenhouse Labs where Brody works are currently being wired for terminals so that faculty can compute from their offices. A batch terminal is planned for the building which houses the departments of economics and sociology, and an agreement has been reached with one of the University dormitories for the installation of a terminal room there.

Together with Robert Douglas, assistant dean of computing in FAS, Brody is developing ideas to utilize the new capabilities. One idea is to run social science laboratories where students will use computerized data from questionnaires or public records to prove or disprove their theories. This is similar, Brody said, to the way natural scientists use computerized data from their observation of nature.

“We are also looking into the possibility of developing a single, introductory computing, statistics, modelling course for all the social sciences at the freshman or sophomore level,” Brody said.

This would be an introductory course where students would learn “what SPSS is, what a FORTRAN-like language is, what APL is, and things of that sort,” he explained.

“At the end of the semester they will do some computing,” but they will also have a very broad background in what the computer can do for them.

Right now if a student in FAS wants to use a computer interactively, he or she must enroll in a different program at the University.

“The humanist should use the computer as a research tool,” Brody said. “It’s a matter of whether the scholars want to go that way or not.”

—Max Lebow

Yeshiva University Decision

(continued from page 1)

Sheldon E. Steinbach, staff counsel for the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C., said he believes “the Court has laid a foundation for all private universities to come within the confines of the Yeshiva decision.”

Here at Pennsylvania, ALMANAC spoke with several members of the University community about the decision and its implications.

Professor William Gomberg, management and industrial relations, described the decision as “well thought out,” but believes the Court “gave the decision to the Yeshiva administration.”

“While nothing can prevent the administration [of any university] from dealing with a faculty union if they want, they no longer have to [as a result of this decision]. The compulsion is gone,” he said.

Although Gomberg would not want to see faculty dependent on collective bargaining—“it is not an appropriate mechanism for a university like ours”—he said he feels faculty “should be able to have that weapon in reserve.”

He believes the decision will more deeply affect private institutions “on the second level”—those below the Ivy League and other top-rated universities—where collective bargaining is really needed.

In general, those second-level institutions do not have the provisions for university governance and faculty input into the decision-making processes that are found at Pennsylvania, Gomberg said.

He agreed with Brennan’s conclusion that Powell’s view of higher education “is a romantic one viewed through rose-colored glasses.”

“Powell’s idea [of higher education] doesn’t make sense in light of the modern university,” Gomberg charged. “Modern education has become big business in which the administration is constrained by budgets and they in turn constrain the faculty.”

While the Yeshiva decision “has no effect where there is no impulse towards trying to establish collective bargaining, it means that universities are free to refuse to deal with faculty employees as a group,” explained Professor Howard Lesnick, law.

University administration can “refuse to recognize faculty representatives for purposes of negotiating wages and working conditions,” he added. “It means they’re legally free to fire them, discriminate against them in hiring, and the faculty have no collective recourse.”

While universities now operating under collective bargaining agreements will probably maintain those agreements until they expire, “after that the university is free to say, ‘no more collective bargaining.’”

Lesnick added that the decision gives university administration an unfair balance of power. We generally have an idea in this country that employees have a recognized right to self-organization, he said. “This decision denies that right.”

Could the decision have implications for other groups of professional employees? Lesnick believes the decision does “encourage management to resist the unionization of professionals and gives them new ways of doing that successfully.”

In an article for the AAUP, Professor Robert A. Gorman, law, charges that the majority opinion contains serious flaws; chief among them is the failure to understand modern university governance.

...several members of the Court were beguiled by the medieval maxim that the
City Hall meets Oldenberg's Clothespin in Urban Encounters, the Institute of Contemporary Art's new exhibition, which opened yesterday in the Fine Arts Gallery of the Fine Arts Building.

March 20-March 29
Items for On Campus should reach the Almanac office by noon the Thursday preceding desired publication.

20, Thursday
Blood Drive: The University Hospital seeks donations at Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity.
Lecture: The School of Medicine presents the D. Hayes Agnew Surgical Lecture featuring Dr. Ward O. Grifffen Jr., chairman of the department of surgery at the University of Kentucky, on Morbid Obesity—A Surgical Disease. Medical Alumni Hall, 4 p.m.
Movie: International Cinema presents the award-winning Cuban film Portrait of Teresa at the International House at 7:30 and 9:30 p.m. Admission is $2.
Music: Children's Carpet Concert will be performed in the Annenberg Center Lobby at 10 a.m. The concert is free; juice and cookies will be served.
Performance: Bloomers continues with Late Bloomers, 7 and 10 p.m. in Houston Hall Auditorium.

22, Saturday
Concerts: The Penn Union Council presents a night of jazz with Jack Bruce and friends in Irvine Auditorium at 8 p.m. Tickets are $8-$5.
Lecture: The Wharton Women will sponsor an Alumni Conference on Planning for the Eighties: Emerging Alternatives, 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. in Vanney Hall.
Dance: Collegeium Musicum and the Cambridge Court Dancers present Shakespeare and the Dance in the Annexenberg Studio Theatre at 8 p.m. Admission is $4, $2.50 with ID.
Movie: The University Museum's children's series presents The Little Fugitive at 10:30 a.m. in Harrison Auditorium.

23, Sunday
Movies: Artest '80 brings the 14th Annual Tournee of Animation to the Zellerbach Theatre at 8 p.m. Admission: $3.
The University Museum's film series features The Wedding Camels at 2:30 p.m.
Music: The International House hosts Eastern European music and children's folklcance from around the world at 2 p.m. Cost is $1.50 for children and ID members, $2 general admission.

The Archeaeus Theatre Ensemble, a Washington D.C. professional theatre company, brings its distinctly delightful Ridiculousness to the Harold Prince Theatre on Sunday, March 23, at 2 p.m.
The Penn Composers Guild will present new works in the Prince Theatre of the Annenberg Center at 8 p.m.

24, Monday
Colloquia: The Annenberg School of Communications presents Scott Ward, professor of marketing at the Wharton School on Television Marketing and Family Conflict: Where, Where, Whv and How at the Annenberg School Colloquium Room, 4 p.m.
The department of history and sociology of science presents Professor Peter Weingart of the University of Bielefeld on The Ambivalent Public of Science and Technology: Indicators of a Crisis of Legitimation. Smith Hall Seminar Room 107, 4 p.m. Coffee will be served at 3:30 p.m.
Seminar: The department of chemical and biochemical engineering will host Dr. John Brady of Stanford University on The Deformation and Breakup of S STM04U6 in the Alumni Hall of the Towne Building.
The Administrative Assembly Brown Bag Seminar series presents Faculty Senate Chairman Walter Wales on Governance as Seen by the Faculty in the Harrison-Penniman-Smith Room of Houston Hall at 1 p.m.

25, Tuesday
Blood Drive: The University Hospital moves its blood drive to Hill House.
Lecture: The Collegeium Musicum presents Alan Krantz, guitarist, at 7 p.m. in the Collegeium Musicum Auditorium.
Movie: Coppola's The Conversation will be shown in the Studio Theatre at 8 and 10 p.m. by the Penn Film Alliance. Admission is $2.
Music: The University Choir presents The Hymn of Autumn at 7:30 p.m. in the Zellerbach Theatre.
Seminar: The Center for the Study of Aging will host Dr. O. H. E. Stavn of the Annenberg School of Communications on Aging as a Social Role in the Water Institute Auditorium at 4 p.m.
Colloquium: The student government in epidemiology presents Mary Monk, department of community and preventive medicine of New York Medical College on Hypertension and Psycho-social Factors at noon in Room 111 of the Nursing Education Building.

26, Wednesday
Movies: International Cinema brings a program of newsreels at 7:30 p.m. to the International House, followed at 9:30 p.m. by Koko, The Talking Gorilla. Each program is $2.
Poetry: Poet Janet Littell presents a program of poetry at 8 p.m. in Hinsdale Hall.
Music: The University Choir presents The Hymn of Autumn at 7:30 p.m. in the Zellerbach Theatre.

27, Thursday
Blood Drive: The University Hospital will collect blood at the School of Medicine from 11:30 a.m.-6 p.m.
Discussion: The Center for the Study of Aging will host Dr. O. H. E. Stavn of the Annenberg School of Communications on Aging as a Social Role in the Zellerbach Theatre at 8 p.m.
Lecture: The department of history and sociology of science presents Professor Peter Weingart of the University of Bielefeld on The Ambivalent Public of Science and Technology: Indicators of a Crisis of Legitimation, Smith Hall Seminar Room 107, 4 p.m. Coffee will be served at 3:30 p.m.

The department of biology presents the annual conference on Therapy in the Zellerbach Theatre at 8 p.m.
Music: The University Choir presents The Hymn of Autumn at 8 p.m. in the Zellerbach Theatre.

28, Friday
Alumni Event: Mask and Wig hosts Class Night at its clubhouse, 310 S. Quince St., with a performance of Dazed and Confused at 8:30 p.m. Admission, including show and dinner, is $20.
Continuing Education: The continuing education program sponsors a course on Therapy in Neurology in the Annenberg Auditorium of the Medical Education Building. Dr. Austin Summer is the course director.
Kintner Advocates Strong Defense

(continued from page 3)

it is responsible for the tabling of the SALT II Treaty, a move that Kintner does not see as serious as others do. He does not believe the treaty furthers the interests of the United States, as much as it provides the Soviet Union a means of seriously hampering our own strategic position.

"The central argument to be applied to the treaty is: does it enhance our security or not? I would argue that it does not," he said.

In his Chicago speech last fall, Kintner explained his doubts about the treaty:

"...while this treaty is not totally insignificant, by any means, its terms alone cannot tell us much about the future of the strategic balance, about the vitality of NATO, or about the chances of peace and war.

"These critical issues will be decided independently of what the Senate does with the SALT Treaty...the importance of SALT can be assessed only within the fuller context of America foreign policy, writ large; it is simply impossible to judge the impact or the merits of SALT II in a vacuum."

Kintner would not totally abandon the treaty, despite its imperfections.

"Our problems arise more from our own inadequate strategic planning than from the SALT II Treaty. Consequently it will take more than money to provide for America's future security. We need to develop a more suitable and more credible strategic doctrine and equip ourselves with the weapons needed to sustain it.

"Maybe after the situation in Afghanistan is settled, consideration of the treaty can resume."

The principle of coexistence, as fostered by detente, "was at least encouraging," Kintner said. "Talking with each other is essential.

"We and the Soviets are people living on the same earth," he added. "Although we are deeply divided on many issues, the first thing, the most important thing, is that we not blow the world apart." —C.A.V.

Yeshiva Decision

(continued from page 5)

faculty at the university. The Court majority gave conclusive weight to the influence of the Yeshiva faculty upon university decisions regarding personnel and educational policy. It rejected the arguments...that faculty decisions are not based on the interests of the particular administration but on concerns regarding educational quality, and that faculty decisions are generally endorsed by the administration not because the faculty are managers but rather because of the faculty's special competencies as professional employees," Gorman wrote.

Clyde W. Summers, Jefferson B. Fordham Professor of Law, concluded that the decision "is based on a premise that is a perverse and primitive conception of collective bargaining, one that assumes that employer and union should be antagonistic.

"They view collective bargaining in a schoolboy stereotype of cowboys and Indians," he said, "with employer and employees battling it out rather than finding common interests on which to make a mutual decision."

Summers explained that a "civilized and mature" interpretation of collective bargaining should work to give employees a share in the decisions of management. "Indeed, the whole objective of collective bargaining is for the employee to have a voice in decisions that otherwise are made by management," he said.

Yet the Supreme Court determined that faculty who have a voice in management can have no collective bargaining, he noted.

In fact, however, "if collective bargaining succeeds, it will result in a sharing of authority which is characteristic of a mature university system of self-governance."

Summers said he thought the decision could have one of a number of consequences.

"The case may have very little consequence because the decision is based on what the court saw as being a method of self-governance at this particular university," he explained.

"In the next case [similar to this one], we may find out how little voice the faculty actually have in many of these decisions," Summers observed. "Few schools have the kind of self-governance system that the Court believed Yeshiva to have."

Additionally, Summers said, the decision could effectively destroy university systems of self-governance, "by putting it to the faculty: you can have a system of self-governance or a union, but not both," he said.

Summers believes that on any campus with a "full and adequate system of self-governance, you don't need collective bargaining because you have everything that collective bargaining could offer."

Yet on those campuses without that well-developed system, "collective bargaining is appropriate."

But he added, that one of the goals of collective bargaining should be the establishment of a system of self-governance.

—C.A.V.
Clearing the Fog in Academic Journals: Scholarly Writing Occludes Decipherability

Academic researchers write their results in an incomprehensible form, and it's because their colleagues prefer it, according to a professor at the Wharton School.

In a study comparing management journals, J. Scott Armstrong, associate professor of management, found that "the harder the journal was to read, the higher its prestige was ranked" by a sample of academicians and graduate students.

Armstrong's article—Unintelligible Research and Academic Prestige: Further Adventures of Dr. Fox—came about during a period when his own colleagues were discouraging him from rewriting manuscripts to make them easier to read. He then came upon a hypothesis called the "Dr. Fox Phenomenon."

"Dr. Fox was an actor who presented a paper at three different medical conferences," Armstrong explained. "It was a paper on the use of computers in medical science. The speech contained things which were self-contradictory, meaningless references, and irrelevant bits of information—a carefully written script.

"Dr. Fox was well-received at all these conferences, despite the fact that his speech made no sense at all. People were asked at the end what they thought of it and on the whole they thought it was a rather good speech. Although they didn't completely understand everything he had said, Dr. Fox certainly knew his stuff."

According to Armstrong, researchers perceive that there is some advantage to using big words and impressing people with difficult language. "Dr. Fox," it seems, holds true for written as well as oral communication.

In ranking 10 management journals for "prestige," Armstrong's sample rated the hardest to read the highest, and the easiest to read the lowest. Reading ease was judged by the Flesch Reading Ease test, which rates randomly chosen 100-word samples using sentence length and word length as guides.

Armstrong also took some sample paragraphs from already-published works and rewrote them, changing only readability. For example the following "difficult" passage:

...to increase the probability of keeping a customer in queue, the server should attempt to influence the customer's initial subjective estimate of the mean service time to give him the impression that it is small, or attempt to convince the customer that his time value of service is large.

is rewritten to read:

You are more likely to ensure that a customer waits in a queue if you can get the person to think that he will not have long to wait. Another way to do it is to get the customer to think he will obtain much benefit by waiting.

Respondents were then asked to rate the samples for "research competence." The "easy" passages were consistently described as less competent than the "moderate" or "difficult" versions of identical findings.

Armstrong feels the biggest reason that academic research is usually presented in an unintelligible form is that "there is no motivation for the researcher to change." Academic journals, he claims, prefer the less readable versions.

"I met somebody at Penn," he said, relating an anecdote from the study, "who had worked on a paper, sent it out for publication after it was in its fifth draft and got back a rejection. He then decided to send in the first draft, which was very hard to understand, to the same journal. And that paper got accepted."

The study also suggests that researchers may not feel it is worth the extra time—and rewriting can often take longer than an original draft—to increase readability. The "publish or perish" dilemma of college professors is certainly a factor. Not only are academicians forced to turn out a large volume of published research, Armstrong said, but they publish in "the hot" fields whether they want to or not.

Readability can be improved in many ways. One means is lowering the use of jargon in papers, which Armstrong claims can be done without much lengthening of sentences. Another method is simply changing style, eliminating useless phrases and overwriting. The bible for this type of editing, The Elements of Style by William Strunk and E.B. White, is a book which Armstrong feels too many academicians have not read.

Not surprisingly, Armstrong's conclusions have received only modest support. The Journal of Consumer Research asked for 25 copies of the study to give to its "referees"—the people who choose the articles. But, according to the study "few journals even list clarity of writing as a criterion in their instructions to authors."

Based on his research, Armstrong feels it is unlikely that any clarity improvements in journals will be initiated by researchers. "Clear communication of one's research," Armstrong says, "is not appreciated." The answer, then, is for journals to stress readability in their article selection.

Armstrong suggests that each paper submitted to a journal should have its readability calculated, and that this index be used in the review process. Then, he suggests that all articles published would appear with their readability indices. "This will help the reader to be aware that a failure to understand (the article they are about to read) may be due to poor writing," he said.

And how easy is Armstrong's research to read? His last book rated a 13 on the Gunning Fog Index, another statistical readability system. The rating was equal to that of the Wall Street Journal.

The Gunning Fog Index for this article is 13.76.

—Steve Fried

Penn Sophomore Dies; Critically Injured in Fall From Dorm Window

Thomas Crafton Keller, 19, Durham, N.C., a sophomore at the University, died Tuesday afternoon at 12:30 p.m., after accidentally falling from a dormitory Friday evening.

University authorities said Keller, a resident of King's Court at 36th and Chestnut Sts., had misplaced his key and was attempting to get into his locked room by climbing out a friend's window next door and through the window of his room.

Keller slipped and fell two and one half stories to the sidewalk on the 36th St. side of the building.

Dr. Sam Fager, director of student health services, said Keller suffered head injuries and underwent emergency brain surgery at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania shortly after the accident, which occurred at 10:43 p.m.

He was a sophomore in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. His father, Thomas, is dean of the business school at Duke University and his mother, Margaret, was a recent unsuccessful candidate for mayor of Durham.

Keller will be buried at 2:30 p.m. today in Maplewood Cemetery in Durham. Services will follow the burial at the First Presbyterian Church of Durham. The family has asked that contributions be sent to the church in the deceased's name in lieu of flowers.
Indirect Costs and the Provost's Research Contingency Fund

By now, everyone is aware that the indirect cost recovery rate for sponsored research is increasing from 55 percent to 65 percent for fiscal year 1980-81. In a number of cases, this will decrease the available direct cost funds to principal investigators to an extent that can seriously affect the conduct of their research programs. To mitigate the negative effects of this rise in indirect costs, the Provost has established a contingency fund to be administered by the Vice Provost for Research.

The new indirect cost rate will be applied to all research awards which allow full recovery of such costs and which have a start date of July 1, 1980 or later. Existing awards (except USPHS grants) and those with start dates prior to July 1, 1980 will bear indirect cost at the rate approved in the award.

The contingency fund will be used only to supplement sponsored research projects in the former category for which additional funding cannot be obtained from the sponsor to cover the increased indirect costs. Principal investigators of affected projects should submit requests to Louis Girifalco, 106 College Hall. The request should contain the amount needed, a calculation of how that amount was determined, the specific use to which it will be put, and the expected starting date of the award. The maximum amount that can be allocated for each sponsored project is 7 percent of the modified total direct costs of the program for the period beginning with the award date and ending on June 30, 1981.

Awards which do not provide for full recovery of indirect cost, provide for separate funding of indirect cost, e.g. USPHS grants, or the amount of which can be increased to cover the increased indirect costs, will not qualify for support from the contingency fund.

It is important to note that the Provost's research contingency fund will exist only in fiscal year 1980-81. Given the increasing stringency of OMB Circular A-21 regulations, it is necessary to establish such a fund for future years.

All deans, directors, department chairmen and principal investigators are therefore urged to plan for fiscal year 1981-82 with the recognition that high indirect costs will continue to be a growing problem.

Louis A. Girifalco
Vice Provost for Research
March 12, 1980

Effort Reporting

The accompanying article was prepared by Alfred F. Beers as the report of the A-21 Committee on Effort Reporting. Mr. Beers was chairman of the committee that designed the effort reporting system which will be implemented on July 1. The committee included faculty, staff and academic administrators. Its central concern was to accommodate faculty views and needs to the greatest extent possible while still complying with the requirements of OMB A-21. The committee was formed to perform the effort reporting task. The form itself is simple enough, but it calls for a compartmentalization of the intellectual life that is alien to the way we work. Many of us have trouble separating our work from weekends and vacations and find it ridiculous to try to accurately separate teaching from research. In filling out the form, the only pragmatic answer is to make the best estimates possible. This necessitates accepting the lack of precision that comes from trying to separate overlapping and intertwined activities. We can do no more.

A second issue is the use that might be made of the data collected on the efforts as a tool for supervision and appraisal within the University. This is most probably a remote danger. Department chairmen and deans know the faculty rather well, and the information on their activities is neither known to them or can easily be estimated. Effort reports will provide little that is new in this regard. Furthermore, the faculty is intimately involved with University governance. Both the governing structure and the tradition of the University provide extensive protection against arbitrary exercise of administrative authority. The University administration will certainly be receptive to additional protection if it is needed.

A possible use of the effort reporting system would be in academic planning on an aggregate rather than individual basis. The effort reports would provide data that could be an input into planning and could have an impact on general academic decisions. To the extent that this is done, it would be necessary to recognize the degree of arbitrariness in the data and to take due account of all the academic qualitative factors. Whether or not the results are beneficial depends on the wisdom of the people involved. In planning, this human factor is always present, and effort reporting will neither add nor subtract from it. It would simply provide a base that must be used with care and judgment.

Another issue is the requirement that faculty members complete effort reports whether or not they receive support from federal funds. If this is not done we stand to lose significant amounts of money, and all academic and research programs are bound to suffer. The University administration has therefore taken the position of encouraging everyone to comply with effort reporting, even though we find it a distasteful and an unwarranted intrusion into our internal affairs. To do otherwise would put too much at risk.

Effort reporting is a result of federal requirements of financial accountability. The fundamental problem is that the manner in which this requirement is implemented is not fully compatible with the way universities work. If there is a solution to this, it lies in the continuing negotiation between universities and government. We must convince legislators and agency personnel that methods can be found to satisfy the requirements of financial accountability without imposing unnecessary burdens on faculty, decreasing faculty productivity or stifling creativity.

It is important to recognize that the administration and staff, as well as the faculty regard effort reporting with disfavor. All of us wish it would disappear. For over two years, the organization mentioned by Mr. Beers have fought for the University position on A-21. The result is better than it would have been without these negotiations but still is unsatisfactory in many respects. Our hope is that, as we continue our work for improvements, government will gain a greater appreciation of the nature of universities and refrain from damaging the conditions that make our contributions possible.

The issue of the use of effort reports within the University is an important one for the faculty. I have therefore asked the Senate Committee on the Faculty to advise the administration on a reasonable policy.

Louis A. Girifalco
Vice Provost for Research
March 11, 1980

Provost Vartan Gregorian
102 College Hall/CO

Dear Provost Gregorian,

In compliance with your directive of May 18, 1979, the Task Force on Faculty Time and Effort Reporting has completed its work and submits the following report recommending an appropriate method for documenting salary charges for faculty and professional staff to Federal grants and contracts as required by Section J-6 (Compensation for Personal Services) of the OMB Circular A-21 regulations.

Section J-6 of OMB A-21 states that an institution has the option of adopting either a system of monitored workload or a system of personnel activity reports to account for the distribution of salaries and wages of professorial or professional staff, whether such salaries and wages are charged directly or are required to be distributed to more than one activity for purposes of allocating indirect costs. Section J-6 also recognizes that "In the use of either method, it is recognized that, because of the nature of work involved in academic institutions, the various and often interrelated activities of professorial and professional employees frequently cannot be measured with a high degree of precision, that reliance must be placed on reasonably accurate approximations, and the acceptance of a degree of tolerance in measurement is appropriate."

After examining both options, the committee recommends that the Personnel Activity (Effort) Reporting System be adopted and implemented as of July 1, 1980 in order to support charges to research related to activities as well as to support various components of indirect cost, for the following reasons:

1. Our current system can be more readily adapted to the Personnel Activity Report concept.
2. The Personnel Activity Report System provides better accountability.
3. The Personnel Activity Report System can be used uniformly for all categories of personnel.
4. The Personnel Activity Report System requires less documentation and administrative disruption to the faculty member.
5. The Personnel Activity Report System does not require the faculty member to predict the nature of his departmental effort in advance of the beginning of each semester.

(continued on page 10)
For the Record

(continued from page 10)

Having recommended a course of action to satisfy the Section J-6 standard of OMB A-21, the committee has discussed and offered some pertinent facts with the hope that the University community will better understand the rationale for what many of our colleagues have referred to as: "bureaucratic, paper producing, time consuming nonsense." Indeed, since March 6, 1979, when the final version of OMB A-21, "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions," was published in the Federal Register, there has been much discussion by faculty and administrators of this nation's major research universities over several of the Principles and their perceived impact on faculty lifestyle.

Nevertheless, the University is bound to comply with the final A-21 cost principles unless or until such principles are eliminated or changed, or risk the loss of all Federal funding. The Association of American Universities, the American Council on Education, the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the Council on Governmental Relations of the National Association of College and University Business Officers along with other interest groups have succeeded in tempering what might have been an even more restrictive document and will continue to press for further changes. For now, however, we have little alternative but to comply with the existing regulation. At risk for Pennsylvania is approximately $85 million, the precipitous loss of which would be disastrous to the institution and its programs.

The form of the new effort reporting to be utilized by the University, will be familiar to most faculty, since under Federal Management Circular (FMC) 73-8, (the current regulations) the standing faculty have been completing a similar type of annual effort report, albeit for indirect cost calculation purposes. The new effort report will be required once for each semester and will cover direct research, instructional and clinical activities as well as indirect activities. School, departmental and central administrative personnel will be designated and trained to minimize the additional paperwork effect on the faculty, thereby making the additional administrative burden as innocuous as possible. However, to be sure, these support personnel cannot sign a faculty member's report or allocate his/her effort.

Finally, it would be tempting for faculty with no direct sponsored research activity to decide not to report their effort. However, their committee work, and other institutional support activities within their department, school or University, generate funds from indirect cost recovery for their school and the University. These unrestricted funds are vital to the continuation of University supported research. Consequently, all faculty and professional personnel will be encouraged to complete periodic effort reports.

OMB A-21, with its principles for identifying faculty, administrative and staff effort through Personnel Activity (Effort) Reporting, is indeed with us and will be effective July 1, 1980. The University will do all it can to minimize its impact in every affected area; however, there will be additional administrative effort, paperwork, audit requirements, etc. Failure to comply places all of our programs at risk. We ask the University community's cooperation, their forebearance, and their good will in the months ahead.

Task Force on Faculty Time and Effort Reporting:

Jacob Abel, Marston Alexander, Alfred Beers (Chairman), Kenneth Campbell, James Ferguson, Stephen Gale, Robert Lucid, Dennis Dougherty (ex-officio), Louis Girfalco (ex-officio), Anthony Mereit (ex-officio)

Last fall I asked the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility to consider whether the effort reporting which the University intends to require of faculty and staff represents a problem with respect to academic freedom. Since the response of the Committee may be of more than casual interest to many members of the faculty and staff, it is reproduced below.

Walter D. Wales
Chairman, The Faculty Senate

Dr. Walter D. Wales, Chairman
The Faculty Senate
Box 12 College Hall CO

Dear Walter:

In your letter to me of 20 November 1979 concerning "the draft effort-reporting forms (and instructions) which the University is planning to introduce on July 1, 1980 in response to Circular A-21 from the Office of Management and Budget" you stated "... I believe the most useful specific function that the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility could perform would be to comment on whether the use of these forms presents a problem with respect to academic freedom."

The members of the committee have read the documents you sent us and at a meeting on 20 December 1979 came to the unanimous conclusion that although the reporting is a nuisance and is undignified, it does not appear to us to be in itself a violation of academic freedom. However, because the concept of "100% of the activity for which one is compensated by the University and which is required in the fulfillment of... one's obligations to the University" is so vague, and because the faculty member must sign a document attesting to the accurate division of this undefined time among several activities in spite of the fact that it is virtually impossible to allocate effort between, say, research and preparation for teaching when these overlap, as they so often do, or even between research or preparation for teaching and consulting when they overlap, the faculty member becomes a hostage to future administrators who may be far more venal than those we have become accustomed to or who may find themselves in a political climate very hostile to academic freedom. This constitutes a very real threat to academic freedom.

We are also concerned that the information can be misused or misinterpreted if it is used in any part of the faculty evaluation process. We believe that the forms should be used for no other than their prime purpose and should be destroyed once the information has been collated. Such destruction would remove the threat we have discussed. However, if for some reason, such destruction is not possible, the reports should be kept separate from the records of individual faculty members. Unfortunately that is minimal protection and if a reason for the preservation of the individual records is overriding, that reason should be made clear to the faculty and the professional staff.

We are gravely concerned that the requirement that those who receive all of their University stipend from grant funds should spend 100% of their time on their funded research removes from participation in the collegial process many of the most distinguished members of the colleague, and diminishes the vitality of the collegial form of University governance which is in itself a bulwark for academic freedom. Furthermore, insofar as the system of University governance is germane to academic freedom, the development of a reporting system to comply without wide participation of faculty itself constitutes a diminution of academic freedom.

We are also deeply concerned that the environment created by the implementation of A-21 transforms the nature of University participation in the research process from that of a partner in joint ventures with the sponsors to that of a vendor of services, a role not wholly consistent with the fundamental idea of a university. We therefore urge the administration to explore the possibility that the major universities might act together to resist this encroachment on our activities.

In the meantime, we strongly recommend that the University administration, to assure cooperation, carefully explain to all faculty and professional staff the necessity for complying with the reporting requirements until those requirements can be satisfactorily modified.

Robert E. Davies
Chair, Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility


Next week ALMANAC will examine some of the fiscal and academic implications of OMB A-21.
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A Capitol Tour!
- The Institute of Contemporary Art will host a special tour of the Capitol in Harrisburg including a special reception at the Governor's home in honor of the Institute's Made in Philadelphia III exhibit on April 20. The exhibition is in the Governor's home from April 1 until May 23 and features the works of Philadelphia artists.

The tour costs $50 per person, including transportation and brunch. For more information, contact the ICA at Ext. 7108.

Annenberg Center Artsfest
- The Annenberg Center and Inter-Acts are hosting Artsfest 80, a festival of the arts at the University through March 29. Musical events include the Penn Singers' presentation of The Mikado and the University Wind Ensemble in concert. Theater productions include Bloomers' spring production, Late Bloomers and the haunting love story, Love Letters on Blue Paper. Film screenings range from a Gene Kelly double feature to Francis Ford Coppola's thriller, The Conversation. For more information on Artsfest, call Ext. 7038. For ticket information, call Ext. 6791.

'Hay Fever' Slated
- The McCarter Theatre Company production of Hay Fever will replace Arthur Miller's Up From Paradise at the Annenberg Center. Starring Celeste Holm, Hay Fever will play the Zellerbach Theatre April 22-27.

The producers of Up From Paradise have indefinitely postponed the production because of funding problems; it will not appear on the Annenberg Center Series Z schedule.

Shakespearean Dance
- Collegium Musicum and the Cambridge Court Dancers will combine to perform the dances found in Shakespeare's plays on March 22 and 23.

Shakespeare and the Dance will be performed in the Zellerbach Theatre of the Annenberg Center on March 22 at 8 p.m. Sunday's show is at the Bluett Theater of St. Joseph's College at 3 p.m. Admission is $4 for the general public and $2 for students and senior citizens. Call Ext. 6791 for reservations for the Saturday show or Ext. 6244 for the Sunday performance.

The Cambridge Court Dancers are one of the few Renaissance Dance troupes in America. The shows are sponsored by the Department of Music.

Handel With Care
- President Martin Meyerson and Provost Varian Gregoriam will sponsor a performance of Handel's Judas Maccabaeus by the Pennsylvania Pro Musica, Friday, March 21 at 8 p.m. in St. Mary's Church, 3916 Locust Walk.

Black Symposium
- The Afro-American Studies, program's sixth annual spring symposium will address New Black Middle Class Prospects March 27-28. The symposium features eight well-known speakers ranging from writers Toni Morrison and Frank Yerby to Harvard professor Martin Kilson, as well as panels composed of national and local academic figures.

The panels and speakers will discuss the prospects of the new black middle class which has been developing since the 1960s. The group is termed "new" to distinguish it from the older, community-service-oriented black bourgeoisie. It will be held in the Members' Lounge of the International House. Call Professor Joseph Washington, Jr., director of the Afro-American Studies Program, Ext. 4965, for more information.

Weight Control Study
- Subjects are needed for a study of new weight control medication. Participants must be at least 18 years old and between 10 and 30 percent overweight. The study will extend over a 13-week period, and participants will receive their treatments free of charge. Assistant professor of psychiatry Michael Pertschuk is conducting the study. Call 662-3503 at HUP for information.

Cancer Grants
- Through a grant from the American Cancer Society, the University Cancer Center will provide support for biomedical research throughout the University with "seed money" grants ($3,000-$5,000 maximum) for the exploitation of new developments in cancer research. Applications will be judged on the basis of scientific merit and the role that research support will play in the development of new research. Priority is given to new investigators. If funds permit, limited consideration will be given to established investigators embarking on a new direction. The Scientific Review Committee of the Cancer Center will review applications and establish priorities. Interested faculty members are invited to obtain application forms from Ralph Czachowski, Administrator, University of Pennsylvania Cancer Center, 7 Siverstein/G12 (Ext. 3910 at HUP). The deadline for all applications is April 15. Awards will be for a one year period, not renewable, and will be effective July 1.

Sigma Xi Nominating
- Nominations for Sigma Xi, the scientific research society, are now being accepted. The deadline for applications is April 1. Please send nominations and requests for nomination forms to Professor G. S. McDonald, 358 Anatomy-Chemistry/G3.

Non-tenure Seminar
- The Research Committee of the University Council will sponsor a symposium on Non-Tenure Alternatives for Research Personnel: Present Status, Use and Abuse on March 21, 2-4 p.m., College Hall Room 200.

Robert Zemsky, director of planning analysis and associate professor of American civilization will discuss The Incidence and Distribution of Non-Tenure Accruing Personnel. Nicholas A. Kefalides, director of the connective tissue research institute and professor of medicine, biochemistry and biophysics, will address the issue of The Viewpoint from the Institutes and Centers. Faculty Senate Chairman Walter Wales, professor of physics, will speak on The Viewpoint of the Faculty Senate. Louis A. Girfalco, vice-provost for research and professor of materials science and engineering, will round-off the speaker's program with Some Unanswered Questions.

A discussion of the talks will follow the speakers. Panelists for the discussion are: Joseph Bordogna, associate dean for graduate education and research, School of Engineering and Applied Science, and director of the Moore School; James E. Davis, associate dean of FAS and adjunct associate professor of chemistry; James J. Ferguson, Jr., associate dean for the School of Medicine, and professor of biochemistry; and Richard C. Clelland, associate dean of the Wharton School and professor of statistics and operations research.

Howard Myer, chairman of the research committee of the University Council and professor of pharmacy will present the concluding remarks, and Raymond S. Berkowitz, professor of electrical engineering, will moderate the symposium. All University personnel are welcome.

Musical Treasures
- An autograph manuscript of Johannes Brahms, the only recorded copy of a collection of revolutionary songs published in Philadelphia in 1795, and the first edition of the full score of Joseph Haydn's Symphony No. 64 in A major are among the musical treasures from the Library's collection which will be on exhibition in the Ramoald Gallery, 6th floor, Van Pelt Library this month. The exhibition is sponsored by the Music Department and organized by Professor Otto E. Albrecht.