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The following is adapted from a letter by the committee's chair, sent to the Office of the Secretary with the notation that most of the student members and many of the faculty had already dispersed at the time of writing.

Academic Review Committee

This was the Committee's first year in operation. It met four times and was most certainly not overworked. The first meeting was organizational, at which time the Provost explained the Committee's charge and a modus operandi was adopted. The third meeting was devoted to a review format developed by Chuck Dwyer's Committee which is to be used by the Ad Hoc Committees that review the proposals submitted to the full Committee. During its second and fourth meetings, the Committee recommended approval to the Provost of all proposals considered during the year except one, that of the proposed Center for Health. The Committee's charge and was most certainly not overworked. The first meeting was organizational, at which time the Provost explained the Committee's charge and a modus operandi was adopted. The third meeting was devoted to a review format developed by Chuck Dwyer's Committee which is to be used by the Ad Hoc Committees that review the proposals submitted to the full Committee. During its second and fourth meetings, the Committee recommended approval to the Provost of all proposals considered during the year except one, that of the proposed Center for Health and Planning in the Leonard Davis Institute. This proposal at present is being reviewed by an Ad Hoc Committee appointed at the last meeting on May 4. The interim report will be presented to the Committee at its initial meeting next year.

The Academic Review Committee has made a stuttering start. The part it plays in the academic affairs of the University will be determined by the manner in which and the extent to which it is used by the Provost as he charts the academic course of the institution. The review mechanism seems reasonable. The questionnaire should provide the Ad Hoc Committees with the necessary information to carry out their reviews and formulate their reports to the full Committee. The reviews should be accomplished with reasonable dispatch and should not lead to a significant delay in the establishment of the units. This year, as in the past, the Committee received several proposals for units which were already operational or were to be operational at such a time that an adequate review could not be accomplished. Reviews of units which are faits accomplis mock the review process. It is urged that it not occur in the future.

As its first order of business next fall, the Provost has requested that the Committee draw up guidelines and criteria for units, centers and institutes since none exist at present.

Finally, as I leave the chairmanship, let me express my appreciation to the Associate Secretary, Robert Lomdale, and my hope that the part played by this Committee in the development of the University's academic programs becomes increasingly more important in the years to come.

—Truman G. Schnabel, M.D., Chair

Bookstore

Last year's report noted that the Committee has been reconsidering certain problems annually since its earliest years. It suggested that special consideration should be given to the possibility of making a fundamental change in the position of the Bookstore in the structure of the University as a way of countering some of these perennial problems. This year the Committee was given the mandate to carry out that task. The main possibilities that had been listed in the previous report were:
1. to make the Bookstore independent of the University administration and set it up as a co-op;
2. to take it out of Operational Services and put it under the Provost's Office.

This year the Committee discussed each of these possibilities in detail, but was unable to recommend either of them. Briefly, we found that the logistical problems involved in converting to a co-op were likely to be insurmountable (although it must be said that we did not manage to get as much expert advice in this regard as we would have liked, and we should like to leave open the possibility that a more successful investigation of the realities and economics of cooperative institutions might lead to a different conclusion). The second possibility was considered unlikely to lead to any real change. The Committee is forced, therefore, to admit to not having succeeded in finding the ultimate solution to the problems that the University continues to find in the Bookstore, and we are obliged to pass the task on the Committee for the coming year.

In the meantime, however, the Bookstore is under new management. As the new director of the Bookstore completed her first year, it gradually became obvious to us that many of the problems the Committee considers and reconsiders from year to year may have to do less with structure and more with managerial style. We noted a definite improvement in Bookstore services in the course of the year, which we assume may continue as the new director has the opportunity to carry out more of her programs.

—Brian Spooner, Chair

Communications

The Committee met seven times during the year 9/81-9/82: October 15, 1981; November 19, 1981; December 10, 1981; February 17, 1982; March 24, 1982; April 27, 1982; and May 13, 1982. In addition, the Committee was invited to meet with the University Council Committee on Committees, on March 30, 1982, to discuss the future of the Communications Committee.

The Committee began its second year (1981-1982) with a review of its first year (1980-1981). It appeared that several of the recommendations which had been made were within the purview of Ms. Nichols, director of communications services. Therefore it seemed important that the Committee should become better informed on the activities of the Publications Office and the News Bureau. Accordingly, the November and December meetings were held in those offices, with the staff. Activities and operational problems were thoroughly reviewed. Services available to the University were listed, and goals for the future were outlined.

There was a clear definition of objectives and setting of management goals, upgrading of equipment, and assessment of the needs of each department within the University, and methods of meeting these needs. The News Bureau explained its operation of the clipping service and mechanism of news releases, and also the "beat" system set up for each staff writer. The Bureau also gave the Committee information on its use...
of radio programming for the University and demonstrated the equipment available for this.

It was the collective opinion of the Communications Committee that both of these meetings had been most instructive and that the mechanisms at present available and possible goals for information distribution and communication were considerably understood. These therefore became workable tools to deal with communications problems as they presented themselves for consideration by the Committee.

There was continuing discussion by the Committee of the current and constantly recurring problems in telephone communications, specifically the problem of telephone manners. This matter would be kept on the agenda until a resolution could be made.

As a corollary to its meetings with Publications and the News Bureau Office, the Committee was asked by Mary Nichols to have a meeting set aside for the sole purpose of a discussion of the new Calendar. This was held on March 24, 1982 and questions of size, design, format, readability, distribution, and general utility were explored in depth. A concern was raised that, because of early deadline requirements, the listing of academic events such as seminars would prove to be incomplete and unsatisfactory. To this was added the concern of several of the faculty members on the Committee that with the demise of the Almanac calendar, the faculty would not be so well served. It was recommended that the Committee give consideration to the best method for publicizing academic events. Because of the importance of this issue, a decision was made to continue the discussion with these two publications as a running agenda item for the Committee.

(At the Spring Meeting of the Faculty Senate, April 21, 1982, a statement of concern from faculty members of the Committee on Communications was read. A copy of this statement is enclosed.)

This concern was expressed once again at the April 27 meeting of the Committee. Mr. Edward Jordan, executive vice president of the University was present and affirmed his commitment to communications, which he placed very high on his list of priorities. When asked if his office would be amenable to strong recommendations by our committee, he was strongly affirmative.

At the final meeting of the Committee, May 13, 1982, the draft copy of this report was reviewed, and agenda items for the year 1982-1983 were considered. These included mechanisms for marketing and publicizing events on campus, more satisfactory mechanisms for the dissemination of information to students—undergraduate and graduate—and development of better means of communication between constituencies and within a given constituency.

—Adelaide M. Deluva, Chair

Addendum:

On March 30, 1982, at a meeting of the Committee on Committees of the University Council, the Communications Committee was asked to present an assessment of the first two years of its existence, this being the second year of a two-year trial period. The Committee had been formed in 1980, and had used the intervening time as an exploratory period: what problems needed to be solved, how the University constituencies could best be served, and how the Committee could fulfill these needs. An additional two years was requested before a final decision be made, in order to aid in the consolidation of our role into a coherent pattern.

Enclosure

Statement of Concern

From Faculty Members on the Committee on Communications (Council) concerning the new Calendar vs. the Almanac calendar.

We have a growing concern regarding the monthly appearance of a new and only moderately academic calendar, particularly when coupled with the apparent demise of the more familiar weekly Almanac calendar. One of the main points of concern is the inadequate coverage of academic events in the new calendar, which is an inevitable result of the requirement for an early deadline in advance of publication. A second point centers around the obvious increased costs which of necessity must be incurred by the production of the new calendar. We feel that these changes may be detrimental to effective communication of campus events among interested faculty. In addition, this action lessens the vitality of Almanac as a vehicle for faculty communication.

As a counterproposal we would suggest the inclusion of a monthly, expanded calendar appearing as a supplement in Almanac, thus providing economical distribution on campus and facilitating additional copies for dissemination to off-campus constituencies, without compromising space in Almanac needed for news and comments.

—Michael Katz, Chair

Facilities

Housekeeping and Maintenance: The Committee addressed the widespread perception that housekeeping and minor routine maintenance and repair services are unresponsive to occupants' needs. It met with Robert McKain, Director of Physical Plant, and Michael Grogan of the Macke Company, Manager of Housekeeping Services, to discuss the mechanism for obtaining these services and exerting quality control over their performance. The number of supervisory personnel in these services is sufficient to oversee the workers and direct them to areas where attention has been requested, but does not permit a continuing survey of all potential needs for work to be done. Adequate service therefore depends on an effective conduit for the flow of requests and feedback on their satisfaction from the building occupants to Physical Plant. A more explicit definition of roles and responsibilities is plainly needed. This question will be further explored in the context of the role of Building Administrators, discussed below.

Building Evacuation: The occurrence of a bomb threat in Williams Hall in December revealed considerable misinformation among the University community concerning policy on the evacuation of buildings. In these circumstances evacuation may only be ordered by the Director of Public Safety or the Philadelphia Police Department. A memorandum detailing this policy and the steps to be taken in the event of a bomb threat was recirculated to all relevant administrators and publicized in the campus press.

Superblock Landscaping: Several members of the Committee evinced concern at the unsightly and inconvenient muddy paths that appear on certain heavily traveled grass areas, notably the vicinity of the high rises, ALMANAC SUPPLEMENT October 19, 1982
during wet weather. Similar problems have also been noted on Hill Hall Field. Titus Hewryk, Director of Facilities Development, presented measures that had been considered to alleviate these. The ideal solution would be the establishment of a similar approach, but somewhat different design criteria, to the very successful Blanch Levy Park. However, for the superblock area, this would cost about $2 million. Some less expensive palliative measures are therefore being considered.

The Committee recommended that in any such plans the predominant use of the area as the only convenient open space for recreation and informal games for the superblock residents be carefully considered. Therefore any significant reduction in the extent of space available for such activities or injudicious use of materials, such as tarmac or concrete, that would make them hazardous should be avoided.

**Asbestos:** The Committee received updates on the progress made in the elimination of health hazards due to the use of asbestos as a construction material in residential buildings, particularly the West Campus and Graduate Towers dormitories. Locations where asbestos is known to be present on the structure poses an immediate risk of aerial contamination are subject to preventative measures. There have been instances of delays in addressing such problems, but in general, this aspect of the asbestos management program should now continue to proceed smoothly. Some concern was expressed that the informational material that warns incoming residents of these hazards and points out the steps to be taken to minimize the risk and to report areas of potential danger is not distributed sufficiently frequently, in view of the extent of turnover of students during the academic year; this material is now sent out more often. As a long-term measure, the Committee recommends that the University develop and implement a plan for the phased removal of asbestos from all of its buildings.

**Broad Band Cables:** Advances in communications technology over the past decade present opportunities for the development of a single network of cables to serve digital, video and voice communications.

Potential users of such a system include the academic, business and administrative computing communities, producers and consumers of educational and recreational television transmissions, security, telecommunications, office automation, and energy and physical plant management and control. The Committee, together with guest representatives of Energy Management and Conservation, Operational Services, Public Safety, Telecommunications, UMIS and UTV, received a presentation from George McKenna, Acting Director of the Office of Computing Activities, on the technical feasibility of this project.

The Committee concluded that a satisfactory definition and resolution of the technical issues was imminent. This highlights the urgent need to establish mechanisms for review and decision making in three separate but related areas:

1. Review of the technical aspects of any plan proposed by a body with the appropriate range of expertise and representation of potential users.
2. Establishment of policy and the assignment of responsibility for the administration, maintenance and future development of the network, and for decisions concerning the establishment of independent communications facilities.
3. Identification of sources for the capital, operating and future expansion and development costs of the network.

The Committee recommended to the Vice Provost for Research that mechanisms to address questions falling in each of these three areas and for overall coordination of planning for cable communications be established as soon as possible.

**Building Administrators:** As noted above in the discussion of housekeeping and maintenance, and further emphasized in the reports of the Subcommittees on Classroom Space and Scheduling and Energy summarized below, Building Administrators fill a central role in communications between building occupants and users and Operational Services. Additional areas not addressed in this report in which these individuals may play a part include monitoring of the physical aspects of building security, coordination of delivery services, and supervision of mail distribution. The Committee has noted widespread variation in the level to which these functions are fulfilled. In some instances, particularly those schools with extensive but closely contiguous physical plant, a person is employed with full-time responsibility in these areas. Such a person not only becomes well known to all of the occupants of the building complex as the appropriate point of contact in requests for services, thereby facilitating communication, but also on his or her own initiative monitors and reports on many aspects of the state of repair, quality of environment, efficiency and functionality of the buildings. A very different scenario emerges when the job of Building Administrators is assigned to the occupancy of a department, for example as Business Administrator of a department. Such persons cannot be expected to be as familiar with the problems and needs of their buildings and a communication gap may develop.

In view of the multiple and essential roles envisaged for Building Administrators in many aspects of facilities management and functioning, the Committee believes that these roles should be carefully studied and defined. A detailed job description should be developed that will act as a guide in the appointment of Building Administrators. We see this as an important task for the Committee in the forthcoming year.

**Central Planning:** Through its representatives the Committee has noted with concern that the University Space Committee has become defunct, that the Real Estate Council appears likely to become so, and that the President’s Capital Council and the Committee on Planning of the Campus have only met infrequently and sporadically to address issues on which an immediate decision was necessary. This leads to the fear that these areas are being neglected, or that decisions are being made on them without due consideration and consultation.

We recognize that the President, Provost, and Executive Vice President are all comparatively new to the campus, and may wish to review and perhaps improve the existing decision making procedures. In the interim, however, important long-term questions of capital planning and design await attention. The Committee urges that the groups responsible for these central planning functions be reconstituted or redefined and set to work without further delay.

**Classroom Space and Scheduling:** The report of the Subcommittee charged with this subject, chaired by Vincent Conti, (Almanac: September 14, 1982) is attached. As recommended therein, the Subcommittee, originally ad hoc, will become a standing subcommittee, chaired by the Registrar, to provide continued monitoring of problems and progress in this area. The report details declines in both the quality and quantity of classroom space, exacerbated by the temporary unavailability of Dietrich Hall. Much of that which is available is inefficiently used.

The block system is little known and even less followed. Much of the classroom space on the campus is not under the control of the Registrar. Recommendations to address these problems include an expanded role of the Registrar in the decision paths relating to classroom space, mechanisms to improve the efficiency of its use, and greater information sharing about the availability of space not in the Registrar’s pool. The block system should be brought up to date and enforced. An expanded role of Building Administrators in monitoring the quality of classroom space and its housing is recommended. Its maintenance should be properly and identifiably budgeted.

These measures will not only lead to more efficient use of classroom space, but also improve the quality of the teaching environment and enhance the range of educational choices available. Improved efficiency in the use of classroom space can also make an important contribution to energy conservation.

**Energy:** The report of the Subcommittee on Energy, chaired by Jon Lang, is attached. It describes encouraging progress in improvement of energy systems and urges continued attention to this important program. A summer fellowship program to identify and explore innovative conservation plans is proposed. A study of the question of thermostat control and access policy is recommended. The outdoor environment as well as the campus must be considered in the overall planning for efficient comfort delivery in a varied climate. An expanded role of Building Administrators in monitoring the performance of energy systems and adherence to conservation measures on a local level is proposed. Incentives for conservation in the residences should be introduced and publicized. Educational outreach programs to the campus community as a whole should continue unabated and be more precisely targeted.

**Transportation and Parking:** The report of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Parking, chaired by Vukan Vuchic, is attached. The Committee as a whole also received two presentations related to transportation and parking issues. The first, by Steven Murray, Director of Transportation and Parking, outlined plans for the construction of a parking garage on the north-east corner of 38th and Walnut Streets. This raised some concerns about the overall design for the development of the part of campus and its environs immediately to the north of Walnut.
Energy Subcommittee

Between 1973 and 1981 the total energy cost to the University rose from $4.4 million to $19 million. It is estimated that the energy bill for the University will be $23 million this year. During the same period, energy consumption has decreased by 12.9 percent despite an increase in the total building square footage in the University. This indicates two important factors:

1. The University's Department of Energy Management (the Energy Office) has worked effectively to create an "energy cost avoidance" without which the energy cost problem would be much worse.

2. Considerable energy wastage exists originally. The University community has become aware of the energy problem but much remains to be done.

This report outlines what has been done and makes recommendations for future endeavors.

A. Energy Systems

The University has embarked on a number of programs. These can be categorized under Quick Fix Items, Fast-Payback Items and Slow-Payback Items. The progress can be summarized as follows:

1. Quick Fix Items

200 of these have been identified by the Office of Energy Management. These include the repairing of steam traps, turning off systems when unused. These items have been 75 percent completed.

2. Fast-Payback Items

a) Those requiring small technical changes
b) Those requiring major technical changes

Items under (a) include such things as Automatic Temperature Controls while those under (b) include such items as the redesign of a system (e.g., air-handling system at the Palestra). Casual inquiries suggest that (a) requires continuing and vigorous attention. Many of the programs that the Energy Office is currently pursuing are under (b).

3. Slow-Payback Items

These include items such as window adjustments, repairs. These are only tackled when the item is being attended to for other reasons. A Building Energy Survey is presently being conducted to identify these items.

Much has been done in these areas. The Energy Office needs to continue its analysis of the appropriateness of systems. Physical Plant needs to develop its concern with the maintenance of existing systems. Both need to have additional resources available to them.

The sub-committee makes the following recommendations:

1. The Energy Office should continue to pursue the identification of Energy Conservation projects and the implementation of proposed projects particularly with reference to residential buildings.

2. Physical Plant should develop clear systematic procedures for maintenance of equipment such as thermostats. Casual but repeated information indicates that many thermostats, etc., are not working effectively.

3. Physical Plant should identify what staff additions are required to implement such a systematic process, and in conjunction with the Energy Office to identify what the costs and benefits of such a process would be.

4. The Energy Office should examine the possibility of establishing an ongoing specialized research program grant to encourage faculty/student research directly related to the University's policies/hardware, such a program to be jointly administered by a committee of Energy "Experts" on campus and the Energy Office. This goal would be to identify and disseminate knowledge on different technologies for energy conservation.

Not only is the comfortableness of the indoor environment of concern here. The walks, greens, yards of the University are much inhabited. No thought seems to have been given to the comfortableness of these areas, the use of the sun and vegetation as the energy source and controlling device for these areas. The New Dining Wing, for instance, eliminates what was a delightful patch of winter sun; the winds around the high rise buildings are notorious.

The sub-committee recommends that:

The Energy Office and the Department of Facilities Development establish design principles for building configurations and landscape architecture that maximize the comfortableness of outdoor areas.

B. Administration

While memoranda describing the systems under the control of a building manager have been distributed, it is not clear that these have had much effect. Defects and problems are reported on a crisis basis. Guidelines/standards have been established by Physical Plant and are being monitored by twenty-five work-study students. This effort has been hampered by the lack of quality of the monitoring systems and lack of personnel. Building Managers appear to be only marginally involved in these matters—they have many other tasks; being building manager is often an additional one.

The sub-committee makes the following recommendations:

1. Physical Plant and the Deans of each school establish procedures for the building manager of each building to be known to the users of each building.

2. That the Energy Office develop a booklet describing the energy systems, appropriate temperature setting, etc. (i) procedures for monitoring them (ii) procedures for dealing and/or reporting problems

3. That a network of building administrators, energy monitors and representatives of the Energy Office be established. That regular meetings be held to keep members of this network up-to-date and involved in what is being done and what might be done. As new members join the network they should be made fully aware of their responsibilities.

4. The Energy Office and the University Registrar cooperate in room scheduling so that energy savings are achieved through the efficient use of classroom space. In doing this, it must be recognized that unclaimed spaces (i.e. those in the general pool) tend to be unoccupied and undefended and maintenance costs may rise.

5. The Energy Office, the Office of Student Life, and Residential Living devise procedures for passing on energy savings to students in residential buildings either directly through rental rebates or indirectly through observable investments in the living environment of students.

C. Education

Posters, signs on light switches, articles in The Daily Pennsylvanian as well as the national press, etc., have brought the nature of energy costs to the University community. An apathetic attitude still persists amongst many people on campus. The understanding of the issues/costs/savings involved needs to be increased on campus as it exists in society as a whole.

The sub-committee recommends that the Energy Office:

1. Develop a new series of posters. These should be explicitly for specific locations, e.g., laundry (i) develop (ii) be seasonally specific

2. Use The Daily Pennsylvanian and Almanac more vigorously to disseminate information via articles/ads/advertisements.

—Jon Lang, Chair

(Reports continue past Membership supplement)
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Transportation Subcommittee

During the past academic year the Transportation Subcommittee met several times to consider special issues and prepare recommendations for the Committee. It invited and maintained numerous contacts, and it had several formal presentations, by Steven Murray, director of Transportation and Parking, by David Johnston, director of Public Safety, and several other persons.

The Subcommittee has continued to broaden its scope of concerns and actions to all aspects of transportation affecting the University. Major activities the Subcommittee has been involved in have been the following:

1. Plans for a 650-space garage on the north-east corner of 38th and Walnut Streets were discussed on several occasions. The Subcommittee raised concerns of coordinating such a major project involving a sizable investment with land uses, aesthetics and pedestrian movements in adjacent blocks. Relationship of commercial outfits in the proposed garage to other commercial developments was also considered.

The Subcommittee recommended that these issues of broader planning for the garage (location, land use characteristics, vehicular and pedestrian flows, etc.) be considered by the Committee on the Planning of the Campus, which should then give its endorsement or objections.

With respect to financing and design of the proposed garage, the Subcommittee recommended that the construction be approved only if:
   a. No more than 10 percent interest is incurred on the debt, for example through a 30-year PHEFA mortgage;
   b. The development of RDA Parcel 2A (36th to 37th Street, north of Walnut) is approved, reducing parking capacity; and
   c. The final plans for the garage are approved by the Subcommittee.

Dr. Vuchic has been appointed to be a member of the Garage Building Committee.

2. Office of Transportation and Parking has been in contact with SEPTA considering possibilities for selling SEPTA's Transpases through University's payroll. It is likely that this service will be introduced as soon as SEPTA's current fare changes are completed, hopefully by September 1982.

3. The Subcommittee has continued to follow up the planning of the actual improvements of subway stations in the campus area. Thirty-fourth Street station on the Market-Frankford Line and 33rd Street station for Subway-Surface Lines have been very much improved; similar renovations will be made in the other subway stations, primarily 36th and 37th Street on Subway-Surface Lines. SEPTA's presentation of these plans was attended by several Subcommittee members. Some features of the proposed renovations, however, may not be in the best interest of the University and public in general. The proposed reductions of underground areas and closing of entrances could inconvenience passengers. Moreover, the 36th Street station could be very effectively connected with the proposed large commercial development to the west of it. Members of the University Administrative Transportation Committee (including Vuchic) will follow up on this problem and organize a meeting with SEPTA officials to ensure that the redesign will utilize all opportunities for improved accessibility.

4. "Getting to/from Campus" brochure, containing information about transportation options, will be distributed to all new University employees.

5. The Subcommittee noticed and expressed satisfaction about University's action to paint "Zebra"-type crossings in the Campus area. These crossings have increased courtesy of drivers toward pedestrians and thus enhanced safety.

6. The Subcommittee has also followed—and Dr. Vuchic has taken an active role with Mr. Murray—a request from the City to introduce parking meters in the University area.

Presently there is extensive free, unlimited curb parking even along such busy streets as Walnut, 33rd and 34th. On the other hand, there is virtually no short-term parking. Introduction of meters will ensure much better utilization of this prime street space, increase convenience for visitors, business travel, etc. The City has included the campus area in its plans for major modernization of parking regulation and control, and the University's Office of Transportation and Parking will remain in close contact with the City about these developments.

7. The Subcommittee has recommended adoption of the new parking rate schedule proposed by the Office of Transportation and Parking. The rates are being increased by 15 percent on the average. This increase includes the second of the three increases staggered over three years caused by the inclusion of the costs to the University of the land and energy of parking facilities. The other part of the increase is due to the rising operating costs.

—Vukan Vuchic, Chair

International Programs

The Committee on International Programs met four times during the 1981/1982 academic year in October, December, March and April. The Committee's agenda in the course of the year included the following major issues:

1. University of Pennsylvania Contacts with Europe: With the termination of the University's relationship with the L'Alnapoule Art Foundation, the Committee discussed alternative ways of fostering contact with Europe, particularly in the form of meetings with European scholars. A small subcommittee was established to review the possibilities and later reported on the feasibility of several different models for the promotion of conferences and seminars in Europe. The subcommittee, with the assistance of the Office of International Programs, will continue to pursue this matter.

2. English Language Proficiency of Foreign Students: The Committee reviewed the opportunities for English language study for foreign students at the University, including the course offerings of the English Program for Foreign Students, and discussed the relationship between the English Program and the felt needs of the institution with respect to the English language training of Pennsylvania students. This is a question that continues to be of interest to the Committee and which is currently under consideration by the Office of International Programs.

3. Proposed Cuts in the Federal Budget Affecting Fulbright Awards and other International Educational Activities: The Committee lent its efforts in organizing a campus-wide effort directed at Congress and the International Communications Agency on behalf of these programs.

4. Foreign Student and Scholar Housing: A representative of the Committee was asked to serve on the Task Force on Foreign Student and Scholar Housing which was established by the Vice Provost in the spring of 1982. Matters under consideration include short-term housing needs, selection of appropriate housing, foreign student orientation, and personal safety.

5. Summer Programs Overseas: The Committee reviewed, with a representative from College of General Studies, the development of several new summer programs overseas, including the program in Mexico and film course in Venice. Also discussed was the possibility for a French-language program at the University of Technology at Compiègne (France), which would be designed primarily for students in the natural and applied sciences, especially engineering. The program is likely to get underway in the summer of 1983.

6. Philadelphia High School for International Affairs: At the suggestion of President Hackney, the Committee established a sub-committee to promote involvement between the University community and the high school, which is now the third magnet high school in the city, having opened last fall. The subcommittee will include, in addition to representatives from the full committee, representatives from the Office of Admissions, Graduate School of Education, College of General Studies and the International Classroom Program.

7. Exchange Agreements and Study Abroad Programs: The Committee continued to monitor the development of a number of the University's affiliates with institutions overseas, including the numerous developments in the recently enacted exchange with Ibadan University in Nigeria. Also reviewed were the exchange programs with International Christian University, University of Technology at Compiègne, University of Paris, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and Edinburgh University.

—F. H. Conroy, Chair

Library Committee

1. Budget: As a result of lengthy discussion at the first meeting of the year, the Committee decided to devote its attention to the ongoing problems of the "information crisis" (as it has occasionally been termed in library periodicals), namely, the inability of libraries in general and our own library system in particular to keep up with the ever-increasing cost of journal subscriptions and books. Over the past decade, journal prices
Personnel Benefits

Three major items occupied the agenda for 1981-82, as follows:
1. Elimination of the six-month waiting period for University paid benefits for all faculty and senior administrators. It had been the practice for the University to require that all newly hired staff (except faculty and senior administrators) either forgo health and life insurance benefits or pay their own premiums for 6 months, after which time the University would pay for the benefits. The committee unanimously recommended the elimination of this waiting period. The recommendation was accepted by the administration and it is being implemented effective April 1, 1982.

2. Benefits for retirees and those between ages 65 and 70 on active service. Group life insurance is reduced annually between ages 65 and 70 and is kept at $2000 after age 70. Also, health insurance coverage is more limited after age 65. Improving these benefits will be very costly. If a flexible benefits system is instituted, it may be possible to trade off benefits earlier in life for better coverage after age 65.

3. Flexible benefits systems. Like the weather, everybody talks about it, but very few people can do anything about it—so far. This item carried over from last year's agenda and will continue on next year's agenda. The more we discuss it, the more complicated it becomes. The committee chose to seek professional advice. We recommended to the Director of Compensation and Benefits Planning that an outside consultant be engaged to study flexible benefits plans within the context of the University of Pennsylvania benefits program and within a framework specified by the committee. This framework consisted of "core benefits" providing basic health, life, and disability insurance, retirement fund, and (by committee vote) tuition for dependent children and a "flexible" portion of the package which could include pay for time not worked (excluding faculty), additional health, life, disability insurance, additional retirement benefits, other tuition benefits, etc. As I write this, discussions are underway with consultants. We anticipate their report by early fall.

On behalf of the entire committee, I express my appreciation to the ex officio members Alfred Beers and especially to Claire Nagel who provided much of the informational basis of the Committee's work. We also thank Ms. Leslie Achuff for the fine minutes she prepared.

—Roger Allen, Chair

Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics

The early meetings of the Committee were devoted to (a) reports and discussion of national athletic meetings (NCAA, AIAW) and the impact of changing national policies on the Ivy League and our University; (b) discussion of our own intramural sports program, its very substantial strength, and the remedy of difficulties which were then current. By the third meeting and through the next several, the Committee considered its response to the President's request for advice concerning the statement of University Athletic Policy. This consultative process was disrupted by the unexpected presentation of a DRIA Implementation Plan.

After meetings with the President and Provost, lively discussion and debate with the Committee (and on the campus at large) ensued. Finally, a consensus was reached within this Committee and our advice conveyed to the President. Some of our concerns were addressed in the final version of the Policy Statement. The discussions surrounding the Implementation Plan were rather more contentious. Our response to the President in this instance took the form of majority and dissenting views.

On one hand, we were pleased to see certain uniformly unpopular elements deleted from the final plan. However, the majority acknowledged with reluctance the necessity for demoting five teams from varsity status.

The Committee concluded its report at the 13th meeting of the year with the strong recommendation that the criteria and method by which teams move from club to varsity status be re-examined and that a subcommittee be appointed to facilitate the promotion of affected teams.

It is encouraging to observe the present efforts to re-institute varsity status for the golf and sailing teams.

—Sheldon Steinberg, Chair

Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid


The Committee was organized into five subcommittees, with three to four members. The subcommittees and their chairmen were (1) Academic Performance (Albert Oliver); (2) Class Diversity (Robert Regan); (3) Class Size (Paul Zingg); (4) Financial Aid (Paul Shaman); and (5) On-Campus Recruitment (John Keenan). A final report with recommendations was presented to the Committee from each subcommittee with the exception of the On-Campus Recruitment Subcommittee, which was unable to complete their study. The Committee also considered two other topics: (1) Title of the Chief Admissions Officer and (2) Transfer Admissions from Community Colleges. The Committee also heard periodic reports on the activities and progress of the Admissions Office from Willis J. Stetson, Jr., dean of admissions.

Academic Performance: The recommendations of the subcommittee were unanimously adopted. It was recommended that the Predictive Index (PI) be re-validated in terms of current student applications and current programs. The evaluation should consider what traits, background factors, and past performance data provide the most accurate indication of future performance. It was also recommended that a student's four-year record be used in addition to the freshman grades, in the re-evaluation of the PI. A profile should be made of those who withdrew, to evaluate the attrition rate and supportive services. The committee recommends that these studies be a high-priority item for next year's committee and urges that the results of any other University study of these basic and important questions be freely and expeditiously made available to the full Committee.

Class Diversity: After considerable discussion, the Committee unanimously adopted the following resolutions on class diversity:

The Committee on Admissions applauds the commitment of the Dean of Admissions and the Admissions Office to increasing the geographic and ethnic diversity of the University's student body and urges:

I. That enrolling and retaining a student body geographically and ethnically diverse be counted among the highest priorities of the University.

II. That to expand the pool of applicants from geographic areas and
ethnic groups currently under-represented, increased funds for staff, for travel, and for “likely parties” in such communities should be made available to the Admissions Office.

III. That to increase the awareness of Pennsylvania in remote geographic areas and in ethnically diverse communities, appropriate programs of spring visits and presentations targeted at secondary-school juniors be instituted by the Admissions Office.

IV. That financial-aid packages offered to students from relatively remote areas reflect the actual increased costs transportation imposes upon them.

V. That travel funds be offered minority students invited to the “Scholars’ Invitational Weekend.”

Class Size: In discussions and subsequent resolutions, the Committee emphasized a strong commitment to a stable-stable pattern for overall undergraduate enrollment and affirmed that factors of selectivity, resource availability and quality of life at the University be maintained at present levels, in the determination of class size. The Committee concluded that any increases in the freshmen class size figure for the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) would seriously decrease its selectivity and would diminish the attractiveness of the University to the more outstanding high school students. At the request of the Committee, the Chairman and the Dean of Admissions met with the Provost in May to discuss the manner in which class-size targets in CAS could be decreased over the next three years.

Financial Aid: The Subcommittee on Financial Aid considered two major issues: improvement of the data base for planning and prospective cutbacks in federal and state funding. The Committee unanimously adopted the following two Subcommittee recommendations concerning these issues.

The Office of Student Financial Aid has been working to improve its data base management capabilities and to develop systems and modules to be used for planning. These efforts include acquisition of personnel, moves toward increased computer usage, and institution of interfaces with data and information sets maintained by the Admissions Office, the Registrar, and the Bursar. The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid strongly supports these steps and urges that the necessary support be provided to allow the Office of Student Financial Aid to implement these steps rapidly and effectively.

Present and planned cutbacks in federal and state funding of financial aid programs have placed severe pressure on many colleges and universities and have led some which currently offer need-blind admission to consider changes in this policy. While the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid affirms the University’s strong commitment to the goals and the practice of the need-blind admission policy, we recommend that study of this policy should be a high-priority item for this committee during the next academic year.

Title of Chief Admissions Officer: In September, a Subcommittee report (authored by Christian C. Day) which summarized the background and views concerning the title of the chief admission officer at the University of Pennsylvania was received and distributed. After discussing this report, the Committee adopted (12 to 3, 1 abstention) the following resolution: that the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, having inquired into the titles of the chief admission officer at comparable institutions and considered the implications of such titles, urges that the chief admissions officer of this University be designated the Dean of Admissions. After discussion and advice from the University Council Steering Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Provost announced in January that the title of the chief admissions officer would be changed from Director to Dean.

Transfer Admissions from Community Colleges: In the past the Committee has expressed concern about the performance of students who had transferred from local community colleges. Mr. Daniel Lundquist, director of transfer admissions, confirmed that students from community colleges have shown a greater decrease in grade point averages (G.P.A.) than their counterparts from four-year colleges. The Admissions Office is now requiring SAT scores from all transfer applicants to help establish a more accurate appraisal of their future academic performance at the University of Pennsylvania.

During the year, Dean Stetson provided the Committee with progress reports of the recruitment and selection of the Class of 1986. At the final Committee meeting in May, the Chair congratulated the Admissions Office on their fine work, which was reflected in the increased yield rate and in the improvements in geographical and ethnic diversity. The Chair also expressed his appreciation to the Committee members for their diligent service.

—Wayne L. Worrell, Chair

Reports of Independent Committees

Disability Board

Much of the attention of the Long Term Total Disability Board during its four regularly called meetings during 1981-82 and one special meeting of the Medical Subcommittee was devoted to following up on the rehabilitation procedures begun in April 1981. In part because of rehabilitation counseling, the number of benefits recipients was reduced during this year rather than increased, as it has done each previous year since the inception of the Plan.

Every new benefit recipient was referred to a rehabilitation specialist for evaluation, and, in addition, some referrals were made even before Long Term Disability benefits were approved. As a result, several potentially disabled employees were assisted to return to work who in prior years might well have been placed on the Disability rolls, and others already receiving benefits were able to return to work.

Procedures were adopted by the Board for terminating benefits to those who have recovered from their disabilities and for obtaining 1981 income information from all individuals who had received benefits in 1981 and continued on the Disability rolls during the spring of 1982.

Five amendments to the Plan were approved by the Board. The first of these was in response to a request from a University staff member, the second to adjust the Plan to the requirements of the Age Discrimination in Employment Amendments, and the remaining three to facilitate rehabilitation efforts:

1. The Early Coverage provisions of the Plan were modified to make it clear that early coverage under the Plan can be arranged any time between the completion of one year’s full-time employment by the University and the completion of three years. The medical examination requirements were also broadened to allow participants in Blue Cross/Blue Shield insurance plans to utilize any coverage provided under those contracts.

2. The original Long Term Total Disability Income Plan contained a provision that Social Security Disability benefits should be an offset against any University payments under the Plan; at that time, Disability payments ended at age 65 and pension payments (both Social Security and University) took effect. Under the Age Discrimination in Employment Amendments, it is possible for an individual to remain eligible for Disability payments after age 65. It was therefore necessary to amend the Plan to provide that Social Security pension payments as well as Social Security Disability payments should be included in the offset.

3. The Board adopted an amendment requiring cooperation with the
rehabilitation counseling program as a condition for receiving benefits under the Plan.

4. To encourage job placement of apparently recovered individuals, the Board adopted an amendment providing for restoration of disability benefits if the individual should suffer a recurrence of the same disability within two months of embarking upon a new position with an employer other than the University.

5. To encourage rehabilitative employment, the Board adopted a provision calling for reduction of monthly benefits by one dollar for every two dollars earned in place of the prior provision that called for a reduction of benefits by 100 percent of everything earned above 20 percent of the benefits base at the time of disablement.

—Dan M. McGill, Chair

Faculty Grants and Awards

Attached is the statistical breakdown of awards issued by the Committee on Faculty Grants and Awards for 1982-83.

—Elaine Allen, Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I</th>
<th>Applications Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Fellowships</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants-in-Aid</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Fellowships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants-in-Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry-over from prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE II Distribution of Awards by School and Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil and Urban Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honorary Degrees

The Committee on Honorary Degrees met on a weekly basis during the fall term of 1981 in order to discuss recommendations for submission to the Board of Trustees for consideration as recipients of honorary doctor's degrees from the University of Pennsylvania at its 1982 Commencement. Although it would be inappropriate to identify either the several score names that we discussed or those that we finally proposed to the Trustees, they were drawn from all areas of academic, educational, and cultural life. We also endeavored to achieve in our final list a set of names that reflected the ethnic diversity of American society as well as its equal division into males and females.

I think that our final list was a good one, and I was disappointed to find that the Trustees chose to follow only one-half of our recommendations. I do not challenge the right of the Trustees to follow their own counsel, but I do think that it would have been the minimal courtesy thing to do to inform the Committee as to why they set aside so many of our recommendations in favor of ones of their own choosing. Nor do I challenge the selection of such eminent figures as Edwin Wolf and Jerome Weisner to receive such degrees (1 wish that we had come up with their names ourselves), but I do think that dropping names that we proposed for those of Henry Fonda and Katharine Hepburn needs explanation. Indeed, this entire incident causes me to suggest that the University Council ought to consider whether or not the Honorary Degrees Committee ought to continue to function since the large amount of time spent by those who compose it obviously did not result in names that the Board of Trustees was willing to embrace as honorary degree recipients.

I attach to this report a letter from a committee member, Professor Robert J. Rutman, who feels equally strongly about this matter.

—Jack E. Reece, Chair

Text of Attachment

In keeping with our conversation concerning the matter of Honorary Degrees, I would just like to make a few observations. My file for the Committee deliberations on the matter of degrees is quite plump; meetings lasting an hour or so took place from early fall 1981 to the end of November. Most of the people involved in the deliberations are active faculty, engaged in teaching, research and other University services. If their contribution was similar to mine, each may have expended as much as 36 hours on committee work. Since the majority of the choices made by our Committee were rejected (5 out of 9), what was the real justification for this expenditure of effort? It is my guess that had our committee made no recommendation whatsoever, the final list would have differed by no more than two from that which was actually adopted, making the extensive efforts appear even more pointless.

In addition to the conservation of valuable faculty energies, I am concerned about the process by which a final list is achieved. The committee, under your guidance, first elaborated a viewpoint and general criteria. We then attempted to apply these to secure balances in the areas of scholarship, in ethnic composition and between males and females which still provided a group of individuals of acknowledged scholarship and leadership in higher education. There can be no question as to the desirability of the Trustees 'adding to such a list degree recipients of national or international stature; the question is, could this not have been done without rejecting the bulk of the faculty list? If it is just a question of a set of preferences, why have a deliberative committee at all. Just send in recommendations and let the Trustee Committee choose. After all, 5 out of 9 recommendations were not accepted; on another occasion, this might be 8 out of 10. What would limit this?

I'm not certain what can be done about this. Certainly, the Trustees have and should retain authority in awarding Honorary Degrees; somehow or other, however, the consultative role of the Faculty ought to be stronger if the Committee is to be expected to carry on in a serious, deliberative fashion.

—Robert J. Rutman, Professor of Biochemistry

Open Expression

During 1981-1982, the Committee on Open Expression met to consider two issues related to open expression. One issue concerned the Trustees' meeting of January 22, and had to do with what should be considered an adequate level of noise during a demonstration. The other issue dealt with the use of campus facilities by groups that might not be legitimate student organizations from the standpoint of their methods and goals.

The Committee examined both problems and responded accordingly.

—Madeleine Joullie, Chair