

TEN-YEAR FORECAST

The U.S. economy is expected to reach the two-trillion dollar level by 1980—double the one-trillion level it has passed this year, according to economic forecasters at the Wharton School. Their ten-year forecast released this month shows the U.S. Gross National Product in current dollars rising from \$1047.6 billion this year to \$1997.2 billion by the end of 1980.

Predicting the progress for many economic indicators in the next decade, Professors Ross S. Preston and Lawrence R. Klein of the Wharton School's Econometric Forecasting Associates expect GNP to increase about 7 per cent a year in current dollars, while the price level creeps up at only a non-inflating 2.5 to 3 per cent a year. The unemployment rate, now close to the 6 per cent mark, should drop to 4.5 per cent by 1973 and stay close to that for the rest of the decade.

"In human terms, this holds the promise of a decade of peace and welfare—human benefits for almost everybody," Preston said. "Personal disposable income will almost double, total profits will rise, the hours we work will decline, and federal, state and local budgets will have several years when they are balanced. In fact, we see a slight surplus for the federal budget from 1977 through 1980."

To project these figures for the decade, the Wharton economists developed a completely new computerized model of the economy, based on the techniques and the experience gained from the well known model on which they make their quarterly forecasts. The new Annual and Industry Model contains more detailed data and traces the development of all major U.S. industries through a 50 sector input-output table.

NO MAJOR WARS

"To make these projections," Preston pointed out, "we assume that the Vietnam War will wind down and that no major wars will be waged in those ten years. We also assume the federal government will turn more of its attention to reconstructing cities, combatting pollution, and revitalizing our social and economic environment."

The feat of doubling the U.S. economic level in ten years has been accomplished before. In the 1960's the GNP went up from \$500 billion to \$1 trillion. On the other hand, in the 1930's—the time of the Great Depression—GNP made practically no gain for the decade. For the 1940's the GNP more than doubled under the drive for wartime production. The 1950's pushed GNP up but only from \$284 billion to the \$503 billion mark.

Doubling the GNP in the 1960's was accomplished with the Vietnam War production and with a dangerous level of inflation for several years. "The big news in our present forecast is that we ought to be able to do the same thing—double the GNP in ten years—without wasteful war production and without steep price rises which would deprive our citizens of the things they want. This could be possible," the Wharton forecasters emphasize, "because the labor force will expand steadily in the 1970's, the productivity of labor will increase so that unemployment will be kept low and the hours worked will decline throughout the ten years."

Next week, Associate Provost John N. Hobstetter discusses the University's own financial conditions. Almanac is edited by Karen C. Gaines at the University News Bureau, 524 Franklin Building.

IN THIS ISSUE:

- *Senate Elections*
- **FORUM:** *Restructuring the Faculties*
- **OF RECORD:** *Judicial System*
- **COUNCIL:** *By-Laws Amended*
- **TRUSTEES:** *Corporate Responsibility*

Almanac

Volume 17, Number 4

March 31, 1971

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

From the Senate Chairman

Restoring the Faculty Voice in University Decisions

I have been dismayed that, as Chairman of the Senate, I have had no means by which to address the faculty at large with current news or with interpretation of University developments. Faculty members have had no medium for the exchange of opinion. We have been atomized and isolated and our sense of cohesion has been attenuated. In a new Senate section of Almanac we at last achieve a faculty medium, entirely under faculty control. I intend to write to you about University affairs from the Senate point of view. Letters or articles on any matter of faculty interest are solicited. And we shall organize "Forums" on specific issues, followed by write-in polls of faculty opinion.

I think this new means of forming, informing and sampling faculty opinion is an essential innovation. For some fifteen years in the 50's and 60's this faculty worked for the establishment of a system of University governance with strong faculty influence. The Senate was the spearhead in this drive and it was the first instrument of faculty involvement. In 1963 some functions of the Senate were transferred to the University Council. The Council and Senate together were very successful. Although both were only advisory to the President, they provided advice with restraint, care, and deliberate responsibility. A tradition of acceptance of that advice was established, and the advice was seldom or never ignored. The remarkable academic improvement of the University over the last two decades is undoubtedly related to this effective involvement of faculty with University policy.

Unfortunately the system precipitously collapsed two years ago, with the expansion of membership of the Council. Restraint gave way to impatience, and deliberation was replaced by argument. The Council degenerated from a forum to an arena. In its meetings faculty members now speak relatively

(Continued on Page 2)

From the Senate Chairman (Continued)

rarely, having little taste for the stridency of the discussions or for the endemic parliamentary wrangling. The strong force of tradition of acceptance of the advice of Council has been dissipated. The faculty is effectively disenfranchised.

The challenge to faculty is to restore effective faculty involvement in University policy decisions, now.

Unless the Council is restructured drastically, I see little hope in it. The Senate may then resume its erstwhile role. The Senate voice in Almanac is one step, for without a sense of cohesion we are impotent.

There are approximately 1640 members of the Senate. Plenary sessions are not a sufficient means of involvement of the membership in a body of this size. But all will be able to participate through the Forums on topical issues and through the subsequent write-in opinion polls.

The Senate must also consider carefully the advisability of re-instituting Senate committees. Obviously this must be done with great restraint, if at all. Overlap with Council committees would be an enormous burden on faculty time, and a conflict of committees leads only to mutual ineffectiveness. But there may well be areas in which Senate committees can speak strongly for the faculty. The time for total deference to the Council has passed.

SENATE ELECTIONS

My remarks above obviously have implications for the challenge to be confronted by the new officers of the Senate and by the new Senate Advisory Committee. Election of a Chairman-elect and a Secretary-elect of the Senate, of four members of the Senate Advisory Committee, and of two members of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, will take place at the regular Spring Meeting of the Senate (on April 27 at 3:00 P.M., in Room B-6 of Stiteler Hall). The Chairman of the Nominating Committee is Professor Irwin Friend. Send your suggestions or nominations to him immediately; his committee reports this week.

The continuing membership of the Senate Advisory Committee is Professor Henry Abraham, Political Science, (Chairman, 1971-72); Asst. Professor Alan Kors, History, (Secretary, 1971-72); Professor Herbert Callen, Physics, (Chairman, 1970-71); Assoc. Professor John De Cani, Stat. & O/R, (Secretary, 1970-71); Professor James O. Freedman, Law; Professor Harold Ginsberg, Micro. Med.; Professor Britton Harris, City Planning; Professor Paul Rozin, Psychology; Assoc. Professor Paul Taubman, Economics; Assoc. Professor Roger Walmsley, Physics; Assoc. Professor John Wideman, English; Professor Saul Winegrad, Physiology.

The retiring members of the Senate Advisory Committee are Dean Bernard Wolfman, Law, (Chairman, 1969-70); Asst. Professor Ralph Ginsberg, Sociology, (Secretary, 1969-70); Assoc. Professor Malcolm Campbell, History of Art; Professor Robert E. Davies, Molecular & Animal Biology; Professor Murray Gerstenhaber, Mathematics; Professor Ralph Showers, Electrical Engineering.

The continuing members of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility are Professor Orin Burley, Marketing & Internat'l. Business; Professor Stuart Churchill, Chemical Engineering; Professor Julius Halpern, Physics; Professor Donald Langenberg, Physics.

The retiring members are Asst. Professor Helen Davies, Micro. Med., (Chairman 1970-71); Professor Walter Isard, Regional Science; Assoc. Professor Harvey Winston, Psychology.

—Herbert Callen

FORUM

Conducted by the Senate for the Faculty

Restructuring the Faculties

I. IN SUPPORT OF UNIFICATION:

Irving B. Kravis

Most members of the faculty would, I think, subscribe to at least two of the basic propositions that underlie the Task Force recommendations on the restructuring of our faculties at Pennsylvania.

One proposition is that each faculty member should have a part in the decision-making in the program in which he has an important teaching responsibility. The Departments of Economics, Political Science, and Sociology teach about one-fourth of the arts and science student hours, but their members have only token representation in the College Faculty, the decision-making body for the University's arts and sciences program.

A second proposition is that where a substantial group of faculty members has responsibility for more than one degree program it is better to have an organization that faces the jointness of the group's tasks squarely.

In the arts and sciences area, most faculty members are involved in both graduate and undergraduate teaching. They are organized into departments over which the dean of an undergraduate school has budgetary and personnel responsibilities. They do their graduate teaching under the aegis of the graduate school whose dean has little or no voice in the allocation of resources between schools, departments or programs. Decisions regarding graduate and undergraduate programs are obviously interdependent, but the administrative organization of the faculties does not reflect or even recognize this. The organization also fails to make any provision for the jointness of faculty efforts related to inter-disciplinary programs and thus tends to work against such activities. The organization of the faculties should facilitate decision-making rather than obscure it by a separation of responsibilities that have to be exercised by the same people.

AN EXPANDED FACULTY

These two propositions lead, it seems to me, to an expanded arts and sciences faculty which would include the social science departments now in the Wharton School and embrace both undergraduate and graduate education.

These changes alone would be important and constructive, but I believe that there is a compelling case for going further. We should move toward an integrated faculty including all faculty members having a significant responsibility for undergraduate instruction. For reasons given above, this faculty should at the same time be the faculty charged with instruction in graduate arts and sciences programs. The following reasons may be offered in support of integration of undergraduate faculties:

1. Students at Pennsylvania have the right to expect that differences in the degree requirements for the various programs of study will reflect rational consideration by the faculty rather than accidental differences arising out of the organization of

(Continued on Page 6)

The Task Force on University Governance has proposed the integration of the undergraduate faculties into a single Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The suggestion has been opposed by several Faculties and is under debate throughout the campus. After the Senate voted March 9 to call for further study by a broadly representative committee, President Meyerson asked the Senate Advisory Committee to act as such a committee, adding additional members to achieve the required breadth.

To initiate a Forum on this issue, the S.A.C. here presents three viewpoints. Others are invited, and suggestions for alternative action are particularly solicited. All material should be delivered to Almanac, Room 524 Franklin Building.

II. SOME NOTES IN DISSENT: Charles E. Dwyer

One caution concerning the Task Force's recommendations focuses on what could be termed the principle of "maximum magnitude of solution" applied throughout the Report.

Presumably a good solution is one which:

- focuses in on the problem,
- has a high probability of solving it,
- preserves the values of the present system, and
- minimizes the new disutilities introduced into it.

These recommendations violate all these criteria but most blatantly in their unnecessary breadth.

CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES

Unquestionably there are significant problems in both undergraduate and graduate education. Even if there were agreement on the nature of these problems (which there is not) it seems unwise to begin with the proposed solutions which are the most drastic, far-reaching, controversial, and potentially disastrous in their application. Task Force members in their dissents, the Committee of Deans, the ad hoc study committee of the College and an independent group of faculty from across the campus have all proposed far more moderate solutions, tailored to the perceived problems. Many of these suggestions appear to be more effective in improving the University while preserving present values and minimizing new disutilities. It seems prudent to give these alternative proposals consideration and even trial before accepting far more drastic and controversial ones of "maximum magnitude."

Now, let us look in more detail at the arguments and implications attending these recommendations of the Task Force.

The report offers a number of justifications for the integration of undergraduate education. It points out that full time, independent, undergraduate programs are now offered in five separate units of the University and it concludes "It is doubtful that such complete separation serves a useful educational purpose." Also, it is argued, such separation results in different rules which "cannot be justified by varying educational requirements from one school to another."

But it could be counter-argued quite persuasively that the excellence of the Engineering Schools and the Wharton School are very much a function of their autonomy, that the smooth functioning and fine student-faculty relationship established in the College for Women are a function of its autonomy. Such autonomy facilitates experimentation and supports the tailoring of programs to the needs of the times and the desires of the students.

The homogeneity suggested by this recommendation of the Task Force has structural neatness and administrative tidiness but little else. Why should *all* undergraduates of our University be forced to meet the same requirements and have the same experiences?

The burden of proof rests with those who would change the
(Continued on Page 6)

III. A SEARCH FOR ALTERNATIVES:

Albert L. Lloyd

If all the time and effort which was put into the Task Force Report is not to be entirely wasted, it is important that its conclusions should serve as a basis for discussion and planning at all levels in the University Community.

The Committee on the Organization of the College Faculty, of which I am Chairman, after studying the Task Force proposals for the better part of this academic year, has already presented one report to its Faculty and will submit a second at the next meeting. In these we suggest some alternatives, which I shall but outline in broad terms.

But first: one hears it said that we should support the principle of the Task Force proposals even if we reject their specific implementation; yet what is the underlying principle? At least in academic reorganization, it seems to say that 'a sense of *universitas*' is good, 'fragmentation of education' bad. If I were to reword this as 'a monolithic approach to education' versus 'diversity,' I think we could easily reverse the adjectives.

No serious attempt to improve the weaknesses of our structure and at the same time preserve its strengths can or should proceed from any preconceived idea as to the *only* way in which a university should function. The proposal to merge all types of undergraduate education in one faculty is based on the unproved assumption that there is only one acceptable approach to undergraduate education, namely liberal arts. Apart from the practical complications, the proposal would seem to stifle diversity.

AN ADVISORY BODY

Nevertheless, it does seem to be a weakness that there is no body in this University concerned with undergraduate education as a whole; laudable innovations in one school often go unnoticed in others and questions about undergraduate education in a changing world must be asked and answered separately in each school.

One solution would be to create an advisory body (Council on Undergraduate Education), composed of faculty and administrators of each school to coordinate the interrelated activities of the various schools and programs.

The proposal for unification of graduate and undergraduate liberal arts faculties does not raise the question of academic diversity, but only budgetary and administrative *fragmentation*. The line between graduate and undergraduate liberal arts education is a rather artificial one in many ways: the same faculty members are often involved in both, and increasing numbers of undergraduate students are enrolling in primary graduate courses or even submatriculating in the Graduate School.

Certainly the present budgetary structure (or lack of it) relative to graduate programs is unsatisfactory, particularly at a time of financial stress.

Yet at the same time it cannot be overlooked that the existence of a strong, prestigious graduate school is one of the
(Continued on Page 7)

OF RECORD



JUDICIAL SYSTEM FOR THE UNIVERSITY

*Approved by the University Council October 14, 1970
Amended by the University Council March 10, 1971*

I. PURPOSE AND COMPETENCE:

This judicial system shall deal with infractions of the regulations of the University of Pennsylvania *other than those* which allege *academic* dishonesty, e.g., plagiarism and cheating on examinations or papers, by students, or violations of the obligation of the tenets of academic freedom and responsibility by faculty. Among the regulations of the University included under this judicial system are the specific conduct rules contained in the Student Handbook, standards of conduct established by divisions and departments, and the Guidelines on Open Expression.

Whenever it appears, in the judgment of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, that a case at issue involves rights of faculty protected by principles of academic freedom or would interfere with existing professional employment relationships, the charges shall be heard and determined by the appropriate professional body within the University. Whenever it is claimed that rights of academic freedom or professional employment relationships are in jeopardy as a result of action taken by a court in this system, this claim shall be decided by the appropriate professional body without regard to such prior determination under this system.

II. TRIBUNALS:

A. Primary Courts

1. There shall be one court of original jurisdiction in cases involving undergraduate and graduate students, provided, however, that any graduate or professional school may resolve to establish (or continue) its own court of original jurisdiction for its students, not inconsistent with these procedures and guidelines.

2. A judicial pool for the Primary Court shall consist of 24 students (12 graduate and 12 undergraduate), 8 faculty, and 4 administrators. All shall be chosen by appropriate constituency procedures with graduate student representation to be allocated according to the representation on the University Council of each graduate or professional school not maintaining a separate primary court.

3. In the Primary Court, one member of the judicial pool shall be elected to serve as the Administrative Judge. In addition to overseeing operations of the Court, the Administrative Judge shall convene a panel of six members of the judicial pool for each case. Each panel shall consist of 3 students (3 graduate students when the accused is a graduate or 3 undergraduate students when the accused is an undergraduate), 2 faculty, and 1 administrator, any four of whom

shall constitute a quorum. The panel for each case shall select from among its members, at the time of the hearing, a chairman who shall vote only to break a tie.

B. The University Court

1. There shall be one court of *university-wide jurisdiction* to be known as the University Court. It shall have *appellate* jurisdiction over the Primary Court and independent graduate or professional school primary courts. In addition, it shall have *original* jurisdiction in all cases involving faculty or administrators, and all cases involving students from different primary court jurisdictions.

2. A judicial pool for the University Court shall consist of 10 students (5 graduate and 5 undergraduate), 8 faculty, and 4 administrators. The members of the pool shall be designated by the Steering Committee upon the recommendation of the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees shall solicit student nominations from each appropriate constituency which shall be more than the number of judicial pool positions for that constituency, and faculty and administrator nominations from appropriate bodies.

3. The Committee on Committees shall also nominate, and the Steering Committee approve, a President Judge. In addition to overseeing operations of the Court, the President Judge shall convene a panel from members of the judicial pool for each case. Each panel shall consist of the President Judge or his designee, 4 students (2 graduate and 2 undergraduate), 3 faculty, and 1 administrator, any six of whom shall constitute a quorum. The President Judge, or his designee, shall serve as chairman of the panel and shall vote only to break a tie.

C. The *final court of appeal* shall be the person of the President of the University, or in his absence, the Provost.

D. Where an accused has been acquitted, there shall be no appeal. In all cases on appeal from a lower court, findings of fact shall not be reconsidered. Review shall be limited to the existence of guilt, degree of punishment, and procedural error.

III. SANCTIONS:

Where a panel judges an accused guilty, the following sanctions may be imposed: warning (reprimand), probation, term suspension (not longer than two years), or indefinite suspension (not less than two years).

In addition, financial restitution, within a period fixed by the panel, may be required in all instances involving financial damage.

Substantive punishments, such as withdrawal of privileges (e.g., use of certain facilities in part or in whole) may also be imposed in all instances involving misuse of such facilities.

Enforcement of sanctions shall be the responsibility of the appropriate deans and/or administrators.

IV. GENERAL PROCEDURES:

A. Written complaints may be filed by any member of the University community with the Office of the Judicial Clerk, who shall inform the Administrative Judge or President Judge of the court which has jurisdiction. That Judge shall consult with two members of the court's judicial pool to determine whether there is a reasonable probability that an offense has occurred which falls under the jurisdiction of the judicial system. Upon such a finding and at least three full weekdays prior to the date chosen for the hearing, the Clerk shall send to the accused by registered mail, return receipt, the following a) a copy of the charges; b) the time and location of the hearing; c) the names of the panel members who shall hear the case; and d) a copy of this Article (IV) on General Procedures and any additional relevant procedures. Mailing all of this information shall be deemed adequate notice to the accused of his rights. At the same time, the Administrative Judge or President Judge shall designate one of the two consulting pool members to present relevant information about the case (e.g., witnesses, documents, and evidence) to the panel at the time of the hearing.

B. Judicial pool members may disqualify themselves from hearing a case, at their discretion, but must do so when they believe, in good faith, that they are incapable of making an objective judgment in the case. The Administrative Judge or President Judge shall not appoint as members of a panel to hear a case those two members of the pool who were consulted about that case under the provisions of Article IV (A).

C. At any time after receipt of notice from the Clerk under Article IV (A), but not less than 24 hours before the hearing is scheduled, an accused may, by writing to the Clerk, object, for specified cause, to any panel member assigned to hear the case. If the Administrative Judge or President Judge accepts the challenge as valid, he shall then replace the challenged member from the Court's remaining judicial pool.

D. All hearings shall be held in appropriate University facilities (e.g., the Bishop White Room or the Franklin Room of Houston Hall) and shall be private unless the accused informs the Clerk in writing at least 24 hours in advance of the hearing that accused desires an open hearing.

E. The accused may be accompanied by an advisor of his choice who may address the Court. At the hearing, witnesses may be questioned by either the accused or the accused's advisor, but not by both. The University may, in its judgment, avail itself of counsel.

F. Proceedings shall be taped. Tapes shall be retained by the Office of the Judicial Clerk and shall be available only to the accused and others authorized by the Administrative Judge or President Judge. Tapes will be erased one year after final disposition of the case, unless accused requests preservation for another year by writing to the Clerk.

In Evolution:

A COMMON JUDICIARY FOR THE CAMPUS

The lack of a University-wide judicial system and standards led to the appointment in June, 1970, of an *ad hoc* committee of the University Council Steering Committee. Members of the committee represented the three segments of the University community: students (Gregory D. Keeney, Law 1971, and David Silvers, College 1971); faculty (Dr. Henry J. Abraham, Political Science, and Dr. Paul M. Lloyd, Romance Languages); and administration (Mrs. Alice F. Emerson, Dean of Students). The Committee proposed a Judicial System which was debated and approved by Council in October, 1970, and amended in March, 1971.

A philosophy of shared community is reflected in the structure of the new system. Students, faculty, and administrators are, for many purposes, part of one University community subject to certain common rules and regulations. For this reason, the committee proposed that all segments of the University community be included under the jurisdiction of this system. Similarly, all judicial bodies comprising the system are constituted from among all three segments of the University community.

SAFEGUARDS

Of equal importance in the new judicial system is the significant expansion of the procedural safeguards which are guaranteed to an accused member of the University community. Although Federal and State constitutional standards have been held not to require that many of these rights be provided in intra-University proceedings, the committee believed strongly that such protection should be afforded an accused and that failure to do so is to deny the due process and equal protection to which every member of this community, as a member of the community, is entitled. In addition, strong and explicit safeguards of academic freedom and of professional employment relationships have been incorporated.

The Judicial System is a flexible one in the sense that it can be adapted to meet the changing needs of the University community. Already the University Traffic Court has been incorporated into the System, and proposals are presently being considered to establish a voluntary arbitration procedure to resolve disputes between students in which the University has no direct interest. The System is also a mechanism by which University rules and regulations are being updated and revised.

After being accepted by the University Council in October, 1970, and approved by President Meyerson shortly thereafter, the University Judicial System began operation on the first of January, 1971. As recommended in the Judicial System Report, an independent Office of the Judicial Clerk was established to administer the entire System. Operating in the Office of the Secretary of the Corporation, Dr. Richard W. Sherman, Assistant Secretary of the Corporation, implements the provisions of the Judicial System Report and handles the daily operations of the System.

The Senate Advisory Committee has specified that nominations of faculty members to the Judicial pools shall be by random selection. Student members are nominated by the Community of Students. Administration members are nominated through the Administrative Assembly.

—Office of the Judicial Clerk

FORUM CONTINUED: On Restructuring the Faculties

I. KRAVIS (Continued)

the faculties. At the present time, for example, a Wharton student concentrating in marketing or in economics needs 40 course units to graduate, while a College student majoring in mathematics or in economics needs 32. Many of the courses taken by the two sets of students are identical, but the College student receives in effect 25 percent more credit toward his degree for each course than the Wharton student. Such accounting considerations should not, of course, be the sole or even dominant criterion, and it may be that there are sound educational reasons for these differences. However, without any overall faculty structure to consider the programs, no one can say authoritatively whether there are such reasons or not.

2. The faculty members concerned with undergraduate education should be organized so that they can consider educational problems that transcend the scope of any subset of faculty members. There are, now, and are likely to be in the future, important university-wide problems (admissions policies, for a current example) and there is no university-wide faculty to deliberate upon them, to respond to student needs and proposals, or to guide the Administration. In the absence of such a faculty, other groups have sometimes filled the gap. The undergraduate deans, for example, met and considered the position of black studies. While this may have been a justifiable recognition of the fact that the issue did not fall solely within the province of any one of the schools, it was properly the business of the kind of University arts and sciences faculty contemplated in the Task Force proposals. The Senate also has and should consider some of these issues, but the Senate is not and should not be a decision-making body with respect to curricular and related affairs; that is the role of a faculty, organized as an integral part of the operation of the University.

3. An integrated arts and sciences faculty in which faculty of the professional schools would have membership in proportion to their contribution to the teaching burdens in undergraduate programs and in graduate arts and sciences programs would strengthen undergraduate programs in professional fields such as business and engineering. The presence of the social science departments in the Wharton School, for example, has contributed to an important degree to improvements in the undergraduate business curriculum. With respect to engineering, a faculty committee at M.I.T. recently reached a similar conclusion. (See *Creative Renewal in a Time of Crisis*, Report of the Commission on M.I.T. Education, November 1970, p. 18.) It proposed that the first two years of undergraduate education should be the responsibility of the entire faculty (consisting of the Schools of Engineering, Science, Humanities and Social Science, Management, and Architecture and Planning).

These are the benefits. What are the costs? There are two major objections that have received a good deal of attention in campus debate and discussion.

One is that the faculty so created would be large and unwieldy. Larger size is undoubtedly a disadvantage, as the Task Force Report squarely recognized. What has been overlooked, however, is that most of the increase in size of the proposed Faculty of Arts and Sciences over the size of the present College Faculty would come from the addition of the departments of Economics, Political Science, and Sociology. To this degree, the question is not one of smaller size versus larger size, but whether those responsible for teaching one-fourth of the course units taken by college undergraduates

should continue to be excluded substantially from the decision-making process. The faculty teaching arts and sciences is already larger than the College faculty. It is too late to retain whatever advantages there are in the smaller size of the present College faculty without perpetuating an injustice. In any event, arts and sciences faculties at other leading universities, in some instances, are substantially larger than the faculty contemplated in the Task Force Report, and it is doubtful that an inverse correlation would be found among major institutions between faculty size and any important aspect of educational quality.

A second objection concerns an alleged loss of diversity in education, and the fear of centralization of power in the hands of a single undergraduate faculty. No one has, however, pointed to any evidence of undue pressure upon departments by existing faculties. Nor has anyone suggested any reason for expecting that a faculty enlarged from 500 to approximately 700 would suddenly prove more authoritarian than the existing faculties in their relations with individual departments and programs. The proposed arrangement would simply give the faculty of this University concerned with undergraduate education the right to make decisions about undergraduate education. If that faculty desires diversification and experimentation, there is no reason why such diversity and experimentation cannot be achieved. Indeed, the diversity of membership is in itself the best guarantee against the establishment of a lock-step in undergraduate education.

I believe that as the Pennsylvania faculty considers these issues, there will be a growing degree of support for a movement toward the integration of undergraduate faculties. The Senate resolution of March 9 calling for the establishment of a widely-based committee on the integration question was a constructive step. I hope that the committee will carry on discussions with the individual schools about methods of implementing the basic ideas in the Task Force proposal. The engineering faculty, in particular, poses a problem. It has expressed its opposition to a unified faculty forcefully and with a high degree of unanimity. I think this is a mistake from the standpoint of engineering education and from the point of view of the university. I hope that the engineering faculty can be persuaded to change their view, but if they do not, I think we should make a start without them. While it would be very regrettable to lose them, even for a time, it would not be right to allow a part of the University that enrolls less than 500 out of the nearly 7000 undergraduates to impede the establishment of a better faculty organization to meet the tasks and problems of today and tomorrow.

To a large extent, the issue turns in the final analysis on the confidence and trust one places in the faculty. I have confidence in the ability of the faculty of this University to govern itself well and with due regard to the rights and needs of its component groups.

II. DWYER (Continued)

system. Their only response is that we must choose between a professional undergraduate focus and a liberal pre-professional one. They clearly have chosen what they call 'liberal'. They pose a false dilemma on two grounds. First it suggests that professional undergraduate education as it presently exists, is or must be illiberal (and presumably that one *can* have a 'liberal' education without exposure to engineering and business) and secondly it attempts to force a choice where no choice is required. An outstanding University such as ours can certainly stress and sustain high quality undergraduate

programs in professional areas *as well as* in the traditional arts and sciences disciplines.

In what must stand as a paradigm of the *non sequitur* the Report argues that in order to *preserve* these sources of strength (Engineering and Wharton) we must submerge them in a single monolithic undergraduate faculty.

The Report tries to suggest that this integration of undergraduate education will help everyone and hurt no one, yet this recommendation has been rejected by the Committee of Deans, the Engineering faculty (unanimously), the Faculty of the College, a group of faculty members from across the University, and by members of the Task Force. It also flies in the face of student demands for more *decentralization*.

If there are genuine educational needs for more coordination and cooperation among the various undergraduate programs in the University then such coordination and cooperation should be worked out voluntarily among those autonomous units. The Office of the Provost is the appropriate agent to facilitate such efforts. If on the other hand the Task Force recommendation were implemented we would have a façade of homogeneity masking an unmanageable structure under a centralized authority attempting to impose common patterns on unwilling faculty and students.

The recommendation concerning the establishment of a Faculty of Arts and Sciences with responsibility for all undergraduate degrees, Masters degrees in Arts and Sciences and the Ph.D. at least speaks to specific, real problems. The complex and generally unsatisfactory relationships of graduate groups to the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the frequent lack of coordination among graduate groups and the budgetary difficulties that result from the relationships of undergraduate and graduate programs are real and significant problems. The questions are: Is the Task Force recommendation likely to deal effectively with these problems? Are less drastic or more effective remedies available? What are the possible negative consequences of any of these solutions?

This Task Force recommendation also demonstrates a penchant for homogeneity over heterogeneity. The comments of the author(s) of this recommendation indicate that autonomy in student selection, size of program, program requirements, and overall quality of program should all be subject to much tighter centralized control. Such concepts go completely counter to the strongest ideas of how one builds outstanding graduate education, i.e., select the best faculty possible and provide them with maximum autonomy.

The Task Force report acknowledges the need for strong staff in building a strong graduate department but then goes on to recommend that much greater power in personnel decisions be given to the Dean of this proposed seven hundred plus faculty in order that such decisions be made with more adequate data and perspective. Is the quality of graduate programs actually going to improve by moving the power for such decisions from the faculty and chairmen of the graduate groups to this Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences?

It is also interesting to note that this principle of autonomy is (inadvertently) applied to the professional schools at the graduate level by the Task Force recommendation. Professional graduate degree programs would be isolated from the rest of the University and allowed to do as they pleased as long as they do not offer programs leading to the M.A., M.S., or Ph.D.). It is as if the Ph.D. must have its integrity and purity preserved by ensuring that it be offered only through a single mold under the tight control of a centralized authority.

According to the report, professional schools must be integrated at the undergraduate level and segregated at the graduate level. The logic of this arrangement is difficult to grasp.

The prices to be paid for implementation of this Task Force recommendation are:

- (1) An unworkable faculty organization.
- (2) A substantial increase in centralized power.
- (3) The merging of undergraduate and graduate education even further (except in the case of graduate professional programs) probably at the expense of graduate education without corresponding gains at the undergraduate level.
- (4) Rigidity, inflexibility, lack of experimentation and 'leveling' at the graduate level.
- (5) Isolation of professional graduate education from the rest of graduate education.
- (6) Inability of professional schools to offer the Ph.D. with implications for the University in terms of its attracting power, prestige and influence.

If one adds to this the availability of viable alternatives which are far more moderate and far more likely to achieve the desired results without paying the prices indicated above (see Task Force dissents on this recommendation and the report of the College Committee on the Task Force Report) then this recommendation of the Task Force is completely without merit.

III. LLOYD (*Continued*)

major attractions of a great university, and any change—no matter how desirable from a practical point of view—is undesirable if it undermines or even gives the impression of undermining this strength.

The Task Force Proposal, as stated, does give this impression—an unintended one, I am sure, but none the less dangerous. On the other hand, attempts to reinforce the largely artificial boundaries between graduate and undergraduate education—such as various proposals to give the Graduate School a separate budget—would in my opinion be no more constructive.

By using the Task Force proposal as a basis can we not find a way to eliminate its defects and retain its virtues?

One possibility would be to create a Faculty of Arts and Sciences which would bring together all departments and graduate groups offering programs in arts and sciences, no matter where they may now be located (as proposed by the Task Force), but to model it on the structure of most departments today. At its head would be an administrator on the same high level as the chief administrative officers of other major divisions of the University, such as Medical Affairs, who would have budgetary and administrative responsibility. He would be assisted by an undergraduate Dean (or Deans) and a Graduate Dean, who would have administrative responsibility in their areas and would participate with the chief administrator in budgetary and personnel matters. For the sake of historical continuity, even titles such as Dean of the College, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences, could be retained for these offices.

The professional schools which now offer Ph.D. programs through the GSAS would offer their own Ph.D. degrees, with an advisory body (Council on Graduate Education), composed of faculty and administrators of each school, to coordinate interrelated activities and establish minimum standards for the Ph.D.

These proposals appear in greater detail in the reports of our committee. They are not given as representing the only alternatives to the Task Force Report, but as examples of the possibilities that exist to change creatively, without destroying what we have that is good.

THE COUNCIL

AMENDMENT TO BY-LAWS

At a special meeting March 24, the University Council adopted the March 10 Steering Committee amendment to the By-laws, with a further amendment (*italicized below*) so that Article II (1) shall read:

Membership

- (a) Twenty-seven fully affiliated faculty members, elected by mutually exclusive constituencies composed of all fully-affiliated faculty with the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, all tenured faculty holding other ranks, and those eligible to vote pursuant to 11, 2, (b), (i), as follows:

	Current Number	
College*	7	12
Grad. School of Arts & Sciences	1	2 (estimated)
Wharton	4	8
Medicine	4	8
Law	1	1
Engineering	2	3
Dental	1	1.5 (estimated)
Veterinary	1	1.5 (estimated)
Nursing	1	.5 (estimated)
Allied Medical Professions	1	.5 (estimated)
Fine Arts	1	1
Education	1	.5 (estimated)
Annenberg	1	.5 (estimated)
Social Work	1	1

In all cases where more than one representative is to be elected (College, Wharton, Medicine, Engineering, and Dental) mutually exclusive constituencies shall be established by the faculties involved by vote of the members of the respective faculties.

Individuals holding administrative posts above the rank of department chairman shall not be eligible under the provision. If a constituency representative assumes such rank during his term of office, he shall be considered to have resigned as a constituency representative. In such a case, he shall be replaced in accordance with the provisions of Article II, Section 5.

- (b) Thirteen representatives of the faculty at large, who shall be the Chairman, Chairman-elect, Past Chairman, Secretary, Secretary-elect, and the eight members of the Advisory Committee of the University Senate who have served the first year of their three-year term on the Advisory Committee of the Senate.
- (c) Four (six) fully-affiliated Assistant Professors, selected by the steering Committee from nominations to be offered by the several constituencies. The Steering Committee shall select the Assistant Professors for membership on the Council from fully-

*With a Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the College and Graduate School constituencies would very likely be merged. Slight adjustments might be necessary in Council proportions, depending upon the number of faculty with voting rights in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences from the various professional schools. Preliminary estimates indicate this would not change significantly the scheme of representation proposed.

affiliated faculty members of that rank who have been fully affiliated, at the time of their selection, less than six years.

- (d) Twelve administrative officers, including the President, the Provost, and ten members of the administration to be appointed annually by the President, at least five of whom shall be Deans of Faculties.

All Deans and appropriate academic administrators other than those appointed to membership in Council may attend Council as non-voting participants, as may such non-academic administrators as the President of the University may invite.

- (e) Seventeen full-time undergraduate and graduate-professional students, as follows:

Undergraduate schools and colleges—9 students

Five (to be elected from mutually exclusive constituencies to be established by the student government) and At large (one of these four may be the principal officer of the student government, ex officio.)

Graduate and graduate-professional schools—10 students

With the understanding that the graduate and professional schools' student representatives will determine together the precise distribution among the schools.

NOTE: According to Professor Julius Wishner, chairman of the Task Force's Subcommittee on Legislative Function, it was the intent of the Subcommittee that faculty members in Military Science, Naval ROTC and Physical Education be appointed to appropriate faculties so that they will become members of constituencies.

THE TRUSTEES

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

Bernard G. Segal, Chairman of the Trustees Committee on Corporate Responsibility, has named to the committee:

Charles D. Dickey, Jr., president of Scott Paper Company.

John W. Eckman, president of Rorer-Amchem, Inc.

Judge A. Leon Higginbotham, of the U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Carl Kaysen, director of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.

Donald T. Regan, president of Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith.

Mrs. Marietta Endicott Peabody Tree, partner of Llewellyn-Davies Associates, New York City, city planning and health planning consultants.

Mr. Segal is chairman and senior partner of the Philadelphia law firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis and immediate past president of the American Bar Association.

Formation of the Committee on Corporate Responsibility was announced in January. Its initial meeting is scheduled Thursday, April 8.

In response to inquiries he has received, Mr. Segal announced that the University had sold 33,693 shares of General Motors Corporation common stock during the period extending from April 27, 1970, through March 18, 1971, at a net gain of \$1,597,270.77. Accordingly, the University's holding of General Motors common stock has been reduced to 272 shares which are being held in accordance with the terms of a life income arrangement.