

---

# NEWS IN BRIEF

---

## COUNCIL REALIGNMENT

All Deans of schools and colleges were advised this week by the Office of the Secretary of the Council of the new allocation of faculty seats and of new expiration dates for many present representatives.

In line with recommendations of the Task Force on University Governance, the Council endorsed a change in its By-laws on March 24 to reduce faculty representation from 39 to 27 fully-affiliated faculty members from mutually-exclusive constituencies. (See Almanac March 31.)

Instead of electing a third of the Council's membership each year for three-year terms, the faculty will now elect half the membership each year for two-year terms.

To prepare for the first election this month, each school or college which will have more than one representative must design its own plan for apportionment of the seats allotted in the amended By-laws.

Partial text of the Secretary's letter to the Deans is on Page 8.

## SENATE SLATE FOR APRIL 27

The nominating committee of the Senate has proposed the following slate of candidates for office in 1971-72:

For Chairman-elect: Professor Jean B. Crockett, Finance.

For Secretary-elect: Professor E. J. Lawson Soulsby, Parasitology.

For membership on the Senate Advisory Committee:

Professor Robert Mundheim, Law;

Professor Louis A. Girifalco, Metallurgy;

Associate Professor Phoebe Leboy, Biochemistry (Dental Medicine);

Professor Murray G. Murphey, American Civilization.

For membership on the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility:

Associate Professor Stephen R. Goldstein, Law;

Associate Professor Louis Shoemaker, Social Work.

Continuing members of the Senate Advisory Committee and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility are listed in the March 31 issue of Almanac.

The Senate election will be held at the regular Spring meeting Tuesday, April 27, at 3 p.m. in Room B-6, Stiteler Hall.

## HUMAN RESOURCES BOARD

A new Human Resources Board has been established by the National Research Council to make a broad survey of national education and manpower problems, and to select specific areas for in-depth study.

Paul J. Taubman, Associate Professor of Economics at the Wharton School, is one of ten members appointed to the board by Philip Handler, President of the National Academy of Sciences. The chairman is Robert W. Morse, former President of Case Western Reserve University.

The group will consider a wide range of studies, including an evaluation of social and economic returns on higher

(Continued on Page 6)

## IN THIS ISSUE:

- COLLEGE: *Call to Meeting*  
*Committee on Organization Report*
- SCUE *Report Summary*
- COUNCIL: *Status of Women (Part I)*
- ASSEMBLY: *Elections*  
*Salary Survey*
- COUNCIL: *Call to Meeting*  
*Realignment of Constituencies*

---

# Almanac

Volume 17, Number 6

April 13, 1971

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

---

## INDEPENDENT STUDY

At least 260 course offerings have been submitted for the College's independent study program next fall in response to a letter asking for volunteers in both the graduate and undergraduate faculties.

Offering to teach accredited courses without additional compensation were 42 full professors, 25 associate professors and 35 assistant professors, College Vice Dean Peter Conn said. Fourteen of the volunteers are academic administrators—deans, directors, chairmen and graduate-group chairmen—and several hold chairs and other honors.

For the 129 courses suggested by 43 College faculty members, there is no accreditation problem, Dr. Conn said. For the rest, the College's Committee on Instruction is preparing a proposal to allow credit in the College for courses taught in non-College departments.

Twenty members of the School of Medicine Faculty suggested 39 courses, ranging from socially-oriented (sociology of medicine; delivery of health care; communication between physicians, nurses, teachers and community) to basic courses in genetics, pathology, electrochemical research and the like.

Thirteen Wharton School Faculty members contributed 36 course ideas, many of them geared to marketing and consumer problems, urban development, and public policy—but not excluding such topics as accounting theory and applied mathematics.

In the Engineering Schools, seven faculty members created 13 course titles, many of them interdisciplinary (engineering for developing countries, mathematical models of social and biological systems) and many in the environmental trend: (pollution control, transportation engineering).

Six members of the Animal Biology Department at the School of Veterinary Medicine; four in Landscape Architecture and two in City Planning at the Graduate School of Fine Arts; four in Oriental Studies at the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and members of the faculties of the School of Social Work, Graduate School of Education, School of Allied Medical Professions and Annenberg School complete the faculty roster. A list of the 100-plus teachers and the 260 courses they devised is available from Dr. Conn in Room 16 of College Hall.

---

# THE COLLEGE

---

## CALL TO MEETING

A special meeting of the College Faculty has been called for Tuesday, April 13, by Dean William E. Stephens, to discuss three innovative programs planned for the Fall. Presentations to be made:

- Hill Hall Freshman Residence Program—Dr. Robert M. Zemsky and Dr. Burton Rosner;
- Van Pelt House—Dr. Richard Solomon and Dr. Mark Adams; and
- The Experimental College—Dr. Joel Conarroe and Dr. Peter Conn.

The meeting will begin at 11 a.m. in Room 200 College Hall.

---

## SCUE REPORT SUMMARY

The 50-page report of the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education (SCUE) is now available in printed form at the SCUE Office, 17 College Hall, and at the Community of Students' Office, Houston Hall.

The Report summarizes its 25 key recommendations in admissions, freshman education, educational opportunities and faculty roles as follows:

### **Admissions:** *We recommend . . .*

1. . . a reduction in the size of the freshman class to a range of 1600-1700.
2. . . that increased reliance on academic indicators not be allowed to reduce the representation of minority, high personal or Commonwealth students.
3. . . the use of student-faculty academic recruitment teams.
4. . . the establishment of a Commonwealth Parkway School at the University.
5. . . the phased attrition of over-staffed departments.

### **Freshman Year:** *We recommend . . .*

6. . . that a pre-freshman advising office staffed by students be established in every academic division.
7. . . the use of senior faculty in introductory courses.
8. . . the use of videotape for all introductory and other large lectures.
9. . . the establishment of a videotape and film library for collateral use of taped guest lectures and interviews.
10. . . the formation of interdisciplinary introductory seminars to be used in partial completion of distributional requirements.
11. . . the optional use of a pass/no credit grading for the entire freshman year.
12. . . the establishment of academic programs in all freshman residences.
13. . . the creation of a Central Advising Office, charged with sponsoring freshman seminars on the methods of education available.

### **Educational Opportunities:** *We recommend . . .*

14. . . the establishment of a variety of residential education centers whose number should depend solely upon student interest levels.

(Continued on Page 8)

*Voting in Progress:*

## COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION RECOMMENDS F.A.S.

### 1. *INTEGRATION OF UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE LIBERAL ARTS FACULTIES.*

(Task Force Recommendations 25-30, pp. 38-50)

This Committee, as appointed and constituted by the College Faculty, is primarily concerned with matters relating to undergraduate education. Undergraduate and graduate liberal arts education are, however, so intimately interrelated both for faculty and students that any consideration of the organization of the College Faculty must also take into account the organization of graduate education and its relation to the undergraduate sector.

The Committee supports the principle of a more rational administrative structure for graduate education, as advocated by the Task Force. We recognize that, in contrast to the departments in the College, the graduate groups are only loosely bound together by the tenuous framework of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, which has little budgetary or other control over them (with the exception of a few departments). At the same time, those groups with home departments in a particular school are much more closely connected with that school than with the GSAS. Particularly at a time of financial stress, when every area of the University is competing for available resources, budgetary responsibility for the graduate sector seems to be dangerously tenuous.

On the other hand, the Task Force recommendations, as formulated, without any further specification as to the relationship between graduate and undergraduate programs, may tend to give the impression of weakening the status and prestige of graduate education at this University, by combining it with undergraduate education in one undifferentiated unit. We realize that this was not the intention of the Task Force, but believe that such an impression, whether justified or not, must be taken into account, since it is especially the quality of our graduate teaching and research which attracts top faculty and students and enhances our strength and reputation on all levels.

We accordingly submit a somewhat modified version of the Task Force recommendations, not as representing the only alternative, but as an example of what we believe to be a workable and preferable system.

1. We recommend that a Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) be created, with responsibility for all undergraduate and graduate degrees in liberal arts fields. (Note that in Part I of this report the Committee opposed the integration of undergraduate liberal arts and professional education in the manner proposed by the Task Force.)

2. The FAS should be headed by an administrative officer of a rank, title, and status comparable to the chief administrators of other major divisions of the University, such as the Medical Sector. Since this matter is at present under discussion, it is inappropriate to present a firm recommendation; however, we would tentatively suggest that a combined title such as Vice-Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (hereafter simply referred to as Dean of FAS), might be a satisfactory solution, if a similar arrangement were arrived at for other divisions of the University.

The Dean of FAS would have budgetary and administrative responsibility for the entire Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

3. The Dean of FAS would be assisted by an undergraduate Dean (or Deans; see below) and a graduate Dean, who would have administrative responsibility in their areas, and

would participate with the Dean of FAS in budgetary and personnel matters.

The organization of the FAS would thus be modelled on the organization of most departments today, i.e., a single faculty under one overall administrator, assisted by separate administrators for undergraduate and graduate programs. We believe this arrangement would permit a great degree of flexibility; the undergraduate sector, for example, could be administered by a single Dean (in the event of a merger of the College and College for Women\*), or, if so desired, by several, representing different units (e.g. College for Women, some type of experimental college, etc.).

The exact titles of the undergraduate and graduate Deans need not be specified here; however, it is suggested that some degree of historical continuity could be retained by using such titles as: Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

4. We propose that the FAS should bring together all departments and graduate groups offering programs in the arts and sciences, whether they are now located in the College, the GSAS, or elsewhere.

Accordingly, the Committee feels that it would be appropriate for the social science departments (Economics, Political Science, Regional Science, Sociology), now located in the Wharton School, to be included in the FAS. Although we recognize that this may present practical difficulties, such a move would seem to us desirable, in view of the common interests of the faculty of those departments and other departments included in the FAS, and in view of the fact that the overwhelming majority of undergraduate students taking courses in these departments are registered in the College and College for Women.

5. Since this plan, like the Task Force proposal, would divorce the graduate professional programs from those in arts and sciences, the problem of graduate professional degrees presents itself. There are two alternatives: either the professional schools would have to offer their own professional degrees, or it would be necessary to grant them the authority to offer a Ph.D. degree. The former is considered undesirable by the professional schools. We recommend the latter, though we recognize that it could lead to disparities in the Ph.D. degrees given by different schools. In order to guard against this danger and to retain some of the spirit of cooperation produced by the GSAS, we propose the formation of a Council on Graduate Education, consisting of several elected faculty members representing each school offering graduate programs leading to the Ph.D., as well as the Dean, Assistant Dean, or other administrative officer responsible for graduate programs in each school (ex officio). This Council would act in an advisory capacity and would concern itself with recommending minimum standards for the Ph.D.

The Committee therefore presents the following recommendations:

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** The Committee recommends that the College Faculty approve in principle the formation of a Faculty of Arts and Sciences with responsibility for all undergraduate and graduate degrees in liberal arts fields; however, this principle should not be implemented in such a way as to endanger the quality and prestige of graduate education at this University.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** The Committee recommends that the specific proposals 1-5 above be endorsed by the College Faculty and transmitted to the Administration for consideration.

\*The Committee has under consideration the status of the College for Women and hopes to present a recommendation shortly.

---

*The foregoing section of the report of the Committee on Organization (Albert Lloyd, Chairman) was adopted by the College Faculty on April 6, with an amendment to Recommendation 2 to read "... the specific proposals 1-4 ..." The fifth proposal was returned to committee. The section on Improvement of Undergraduate Education, below, will come before the College Faculty on April 20.*

---

## II. IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION.

Regardless of the future organization of the Faculties and Schools of the University, the Committee is aware of the fact that there is a need right now for some improvement in undergraduate education, and wishes to propose two recommendations which could be implemented now, and could also be of value if a reorganization such as that proposed above were put into effect.

1. The Committee believes that the best way to approach the real problems of undergraduate liberal arts education in a changing world is first to put our own house in order and then to encourage increased cooperation in undergraduate education at the university-wide level. The College, as the largest and most central unit devoted to undergraduate liberal arts education, should lead the way in exploring new avenues. The Committee on Instruction has performed heroically in attempting to add to its primary function of course and program approval also the added burden of considering the directions which education should take. Yet this Committee is designed primarily to react to proposals from the departments or other sources rather than to initiate new ideas of its own. Further, it has undeniably become overloaded and overworked. A new body is necessary, whose sole mandate would be to concern itself with the major concepts of undergraduate liberal education, and to present imaginative proposals to the Faculty, thus freeing the Committee on Instruction to perform the task for which it was created. Two important areas of activity of this Committee, for example, would be the development of proposals for revising the educational programs of the first two years, and the encouragement of interdepartmental cooperation and programs.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** The Committee recommends the establishment of a Standing Committee on Undergraduate Education in the Arts and Sciences, to concern itself with the basic structure of undergraduate liberal arts education, with special emphasis on: 1) the educational program of the first two years, and 2) inter-departmental programs. This Committee would be constituted at first as a College Committee, but with representation also invited from those departments in Wharton School and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences which offer undergraduate programs.

2. To encourage closer liaison and interchange of ideas among the various Faculties offering undergraduate programs, a body similar to the proposed Council on Graduate Education (see I, 5, above) should be established for undergraduate education.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:** The Committee recommends that the Faculty support the establishment of a Council on Undergraduate Education, consisting of several elected faculty members representing each school offering undergraduate programs, as well as the Dean, Assistant Dean, or other administrative officer responsible for undergraduate programs in each school (ex officio). This Council would act in an advisory capacity and coordinate the inter-related activities of the various schools (such as admissions, accreditation of programs involving more than one school, etc.)



## From the Committee on the Status of Women:

# Women Faculty in the University of Pennsylvania: Part One

Mildred Cohn, chairman; R. Jean Brownlee, Helen Davies, Alice F. Emerson, Virginia Henderson, Theodore Hornberger, Robert C. Jones, Madeleine Joulie, Phoebe Leboy, Johanna Lieb and Martha Mueller, members.

March 23, 1971

The ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women was established on May 8, 1970, by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Council. Among its charges were:

- (1) to collect information on the representation of women in the various disciplines, both for the current year and for previous years;
- (2) to solicit the views of members of the University community on possible discrimination in appointments and promotions because of sex;
- (3) to study the percentage of women in academic positions by rank and discipline, and to compare it with that prevailing in comparable universities;
- (4) to make recommendations to ensure an equitable representation of women on the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania.

The Committee has confined its investigation almost wholly to the problem of the status of faculty women. Other groups of women in the University community, particularly those employed in non-faculty positions and the large number of women seeking professional degrees, have a strong interest in the elimination of discrimination because of sex. The Committee has been aware of this concern, but its charges and its lack of time, staff and financing have led it to focus its attention upon the woman teacher and scholar, holder of the Ph.D. degree and entitled to equal opportunity for employment in fair competition, equal compensation with men for the same work and equal honor and respect.

## The National Picture

The Committee has worked with full awareness of the charges of discrimination lodged with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare by the Women's Equity Action League against, according to the *Saturday Review* for March 20, 1971, "245 institutions, including the entire university systems of New York City, New York State and California." "In general," the same source affirms, "the higher the professional rank and the greater the institutional prestige, the greater the likelihood of discrimination against women. At large prestigious universities, the percentage of women faculty members averages less

than 10 percent, while at small four-year and two-year colleges, women comprise up to 40 percent of the faculty. Nationwide, including all kinds of institutions, women comprise only 8 percent of the full professors, 15 percent of the associate professors and 19 percent of the assistant professors."

A 1963 study by the United States Office of Education estimated that 11 percent of the full-time faculty in large universities were women. The corresponding estimate for the University of Pennsylvania in 1970, arrived at by laborious efforts to identify fully-affiliated individuals, is 12 percent. Data produced in a recent study at the University of Chicago showed that women constituted 6 percent of the regular teaching faculty in the professorial ranks, compared to 7 percent at Pennsylvania. However, Chicago has no School of Nursing and it is not clear whether or not that study distinguished between fully- and partially-affiliated faculty. In general, however, it seems certain that our situation conforms to a national pattern for large, private universities.

## The Pennsylvania Profile

The general picture which emerges from the data detailed below is a familiar one resembling other universities. In particular,

(1) there are very few women on the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania: only 7 percent of the fully-affiliated faculty at the professorial level are women. For the College, the single largest school,\* the figure is only 5.7 percent.

(2) women are concentrated in the lowest ranks and represent 2.5 percent of the full professors, 7.0 percent of the associate professors and 12.7 percent of the assistant professors. Again, the trend is more striking in the College: full professors include 164 men and 0 women; associate professors, 64 men and 3 women; and assistant professors, 101 men and 17 women.

(3) there are 14 academic departments with zero women members which should have on the average more than two on the basis of the percentage of women Ph.D.'s available.

\* Excluding the School of Medicine which is larger because of its clinical faculty.

(Continued on Page 6)

### Appendix I

Distribution of Fully-Affiliated Faculty, Professorial Ranks, By School, Rank, and Sex

School	Prof.		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total		% Fem.
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Allied Medical	0	1	0	4	1	3	1	8	(88.9)
Annenberg	7	0	2	0	3	0	12	0	(0.0)
Graduate A. & S.	10	0	15	1	17	1	42	2	(4.5)
College	164	0	64	3	101	17	329	20	(5.7)
Dentistry	14	0	14	1	20	3	48	4	(7.7)
Education	13	1	8	3	4	3	25	7	(21.9)
Chemical Eng.	3	0	5	0	4	0	12	0	(0.0)
Civil & Mech. Eng.	11	0	8	0	3	0	22	0	(0.0)
Elec. Eng.	17	0	16	0	13	0	46	0	(0.0)
Metallurgy & Mtls. Sci.	7	0	4	0	2	0	13	0	(0.0)
Fine Arts	10	2	21	0	8	1	39	3	(7.1)
Law	21	0	6	0	2	1	29	1	(3.3)
Med.-Preclinical	37	2	22	2	24	3	83	7	(7.8)
Nursing	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	5	(83.3)
Social Work	6	2	3	2	8	3	17	7	(29.1)
Vet. Medicine	29	1	25	2	28	4	82	7	(7.9)
Wharton	85	1	51	1	77	4	213	6	(2.7)
Totals	434	11	264	20	316	46	1014	77	(7.0)
% Female, By Rank	(2.5)		(7.0)		(12.7)		(7.0)		

### Appendix II

Distribution of Fully-Affiliated Faculty, Other Ranks, By School, Rank, and Sex

School	Lecturer		Instructor		Other		Total		% Fem.
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Allied Medical	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	6	(100.0)
Annenberg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—
Graduate A. & S.	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	(0.0)
College	2	2	19	3	5	2	26	7	(21.2)
Dentistry	2	0	6	3	9	0	17	3	(15.0)
Education	4	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	(50.0)
Chemical Eng.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—
Civil & Mech. Eng.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	(0.0)
Elec. Eng.	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	(0.0)
Metallurgy & Mtls. Sci.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—
Fine Arts	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	(0.0)
Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—
Med.-Preclinical	0	0	5	1	14	6	19	7	(26.9)
Nursing	0	2	1	27	1	12	2	41	(95.3)
Social Work	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	(42.9)
Vet. Medicine	0	0	13	0	2	4	15	4	(21.1)
Wharton	23	4	7	0	7	2	37	6	(13.9)
Totals	38	14	53	39	40	28	131	81	(38.2)
% Female, By Ranks	(26.9)		(42.4)		(41.2)		(38.2)		

# Appendix III

## Distribution of Fully-Affiliated Faculty, Professorial Ranks, By Department, Rank, and Sex

School/Department	Pro-fessor		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total		School/Department	Pro-fessor		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Allied Medical Professions	0	1	0	4	1	3	1	8	Law	21	0	6	0	2	1	29	1
Annenberg	7	0	2	0	3	0	12	0	Medicine-Preclinical	9	0	3	0	1	0	13	0
Graduate Arts and Sciences:									Anatomy	2	0	4	0	6	0	12	0
American Civilization	2	0	2	0	4	0	8	0	Biochemistry	4	1	2	1	8	0	14	2
Classical									Phys. Bio.	3	0	2	0	1	0	6	0
Archaeology	1	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	Medical Genetics	4	0	4	0	1	1	9	1
Folklore and Folklife	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	Microbiology	6	0	3	1	1	0	10	1
History and Phil. of Science	0	0	1	0	3	0	4	0	Pharmacology	9	1	4	0	6	2	19	3
Oriental Studies	7	0	6	1	5	0	18	1	Physiology	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	5
South Asia									Nursing	6	2	3	2	8	3	17	7
Reg. Studies	0	0	2	0	3	1	5	1	Social Work								
College:									Veterinary Medicine:								
Anthropology	11	0	4	0	5	0	20	0	Animal Biology	10	1	5	2	5	1	20	4
Astronomy	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	Clinical Studies	13	0	14	0	15	2	42	2
Biology	15	0	5	0	3	1	23	1	Pathobiology	6	0	6	0	8	1	20	1
Chemistry	15	0	5	1	5	0	25	1	Wharton:								
Classical Studies	5	0	1	0	2	0	8	0	Accounting	5	0	0	0	7	0	12	0
English	20	0	6	0	15	10	41	10	Business Law	2	0	3	0	1	0	6	0
Geology	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	0	Economics	16	0	9	0	14	0	39	0
German	5	0	1	0	3	0	9	0	Finance	9	1	8	0	6	1	23	2
History	7	0	9	0	7	0	23	0	Industry	9	0	9	0	12	0	30	0
History of Art	3	0	2	0	4	0	9	0	Insurance	3	0	0	0	3	0	6	0
Linguistics	6	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	Marketing and Intl. Bus.	6	0	6	0	5	0	17	0
Mathematics	19	0	3	0	5	0	27	0	Political Science	12	0	4	1	12	3	28	4
Music	2	0	7	0	1	0	10	0	Regional Science	3	0	3	0	4	0	10	0
Philosophy	4	0	0	1	8	0	12	1	Sociology	10	0	5	0	8	0	23	0
Physics	19	0	10	0	17	0	46	0	Statistics and Oper. Res.	10	0	4	0	5	0	19	0
Psychology	11	0	7	0	9	1	27	1	TOTALS	434	11	264	20	316	46	1014	77
Religious Thought	3	0	3	0	2	0	8	0	Addendum								
Romance Languages	11	0	0	0	8	3	19	3	School/Department	Pro-fessor		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total	
Slavic Languages	3	0	0	1	2	2	5	3		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Dentistry:									Medicine-Clinical:								
Biochemistry	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	Anesthesia	2	0	5	1	9	1	16	2
Fixed Prosthodontics	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	Community Medicine	3	0	1	0	3	2	7	2
Histology	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	0	Dermatology	5	0	0	0	3	0	8	0
Microbiology	2	0	1	0	2	1	5	1	Medicine	27	0	32	0	35	2	94	2
Occlusion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Neurology	2	0	8	0	5	1	15	1
Operative Dentistry	1	0	2	0	1	1	4	1	Obstetrics and Gynecology	5	0	7	1	6	1	18	2
Oral Hygiene	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	Ophthalmology	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	0
Oral Medicine and Diag.	3	0	2	0	1	0	6	0	Orthopaedic Surgery	2	0	2	0	2	0	6	0
Orthodontics	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	Otolaryngology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peridontics	2	0	3	0	2	0	7	0	Pathology	13	0	5	1	10	2	28	3
Prosthetic Dent.	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	Pediatrics	11	1	13	3	11	1	35	5
Other departments	3	0	3	0	7	0	13	0	Physical Med. and Rehab.	1	0	2	0	2	1	5	1
Education	13	1	8	3	4	3	25	7	Psychiatry	11	1	6	0	8	1	25	2
Chemical Engineering	3	0	5	0	4	0	12	0	Radiology	8	0	3	0	9	0	20	0
Civil and Mechanical Eng.	11	0	8	0	3	0	22	0	Research								
Electrical Engineering	17	0	16	0	13	0	46	0	Medicine	1	0	0	0	3	0	4	0
Metallurgy and Mtls. Science	7	0	4	0	2	0	13	0	Surgery	22	0	7	0	13	1	42	1
Fine Arts:									Therapeutic Research	2	0	0	2	0	1	2	3
Architecture	2	1	4	0	1	1	7	2	Sub-totals	117	2	93	8	119	14	329	24
City and Reg. Planning	5	1	6	0	1	0	12	1	Percent female	(1.7)		(7.9)		(10.5)		(6.8)	
Fine Arts	2	0	5	0	2	0	9	0									
Landscape Architecture	1	0	6	0	4	0	11	0									

## STATUS OF WOMEN (Continued)

The distribution of women faculty by school should also be remarked. Women constitute a distinct majority of the faculty at the professorial ranks in the Schools of Allied Medical Professions and Nursing. They represent more than 20 percent of the faculty in the Graduate School of Education and in the School of Social Work. In all other schools women comprise less than 10 percent of the faculty, with no women at all in the Annenberg School and in the four Schools of Engineering. To phrase it in another way, more than one-third of the female faculty are found in four schools: SAMP, Nursing, Education and Social Work. The faculty of these four schools comprise only 6 percent of the total University faculty at the professorial ranks.

To ascertain the current number of fully-affiliated men and women in the various academic ranks in each department of the University, the Committee distributed two questionnaires. One was sent to all department chairmen, the other to all schools with teaching faculties.

The results are presented in Appendices I, II and III. Appendix I lists the number of faculty in the professorial ranks by sex, rank and school. Appendix II gives the number of fully-affiliated faculty members in other ranks. Departmental enumerations for the professorial ranks are given in Appendix III. The enumeration involves all academic departments within the University except the clinical departments of the School of Medicine. Because of the special and numerous problems of the affiliation and salary status of individuals in these departments, we propose to consider them separately although an initial enumeration appears as an Addendum to Appendix III. A special subcommittee has been appointed to study partial affiliation in the School of Medicine and a separate report will be made later in the semester.

Statistics in Appendix I indicate that of the 77 women enumerated, 14 percent are full professors,\* while 60 percent are assistant professors. Correspondingly, 43 percent of the men are full professors and 31 percent are assistant professors. Furthermore, as seen in Appendix II, women are relatively more conspicuous in the ranks below assistant professor than in those above: they constitute 27 percent of the lecturers, 42 percent of the instructors and 41 percent of those in other ranks (mainly associates and research associates).

Further information on the concentration of women faculty can be drawn from Appendix III. Among 72 departments of the University (counting as one department each SAMP, Annenberg, Education, Law, Nursing, Social Work and the four Schools of Engineering), 43 have no women faculty at the professorial ranks, 15 have one woman at the professorial rank and 14 have two or more women faculty members at the professorial ranks. In addition to the concentration of women already noted in SAMP, Nursing, Education and Social Work, a significant concentration of women also appears in the Department of English at the assistant professor level.

### Difficulties in Gathering Data

Inadequate record-keeping in various parts of the University limited the scope of this study. While our data may be the most accurate presently available, we are under no illusion that it is absolutely correct. Where the same information was obtained from different sources, numerous discrepancies were noted. For example, the information on distribution of the faculty by rank within a department could usually be compared with records from school and University administrative offices, and attempts were made to correct all errors which could be detected. However, data on salaries and length of time at rank could not be confirmed and the accuracy of this information must remain in doubt.

Numerous difficulties were also encountered in attempting to calculate the number of Ph.D.'s awarded, by sex, in a year. The Graduate Groups provided us with one set of figures and the Registrar with another grossly different tally. Three conflicting figures were given us on the number of graduate students. Because of inaccurate data and difficulty in crosschecking replies, no study of graduate students appears in this report.

\* In addition to the 11 full professors tabulated in Appendix I, there are two in the clinical departments of Medicine: one in Pediatrics and one in Psychiatry (with a joint appointment in Sociology).

Many schools keep no records on the number of graduate student applicants they have in a year; some do not make any breakdown as to sex. Many departments do not keep extensive faculty work records. Some are unable to complete salary data because of complicated budget arrangements which change from year to year. Many departments do not keep complete records on the number of faculty considered for appointment and promotion and the results of such consideration. Extensive data on termination of appointments were apparently unobtainable. It is essential that the University give attention to maintaining accurate records.

*We recommend that the administration publish annually for each department, by sex, the number of a) faculty at each rank, b) graduate students enrolled and c) Ph.D.'s and Doctorates granted.*

*Next week in Almanac, the Cohn Committee report continues with data on Myths Relating to the Scarcity of Qualified Women and other subjects, and gives further recommendations on the status of women.*

---

## NEWS IN BRIEF

---

### HUMAN RESOURCES (Continued)

education and an analysis of the vast education and manpower data-collection systems. In addition to conducting some studies itself, the board will stimulate studies by other groups.

Russell Sage Foundation has pledged \$50,000 a year for five years as partial support.

The new Human Resources Board expects to give early consideration to such questions of higher education as: How do the American society and economy benefit from the increasingly more costly investment in higher education? Is a national wave of 'credentialitis' creating an artificial demand for undergraduate and graduate degrees? Is formal education really necessary to provide manpower for many jobs that now require college degrees? Are the beneficiaries of education—the individual, the employer, and society—sharing fairly in education costs?

Unlike short-lived groups established to produce a single report on a specific topic, the new board hopes to take a larger and longer view of human resources problems. Other possible topics for exploration: the effects of longer life expectancy and earlier retirement on the individual and on manpower utilization; retraining opportunities for persons at all skill levels who are forced to or wish to change occupations in mid-career; effects on manpower utilization of changes in government policy, such as reduced defense spending or approval of family-assistance programs; and long-range trends indicated by the wealth of education and employment data collected by government and private agencies.

### PERFORMING ARTS

Richard L. Kirschner has been named Acting Director of Performing Arts at the Annenberg Center for Communication Arts and Sciences, Dean George Gerbner announced this week.

Mr. Kirschner remains Managing Director of the Center. A proposal to consolidate the two positions into a single directorship has been sent to the University Performing Arts Council by the Directors' Group of the Annenberg Center and The Annenberg School of Communications.

*Almanac is edited by Karen C. Gaines at the University News Bureau, 524 Franklin Building.*



# THE ASSEMBLY

## ASSEMBLY ELECTION

At its spring membership meeting Thursday, April 15, at 1 p.m. in Room 200 College Hall, the Administrative Assembly will elect officers for 1971-72. The slate forwarded by Mrs. Linda Koons, chairman of the nominating committee:

For Chairman-elect: Gene P. Abel; Alice F. Emerson.

For Secretary-elect: George Kidd, Jr.; Gloria K. Olmstead.

For the six places on the Executive Committee: Alfred F. Beers; Helena F. Clark; Manuel Doxer; Robert M. Ferrell; Norman S. Fink; Karen C. Gaines; Arthur J. Letcher; James L. Malone; Margo P. Marshall; Anthony Merritt; Ted A. Nash; Hugh P. O'Doherty; William G. Owen; James H. Robinson; Shirley H. Smith.

Taking office on that date will be Gerald L. Robinson, Dean of Residential Life, as chairman of the Assembly, and John P. Butler, Director of Capital Programs, as secretary. They succeed John R. Kershner, Assistant to the Vice Provost for Research, and Davis B. Oat, Business Administrator of the Laboratory for Research in the Structure of Matter.

## A-1 SALARY SURVEY

In collaboration with the Personnel Department, the Research Committee, Administrative Assembly conducted a survey this year to determine in general terms, the comparative status of University A-1 salary scales.

After reviewing all A-1 job classifications, the Committee selected a representative sampling of 28 titles, most of which have counterpart classifications in both industry and government.

The Committee then selected the organizations with which it wished to exchange salary data: In the field of *education*, three state affiliated institutions (Temple, Penn State and Pittsburgh), four "Ivy" schools (Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth and Princeton), five nationally known universities (Maryland, Virginia, Rice, Texas and Stanford) and two local medical schools (Hahnemann and Jefferson).

For comparisons with local industry, the Committee had access to the autumn report of the Philadelphia Salary Survey Group which embraces 68 major industrial, commercial and financial organizations.

For its comparison with government rates, the Committee selected the City of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia School District, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Federal Civil Service complex.

Using a convenient questionnaire form, the Committee requested of each participating organization, the established salary range for each listed position. From these ranges the midpoints were calculated and used as a basis for comparison. (See table.)

As reflected by the tabulation, A-1 salary levels at the University of Pennsylvania, on the average, appear to be approximately 18% below counterpart levels in the local employment market.

When compared with other selected educational institutions, University of Pennsylvania scales average 13% lower than their competition. In comparison with industry, they fall 18% below the local average. The largest differential, however, is with government counterparts in relation with which University scales fall 24% below the average of local, state and national levels.

Reflecting the influence of the supply and demand factors, and perhaps internal pressures, there are some significant deviations in competitive status among the various job families. The most favorable competitive posture at the University is enjoyed by Data Processing, where scales average 2% above its educational competition, 7% below the industrial average, and 14% below the government average. In descending order are the averages of the Library, Engineering, Accounting and Administrative categories.

Supporting these summary statements are tabulations of detailed salary data for each of the 28 positions embraced by the survey. These will be used, as were similar surveys in the past, as guidelines for the annual review of all A-1 salary classifications in collaboration with appropriate representatives of each organizational area.

It should be noted however, that unlike A-3 scale increases, A-1 scale hikes are not accompanied by automatic salary adjustments. On the other hand, A-1 scale limitations have not directly exerted a repressive effect upon merit increases, because our more flexible A-1 scales have been used essentially as compensation guidelines rather than rigid salary control devices.

Accordingly, salary improvement for A-1 employees in the past has been confined almost entirely to annual merit increases. It is important to note too that the magnitude of these increases is determined individually by department heads with due regard to the incumbent's performance, and of course, within the limitations of the department's fund allocation, which as you know, is a pre-determined percent of payroll.

Gene P. Abel, Chairman

W. Austin Bishop, Secretary

Manuel Doxer

Joel E. Kinley

Arthur J. Letcher, Co-chairman

A comparison of selected A-1 salary scales with *education*, *industry* and *government* counterparts, reported by job families and shown in terms of their deviation from respective midpoint averages:

EMPLOYMENT AREAS					
Job Families and No. of Titles	No. at Penn	Educ- tion	Indus- try	Govern- ment	All Areas
Accounting (4)	13	-22%	-15%	-30%	-22%
Administrative (13)	44	-20	-33	-24	-26
Data Processing (3)	11	+ 2	- 7	-14	- 6
Engineering (3)	3	-14	-23	-23	-20
Library (5)	67	- 5	—	-28	-16
Average(s)	138	-13%	-18%	-24%	-18%

## EMPLOYEE BENEFITS SURVEY

An item analysis of the ten major employee benefits included in this survey is presented in the accompanying tabulation of *Modal Patterns* of fourteen major *educational institutions* and eleven major *local industrial organizations*.

When compared with *industry*, the University's benefit package contains three (3) items which do not compare favorably, namely: Retirement, Life Insurance and Blue Cross/Blue Shield benefits; three (3) items are approximately equal: Major Medical, death gratuity and tuition for the employee; four (4) items in which University benefits excel, namely: long term disability coverage, tuition for spouse, tuition for children and paid vacations.

(Continued on Page 8)

**Modal Patterns of Employee Benefits  
provided by  
Major Educational Institutions and Industrial Organizations**

<b>Benefit</b>	<b>Penn</b>	<b>Major Educational Institutions</b>	<b>Major Industrial Organizations</b>
1. Retirement Program	Partial	Partial	Full
2. Life Insurance Plan	Partial	Partial	Full
3. Blue Cross/ Blue Shield	0	Partial	Partial
4. Major Medical Insurance	Partial	Partial	Partial
5. Long Term Disability	All	All	0
6. Death Gratuity	Yes	No	Yes
7. Tuition—Self	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. Tuition—Spouse	Partial	No	No
9. Tuition—Children	Yes	Yes	No
10. Vacation	1 yr./5 wks.	1 yr./4 wks.	1 yr./2 wks. 15 yrs./4 wks.

*Legend:* Tabulation indicates full or partial payment of premiums, where appropriate. Also indicated on the identification of other benefits, and the length of paid vacations.

The University's competitive position among other major educational institutions is also favorable. In six (6) items our benefits are the same as those offered by other institutions: Retirement, Life Insurance, Major Medical, long term disability, tuition for self, tuition for children; in three (3) items University benefits excel, namely: death gratuity, tuition for spouse and paid vacations; in one important area—Blue Cross/Blue Shield—we fall short of the modal pattern in that the University does not contribute to the payment of premiums. The mode in education is *partial premium payments*.

**SCUE SUMMARY (Continued)**

15. . . . that Thematic Learning Centers be created in former fraternity houses.
16. . . . the offerance of a Work/Study program that would allow students to take a semester off to work in a job related to their major.
17. . . . the creation of a Midyear Individualized Research Period.
18. . . . the establishment of satellite campuses in Washington and New York.
19. . . . the option of a three year intensified major as the first half of a six year Ph.D. program.

**The Faculty: We recommend . . .**

20. . . . a major review and change in the tenure system.
21. . . . the establishment of a formula for determining the teaching load of faculty based on a fifteen hour in class week.
22. . . . the integration of Undergraduate Education under the office of a Vice Provost level officer.
23. . . . the retention of the current structure of the Admissions and Financial Aid Office and its transfer to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education as the line superior to the Dean.
24. . . . the creation of three cross-budgeted structural functional undergraduate divisions: Social Sciences and Administration, Physical and Applied Sciences and the Humanities.
25. . . . a thoroughgoing review of undergraduate professional education in Engineering and Business.

# THE COUNCIL

## CALL TO MEETING

The next meeting of the University Council will be held on Wednesday, April 14, at 4 p.m. in the Council Room of the Furness Building. The agenda will include further changes in the Council By-laws and recommendations of the Engineering Faculties on awarding the Bachelor of Science in Engineering.

## COUNCIL REALIGNMENT

The Secretary of the Corporation has forwarded the following to the Deans of the Schools regarding realignment of constituencies:

At the special meeting of the University Council on March 24 a resolution was adopted authorizing the forthcoming election of faculty constituency representatives in accordance with a change in the bylaws which will be approved at the April meeting. The election of faculty representatives must proceed at once. This letter is to ask your cooperation in expediting the special arrangements required in the transition period.

The resolution calls for a total of 27 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 the following provision: the aforementioned eligible faculty members within each constituency may decide on an annual basis whether or not to extend constituency membership to those Associates and Instructors on their faculties who are fully-affiliated and have completed their professional preparation.

Individuals holding administrative posts above the rank of department chairman shall *not* be eligible for election.

The new allocation of constituency representatives is as follows:

College . . . . .	7	Wharton . . . . .	4
Graduate Arts . . . . .		Medicine . . . . .	4
and Sciences . . . . .	1	Law . . . . .	1
Engineering . . . . .	2	Veterinary . . . . .	1
Fine Arts . . . . .	1	Dental . . . . .	1
Social Work . . . . .	1	Nursing . . . . .	1
Allied Medical . . . . .	1	Education . . . . .	1
		Annenberg . . . . .	1

One-half of the representatives shall hereafter be elected each year. In order to facilitate the changeover, the Steering Committee has determined that all representatives whose terms on the present Council are due to expire in May 1972 shall be deemed to have completed their service as of May 1971 (with the exception of the representative in old constituency #8, who was recently elected as a replacement with a term to expire in 1972). Representatives on the present Council with terms due to expire in May 1973 will continue as incumbents until May 1972, subject to the consideration below.

The new by-law will state that "in all cases where more than one representative is to be elected, mutually exclusive constituencies shall be established by the faculties involved by vote of the members of the respective faculties." *Deans of Schools to which this regulation applies are required to arrange for the establishment of constituencies at once.*

New constituencies should be formed without regard to the incumbents. Continuing members of Council who are members of one of the new constituencies will be considered as the constituency representative. If two continuing members of Council are members of the same new constituency, the representative will be determined by a coin-toss, and the term of the other member will be terminated.

When the above questions have been resolved the required constituency lists and nominating forms will be sent by the Secretary to all constituencies in which elections will be required in April.