
NEWS IN BRIEF

100 FACULTY FOR SEPTEMBER 8

Colleagues! We want to have a Faculty-Student Day for incoming freshmen September 8, 1971.

We want to have all-day or half-day ventures that show how a particular field and the personalities of its teachers apply to a problem or creative enterprise.

For instance, students might work with the Wharton Forecasting Model to consider the effects of certain kinds of student (or labor) changes on the economy . . . work with a playwright to develop (or else *make*) a scene . . . develop basic principles of student-society relations with a philosopher . . . visit the magistrate courts with a lawyer. And so on, for an endless list of possibilities.

Possibilities become realities with DOERS. We want you, at least one hundred of the twelve hundred faculty, to dream up something and to *do* it on September 8 with the incoming freshmen.

Will you? Will you take ten or fifteen new students for the day or part of it and give them an experience to remember, a real introduction to the personalities and the intellectual and research life of your corner of the campus? Call Mrs. Deborah Kurz (8596) by May 19, no later. We'd call you, if we knew who you were! There must be a lot of imagination at Penn. How about some for September 8?

Alice F. Emerson, Dean of Students
James F. Ross, Professor of Philosophy

BLOOD DONORS FOR MAY 12

A special drive for faculty and staff blood donors will be held from 10 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Wednesday, May 12, in the Bowl Room of Houston Hall.

Giving a pint of blood provides the donor and his or her family with an unlimited supply of blood whenever needed anywhere in the U. S. It also supplies the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania with its safest blood supply: the incidence of hepatitis is ten times less in volunteer donors. For more information, or to set a time for giving May 12, call 662-3455.

OPEN LETTER: Vice Provost Search Committee

The Consultative Committee on a Vice Provost for Research welcomes recommendations of suitable candidates for the office of Vice Provost for Research. These should be sent to Professor Eliot Stellar, 243 Anatomy-Chemistry (Phone 8820) as soon as possible. Supporting information would be very welcome.

The Committee, named by President Meyerson to advise on filling one of the functions now being carried by Associate Provost John N. Hobstetter, is chaired by Professor Stellar.

Its members are Professors David E. Boyce (Regional Science), Neal E. Cutler (Political Science), Robert E. Davies (Molecular Biology), Adelaide Delluva (Biochemistry/Vet), C. Nelson Dorny (Electrical Engineering), Alan M. Laties (Ophthalmology/Med), Charles C. Price (Chemistry), and Julius Margolis (Fels Center); Ross Abrams and John McKittrick of the Graduate Students Association; and Eric Fisher, Community of Students.

TOWN MEETING II: May 11

President Meyerson and Provost Reitz have called a May 11 follow-up to the May 4 town meeting to discuss the office of ombudsman at the University. The Provost will attend Town

(Continued on Page 4)

IN THIS ISSUE:

- ASSEMBLY: Q & A with Martin Meyerson
- AAU: The Role of Colleges in Military Officer Education
- A Panel of Community Advisors
- Unemployment Compensation

Almanac

Volume 17, Number 10

May 11, 1971

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

FINE ARTS DEAN: Peter Shephard

Peter F. Shephard has been named dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts at the University of Pennsylvania, effective September 1.

Mr. Shephard, president of the Royal Institute of British Architects and partner in the London firm Shephard and Epstein, succeeds G. Holmes Perkins, whose retirement was announced in February, 1970.

In announcing the appointment, President Martin Meyerson said, "Peter Shephard is one of those unique people in the world who represents an amalgam of the professional fields of architecture, landscape architecture and city planning. Though his career seemingly has been more in the practice of his professions than in academic pursuits, he has in fact devoted himself to education. As current president of the Royal Institute of British Architects, he has concentrated on the educational issues in this field in British universities. Throughout his career he has been a writer. He knows our University well, having served often as a visiting member of our faculty. Building on the outstanding success of Dean G. Holmes Perkins, we look to Peter Shephard to develop the school further in the years ahead."

"Mr. Shephard will be an outstanding dean," said Dean Perkins. "He has made important contributions in Britain as president of the Royal Institute of British Architects, the Institute of Landscape Architects, and the Architectural Association of London and has been extremely interested in the development of architecture and planning education."

Mr. Shephard was one of the two architects to formulate the master plan for England's first New Town, Stevenage, and later became Deputy Chief Architect and Planner to the Stevenage New Town Development Corporation. He has also served as planning consultant to the British cities of Guildford and Winchester.

His buildings include housing for the London County Council and other London boroughs; schools at Bromley and Battersea, London; and structures for the Universities of Liverpool, Keele, Winchester and Oxford. He devised the master plan and building designs for the University of Lancaster in England.

(Continued on Page 4)

"Somehow the new administration has got to get a tone established . . ."

President Meyerson at the Assembly: Questions and Answers

As guest speaker at the Administrative Assembly's spring membership meeting April 15, President Martin Meyerson talked briefly but answered questions at length. Some excerpts from the session:

I suppose the ideal organizational arrangement of a university would be one in which almost nothing came to the attention of the President. I don't think that will happen, but I do think that we have to develop a pattern in which more of the decisions are taken on a decentralized basis.

When Harry Truman had a poster put up in his office saying "*The Buck Stops Here*" it was a fine poster, except it seemed to me it was a very inappropriate poster. Its implication was that those things that get bucked should come there, whereas the real problem is to keep them from coming to the President's office. We should instead have them taken care of as close to the issue as can be.

* * *

We have to make cuts—rather serious cuts—and these are going to hurt. But if we succeed in what we are trying to do and if the new government in Harrisburg is mindful of what we are trying to convey, we ought to be in a position where we can in fact balance the budget within the two-year period that the Trustees have given us.

But I insist that we are not going to balance the budget at the expense of salaries and raises to our staff. It just can't be on that basis. I was hoping we would have better information on this whole matter by the time the Trustees meet in early May, but it is clear that we won't because the Government budget message won't be forthcoming until after our Trustees' meeting.

Q. Some of us in the Administrative Assembly are very much aware of the distinction between the academic administration and what is often referred to as "other" administration. Some of us feel that the concept of education is rather broader than what's implied in changing the titles of the non-academic deans, for example.

A. Let me comment about the origin of the title "Dean." It has a very special origin. The way we use it comes out of the medieval era, as a clerical term—specifically, a monitor over ten monks. We have used it in almost a clerical way generally in those activities where a Dean has some kind of flock. A Dean in a School of Medicine has a flock of students and teachers (and I would like to regard these really as a single group, that of learners). A Dean of Students has that kind of flock, and I think the Task Force is very wrong in that regard.* But I am not making policy on the podium here; there are others who will have to go into that. I think the Dean of Students is somebody who has important responsibility for a very large clientele, to interact with in the historic way that a Dean would. But in the case of somebody who is head of admissions, I would make an important distinction—not that one is more important than the other, but only that titles ought to be as clearly related to function as can be.

Something a lot deeper than that—the impression that there are two breeds in a university, one breed in the center

and another breed made up of everybody else—is one reason why the Administrative Assembly was started. I don't think a good university can flirt with that kind of division sharp and clear; it just doesn't work.

Q. How would you see the Assembly as most effective? As it is now, in an unofficial status, or with a vote on some of the University's committees or on the Council?

A. I have been debating whether what is called the President's Staff Conference should be renamed as a Cabinet, with the idea that if it were, and if there were people with specific kinds of representation in it, the Cabinet would become a kind of clearinghouse for information. If we were to do this I would want to have in that Cabinet the head of the Administrative Assembly, whoever that happened to be. For example, we are moving ahead to establish an ombudsman at the University as the person (I hope one person will do) to whom complaints will come. My concern is that the ombudsman, whether man or woman, serve for every part of the University. To make sure that that is the case, I intend to ask an advisory committee to help to choose the ombudsman, and to ask the Assembly to have a member on that group.

How can the Administrative Assembly be more helpful? Somehow the new administration has got to get a tone established among its administrators where they instinctively feel there are certain things that are the important things to the university, and go ahead and do those. We ought to be a University where in almost everything we do, we feel that we are really tops. We recognize that we have lots of limitations, and that there are kinds of things that we just won't be able to do; but of those things that we do do, we must make sure that we do them at the highest level of quality. To do this will take our ingenuity, not only individual ingenuity but collective ingenuity; I would guess within this group there are talents that go far beyond particular assignments that every person here has, and how do we create a situation in which those talents can freely come to the floor? We can all help each other in ways that may not relate to our specific chores.

Q. Do you think Admissions and Financial Aid should remain together?

A. Yes. The decisions that are made are so thoroughly linked that you really can't separate one from the other. I suppose if I had any question at all it would be on graduate financial aid. Perhaps all admissions, graduate and undergraduate, ought to be together. Certainly insofar as the undergraduate admissions and financial aid are concerned it would be a great mistake to think of them separately.

Q. Do you expect response from this group to your proposals for Consideration by the University Community?

A. I would be just delighted if the Assembly would regard one of its responsibilities to respond to these and subsequent proposals that Curtis and I may be making, and in turn I think we would be delighted to have you make suggestions to us in policy matters that you think we ought to take up with the University Community.

*Task Force Report, page 29.

THE ROLE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN MILITARY OFFICER EDUCATION

Following is a statement approved April 27 by the Association of American Universities and submitted to the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the National Association for Equal Educational Opportunity in Higher Education, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges for consideration.

American colleges and universities have long made a national contribution by playing an important role in professional military officer education. Through Reserve Officer Training Corps programs, they now produce the great majority of officers for the nation's military services.

Officer education, like other fields of professional training, requires continuous reassessment and updating. In this belief, the major national associations representing institutions of higher education have united to consider changes aimed at strengthening ROTC programs.

The statement below is based on a meeting of representatives of these associations on March 15, 1971. Several of the associations have in the past issued separate statements reflecting their particular traditions and philosophy regarding ROTC. These are appended. The joint statement expresses common agreement on matters of program and policy.

The following proposals are commended to the Department of Defense and the Congress:

I. Name Change

The name of the program should be changed in the authorizing law from Reserve Officers Training Corps to (Army, Navy, Air Force) Officer Education Program, thereby more accurately reflecting the broad mission of preparing young men and women for commissioned service in all components of the Armed Forces.

II. General Principles

A. Shared Responsibility

The authorizing law should be revised to provide that the curriculum of the several programs shall be developed and established as a joint and mutual responsibility of the participating academic institution and the respective military department. The curriculum agreed upon under this shared responsibility should be duly documented by contract or comparable form of agreement between the institution and the military department.

B. Flexibility

Consistent with the central objectives of the Officer Education programs, maximum flexibility should be permitted to adapt the program to local conditions on individual campuses. Each institution should have the latitude to work out appropriate arrangements with the military services.

III. Policy Recommendations

A. Program Status

The program should be afforded an institutional status comparable to that of a department or similar academic unit, and the institution should establish, in accordance with its normal governing procedures, a standing committee with general cognizance and responsibility for all facets of the program.

B. Faculty Rank

The authorizing law should be revised to allow the participating academic institution to accord the senior military officer detailed to each program a position consistent with the institution's rules of rank and title for a senior head of program. The said position should carry with it the usual perquisites and prerogatives of a person holding that position.

C. Academic Credit

The matter of academic credit for particular courses of instruction should be determined at each institution on the same basis as is credit for other courses offered by the institution.

D. Civilian Instruction

The participating academic institutions and the military departments should seek the maximum appropriate use of civilian faculties in course instruction.

E. Technical Components

While utilizing the resources of the university for the education of officers in the liberal arts, scientific and specialized fields, the military departments should continue to explore ways to shift, to the maximum degree possible, technical-descriptive material and field-type work to short-term or extended periods of training offered in a military environment (with appropriate financial assistance to the students in order to compensate for lost earning opportunities during the summer or other training periods).

F. Appointment of Military Instructors

The military departments should nominate to the institutions for the Officer Education Program military instructors who have advanced academic degrees, competence in appropriate subject matter areas and demonstrated competence in teaching.

G. Role of the Military Instructor

The participating academic institutions and the military departments, mutually, should recognize that during the period an officer is in residence, he is in a position of dual responsibility and accountability. He is at once responsible and accountable to his academic superior in the institution through established institutional channels and to his military superiors through regular military channels. Extra military duties for officers while in residence should be minimal.

The institution should recognize that like any other academic program, the Officer Education Program requires co-curricular and non-classroom contact between its military instructional personnel and its students on a regular and continuing basis.

H. Military Orientation

It is appropriate and necessary that students being prepared for positions as officers in the Armed Forces become acquainted with the customs, traditions and ceremonies of their services. Traditionally this has been accomplished through mutually agreed upon procedures involving a reasonable amount of military assembly, wearing of the uniform, and other experiences that assist in orienting the students to their military service and constitute practical training in leadership and command.

I. Minority Participation*

The military departments should continue their efforts to establish additional units of the program at institutions attended by substantial numbers of minority group students, and, as an initial goal, at least to double minority enrollments in established programs.

J. Disenrollment Proceedings

The military departments should continue to invite institutional participation in disenrollment proceedings.

K. Program Evaluation

The academic community at each host institution should establish procedures for a regular periodic evaluation of the program, either through a locally appointed group or by means of a board of visitors including both military members and civilian academicians.

The military departments should augment their present program evaluation procedures by including academic representatives in groups visiting officer education units on the campuses.

IV. Financing

The Department of Defense legislative proposals for new financing—more scholarships (with appropriate concern for distribution among the services), increased subsistence allowances, and institutional "cost sharing"—should be adopted in the best interest of all parties concerned. In particular, the associations support, as a first step toward the objective of full reimbursement, the proposal to provide the institution \$500 per commissioned officer graduated.

*Note: Paul Cooke, President, D. C. Teachers College, has indicated he will suggest alternative language under this point.

For West Philadelphia:

A Panel of Campus Advisors

President Martin Meyerson has announced the formation of a Panel of Community Advisors under Professor Robert H. Mundheim to advise local community groups in solution of urban problems such as housing, employment and transportation.

Mr. Mundheim, who is Fred Carr Professor of Law and Director of the Center for the Study of Financial Institutions in the Law School, will lead an effort to provide a pool of volunteer technical and professional advisors from the University.

The panel will be available to consult with community organizations at the invitation of those organizations, and with members of the University faculty and staff who are themselves involved with community development. The Office of the President and the Office of External Affairs will provide staff assistance to Mr. Mundheim for the panel's work.

"In aiding the West Philadelphia community and the larger Philadelphia region," the President said, "our greatest resource is the expertise of the faculty and other members of the University. That expertise in problems of finance, health, education, housing, transportation, safety, economic development and governmental administration can best be mobilized through voluntary efforts. That will be the charge of Professor Mundheim and his Panel of Community Advisors."

The new panel will work closely with the University Council's new Committee on Community Development which succeeds the former Committee on Continuing Education and Community Relations.

Efforts will be concentrated initially in the greater University City area of West Philadelphia and subsequently will cover more of the Philadelphia metropolitan area. A particular emphasis is the interdisciplinary nature of its activities in mobilizing academic resources—teaching as well as research—from several areas to address specific problems.

NEWS IN BRIEF (Continued from Page 1)

Meeting II, which begins at 11 a.m. in the Fine Arts Auditorium and is open to staff as well as faculty and students. Supervisors may release staff for attendance unless otherwise indicated in the procedures followed for summer "heat days" and optional holidays.

The town meeting is but one source of ideas in the University's planning toward an ombudsman, the President said following the May 4 meeting Professor Henry Abraham chaired. Members of the University are also forwarding written nominations and opinions on whether a single office, or a committee of ombudsmen, is preferred.

In his talk May 4, Professor Abraham described the governmental ombudsman of the Scandinavian countries, the academic ombudsman of several American universities, and the proposed ombudsman of this institution.

The simplest definition to emerge was "a buffer against unfairness on the part of the governmental authority," to whom the citizen can turn for redress without having to go to court. At Pennsylvania, the ombudsman role was suggested by the Task Force on Governance (pp. 63-64) and endorsed by the Senate and the Council, as one who will hear the complaints of all members of the University community. Segments of the university not represented on Council have been invited to send their own recommendations toward definition of the post to the Office of the President.

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

From the Director of Personnel

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Effective January 1, 1972, University employees along with the employees of all other institutions of higher learning will come under the protection of unemployment compensation. This new coverage results from the 1970 Amendments to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act signed into law by President Nixon in the most sweeping change in unemployment compensation since the program began nationally in 1936.

The Federal Act does not by its own terms cover these non-profit institutions. It requires instead that the states amend their individual laws to extend coverage to employees of colleges and universities, hospitals, and other nonprofit groups. Failing to accomplish this extension will be at the risk of having the state program decertified. The actual planning and implementing of the program at the University must await, then, Pennsylvania's legislative action. The Federal Act also does not control eligibility and disqualification, and the states will be generally free to establish their own rules and regulations.

The test for unemployment compensation eligibility is three-fold. For a person to receive benefits he or she:

- (1) must be able and available for employment;
- (2) must be free from disqualification; and
- (3) must not refuse suitable employment.

Disqualification would result from a voluntary quit or a separation due to misconduct.

The 1970 Amendments provide two special exclusions and one disqualification of benefit receipt for college and university employees. First, students cannot receive unemployment benefits based on work performed for their college or university. Second, student spouses employed as part of a total scholarship package for a student can be disqualified from receiving benefits if the employee is told of this fact at the beginning of the employment. Academic and research personnel are disqualified from receiving benefits during sabbatical leaves or during vacation periods if the employment relationship under the university will continue at the end of such absence, or if a relationship with another institution has been established prior to the beginning of the absence.

A major change in the new provisions concerns the financing of the program. Funding has been on a state and federal taxing basis with the employer covering the cost. The new Act will continue to provide coverage without employee contribution, but does require that the state law give each eligible non-profit organization the option either to reimburse the state for unemployment benefits attributable to service for that organization or pay contributions under the state's normal tax provisions.

Although the unemployment insurance program will be hitting colleges and universities at a time of real money shortages, the coverage will finally treat employees in higher education on the same level as their off-campus counterparts should they find themselves out of work through no fault of their own.

—Fred C. Ford

PETER SHEPHEARD (Continued from Page 1)

A 1936 graduate of the Liverpool School of Architecture at the University of Liverpool, Mr. Shephard was also a University Graduate Scholar there in the Department of Civic Design. Since 1959 he has been at Pennsylvania for three to six weeks a year as visiting professor of landscape architecture.